

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

House of Assembly

For the Period:

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

February 9, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in The Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of fifteen fishermen, these are inshore fishermen who live in the town of Chance Cove in Trinity Bay.

The prayer of this petition, Mr. Speaker, is along the following lines. "We the undersigned, members of the Newfoundland Fish, Food and Allied Workers are seeking legislation in this session of the House of Assembly, giving compensation benefits for fishermen equal to other workers, perhaps equal to offshore fishermen."

They go on to say, "that we feel that we are one of the main primary producers in this Province," and that they have been discriminated against long enough.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by fifteen inshore fishermen who live in the town of Chance Cove, Trinity Bay, The Minister of Fisheries is not here at the present moment, but a meeting was scheduled to be held in the Whitbourne area to - one of these regional meetings - to get questions from fishermen from the various communities in the Trinity Bay area. And I have no doubt that when that meeting is held, the meeting was cancelled or postponed because of a storm a couple of weeks ago, when the Minister of Fisheries plans to reschedule this meeting I am not aware of yet. However, I am sure that when this meeting is held that these same fishermen will be there with questions, of course, pertaining to Workmen's Compensation to inshore fishermen, among other things.

I assume that that meeting will be coming up in the Whitbourne area in the very near future and I dare say an announcement will be forthcoming by the Minister of Transportation

MR. CALIAN: and Communications regarding that matter. He made the announcement, I think, regarding the latest one at Bonavista.

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of this petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented by the member for Bellevue on behalf of fifteen of his constituents in Chance Cove.

I might point out, Sir, in supporting the petition that one of the great problems - incidentally, for the benefit of members, there is already a plan which includes the inshore fishery, the longliner fishermen and so forth. But one of the big problems, Sir, one of the big headaches that Workmen's Compensation have in a number of enquiries that I have made in the last year or so with the Workmen's Compensation Board, is that the inshore fishermen will not participate in the plan. They will not pay their contributions. And it is rather unfortunate because I am aware, Mr. Speaker, of one or two accidents that occurred.

One in my own district, down in Margaree, where the longliner people did not pay the Workmen's Compensation, although I understand from my enquiries I made to the Board that they were still entitled to benefits, that one of the men had his arm torn off in a winch. And even that, Sir, was not enough, I do not think, to make the skippers and the crewmen conscious of the fact that this was a very, very important service that they had and they were not really taking advantage of it. I do not know if it applies to the type of fishermen my hon. friend is talking about, the thirty, thirty-five foot boats or not. I believe it does. Perhaps the minister can tell us. But I believe the

MR. NEARY:

amendments that were made to the Workmen's Compensation Act a couple of years ago include all inshore fishermen. But the trouble is, Sir, the problem is that they are not taking advantage of the privilege that has been given them under the Workmen's Compensation Act. Nevertheless having said that, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition. I think that every worker should be covered by workmen's compensation. I do not know how you can overcome the problems of collecting the contributions from the skippermen and from the crew members of the boat. But it is a big problem, Sir, and I discussed it a couple of times with the Workmen's Compensation people and they tell me that they are only collecting a very, very small, a minute, a very, very small percentage of the contributions that they should be collecting from the inshore fishermen.

So, Sir, it gives me great pleasure to support the petition. I hope something can be worked out to improve the programme.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further petitions?

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I table the following regulations: The Legal Aid Regulations; Private Investigators and Security Guards. No. 27. Regulations, 1974: Summary Jurisdiction (Traffic Ticker) Regulations as amended; the The Securities Regulations and the Motor Carrier Regulations, 1976.

MR. SPEAKER: Before proceeding to the next routine order, the Leader of the Opposition posed the point a couple of days ago with respect to the tabling of material when it is required by the Statutes that it be tabled, whether in fact it would be necessary for an hon. minister to make a verbal presentation in doing so. As I understand it, it would not be necessary. The requirement of tabling could be fulfilled by giving the material to one of the officers of the House. Of course then hon. members would not automatically know what had been tabled. They would not necessarily

MR. SPEAKER:

automatically know because there would be no verbal reference to it.

MR. ROBERTS: It could be distributed.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, it could be distributed. Now there are a number of things tabled which are not necessarily distributed unless somebody wants them, unless somebody requests them.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, could a list be perhaps placed in each day's Hansard saying the following - we will come to it with answers in due course - the following orders have been deposited with the Clerk of the House, and a member then could - I am not even sure we need to distribute it because with these regulations now, in due course the Pages will bring them around and most of them will end up on the floor. It is a waste of photostat paper at a dime a sheet. It is a waste of that. Would it not be better really to deposit them with three or four copies, and if any member wants them - maybe one could go to each group and then if any member wants them he could send a note to the Clerk and the Clerk could arrange to send them.

MR. SPEAKER: It could be done that way and certainly lists would appear in Hansard of what had been tabled.

MR. NOLAN: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, if copies go to the press?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, of course.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. NOLAN: But I mean if we are not going to distribute them to each member of the House, I still think they should definitely, everything, go to the press.

MR. SPEAKER: Everything is certainly available to the press. I believe at times things are distributed, you know, by laws and that which could well be the press may not want, but once they are tabled, it is certainly public. It is certainly available.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Would that include material such as Special Warrants and other statutory items? I mean, where do you draw the line and

MR. DOODY:

who has the discretion to decide? I mean, some of these things are obviously of great interest and importance to the House.

MR. NOLAN: Surely documents of the House of Assembly should be available to the press.

MR. DOODY: I am not talking about the press. I am passing these things to you rather than officially tabling them and bringing them to the attention of the House.

Mr. Speaker.

Everything when it is tabled is available to the press.

MR. DOODY: I am sorry, Sir. I do not think I am making myself clear. I was thinking about the tabling of Special warrants. Can that be done by passing it to a member of the House, or should it be done formally within the House? I mean these are valid points.

MR. ROBERTS: The Speaker says it can be done.

MR. SPEAKER: It could technically be done and fulfill the requirement of being tabled without a verbal reference. It could technically be done that way. Therefore, the option would appear to depend upon the person tabling it.

MR. DOODY: Oh, I am sorry. Then I could pass the Auditor General's Report, the Public Accounts, Special Warrants and all these into the Clerk of the House, and there would be no form of -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker -

MR. DOODY: It is okay with me. I am not complaining.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPôile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously there is a dissension over this matter, Sir, and the only way to straighten it out, in my opinion, is to set up a Committee of the House, and go over it. No, you can do it in a matter of two or three days. Go over all the things that have to be tabled, and throw out the trash, and everything else then after that has to be tabled. That is the only sensible way to do it. Otherwise, Sir, we are going to have cover-ups. We are going to have the government sneaking things into the House.

MR. MURPHY: Assassination.

MR. NEARY: No, no, Sir. No, this is true. We just had an example of it from the Minister of Finance.

MR. MURPHY: Bah:

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that either we stick to the tradition, Sir, of announcing the things that are going to be laid on the table of the House or we draw up a new list of things to be tabled and throw out the trash.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The point as it now is is that there is no rule which would preclude a minister fulfilling the requirement to table if in fact he tabled without a verbal reference. And the further suggestion that the identification of anything tabled should appear in Hansard is certainly a valid one, and should be done.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my question is one which grows out of the Auditor General's Report, specially at this point, page 87, paragraph 75 which is headed, "No authority to enter into an agreement." And I think the first question - I have a number of supplementaries here - should be directed perhaps to the Minister of Tourism. Could the minister tell the House, Sir, what action has been taken to discipline the official, who is not named or identified, the senior official who saw fit to sign a contract for \$6,000 without, apparently, according to the Auditor General, any approval for the entering into that contract having been given by either the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or by the minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have not taken any disciplinary action, because I am not exactly aware of just what the situation is. I have asked my officials for an explanation. When I get that I will determine just what the situation is, and if any action is necessary.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.



MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is the minister accordingly indicating by his answer that the first he was aware of this situation was yesterday or the day before, or whenever it was that he first became aware of the Auditor General's Report upon the Public Accounts of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: As regards to the amount in question, I think where the Auditor General says, "\$2,000 was paid for the engaging of a person to do some special writing," that is my first knowledge of that particular situation. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the matter of entering into contracts has been a subject for discussion in my department on a number of occasions. And there are certain situations which preclude contracts for certain services. When I get the information I will be glad to make a more clear statement as to what those areas are. And I can say, however, that it is of concern to my officials. They have expressed concern to me on a number of occasions, that really it is a technicality within the act, and in fact there is a request, I think, at the moment to have the act amended to authorize certain officials and certainly myself to enter into contracts for limited amounts without the authorization of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: I shall not get into debate because I am not allowed, but the Minister regrettably failed to answer my question. May I ask then accordingly what he did not tell us when he became aware of the situation, whether it was yesterday or earlier—may I ask then what steps he has taken to ensure that this does not happen again, a situation where a senior official, by the minister's own admission unlawfully, improperly enters into agreements, contracts under which half of \$2000 was paid out?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: Approximately a month and a half ago, Mr. Speaker, the matter came to my attention in relation to the Auditor General's preliminary or draft comments which may or may not be included in the report. And my officials brought the matter to my attention, again, as I said, this having been a number of occasions as regards to this problem.

I became aware then that on certain occasions this kind of situation had been done or this kind of agreement had been entered into. Not necessarily a contract, Mr. Speaker, but authorization to provide a particular form of service without necessarily a fullfledged contract, and or without—

MR. ROBERTS: It does not have to be in writing.

MR. HICKEY: Yes, and/or without necessarily approval of myself or my colleagues. For my staff at that particular time this situation was not to be continued, and that we would have to look at the whole area to see if it could be sorted out. If it meant amending the Act I would have to take that to my colleagues and obtain approval. This has not been done up to now. And the best I can say at this point is that there is a request, I am quite sure, to the Justice Department asking for advise and a decision on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General does not say, so I must ask the minister, was anything done by the individual writer concerned in return for the \$2000 which was paid to him, and part of that—or growing out of that, was more, if something in fact was done, was more than \$2000 paid after the end of this fiscal year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKFY: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not want to say anything which is anything other than absolutely accurate. And as I said, I will certainly give a commitment to provide absolute details when I get the information. I can say however that the division involved is the Historic Resources Division, and I have no reason in the world to have any lack of confidence in the director there or the senior staff.

I am quite sure, and I will go out on a limb, as I said, although I do not have the detail, I am quite prepared to go out on a limb and say that certainly work has been done. I am absolutely sure that none of those people would engage the services of a writer for the sake of doing so.

MR. ROBERTS: One final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: One final supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the minister assures us that the Director of Historic Resources, whom I assume is the man who entered into this, the official who entered into this contract, would not enter into it speciously, and I accept that. Could the minister tell us why any official, be it the director or anybody else enters into a contract improperly and unlawfully contrary to legislative authority, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I suppose this is not the time to enter into a debate, but my hon. friend yesterday, you know, chided me for issuing a memorandum to my staff advising them of what the chain of command was that they were to report to, what officials they were to report to, and only after going through the proper, and following the proper chain of command would they approach me with normal and ordinary decisions. That same memorandum, Mr. Speaker, was found to be necessary, and brought about by the fact, this kind of situation for the simple reason that my department is not a old department. It is a relatively new one. I would suggest probably one of the

MR. HICKEY: newer ones in the administration. And a number of the people, at least one, possibly two divisions, for the most part carried on the business of promoting the province on their own, with very little direction from the minister or for that matter deputy minister

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir followed by the hon. gentlemen from LaPoile and Terra Nova.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works and Services. I refer to the Auditor General's report page 111. I have a request relating to the first paragraph there, where the Auditor General reports on the mysterious company B having received work orders totalling 643 work orders. I want to ask a question specifically about the 496 work orders with a total value of \$779,056. I am wondering first of all if the minister could indicate to the House what this particular project was?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am very sure that my hon. friend and colleague from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir is not indicating that the minister misled the House yesterday when the minister in answer to a question from the hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested that when these things are in my hands, the whole part of the report, or statement will be made. Now one might ask, why did he not make it before? The Auditor General writes the department prior to the compilation of the report, and the department writes back and we really do not know what is in the report until we receive it. We do not know what he has changed because we give legitimate answers for it. So in effect what finally came out in the Auditor General's report yesterday, whatever was included or not included from the first draft that we were asked for comments on, I was not aware of.

There are a number of situations which occur in the Auditor General's report in respect to the Department of Public Works, and I would suggest respectfully to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday and to the member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) that I would make a statement on all items contained with the departmental back-up for each of the suggestions made by the Auditor General.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the minister's position except that this is a matter which is something that goes back eighteen months or so, and it is three-quarters of a million dollars. Certainly the minister must know what the project was, or is he indicating he does not know at this point?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: All the minister knows is that anything in the Auditor General's report is suggested for, the term I use is for the information of the House. There is no suggestion there by the Auditor General, at least I do not read it as anything being illegal, and anything worthy of comment at this time.

MR. ROBERTS: He certainly makes some suggestions here.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well, you know, the Auditor General suggests many things, but very often, more often than not they are not suggestions of illegalities. But I will say again to the member, and I will say to him with any other supplementary questions that when I am in a position to answer quite the few items that were raised in respect to the Department of Public Works, I will do so in a full and complete statement because the time is not available in an answer to a question.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I give notice that I am dissatisfied with the minister's answers to this point, and I would like to debate the matter with him on the late show tomorrow.

I have one further supplementary. Can the minister indicate in reference to the project involving the three-quarters of a million dollars without tenders being called, can he indicate whether, to his knowledge or can he undertake to find out if he does not know at the moment whether, there were any special circumstances, any emergency or other circumstances which would warrant the expenditure of three-quarters of a million dollars against the Public Tendering Act without

Mr. Simmons:

calling any tenders?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am not aware of any. But I will undertake again to find out, and in my statement as to the items contained in respect to the department, in the Auditor General's report, that will, of course, be abundantly covered in my statement.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman did indicate that that was his last supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment, Sir. Would the minister tell the House when he expects to make the announcement of his appointment of a Commission of Enquiry to look into or to investigate the automobile insurance industry in this Province?

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

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to establish a date, but I have an awful lot of material gathered together and we hope as soon as possible, and there are other things cooking, that we are not quite ready to announce, but we are working very closely with other departments on it, and we hope as soon as we possibly can, Sir. That is the best I can do at the present moment.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister tell the House if as a result of compulsory automobile insurance a number of insurance companies have pulled out of Newfoundland? If so, could the minister indicate roughly how many have left the Province as a result of the introduction of compulsory insurance?

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

MR. MURPHY: To my knowledge I do not think any have pulled out of Newfoundland. The suggestion was made that there would be, but to my knowledge - perhaps other members might be able to answer the question, someone said, "Oh yes" - but to my knowledge, no.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister inform the House if his department has been approached by the taximen in this Province to have their own co-operative insurance company established? If so, would the minister indicate what progress has been made along these lines?

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

MR. MURPHY: I have not been approached by the taximen, Sir, to form their own co-operative insurance, but I was approached by the taximen to whom I have suggested that they might form their own group. I think on three occasions at least I mentioned that to Mr. - the President of the Taximen's Association -

MR. NEARY: Ern Antle.

MR. MURPHY: - Ern Antle, and I supplied all the material that we could give them, Sir. But up to this date there has been nothing definite as to just what they are doing. I suggested they would form themselves into an association, not only in St. John's but all across the Province, and have a long



MR. MURPHY: hard look at what is happening.

I have met with them, I think the last time was sometime in December. I have heard nothing since so I presume that things have been straightened out somewhat to their satisfaction.

MR. SPEAKER: One more supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister tell the House if the delay in appointing the commission of enquiry is because the minister and his officials are working on the terms of reference of the commission of enquiry, or is it because they cannot find the right people to do the enquiry? What is causing the delay? The minister promised this almost a year ago, what is causing the delay now?

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

MR. MURPHY: There is no delay as such, Sir. The fact is, as I said, as soon as all the facts were assembled we were ready to move and we would appoint this commission of enquiry. We are not just ready yet and we are not looking for the suitable people, we are not looking for anything, it is just a matter, Sir, of when we move we hope to move in the right direction. Before jumping in and finding out how deep the water is, we will test it first.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations and again it relates to the Auditor General's Report.

In paragraph 45 under the heading of "Unsatisfactory Administrative Controls," the consulting contract in it has to do with a consulting firm that was to work with the Buchans Task Force on a contract price of \$20,000. I wonder if the minister can inform the House as to why the lowest bidder did not get the contract in this particular case?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I am going to say what I feel. Yesterday I was in the House of Assembly, it was passed out, I did not know it was passed out. I sat in the House of Assembly last night, we came to caucus this morning - very interested in the affairs of the Province - at 8:00 a.m., we got out of caucus at 12:30 p.m., I am back in the House now and I have not even read the items in the Auditor General's Report, which does not mean that I do not think they are of severe importance.

MR. NEARY: Take it under advisement.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I will take it under advisement. And to keep peppering me with questions - when the good time comes in my list of priorities, or in what the Premier decides is my list of priorities as a minister, I will study the Report of the Auditor General.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: But it will take some time to do that. I am not in position now and I -

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

Under the Question and Answer Period fairly strict rules are applied with respect to questioning, one of them being that only such information as is necessary to understand the question may be included; and the same rules apply to answers as well.

The hon. the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is, when I get the opportunity, and I mean that, I will look at each one of them and I will give replies where replies are necessitated. I know that is a serious charge. I have not been down in the department for a day or a day and-a-half. As soon as we can get

MR. ROUSSEAU: on them we will and we will give satisfactory answers either for Questions for which Notice has been Given or if the member would like to pose the question again, or I will give it in a Ministerial Statement, either way. But we are certainly prepared to give the information as soon as I have the opportunity to compile it.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: I realize what the minister has said, but there is a question that is much more important, and he can certainly take it under advisement, And this relates to the fact that the agreement of the contract was for \$20,000 and according to the Auditor General's Report the company in question submitted a bill for \$37,000, which was \$17,000 in excess of the agreed price. So I wonder if the minister can explain the special circumstances that resulted in almost the doubling of this particular contract?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: I certainly will investigate it. All I know is that I am sure there is no intent of any maliciousness on the part of the departmental officials involved. I can assure the hon. member who posed the question, and hon. members in this House, that the Buchans Task Force Report was one of great importance to this government. And if something happened along the way to increase the cost it was certainly a justifiable cost which I am sure that I will fully be able to explain as soon as I have the information available to me.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow the original questioner one further supplementary.

MR. LUSH: Again the Auditor General's report suggests that the original price submitted by this, or bill submitted by this company was \$55,000 and they agreed to pay simply \$37,000. I am wondering - you know, this again is almost double the price - and I am just wondering in view of that whether the hon. minister would also be willing to identify that particular consulting firm?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am certainly prepared to give the hon. member from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) all the facts related to that item in the Auditor General's report as soon as I have a chance to compile it. I am sure that when I do so that the hon. member will jump with glee in his seat with the happiness of the completeness of my answer.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Tourism. Could the minister identify for the House the names of the nine distinguished Newfoundlanders who received complimentary licenses last year? We already know one or two.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: No, Mr. Speaker. Like my colleague, the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, I have not had the opportunity to get the detailed information on the items which the Auditor General covered in relation to my department. I can offer one explanation with

MR. HICKEY:

regards to licenses under the heading or using the word 'complimentary' for the bulk of the numbers that he refers to. And that is in relation to the explanation I gave last year at which time I said—and Hansard will bear it out — that I acknowledged the Auditor General's comments. I was prepared to look at the situation and correct it if possible, explain that those licenses were given out by way of reward for the forwarding of statistical data. I pointed out then that if there was another method to be used which would realize the same effect of having this information forwarded by individual hunters then we would.

I indicated at that time that the same situation that he referred to last year would appear in this year's report because it had in fact already been done. This is the situation this year. I can say for the benefit of hon. members if they recall during the last session I announced the change, and the change being that no further complimentary licenses of this type would be issued, that instead the penal system would be applied rather than the reward system, being that anyone who failed to supply the department with the necessary information as required under the act would be penalized by being prohibited from holding a license for one year.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister tell the House that in the process of issuing complimentary licenses, the ones that the minister does not agree with being issued, is it also the practice of the department to issue tags with those licenses? And if not, why not?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the word 'complimentary' is probably misuse of a word here, because I do not think really that word should be used in the strict sense of those hundred-odd licenses that I have referred to. Complimentary license as we understand it in my department are licenses which are issued to distinguished people in the sense that —

MR. ROBERTS: Distinguished visitors.

MR. HICKEY: Distinguished people not distinguished visitors, distinguished people. Mr. Speaker, I have covered this matter last year and, you know, hon. gentlemen are really barking up the wrong tree if they think they are on to something here, because for the simple reason we very often when we get stuck with the rules of this House, go by precedent. Now is it such a great sin if this department has followed a precedent which is as old as time in which the Premier of the Province, such as the former Premier of the Province, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province

MR. HICKEY: always and forever since the beginning of hunting were given a complimentary licence.

MR. ROBERTS: Were tags issued?

MR. HICKEY: With no tags.

MR. ROBERTS: That is not the truth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where is mine? Send it over.

MR. HICKEY: There was an election, Mr. Speaker, and that changed that situation.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I will permit one further supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: - to the Premier.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the Minister of Tourism explain to the House or indicate to the House the basis or the purpose for the issuing of 114 complimentary salmon licences in Newfoundland last year.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, you know, again if I cannot supply the absolute details today, I will supply them at another time. The salmon licences are not issued in the same form or in the same sense that big game licences are issued. Such as the Gander Cabin, if an industrialist comes into the Province, if distinguished visitors come to the Province and they go to that fishing cabin licences are issued. Surely the Auditor General does not quarrel with the fact that if such a distinguished visitor comes in and you issue a salmon licence to him you are not going to charge him for it.

Now, you know, what we are talking about here is a difference of opinion and I have discussed this with the Auditor General. I appreciate his comments. Really all he is talking about here is a difference in a system, a technical point in as much as the Auditor General feels that the revenue or the lack of revenue for those licences show up, and there is not necessarily to his mind or in keeping with the Financial Administration Act a satisfactory explanation. He suggests another way around it is for an amount of money to appear in one of the subheads of my estimates to cover those licences. Now we are going to look at that.

MR. FLIGHT: Blatant discrimination.

MR. HICKEY: There is no discrimination.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: A question to the hon. the Premier. Has the Premier anything to add to the statements by the Minister of Finance yesterday concerning orders at Labrador Linerboard Limited and to the effect that the mill might not reopen on February 14th?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I would ask the Minister of Finance to reply to that, Mr. Speaker; but just to repeat what was clear to me and I certainly would hope to everyone else, is that the management of the mill is in the hands of the group we have set up, Mr. Sweeney acting as the manager on site. These will be the people making the decisions as to what does and what does not happen at the mill. As I understood it the reply was yesterday that we would assume that if there were orders there that the mill would open, and if there were not they would not. But that is an opinion as opposed to a directive for or against the mill.

MR. ROBERTS: The government were not directing the issue.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary. Am I to understand then that the Minister of Finance did not know that there was a 5,000 ton order and that Mr. Sweeney had announced that the mill would re-open on February 14th?

MR. DOODY: What I said, Sir, I think, and Hansard will verify it or otherwise, is that if there are sufficient orders on hand then the mill will re-open. If there are not sufficient orders on hand then the mill cannot re-open and the implication there of course was that it was a management decision. The management decision had already been announced. I was stating the obvious. Perhaps I oversimplified it. I should have been more specific for those who were alert enough to catch exactly what I said but I will repeat it now, you know, for the benefit of everybody here that that mill in Stephenville can only operate for as long as it



MR. DOODY: can sell the material. Now we want to keep it operating to eternity if we can, and certainly the people in management control out there, you know, are sharing that conviction and will do everything they can to do so. The markets have never been in worse shape. The European market is absolutely desperate. The Americans are dumping in there at prices that are absolutely unbelievable. The mill has a limited amount of orders out there now, certainly not enough to keep it in operation for a very, very long period of time. Hopefully they will get more orders.

What I was attempting to do was to tell the people in the Province, through this House, that it is a precarious position and it is a position that is dependent on the market place. It is not something that Mr. Sweeney has not said and I am sure it was not a contradiction of what he had already said. I simply verified it and the situation is as it was then, Sir. The mill will re-open. That amount of orders is in place. How long it will re-open remains entirely in the hands of the market place and Mr. Sweeney and his people are doing the best they can in that regard.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. I will allow one supplementary.

MR. HODDER: Is the Minister of Finance aware that when he makes uninformed statements to the House and to the media that it causes great insecurity in Bay St. George?

MR. ROBERTS: It certainly does.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to get a clarification on that point. It was not a misinformed answer. The answer was entirely accurate. It was entirely true and it was entirely as the condition now relates to the mill in Stephenville. How that was interpreted by the people in Stephenville or by those who reported the answer is certainly beyond my control. I have no more control over the marketplace for linerboard products than I have over the method of reporting what I say in this House nor in the interpretation of the comments in the House. If the hon. member feels that I was misinformed then so be it. There is very little I can do about that. I could simply answer the question to the best of my ability. How they interpret it is entirely up to the intellect or the capacity of those people who have listened to the answers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: We have time for only one further question.

The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Thank you. I have a question for the hon. Minister of Fisheries, again arising out of the Auditor General's report. Can the minister give the House an explanation why two employees of his department use rented cars putting 20,000 miles on one at the cost of \$3,900 and another putting 15,000 miles at a cost of three thousand, one hundred and some-odd dollars instead of using the car pool?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries

MR. W. CAPTEP: Mr. Speaker, the reference to the Department of Fisheries

MR. W. CARTEP:

in the report is being studied and I have requested a report from the appropriate officials in the department. As soon as I have that report I shall be happy to supply the information requested.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: If brief.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I will certainly be brief, Sir. When did the minister first become aware of the situation described in the question asked by my colleague from Fogo (Capt. Winsor)?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTEP: I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the matter is being investigated by my staff. As soon as I have the report I shall tell the House.

MR. ROBERTS: When did you become aware of it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: You have known about it for months and done nothing.

MR. SPEAKER: The period for Oral Questions is now completed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: This being Private Members Day, motion 1 is called.

The hon. member for Eagle River,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I trust the House will bear with me. Every time I seem to come to St. John's and leave the cold, crisp Northern climate, I pick up the St. John's flu. Or maybe it is illness induced by the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is a custom, as most of us know, among Indian people that when they sit down and debate and argue out their differences, at the end of the debate they usually transfer the pipe of peace or pass something around which can be shared by all people. The Inuit people are different from that in that Inuit people believe that that should be done at the beginning of the debate or the argument so as to bode well for what happens during the debate. Generally what happens is that when people come in together they

MR. STPACHAN:

will pass things between each other, small gifts between each other.

Since I live in a community which is eighty per cent Inuit, or Eskimo as you wish to call it, Inuit being the right term since Eskimo is an Indian word, we often see this going on where someone gets together, a group get together and gifts are passed across to each other. Generally what happens is that the person who is most disliked or the person who has the most opposite viewpoint is often donated the gift. The idea of this is that if you can start off by taking the two opposing forces, the ones with the biggest difference of opinion, then you can pass a gift and hopefully this bodes well for the rest of the discussion.

Mr. Strachan.

I notice that when I was looking across the House that my worst enemy, or the one who has the greatest difference of opinion from me on many matters concerning Labrador and Labrador native people and wildlife and so on, is the Minister of Tourism. And last year we had many differences of opinion about the Wildlife Act. I notice that he has left his seat, which is unfortunate, because I did intend to do exactly the same as the Inuit people do and present to the Minister of Tourism a token from the people of Labrador or from us in the hope that he will listen to what is being said about Labrador, and if he will listen to what is being said about the way of life there, and will hopefully gain some benefit from it and possibly change a few of his opinions.

Furthermore I did promise last year, Mr. Speaker, that since the Minister of Tourism opened up the black bear season almost too late for almost all of us, that the only black bears that we could get were black bears in the month of July in which there are very large holes at the armpits and no fur on the back, and I did intend sending down a black bear skin killed in the month of July.

MR. DOODY: That looks like my overcoat.

MR. STRACHAN: But to get back to the point, I think I should do it in the Inuit fashion. I do not know whether it is in order to pass across the House gifts to opposing members, but to auger well throughout the debate, I did bring in a small gift to the Minister of Tourism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: Did you have a licence for that?

MR. STRACHAN: There are no licences.

I had nothing to do with it. I did not get it, did not kill it, did not shoot it. I had no boat, no ski-doo, nothing.

MR. NEARY: Just like the Premier of the Province.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, the resolution which I introduced, and I get quite serious now -

MR. ROBERTS: Do they run bigger in July?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, they are usually bigger in the month of July. That was got the day before the minister opened the season.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: If it had been a day after it would have been much bigger.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. gentleman. I will not forget the mistake of opening the season.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, the subject which I brought up is a very serious one to us in Labrador. I do believe that I have forty-five minutes in which to introduce it, and at the end forty-five minutes to close-off debate. I do not know if I will manage to stand the forty-five minutes to introduce it, but I will try.

I intend to be non-partisan in my introduction. I think that the debate we have in front of us on the question we have in front of us is far greater than party politics or far greater than any of us. We are debating a very serious question, a question which many people in Labrador are talking about, are bringing up all the time, a question which often when we come to St. John's we find that people do not tackle with the same seriousness, the same feeling, as the people in Labrador and naturally so. We find that this has come about because of a lack in Labrador of a role by the government or a lack of presence of government, and by that I mean not only this government - I make this quite clear - I think in the past totally there has been a lack of presence of government in Labrador due to the geographical differences and the physical difficulties of trying to travel in Labrador. However, what is happening now is that as communications become greater, and communications within Labrador improve - that is not necessarily from Labrador to elsewhere - but communications within Labrador improve, people are starting to voice

Mr. Strachan.

a great deal of questions, a great deal of asking where they belong, they themselves. I will say at the moment that I feel that many peoples within Labrador do not really know that there is a great deal of dissession within Labrador, within the Inuit, and the Indian

Mr. Strachan:

and the settler on the coast, the people in the centre of Labrador, the Lake Melville area, and in Labrador West there is a very great difference of opinion about where they are, and who they really are and where they are at, and a great deal of opinions expressed about where they are going by all of them. But they are looking for some kind of identity or common feeling between them. And I think as time goes on this will resolve in five or six or seven years time, and I think it is resolving much quicker than we thought. This will resolve itself so the people will become closer together.

There is a very narrow viewpoint of what a Labradorian is, and in certain parts of Labrador I would not be classed as a "Labradorian". In certain parts of Labrador no one here but the member from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) would be classed as a Labradorian, even if he lived there for thirty years. In order to be a Labradorian in certain parts of it, one must be born in Labrador. And this is a strange feeling, a narrow viewpoint and depending on the place you were born depends on what you are, what your nationality is or who you really are.

However many people from the Island have moved to Labrador, and have been there ten, fifteen, twenty years, twenty-five years some of them, and some of them yet feel that they are not classed therefore as Labradorians.

Then again within the Labradorian structure there is another separation in that the people who have been the fifth or sixth or seventh generation are again told that they are not Labradorians originally, because the only ones who were Labradorians originally were the native people, the Indian and the Inuit. So then we get this breaking down of groups within Labrador. And as I say, these things have been in the mill for a number of years now. But slowly they are coming together, and people are becoming more unified, and speaking more and more with a unified voice.

Then they are looking at the Island part of the Province, and they are starting to compare the differences. And constantly we get



Mr. Strachan:

faced with it. I should state right here now that I believe in unity. I believe in a unified Province. I do not believe in separation. The points that I bring up often in the House which may be irritating to some members and ministers, government and other members too, which may irritate are meant to be just that, to be irritating, because although you may not see it people in Labrador have become very upset. And what it does, it causes them to move further and further away from the Island of Newfoundland.

I think the only way we can do it is to bring up constantly the fact that there are differences, that you do say the Province of Newfoundland, and Labrador is not included. That it is the Government of Newfoundland, and Labrador is not included. There is a great deal of confusion about the name of this Province. You can say very easily here because of numbers that if the Province is going to be the Province of Newfoundland, then it is going to be the Government of Newfoundland, and Labrador fits into Newfoundland. That would be all very well, but you will find that almost every one in Labrador will immediately take up arms against that. As the member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) will tell you, he faces great difficulty when he tries to justify that fact to Labrador West, and most of Labrador West are people from the Island part of the Province who have moved to Labrador in the last ten, twelve years. And they themselves do not want to see the dropping of the name Labrador.

So there is a great deal of confusion about the name of the Province. There is a great deal of confusion when they look at the map of the Province, because they see of course the Island in large - a picture of the Island, and inserted is Labrador. And there are examples elsewhere, historic examples elsewhere, in many, many countries, of the colonies being inserted in the corner. And the only time that they ever become important is when their resources become that important that they are then blown up, or there is a feeling that they better be taken care of or there may be some separation or there

Mr. Strachan:

may be some rift between them, and then they are brought into being part of the Province.

Now you may say that it is not important to have Labrador included full size to show its proper prospective on a map.

MR. STRACHAN: But to the people in Labrador it is, because when you show the resources in Labrador you also show the proper perspective. So therefore why when you talk in a social sense do you not also show the proper perspective?

The same thing goes for an area like Shetland Islands, for instance, that I know of very well, in which it also was inserted. It was an insert. The Orkneys and Shetland Islands in Britian and also a number of other countries have done this with offshore islands. And then when they become important, such as in the oil and gas development, as of recently if you look at the map now of Britian you will see that Shetland Islands are not inserted anymore, that you will see the true distance shown from the North of Scotland to Shetland Islands and the Shetland Islands inserted there, in order to make quite sure to everyone that these islands belong to Scotland, belong to Britian. They all belong to one.

There are other examples all over the world. The point is that sometime or other we must settle this fact of confusion of the name. We must settle the difference about how the Province is going to be shown and whether you are really going to show the geographical perspectives of the various areas.

I think the Island is 40,000 square miles and Labrador is 110,000 square miles, in round figures. The population of Labrador is only around 40,000 - 40,000, or 42,000 - which is not very many people for a very large area.

So obviously there can be no talk of Labrador ever having numerically any strength whatsoever. Labrador cannot become a province numerically speaking or any other form that they talk about, while many people in Labrador are talking about these forms actively. If you will listen to the radio almost every day in Labrador there is some mention of some form of government to rule Labrador, that there is a feeling that they want to separate from the Island, or if they want to stay with the Island there must be a different form of government.

MR. STRACHAN: We have had all kinds of things proposed from territories to regional governments to provincial status. I very seldom have ever heard of Labrador joining with Quebec. It seems to be a fallacy. It seems to be a St. John's idea and a St. John's press idea.

MR. ROBERTS: Labrador separatism is not Quebec separatism.

MR. STRACHAN: Labrador separatism is totally different. Labrador does not want, and I have never met anyone who wants to be part of Quebec. But yet I always pick up the St. John's newspapers or St. John's people seem to feel that Labrador would always go with Quebec. In fact it is the very opposite. Quebec is regarded as being, may I say even worse than the Island, a worse choice than the Island by far.

But there is in Labrador a constant bringing forward of ideas about what you want. The territorial status to me is an argument. It is a rather greedy argument in that Ottawa will give more than St. John's will so therefore join Ottawa and become a territory. But of course in having territorial status, essentially what you are doing is that you are giving up all rights and jurisdiction to Labrador and transferring that to a central government. That of course is a defeating purpose. To say that Labrador should become a territory defeats the whole argument that you want to decentralize and have more control within Labrador. Because in that very move you are going to the central government and turning over to the central government all jurisdiction. And just because this central government has more money, hopefully more money than the provincial government in St. John's, you hope to be better off. To me it is a greedy, narrow, selfish viewpoint. But I can understand it being expressed by, for instance, native peoples because native peoples are funded directly from Ottawa since the federal government has accepted responsibility for native peoples under the BNA Act. So, therefore, there is money coming into Northern Labrador for

MR. STRACHAN: native peoples and therefore they can see the advantage of belonging to Ottawa.

There is expressed ideas of becoming a regional government, that there should be some form of government within Labrador, that they can control the destiny and have more say of what is happening. And along these lines I certainly do agree that it is one which is most favourable to me but at the same time there is not within Labrador any real structure, or do I say it would be very difficult at this time, this would have to be something which came in in stages.

The talk of separating totally and forming a province of course is absolutely idiotic at this present time, inasmuch as there are not the people there population-wise, nor the resources in people, nor the administrative staff, nor any of these kind of things, nor is it a very feasible idea politically speaking. And I do not hold much truck with it except the fact that the people will always use it when they are frustrated or when they feel that they want to have some control over their destiny.

So

MR. STRACHAN: So there has to be some kind of thing happen within Labrador which will give the people more control over their destiny and allow the people some kind of decision making power. And it is to that question that I have referred here and the formation of a select committee to report directly back to the House here the various feelings of the people and exactly where we should be going.

There are many problems within Labrador, many problems as they look towards the Island because they see the resources of Labrador being utilized by the Island part of the Province, number one for jobs, and that they see the creation of a resource to provide the jobs for the Island. But generally the benefactor of many of the resources within Labrador is often, and certainly more than Labrador, is the Province of Quebec.

The Province of Quebec extracts far more out of Labrador than this Province does, and certainly more than the Island part does. The Province of Quebec in the ratio of jobs of course in the West is one to four, the ratio of jobs from Seven Islands to Labrador City and Wabush. There are many examples. The Coastal communities for instance are supplied by food from Quebec. The purchasing agent for Labrador City and Wabush is situated in Seven Islands with strict orders from Quebec to give Quebec preference. So any Newfoundland Company who wants to supply Labrador City and Wabush runs the risk of having to deal with a Seven Islands, Quebec purchasing agent who obviously by the rules of that Province, and it is laid down quite specifically, even lately by - more lately by Premier Leveque, must deal with Quebec first or give them every opportunity.

MR. HICKMAN: Has the government released their orders as Crown policy?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes. It is pretty well regarded as such. That is right. Most people in Labrador West -

MR. HICKMAN: Does the hon. gentleman have a copy pertaining -

MR. STRACHAN: No, I do not have the copy but I have been told by people in Labrador West that this was stated, it has been given to them in writing as one of the reasons why recently a firm there -

MR. SMALLWOOD: By whom? Written by whom?

MR. STRACHAN: This has been given by the Seven Islands purchasing agent, the fact that they must deal and must give preference to Quebec goods.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But who gave the purchasing agent that order?

MR. STRACHAN: As far as I understood this was a direct inference from government that they must give benefit -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Government of what?

MR. STRACHAN: The Government of Quebec, sorry.

MR. R. MOORES: The Government of Quebec must purchase from the agent at Wabush?

MR. STRACHAN: No, the purchasing agent in Wabush supplies as the purchasing agents for Labrador City and Wabush. If you are a Newfoundland company and you are dealing and trying to supply goods to Labrador City and Wabush that purchasing agent in Seven Islands will give preference over to Quebec dealers.

AN HON. MEMBER: You have got to go through that agency?

MR. STRACHAN: You have got to go through that agency. In other words, the purchasing agency for Labrador City and Wabush is not situated within this Province. It is situated within the Province of Quebec.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him this simple question? Could not this House, and perhaps the question had better be addressed to someone else than the hon. member, could not this House pass a statute requiring companies developing Newfoundland resources within the Province be required to have their purchasing agent domiciled in the Province? Could that not be made? And why not?

MR. STRACHAN: Well I was only pointing out one of these - this is one of a number of things which occur in Labrador. What I was trying to point out was that possibly there are many more, possibly a select committee or something would report these kind of things because not only is there that kind of physical thing happening, there are political ties with Quebec. set up by these mechanisms.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. member agree that it is absolutely shocking to a Newfoundlander -

MR. STRACHAN: Absolutely.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - to be told, and presumably the hon. gentleman is correct in his statement, to be told that all purchases for those two great companies in Labrador, the City of Wabush and Labrador City, are ordered in effect to do all their buying in Quebec. That is absolutely shocking.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would just like to point to hon. members that during proceedings if another hon. member asks permission to make a comment this is quite in order, in which case the original hon. member should either regain his seat or make some move in that direction. This is purely to maintain the decorum of the House and also to maintain or make the maintenance of order an easier job for the Chair. I would just like to bring that to hon. members' attention. I realize this is early in the session and these habits may take a little while to become ingrained again.

The hon. member for Eagle River.



MP. STRACHAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. I should say, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to just continue without interruption. I would like to get finished and so therefore I am prepared to stand and just carry on without answering any specific questions. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I think that the point I made, and there are a number of other points, show an example that this Province should become more resolute in maintaining its hold on Labrador. It should show more precedence. It should, I think, try to pass some legislation which prevents much of what is happening in Labrador. Quebec is very insidious. We realize that and many people in Labrador are deeply concerned.

I remember on November 15 there were many people in Labrador, on the coast and in Happy Valley, and I dare say that the member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) could give examples in Labrador West, where people were really very concerned about what was going to happen to Labrador. The people need to be reassured. And when they do not have this reassurance, then they start wondering exactly who they belong to, where is their place. This is the kind of thing, I think, that needs to be corrected, that there needs to be some attention to.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there is a danger, a very real danger of over attention as well. I understand that, that one can be so caught up in the idea that it is like belly gazing, you continue to look at yourself until you cannot see anything else. But I do think that over the next few years there is a very definite step has to be made by this Province, by the government, in trying to hold on to that part of the Province and try to make that part of the Province really believe it belongs within the Province. You will never stop separatism by force. You will never try to coerce people. People will always move the way they wish to over a period of time. You may try and prevent it one time, but it will come up again unless they really believe they belong there. This is what I think that I am stating here, is that people are really looking for a place to

MR. STRACHAN:

belong. Before the feelings reach a pitch at which there is no belonging anywhere, where the feelings have hardened to the point that people just do not want to have anything more to do with the Province or the government of this Province, before that happens then these steps must be taken. To delay, to waste time or to believe that it is not occurring and this is what is worse, to ignore it.

It is extremely frustrating and I must say that the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) and myself often mentioned it, that it is extremely frustrating for us to know that when we go back home we are constantly fed with it, we are constantly subjected to pressures which when we put them in front of the House here, or people in St. John's, we are laughed at, scorned or it is not taken seriously. Sometimes I wonder whether it is worth it all presenting this point of view, when I could just go home and let the whole thing go the way it will and separate off. But I believe in unity. I do not believe in taking parochial, narrow-minded, bigoted viewpoints. I believe the place for Labrador is within this Province. If we believe it we must therefore fight for it. If we are going to fight for it, then it must mean that we bring it up and bring it up and bring it up until you realize that it must be fought for as well. It is not given to you as a gift. It is something that you must earn and hold on to. You cannot just pass it off or shrug it off and say that it is a bunch of radicals, it is a minority, as is often expressed, a small loud-mouthed minority, a bunch of radicals up there who are expressing separation.

I agree that it is a small minority who are expressing it. As in all societies, a small number of people will talk and will talk loudest. But a great deal of the people who are nodding yes - and I say nodding - are very sensible, very stable business people, honorary citizens and part of the status quo.

MR. STRACHAN: And they are not saying no any longer. They are not saying no as they did with NLP, they are now nodding yes and they are saying, "I wonder what we could do?" That then becomes very serious when you get this very solid mass starting to nod up and down instead of rejecting it out of hand.

We will always get the small minority who will bawl loudest and shout for separatism, and they do not trouble us really in many cases because they will always be there regardless of what happens. But when the majority start to nod yes and start to look, with a majority of respectable citizens who are starting to think of the ways in which they can separate Labrador from this Province, then I think the situation is very grave and very serious indeed.

A lot of the concern is that you do not understand the people of Labrador, or the people of the North, or the geography, or the way of life. I know many members, in fact one member the other day, I know many members of this House who will ask me on Monday if I were home for the weekend. This has happened many, many times here.

There are many people who will not understand our frustrations about travel but in order to get to this House I was stuck twelve days. Not twelve minutes, not twelve hours but twelve days. Twelve days sitting in one place waiting and waiting and waiting and waiting, trying to take off two or three times but always returning to the same place. And we get very philosophical about it because one has to get very philosophical about waiting in one place twelve days. The longest I have waited was twenty-one days. I remember three Christmases ago I waited with Peter Gzowski for seven days. One gets very philosophical about waiting and therefore very tolerant about waiting, because if you were not going to get philosophical about it you would not be living there, you could not stand it, it would drive you around the

MR. STRACHAN: bend. So you just sit, and you get up every morning and you look out the window, you close the curtains and you pull the blanket over your head and you go back to sleep again.

But I think you must realize that at some time or other, if this is going to be made part of the Province, that we do have very serious difficulties of transportation, of moving people around, of people feeling isolated, forgotten, neglected, and at some time or other the government must come to grips with it. I understand well that this Province is not a have Province it is a have-not Province, that it does not have the money, the funds that it can start lashing out social services all over the Province. I realize that but at some time or other parts of the Island are going to have to be asked to make deliberate sacrifices so that parts of Labrador, which do not have these services, can catch up with them, at least to a certain extent in services.

To try to tell some people who have no electricity and no telephone and no radio and no television and no wharf and no road around the community that they do not need these kinds of services, or you have to wait over a period of time for these kinds of services, will only increase their frustrations. And as they have now started to travel around more and hear more from people, they will eventually feel that they are being forgotten, neglected and it is therefore time to look elsewhere and the looking elsewhere is the separation movement.

I do not know. I realize there are many places who are craving for paved roads, and I listen to the petitions, or places which are craving for various other things. They really need these benefits they are looking for, but I think it is about time that maybe government or some of us should turn around and say that there are other places in this Province that are extremely badly off.

MR. STRACHAN:

And I am not talking about the Labrador North part of my district but certainly parts of Labrador South which are in extreme difficulties. And there is sacrifice can be made, and rather than have your paved roads this year, maybe you would wish to give the community of Fox Harbour a road around the school so that the children do not have to go to school by boat pushing through the ice in the Winter with a life jacket on. Or the community of Williams Harbour can have electricity or Pinsent Arm or they can have some radio or telephones.

These are not luxuries. They are not asking for a great deal. But when they do not get the basic essentials, the basic necessities, and they hear more and more or how rich Labrador is and what we intend to do with Labrador and the Churchill Falls and our uranium and our minerals, then they feel that they are being very, very badly let down, that if Labrador is going to become rich in the future with oil and gas and various other things, why must they wait until that occurs before they get some of the benefits?

As I said, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things on the social side and the economic side which need to be done in Labrador to satisfy some of the demands that people genuinely have. Some of their frustrations would then leave them. They would feel possibly a part of the Province if they did have some of these things done. As I said, there are some things which they are craving for which I feel must be taken in check. There are situations in which they are demanding, in some cases, things which can never be given to them. But in many cases what they are looking for are straightforward, everyday, reasonable things which need to be done if only to catch up some of these parts of Labrador with the rest of the Province.

To live in Main and to have to pay on an escalating rate for electricity, it is bad enough living in the North - I mean bad enough in the sense of having to pay for electricity and these kinds of things, it is bad enough that way and cost-wise because of our dark days

MR. STPACHAN:

and so on without having to find that we are paying the highest rate of electricity within the Province because we are on a diesel generator and we cannot be equalized. Surely small communities like that can be equalized, the electricity rate could be equalized so that we pay the same as everyone else in the Province.

Nobody is going to rush out and put in electric heat because of course it is impossible. The generators will not handle it. But these are things which people are often worried about and bothered by. These are the frustrations when they hear of the Churchill Falls power and they hear of the Lower Churchill and the Gull Island project, transmission lines and tunnels being built and they hear of these wonderful, vast schemes all from Labrador riches which will benefit the Province, and yet every community in my district must pay an increase in escalating rate for its electricity because it is on diesel generating rather than on hydro when it would be a simple matter of equalizing it and removing this frustration, this feeling that here we are with all this power, all these resources and yet we have to pay the highest rate within the Province.

Agreed there are other parts of the Province and other parts on the Island who also have to pay these escalated rates as well. But I feel it could be done very easily for them as well. We are not asking for any special consideration. We are starting that some of these frustrations must be gotten rid of or people will increase to attack the Island and attack Newfoundland and think of themselves as Labradorians, to dislike Newfoundlanders and not belong to the Province whatsoever.

Lastly I would like to mention here that I live in a district in which there are native people and I live in a community in which eighty per cent of the people are Inuit, or basically Inuit speaking, Inuktitut, and they have questions and concepts and ideas which are very different from concepts that are here on the Island or certainly in St. John's, although many of their ways of life and many of their traditions are very close to the traditions of the

MR. STRACHAN: European settlers who came to Newfoundland and settled down. But they do have certain other distinctions that they feel are of value to them. They often use a word, special rights, and I do not quite understand what the 'special' is but I certainly believe that they have rights and they have traditions and based on that tradition of land use and occupancy of land that they have certain things that they can claim. And over the next year or two years, or three years you are going to hear more and more about native land claims within this Province. The native situation within this Province is a very different one from most other Provinces in Canada and from the Northwest Territories in which native people are solely the jurisdiction of the federal government.

MR. ROUSSEAU: People coming in the Province as well.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, distinctly although in essence the idea is that the funding comes from Ottawa. The Province has jurisdiction over them, has retained the jurisdiction, and Ottawa will therefore supply the money through a federal-provincial committee.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The Labrador Inuit and the -

MR. STRACHAN: Oh yes I believe so. I mean there is a basic difference, considerable difference between a Labrador native person and native people of the Island or the original native people of the Island, but I do not believe that they originally are the original native people of the Island.

But rather than get into that, specifically in the Labrador situation we have people and historically they feel they have definite rights over land, hunting rights that seem to be diametrically opposed by government and most governments to such a viewpoint that what we end up doing is putting the native people into adversary role. We keep pushing them down so that they end up taking positions in which their frustration creates

MR. STRACIAN: difficulties with government or difficulties with people they are dealing with. Rather than take in what I feel is a far more mature, and a far more longer viewpoint, because what you are going to be faced with in the next two or three years is, as all native peoples and all governments in Canada are going to be faced with, is a land claim settlement by native people in which they are going to claim certain land. And in essence what a land claim settlement is to me is a last treaty. There have been many treaties written with native people and most of the treaties have been treaties in which the white person has written them and the native person has signed them and the white person has therefore progressed to break them.

In this case here what has happened is that in our wisdom we have now given native peoples money for them to write their treaty, to bring that treaty to us and we negotiate the terms of that treaty and then we sign it. But in future this will be the last treaty, the last signing, and if it is not done right then the native peoples can only blame themselves in essence because they have written the terms of the treaty and negotiated them.

So in essence although we are being kind we are still retaining our power and I think therefore that we must become far more mature and long sighted because we will be dealing in the next few years with a historic document and hopefully this Province will not be looking at Labrador native people and treating Labrador native people in a way in which one hundred years from now people will be viewing us in exactly the same way as we often view now the people who signed the original treaties with Indian people who we are often very much ashamed of.

I say this because the native question will arise in Labrador and it is fundamental to this question of Labrador being part of this Province, because they are dealing with tracts of land which they themselves claim and this question must be resolved



MR. STRACHAN: and it must be resolved clearly. And the viewpoints must be expressed about it and we must come to certain terms with them.

I have then outlined some of the points concerning Labrador. I have tried not to be partisan. I have tried not to list whole documentations, which I could, of differences perpetrated by different governments on the people in Labrador which really upset them. But I have tried to point out that our differences in a way of life, differences in services, differences in needs, differences in the looking at of resources, of extracting those resources, of where these resources are going to go. There is the problem of Quebec, ever present problem of Quebec. There is the presence of native people within the Province, within Labrador; this must be settled.

MR. STRACHAN:

And I hope therefore that the select committee - and I am not one for studies or committees, we have had enough studies in Labrador. We had a royal commission which was supposed to be the last great one. It seems that every time we open the door in Labrador there is somebody knocking at the door with a survey list wanting to study either the shape of our noses or whether we watch television now. A recent crew was in there studying our television habits. By the way, the shape of our noses was studied in Nain. People did come to Nain to measure noses to try and relate it to something of ethnicity. Anyway your cultural background apparently, your ethnic background can be related to the size of your nose. We have had enough of these kinds of studies and I hate like hell to propose that we should have another study. But I think that a select committee to report to this House, because many of you do not appreciate that this is very serious business, that we need to hold this Province together and it should be discussed thoroughly. And I therefore propose this select committee to travel to various parts of Labrador and to listen to the various needs of the people there, to listen to the native statement of claim, to listen to the situation in Labrador West where they feel very strongly about regional government, to listen to the Central Labrador area where they have other feelings, and to the Coastal area where they are proposing certain territorial status and to take these all into consideration and report back to the House. Hopefully then you will understand the immensity of the problem, the complexity of the problem and hopefully then will address yourself to trying to put an end once and for all to this situation which can only cause us harm, only cause us much misery and despair. I believe it should be settled sooner rather than later. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Naskaupi.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COYDIE: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I can disagree, and I

MR. GOUDIE:

do not believe that I have the intention of disagreeing with many of the points which were brought forth by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). I think the member after his number of years of living in Labrador and dealing with the people of Labrador, at least his own particular part of it, is becoming quite familiar with the issues. When I get to the end of my remarks I will have a suggestion as to whether I agree or disagree with the type of solution the hon. member is suggesting with the motion which is presently being debated.

I think in that motion itself, at least for me, there are two main points to be considered. That is that that this House is gravely concerned with the state and sentiment of public opinion in Labrador, and a select committee be appointed to consider and study all matters pertaining to the state and sentiment of public opinion in Labrador.

I might also compliment the member on his gift to the Minister of Tourism. I am sure the minister at some point in time will make reference to that gift in his remarks somewhere along the way. The member also referred or suggested that perhaps I may be the only member in this hon. House who could be or would be classified as a native of Labrador. Just to explain that: When I was in elementary school one of the books I was to study - I did not do very much of a job of studying it - but it was a Newfoundland history book. And in that particular document we - and when I say we, that is the non-Indian, non pure Indian, or non-Inuit, non pure Inuit were referred to as breed. I do not know if that breed will -

AN HON. MEMBER: Half-breed.

MR. GOUDIE: One hon. member suggested half-breed. That may very well be the case as well. But just as a - I do not know if it is a point of interest or not - but to clarify the hon. member's classification of me as a native Labradorian, I have a bit of French Canadian -

MR. GOUDIE: - no relation to Rene - Scotch, English, Indian and Inuit blood. So breed, cross-breed or whatever you want to call it, there it is.

There are a number of points I wish to deal with in the few remarks that I am going to make. There are varying opinions, I think, in Labrador in relation to our position in the provincial strategy, if you will, of development both economically and socially. Unfortunately the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) was unable to attend the most recent meeting of the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, which was held just recently in Happy Valley. He was delayed, I understand, in Nain by bad weather, and I think he was referring to the twelve days, as a matter of fact, in his remarks. The hon. the House Leader was there as was the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

AN HON. MEMBER: You mean to say the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, I am sorry. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

I think they, perhaps, from the two days of meetings may have gathered some feeling for the opinions and so on expressed at that particular conference. We dealt with a number of issues in that conference the more prominent one perhaps was put forward by a gentleman from North West River who represents a particular ethnic group in that community, and that is Labrador separatism. I think that was discussed in some detail, particularly in the manner he presented it in relation to some land claims which are going to be presented to government at some point in time. But it was interesting to note that just following that gentleman's remarks at that meeting, one other person from the coastal community of Labrador, and two other people as well, stood up and suggested that perhaps separatism at this point in time is not the answer and he gave a number of reasons for it. But the one that interested me was that the present

MR. GOUDIE: provincial government has been paying some attention to that part of the Province and perhaps we should give them one more chance. He also in his remarks mentioned that there seems to be, and he included all members who represent the Labrador section of the Province, there seems to be an interest in these members to try and bring about some solutions to some problems which exist in the Northern part of the Province as a whole.

It was interesting to see the varying opinions at that particular conference. We in Labrador have an awareness, I think, an awareness that is being developed of the potential we have, particularly in terms of resources. But the overriding issue, I believe, is not whether or not these resources should be developed but the manner in which they are developed and the benefits to be derived for the Province as a whole. Not just for the Island portion or for Labrador itself, but for the Province as a whole.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: I think people referred to our hydro potential, the various minerals - uranium at Kitts Michelin - I understand there is to be, perhaps already beginning, but very shortly to begin some experimental drilling just West of the Makkovik area at Moran Lake and one other Lake, I believe. So the potential of that remains to be seen.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that near Monkey Hill or part of that area?

MR. GOUDIE: No. I do not know the exact mileage but I would estimate it to be sixty or eighty miles West of the community of Makkovik.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is near Monkey Hill, I think.

MR. GOUDIE: Well, okay. It is not near, it is close.

But in these resource developments that are in the news every day, I think the environmental impact

MR. GOUDIE:                   in perhaps the community of Makkovik,  
the community of Mud Lake, and the resources in terms of uranium and -  
I do not if you would call it a resource - a proposed, or a park  
which perhaps may be proposed for the Mealey Mountains area,

MR. GOUDIE:

are being considered very heavily and I think very positively by the peoples of these two particular communities. The initial reaction was negativism. The only reason that negative reaction was put forth, I think, was because of a lack of information. It is as pure and simple as that. People do not know or did not know - they are beginning to learn - what some of the implications are in the uranium development, in what it might mean to a number of communities in the perimeter of the Mealy Mountains in terms of what jobs will be provided, what type of park that may be and a number of other issues as well.

So it is how the resources are developed, I think, which is very important to the people of Labrador, and I am sure important to this government and to the Province as a whole. We are concerned about something else as well. This is going to be discussed for years to come, I would suggest, and has been discussed for years in the past. That is the processing of our resources in this Province.

There was reference made at various points since this opening of the House to the possibility of some processing taking place in Labrador. I am sure that the member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) when he stands in his place to address this motion will have some comments to make on that. But the hydro potential is there in Labrador. I cannot estimate how much is there. The Minister of Mines and Energy might perhaps at some point in his remarks have something to say about that. But it appears to me that there is all kinds of potential for development to take place up there.

Pipelines, I do not know if that is a possibility. Perhaps some sort of a port corridor complex at some point in time may be considered. I do not know. But what I am saying, I guess, is that in Labrador there are frustrations for a number of reasons and one of them was referred to by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and that is isolation, not only in coastal communities. Granted coastal communities are more isolated from any large center elsewhere than any other point in Labrador, I think. We have coming into my district daily jet service and the boat service in the Summer and so on. But

MR. GOUDIE:

waiting twelve to twenty-one days for an aircraft to arrive in a community on the coast is at some point in time a bit of an inconvenience, I think.

MR. MURPHY: Would that not be due to weather?

MR. GOUDIE: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Would a jet get in there? Would a 737 get in?

MR. GOUDIE: A 737 could not get in there now but -

MR. MURPHY: With the weather I mean.

MR. GOUDIE: You are talking about the coastal communities, are you?

MR. MURPHY: I am just wondering at what point in the year it was.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes. Well perhaps that may be resolved in the next few years as well. The airstrip at Cartwright, I am told, will bring benefit to the area because the different type of aircraft could be used than is being used by the airline which operates within Labrador at this point in time. I understand that there are proposals for other airstrips in coastal Labrador as well. That I think is probably going to be the most influential move that anyone could make in terms of providing access, not only to coastal Labrador from interior Labrador and other parts of the Province, but vice versa. And that is probably the most important part of it, as well, I think, for the people to get from coastal Labrador to other points.

I think there has to be in developing the resources of Labrador a marrying, if you will, of the economic and social aspects. I worked for a couple of years as a community development worker with the Company of Young Canadians in the South Coast region. I am not suggesting I had any influence in some of the developments that are now taking place in terms of the people of Labrador asking questions and getting information and making their points of view known. But organizations such as the Company of Young Canadians, MTN Extension, Frontier College, the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, local citizens' groups which were formed at the citizens' initiative themselves for purposes of familiarizing themselves with certain processes which have to be followed or take place in order to better their lot, if you will, I think have been very instrumental in bringing Coastal Labrador and other points of Labrador



MR. GOUDIE: into the mainstream of life and obviously that has not reached the stage where everyone is happy yet. But at least the move has begun.

The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) raised a number of points, some that I am not going to deal with because they relate to other parts of Labrador, particularly Labrador West, and I am quite sure that my hon. colleague from Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) will have some remarks to make on these points.

One remark which the member for Eagle River referred or made was that he felt there was a lack of government's presence, and that perhaps may have been - not may have been, it has been traditional I think. But that, I believe, is changing. And one other point he raised was where the communications have improved over the last ten or fifteen years and opinions are being heard and perhaps a show on a radio station here in St. John's yesterday morning may be an example of that. The report was sent down by a reporter in Goose Bay on what he at least perceived to be the feelings of some people of Labrador. I was asked for my opinions an on-the-street interview was conducted here in the City of St. John's itself and there were varying opinions I think, but that is an example I believe of how communications are improving and how people are finally beginning to be heard.

These feelings of separatism or whatever you want to call those feelings, or any other feelings that people have in Labrador, perhaps traditionally may not have been heard as much simply because there were no communications. When the Second World War ended, for instance, we found out about it six months later, and that was when one of the people from Labrador who had served in a

MR. GOUDIE: Newfoundland Regiment, walked literally from St. Anthony to what was then the Community of Traveston, which is directly across from Happy Valley, walked by snowshoes.

So that is only a little over thirty years ago. But we are developing I think in Labrador and experiencing growing pains and perhaps the remarks on separatism are a result, or partly a result, of these growing pains. But just getting back to the point of a lack of government presence in Labrador that has been changing I think during the last number of years, recent number of years. There are quite a number of government departments represented right now in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area and I believe some of them in Labrador West, I am sorry, in Menihek. They have not reached to any great degree in Coastal Labrador and I am not sure if it is proper for me to refer to the Throne Speech during these remarks, but there is at least a suggestion there that that is going to change with particularly the Department of Rural Development moving in to make their programmes more easily accessible to the people of Labrador, and other government departments as well. But I am sure that the hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development will pay some attention to that when he stands in his place to offer his remarks.

The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) suggested that he does not believe in separatism and that unity is preferred. And I think that statement reflects the majority of opinion in Labrador. It certainly reflects mine. I do not think that separatism is the answer either. Separatism is a negative word to begin with and I think we have had enough of negativism in the last number of years, particularly in terms of the relationship between Labrador and the Island portion of the Province.

I am not suggesting for a minute that all of the solutions have been provided. I think some of them have and obviously there are more to come.

Mr. Goudie.

But there is no point of my going through the remarks again, I do not think, about the disadvantages of becoming a territory or being a separate province. I think we have a population in Labrador now of roughly 45,000 people. I believe - I can be corrected on this - but I believe that that is similar to the population which the province of Prince Edward Island had when it became a province. I do not know. But I would suggest that since that province of Prince Edward Island could fit very well into one of our lakes, Lake Melville in Labrador, that it may not be very practical for a population of that size, in a territory of our size, 124,000 sq. miles - or it would be impossible to function as a separate province.

The remarks that the Province, as it exists today, must pay more attention to Labrador, but not overdo it, I think, are done with as well. I do not want to get into a speech here where I am completely repeating what the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) has put forth, but just to add my remarks to his. I think we have had a tradition in Labrador where it became very easy for the native, if you will, of Labrador - when I say, native, I mean the two ethnic groups and the settler, if you will - who have always traditionally been in a position where they have been led by people who have moved in from outside of Labrador. And I refer to the International Grenfell Association, the Moravian Mission and ministers of other faith who moved in, the Hudson Bay Company, the French Trading Company, the Dickie Lumber Company and so on. The people who came in, who lived and functioned in a different type of society than that which existed in Labrador, automatically, I think, became leaders. That may not be an accurate statement, but in my opinion it is.

And then you get into my district of Naskaupi, and the largest community in that district, Happy Valley - Goose Bay. It was founded on a military operation. And without going into any great detail

Mr. Goudie.

I would suggest that because of the nature of that - not industry, but that - well, let us call it an industry for the lack of a better word right now - the nature of that particular operation was so structured that people did not even have to make a decision basically on where they might buy an item or what their rates of pay were going to be. It was a completely military atmosphere and remained that way for thirty or thirty-odd years. And the access to cheap goods - well, when I say cheap building material I mean literally that, because I would suggest that until very recently half of the homes in Happy Valley, which was then a civilian community, were built from materials which were scrounged from either the U.S.A.F., the R.C.A.F. or the Royal Air Force units which were stationed there. As a matter of fact, I bought one of these houses myself, and I will not go into that.

A regional government for Labrador, I think, could very well be an answer. I am not completely familiar with what the implications are of a regional government. I have some views on, I think, how it might function with representatives of departments, who have enough status, to make a decision without having to check with a St. John's or Corner Brook office regarding every move or every decision they might take. Perhaps a budget to administer the various areas of Labrador may very well be a legitimate recommendation. But I think an educational system might very well be needed as well. By an educational system I mean whereby existing programmes are explained - particularly the programmes under the Department of Industrial and Rural Development - explained to the people of Labrador and how the people in that part of the Province may very well take advantage of these programmes, for their own benefit and

Mr. Goudie:

for the benefit of their region. I think that is important.

I think the people of Labrador want self-determination. I do not think that has to be manifested through any other form of government than exists right now. I think that this government is in a very enviable position, when you compare it with other provinces and other governments within Canada. And that is we have a vast territory North of here which, I believe, I am led to understand, is rich in natural resources, a very small population, so the potential is there to almost develop-or to develop an almost ideal society, if you will, if it is handled properly.

I would not quite care to define an ideal society because I do not know what makes an ideal society. But we have made, I think, the people of this Province, the governments of this Province, have made mistakes in the past. The Island portion of the Province is pretty well populated at this point in time, Obviously there is room for more population, but when you consider that the Labrador section of the Province is approximately two-thirds the size of the Province as a whole, or takes up two-thirds of the Province as a whole, the type of country up there, the fjords, the glaciers, the rivers, the woods, it is all there. It could very well be, for the lack of a better term, an ideal part of Canada in which to live, that is if you like six or seven months of brisk, cool weather. In the summertime it gets up to, what? eighty, ninety, one hundred degrees. You are not certainly going to find that in Florida these days I am told. I think their products are freezing down there without artificial refrigeration.

I came across a little document the other day which bears something interesting figures, just for comparison purposes. This was from a Financial Post, Perhaps the member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) may very well be familiar with these figures. He may have written or provided all of the information for the articles, I do not know—no, I do not imagine he would have. It is dated October 19, 1928.

Mr. Goudie:

Perhaps the hon. member is familiar with that particular document.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It sounds like Sir Patrick McGrath.

MR. GOUDIE: It could very well be.

But at that point in time, just as an example, the headline reads, "Estimate Forests Have Timber Worth Over \$250 million Dollars," and that was in Labrador. "Government Plans Survey of Wealth of Labrador area." The enormous reserve of power is found in Labrador rivers. And they suggested in that article that perhaps at some point in time paper mills may be run from these hydro resources.

It took thirty years to reach the decision as to ownership, who owns Labrador? And that is a term I disagree with as well. I do not like the term 'own'. That would suggest to me that one part of the Province is inferior to the other. I do not believe that is the case. I do not think people feel that way. But the term, in my opinion, indicates that. I do not think that is right.

I would also suggest, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) referred to the Ethnic groups, the two Ethnic groups in a couple of points in his remarks. One of them, the group that I am or have been more familiar with, at least for the most part of my life, is the Indian, Naskaupi and Montagnais Indians, travelling from Sept Isles to Davis Inlet and the community of North West River, and sometimes the community of Mud Lake. I travelled that part of inland Labrador which was trapped for twenty-odd years by my father and oldest brother. They have some interesting stories to relate about that particular lifestyle. I am not going to get into them at this point in time, but I believe, and again I can be corrected, I believe that during the Privy Council hearings, at least the documents published in 1927 indicate that it was because of the sworn affidavits of these people, the Indian trappers and the Settler trappers, if you will, that were very influential in determining the border as it exists today.

MR. GOUDIE:

That is my understanding, But I just wanted to make a little brief reference to that particular point. I think the present government is beginning to adopt the attitude that in terms of our resource development, particularly in Labrador, the maximum benefit must be derived with the least possible environmental or sociological damage. I do not know if the Minister of Mines and Energy will comment on that at some point in time. But I believe that is the attitude which is being expressed today and I think that is the only practical attitude that any government, whether this government or the governments of the future, will take.

MR. SIMONS: Would the member repeat please? What attitude was he referring to?

MR. GOUDIE: In terms of resource development, the maximum benefit must be derived with the least possible environmental or sociological damage.

I think perhaps I should refer, in terms of resource development at least, to the Labrador Linerboard operation. It does not exist to any great degree in my particular district any more. And the people employed with that operation, I am suggesting, unless something drastic happens to change it, will not be employed by that particular operation after a very short period of time. But I do know that efforts are being made to establish markets overseas. I believe the number of countries approached are in the vicinity of ten or eleven countries. I do not think all of these countries have indicated an interest or at least not a serious interest in purchasing wood from Labrador.

Just on Friday of this week - as a matter of fact I made a brief announcement on it yesterday. I mentioned Thursday but that has now been changed to Friday - or Friday of this week a specialist with the Department of Industrial Development and some other people will be going into Happy Valley-Coose Bay to begin preliminary work on a feasibility study into the type of woods operation which may be practical for that area. We have one woods operation going now, not going very well, I do not think, as far as benefits to the workers are

MR. GOUDIE:

concerned, and that is the Labrador Forest Products I believe.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ryer VanBecke.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, that is right. Ryer VanBecke is the name of the gentleman. People may be more familiar with that name as opposed to his company name. There are problems with that operation in terms of the prices, I think, being offered for wood and the benefits that the workers can get from these prices. It is straining relationships, I think, at this point in time.

But I believe that the correct attitude was explained to at least two groups which have come down here to meet with committees of Cabinet, for instance, in the last six months. That is that government should not become involved in running a business of that nature. I believe that is the sentiment expressed by the hon. the Premier during one of these meetings.

PREMIER MOOPES: And by the group.

MR. GOUDIE: And by the group themselves, yes. But that the people themselves should become involved. So this remains to be seen now whether these European markets can be tapped into practically and whether or not a feasible operation can begin and continue in the Lake Melville area because there certainly would not be any point in having a repetition of the operation of the Labrador Linerboard operations in the Lake Melville area.

There are lots of other resources which could be referred to, but I think another area which should be considered by anyone who addresses himself or herself to this motion, is the difference in traditional funding which has been put into Labrador. Communities North of the Hamilton Inlet, for instance, benefit directly from federal funding to native groups, to the Inuit and the Indian groups. One community South of the Hamilton Inlet, Black Tickle mainly also benefits. And there were a number of circumstances which dictated that community being selected.



MR. GOUDIE: But in addition to that, what that has done with that native funding going in annually to these communities in Northern Coastal Labrador, if you will, a situation has developed where residents South of the Hamilton Inlet are becoming a little concerned in that they do not seem to be deriving the same amount of benefits that communities and individuals in the Northern section of that part of the Province derive. That I think has become, or is perhaps about to become, an issue as well. It was I know mentioned, I referred earlier to the recent meeting of the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, it was brought up there. I do not think there is going to be a division. I think people have gotten beyond that stage, at least just making my judgement on the remarks put forth at that meeting. I think people are above that now, the people of Northern and Southern Labrador.

But that is an area of concern and I will suggest to the government that when these lying departments are moved in, I assume that is going to be not too far in the future, that particular attention be paid to the Southern Coastal section of Labrador.

CAPT. WINSOR: Could the hon. member? I do not want to distract his train of thinking but when you refer to the Southern Labrador is not Black Tickle in Southern Labrador? Black Tickle is south of Domino and the only other community that I know north of Northwest River which would be included in that would be Rigolet. And Black Tickle is now in Southern Labrador and that assistance is given to Black Tickle?

MR. GOUDIE: Okay, I will try and explain that. The hon. member is correct. Black Tickle is south of the Hamilton Inlet but as I mentioned a little earlier it was very difficult because of the - at least I am told - because of the location of that particular community and the rocky terrain, difficult to convince, I suppose, entrepreneurs to -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Super suasive power.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, to provide a number of benefits to the community such as shopping facilities and so on. Although there was one gentleman

MR. GOUDIE: operating a business there I believe until just very recently.

There were some other problems as well so I suppose some person in their wisdom decided that Black Tickle should fit under this native funding, although I do not think, again I could be corrected, but I do not think there is a pure native of either of the two ethnic groups in that community. I think that may have clarified the hon. member's point, I am not sure.

I did mention earlier that perhaps this government and I would hope future governments has taken some and will take more positive steps in terms of establishing a government presence and providing the services of government to the Labrador portion of the Province. I think one very important move that was made by this government just last year, and I hope will be made again next year and that has been the funding of the Labrador Resources Advisory Council. I think it has become a very important forum for the people of Labrador including the people from Menihek district, from the Labrador City, Wabush and Churchill Falls areas, the industrial areas of Labrador, because they have had representatives to meetings of that particular committee. But it has become a forum for the thoughts and feelings of Labrador and I am not going to apologize for any of the thoughts and feelings expressed at these meetings. I think I have indicated that some of the thoughts put forth have been based on frustration, perhaps on a lack of understanding in many ways of some of the unique problems we have in that part of the Province. I am not suggesting the people are unique or anything like that, but I think they are different than the majority of residents in the Province as a whole.

Mr. Goudie.

So that is one type of positive move, I think, that has been made, and I feel should continue to be made in the future. I refer briefly to some measures proposed in the Throne Speech, and I believe at least two hon. ministers will be addressing themselves to these proposed measures when they make their remarks on the present motion. I believe there is, through the carrying out of a feasibility study and the efforts to find markets overseas for wood, there is a desire to improve the economic base of the Lake Melville area. Certainly it cannot very well get any worse, I do not think, not in terms of industry at least. There is none left in the Lake Melville area and the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area as far as I am concerned.

The recent interim subsidiary agreement of eight points, which the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs helped negotiate, is a positive move, and because of the nature of that agreement, I do not think the provincial government can take all the credit for that particular effort. Obviously the federal government was very much involved in this as well. And I think that is something that has to happen in the future as well, and that is that rather than the federal and the provincial government, in some ways, working at odds against each other, that they should reconsider their responsibilities, not only to Labrador but to any part of the country, and perhaps learn, if you will, to co-operate a little more fully for the benefit of the provinces as a whole, and perhaps for the benefit of some of the people, particular people, of the provinces as a whole.

In summing up, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure I agree completely - and I think the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) made reference to this at a couple of points in his remarks - I am not sure that I agree that communities of Labrador or the people of Labrador should be studied any more. He indicated that some people had come in

Mr. Goudie.

to Labrador and even studied the lengths of noses. I did not realize that that had taken place, but I can imagine that it could very well happen and did happen. I suppose the old story of an anthropologist being a member of each family of the North is very well applied at some points in time to the people of Labrador, because there have been so many people in. The Royal Commission - that, I think, is one of the better documents produced based on the study of the conditions, the people, the feelings of Labrador. I do not think that it is necessary for another study to be made. And well when the vote is called, if a vote is called, I assume there will be, I will stand in my place and vote according to my conscience. And that very briefly, Mr. Speaker, is the number of thoughts I have on Labrador and on the particular motion put to the House by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). I must commend him for the initiative he has taken in presenting this motion to the House. I think it is going to spark some very interesting debate at some points along the way. I look forward to remarks which other hon. members are going to make. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I did not intend to start off this early this afternoon, because I anticipated some hon. members from across the way would have wanted to carry the ball for the rest of the afternoon.

MR. ROBERTS: We want to hear you make a fool of yourself.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Is that right?

Mr. Speaker, I would be

MR. LUNDRIGAN: a little bit humble about saying anything. As a matter of fact, I am becoming a great listener on Labrador and I believe perhaps I have more to learn than I can impart. Maybe that is the stance I will take throughout the whole of this debate. I would say I am no more qualified to speak on Labrador than Warren Allmand is qualified to speak on Labrador or parts of the North, and consequently maybe I should not say a word. As a matter of fact, I perhaps think we should sit back and listen to input from members like the distinguished gentleman who just spoke and the previous members because these people have a tremendous background knowledge and I am absolutely a rookie. The most I know about Labrador specifically, I have picked up from bits and pieces of experience from the background my family had in fishing, my father had in the lumber business in Uqjoktok Bay, and as the hon. member from the adjacent district - was it? - or a little to the North said, in my fishing experience in Labrador which goes back beyond the Adlatok even to the Eagle River, but not under the auspices of the Department of National Defence. So I hope my colleague from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) will get up and clarify that point as well.

I have no great background, I am saying, in matters pertaining to Labrador. I am not conversant with the communities to the extent that hon. members are from Labrador, the member who spoke from Naskaupi, the previous member from Eagle River, are people who, to one degree or another, have a tremendous background.

Other hon. members, I believe the hon. the member for Fogo has a background, and I hope he will use the occasion in the House to impart some of his feelings on Labrador to the House, and I am sure he will. Again, we have the former Premier who obviously, in Western Labrador, was in power at the time when some of the developments took place there. And

MR. LUNDRIGAN: he should not raise a question to the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) about why such-and-such agreements were not put in place, why such-and-such requirements were not put in place to force the Iron Ore Company of Canada or other companies to insure that we had the maximum benefits. He should be an expert on questions of that nature and should be able to tell the House why or why not he did not take certain initiatives. I sort of get a little small bit, perhaps, annoyed and it hits me the wrong way when I hear somebody who had twenty years of experience in matters pertaining to Labrador, Western Labrador, Coastal Labrador, who stands up here with a fresh new attitude and idealistic says, "Why cannot we bring in a little bit and piece of legislation that will clarify and cure a particular point?" It is the kind of political attitude which I believe the people of coastal Labrador are particularly concerned about and particularly - what is the word? - particularly apprehensive about or critical of and -

MR. HICKMAN: Resentful.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - basically they do not believe people who make that kind of comment.

I have one little comment from my distinguished colleague from Eagle River this afternoon. I listened to his comments, he had some three or four practical comments about some communities, some services that needed to be put in place. He had, I believe, a short-term perspective on some of the problems in coastal Labrador or rural Canada, for that matter, because I do believe there is a commonality between coastal Labrador and other rural parts of the country.

On the other hand I find it a little bit difficult to be as heartfelt about his comments, which were reasonable, given in a reasonable vein, a very, what you would call, parliamentarian approach to presentation of the problems, presentation of some of his recommendations. That is one side of it. The other side of it is that three or four evenings ago I saw the same hon.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: gentleman on television saying that the Premier of the Province has indicated that the people of Labrador do not know what they want. He said the Premier said the people of Labrador do not want water and sewer, the people of Labrador do not want services, and he went on accusing the Premier of using words like 'lies' and things of that nature. Now that was another gentleman. There is a word in psychology which I do not like to kick around which sort of describes that kind of attitude.

The gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) as well, has to be a little bit responsible in his presentation of his feelings. Because I believe in matters of this nature dealing with coastal Labrador, dealing with problems which are monumental in some ways, dealing with problems that have a lot of emotional circumstances around them, that the people who are leaders of our Province, the fifty-one of us in this Chamber, have to demonstrate some credibility and have to be a little bit reasonable in dealing with problems that are so complex and have been here with us for so long.

Now I have to put that on the record. I would like for the member to be here and perhaps he could get up and challenge what I am saying.

Mr. Lundrigan:

I am not going to, as I say, go into any long indication of what I think are the solutions. I will indicate a couple of things though, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the people in - there are several things happening today in almost every community which is distant from seats of government; communities that do not have the amenities that - I will repeat my comments, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is interested - I indicated, Mr. Speaker that I am not able to feel as good about the presentation today in the Chamber of the hon. member's professional comments, his political professionalism which showed through on the one hand, and the different approach he had in his public presentation which, as I have seen him once the week at least in quite a different kind of story.

Now let me just go on a little bit further, Mr. Speaker. I think that there is an alienation today in society as a whole. If you go into almost any area of the country which is far flung from the seat of government -

MR. STRACHAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I heard your comments earlier on, and what I was stating, I could be very careful about the use of parliamentary language, but I sat and listened to the Throne Speech, and I sat and listened to something in the Throne Speech which just is not so. And I stated so. And I stated so publicly. And I did not want this to -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Did the hon. gentleman ask me a question?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes. What you are doing is you are inferring that I was on an entirely different approach elsewhere. I think the problem of Labrador is much greater than all of this, and much greater than these small things. But if I am asked in an interview, then I obviously will state what I think is so.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What is your point of order?

MR. STRACHAN: And you were stating in a Throne Speech, you were stating things in Labrador which just is not so.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. gentleman say that the Premier of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador said that the



Mr. Lundrigan:

people of Labrador do not know what they want. Going further than that, he said, he has indicated, the Premier said that they do not want water and sewer. They do not want services. And it goes on and indicates that I am sure that no Premier, if the Premier were retarded he could not go on and say that the people of Labrador do not want services. For the obvious reason, Mr. Speaker, that this government with perhaps even the most meager way by the standards of the hon. gentleman has made some effort to try to resolve some of the problems, particularly on Coastal Labrador.

Now let me just mention a little thing which might not be of significance to the world, but should be of significance to the hon. member from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). This is where hyperbole, an exaggeration, can cause and create some of the anxieties, and some of the bitterness, and some of the disillusionment, and the disrespect and the other kinds of things that inhabit the minds of people around the coast of our Province, and throughout the world. The hon. member never mentioned in his comments about some of the things that have happened in his own community of Nain. Now again I stand to be corrected, because I am not conversant with his community of Nain. As I understand, Mr. Speaker, that -

MR. STRACHAN: Do not be talking that way.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, certainly I will, but it is not a speech, a question.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. I can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the minister's feeling on the matter. I would draw his attention as a preamble to my question to the wording of this motion which we are now debating. We talked about this one in Caucus, and the wording is very deliberately very non-partisan. We are making no charges or no inferences about government failures. We feel very -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: So what?

MR. SIMMONS: No, I have a question, I am coming to it. Could the minister restrain himself on the partisan stance he is on to now, because we feel that this issue is bigger than partisan politics, and we would hope that it would be discussed in that spirit.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, are you going to rule on this?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): I was going to bring to the hon. member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir's (Mr. Simmons) attention that he did ask permission to pose a question, in which case I think a few words of preamble would be permitted, but I would suggest that in this particular context where another member has temporarily surrendered the floor that the question should be gotten into quick rapidly.

The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I should have known better to expect the hon. member to treat my reneging and my place with any more than the disrespect he has shown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I understood that. Mr. Speaker, I gave up listening to lectures from the hon. member when I was in high school. And perhaps it is just as well now that he took his seat and listen to my few remarks. He will have his chance to get involved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I am sure he will not be negative. He certainly will not be partisan. The hon. member, I am suggesting, has indicated that nothing has been done in his own community of Nain. This year, from July 1st. to September 30th, we had the fish plant operated.

MR. LUNDRICAN:

The fish plant is a fish plant which was built by both governments. The plant produced approximately 165,000 pounds of char, 10,000 pounds of salmon. During October to November the plant was engaged in scallop fishing in connection with the federal fisheries. Thirty-two thousand pounds of scallons were landed. The plant had 262 barrels of 110 pounds each of pickled char for a total value of \$353,000. There were ten houses under construction this year, six completed, four to be completed, an expenditure of \$250,000.

We have committed funds for a handicraft center, \$50,000 in the community of Nain and -

MR. NEARY: How much?

MR. LUNDPICAN: Fifty thousand dollars. Twenty thousand dollars worth of materials have been purchased, a lot of it is on site. And I would hope in 1977 we will have that particular handicraft center completed.

These are not big things. They are fairly small things. In the community, Mr. Speaker, of Nain in 1971 the average income per person with income tax returns was \$2,260 compared with \$4,664 in the Province as a whole.

MR. ROBERTS: With income tax returns?

MR. LUNDPICAN: Income tax -

MR. ROBERTS: Where does the minister get income tax returns?

MR. LUNDPICAN: I am indicating a statistic, Mr. Speaker, which is a fact. According -

MR. ROBERTS: How did the minister get income tax returns for a community?

MR. LUNDPICAN: Mr. Speaker, the average -

MR. ROBERTS: They are confidential by law.

MR. LUNDPICAN: The hon. member yesterday chided me for having a little chit-chat back and forth across the way with my colleague. I wonder could he observe the same parliamentary behaviour that he preaches and keep his yap quiet until I am finished.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the hon. minister yield for a question, Sir?

MR. LINDPIGAN: Today, Mr. Speaker, the average income in the community, 1974 statistics indicate \$5,375.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised.

MR. NEARY: A very good foundation we laid in 1971, was it not, looking at it at this stage?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir on a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is true that the material being used by the minister now is related to Labrador in its broadest context. But I fail to see how it addresses itself to the subject matter of the motion, namely that a select committee be appointed to consider matters relating to the state and sentiment of public opinion. I would suggest he is using his speech now for a vicious attack on the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). He is far off the subject. He is irrelevant, Mr. Speaker, and I believe he should be directed to be more relevant to the subject at hand.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. When the hon. gentleman for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) was speaking in support of his resolution, he very properly and very clearly and very succinctly set forth certain reasons, economic reasons, particularly in the Coastal part of the Labrador section of our Province as to why there is allegedly certain states of sentiment in public opinion, which are not desirable. That being the proper approach that the hon. gentleman who moved this motion took, it is certainly within the rules of this hon. House for any hon. member speaking in support thereof or to that resolution to follow precisely the same approach.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I think the point that has been raised is one related to relevancy and relevancy is always a difficult issue to get into. But I think it is the position of the House that considerable latitude be given but within the subject matter dealing with the motion. I cannot see that

MR. SPEAKER:

the hon. minister has strayed further from the subject matter than the mover of the motion and I would therefore not see that he was out of order.

The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. LINDPIGAN: Mr. Speaker, since 1971 to 1974 the average income in that community has risen from \$2,262 according to my statistics - the hon. gentleman can get his research people that we have made available to him to do his own research - from \$2,262 to \$5,375. In the Province as a whole it has risen from \$4,664 to \$6,918. In one case it is 138 per cent increase. In the other case it is a forty-six per cent increase.

In any event I use that only to indicate there has been a dimension of economic development in the community of Nain, not to the point where all of the problems are eliminated but there has been a dimension of viability and stimulation in the community of Nain. I can

MR. LUNDRIGAN: go on through practically every community in the Northern part particularly of the Coast of Labrador and indicate a tremendous amount of specific bits and pieces of effort that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador are not satisfied with.

MR. ROBERTS: Paid for by Ottawa.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Partly paid for by Ottawa -

MR. ROBERTS: Eighty per cent.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - and partly paid for by the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And the community of Makkovik, Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I listened for five hours to the garbage from that hon. gentleman -

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - and he has not got the courtesy to sit and listen for fifteen minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

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

MR. MURPHY: Pure ignorance that is.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A certain amount of conversation back and forth is clearly permissible because it has been set as a precedent in the House. But hon. members of course should not interrupt to the extent that an hon. member having the floor cannot continue with his discussions, with his remarks, and I believe that this was occurring.

The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development,

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am delighted to have a bit more civilized House at the present moment with the participants. In the community of Makkovik; we are not a bit satisfied with the circumstance in the community of Makkovik but there

MR. LUNDRIGAN: has been almost \$2 million spent on water and sewer services in the community.

I have had my deputy minister very recently go and visit the community, there have been complaints and we have had - I am, in my own way, of the opinion that perhaps we should look at the money that has been spent. I believe there has been almost \$2 million, my statistics indicate to me. I have asked my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, to have some of his engineers look at the complaints, to look at the value we have gotten for the dollar, to look at the quality of the work. And as a matter of fact I have gone a step or two further than that in that I will indicate to the House in the event that the findings of my hon. colleague suggests that we are not getting full value for our dollar there, not to reflect on the community but the people who are in charge perhaps of the project in terms of the project management group - is that what you call these people who do this sort of thing - in any event I am suggesting that that has been a significant input of funds.

MR. NEARY: How about from Ottawa?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And I can go on down the line. I am suggesting to the hon. gentleman that it is a cost shared agreement, ninety-ten.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ninety-ten.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It could be a hundred and ten to minus ten.

AN HON. MEMBER: So what?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I do not find too many people from Ottawa sitting in my office these days telling me what to do on Labrador services, Labrador affairs, Labrador matters. The burden of the responsibility happens at this moment to rest on my shoulders. I am responsible for the agreement. I have just gotten it under my jurisdiction. I want to go on to perhaps impart to the House one of the reasons why the resolution is a very good point for parliamentary debate and something that will enable us to be our usual statesmanlike selves

MR. LUNDRIGAN: and get up and take part. But I will also suggest that, as my hon. colleague said, that we are sick and tired not only in Coastal Labrador but, I would suggest to the House, throughout the Province of studies and further studies and further studies and the like, further investigations, further analyses of what the problems are.

And I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, although I was accused of on the opening day of the House by the Leader of the Opposition of being colonial in responding to some of the very real problems that were presented by two colleagues today.

Just to go down through a few of the things that I feel should happen and we are going to take action on in this year 1977, beyond what we have already done.

One of the real problems in a lot of our rural communities, very, very particularly Coastal Labrador I would suggest without the detailed knowledge is that the public have never been given the opportunity and the individuals, the leaders, whoever the leaders might be, of taking up the cause and trying to identify their own potential, their own resources, their own capabilities, to find what their problems are and get response and help from government to help resolve their own problems.

There is too much emphasis, I would suggest, in a lot of our communities, especially by the Leader of the Opposition, about what the government can do. What is the government going to do? Yesterday he said, Only \$2 million for LIP. And a great distinguished member of the House of Assembly from Lewisporte (Mr. White) said Ottawa has got \$20 million from LIP. That is the answer. That is the approach. Take more money, throw it in. Let the government spend more money. That is the answer. I would like to suggest -

MR. WHITE: I stated a fact -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: My hon. colleague suggested, as the Leader of the Opposition did, that the answer to the problems of a lot of our communities is for the government to take more control, more responsibility, put in more money, do more. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the government's role is to provide the opportunities, the climate, the incentives, the



Mr. Lundrigan.

programmes that can allow people to do this themselves. With this in mind and having spent six months or more looking at the formation of a Labrador Development Corporation, looking at the pros and cons, consulting as much as one could with the limited time, bearing in mind that there was a massive study done on Labrador by the Snowden Commission, bearing in mind - going back to 1946 there is enough documentation in government to fill up the House of Assembly on recommendations on Coastal Labrador, on Labrador, on Labrador. For the last four or five years, there must be over 100 particular kinds of documents that have been presented talking about Labrador, Labrador, Coastal Labrador. Somebody had to take the bull by the horns and make a decision. The government have made a decision that this year there will be several things happen which, I feel, will make a beginning on problems that now are very, very troublesome and disconcerting to the people of Coastal Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, before indicating this, I would just like to suggest that there is no panacea. There is no this year's solution. There is no five year solution. There is no, maybe, a ten year solution to alot of the problems. Neither is there a five, two or ten year solution to the problems of alot of our communities around our coast. That is a fact. The political comment to make is that by the end of this year, we will have massive development, massive improvement, massive input of this. The facts are that almost all of the areas of the Province, where the leadership, the kinds of things that inspire people to take a hold of their own problems, have been dissipated, have been undermined for a variety of reasons. And I will not be political and exaggerate or comment on what my feelings might be on that. We feel that the first and most important move to make from what you might call a logistic point of view, or a point of view of administration or a point of view of allowing participation from the public, is to make more of a regional presence of government in Labrador with more regional offices from the point of view of government. This is a priority. The member on opening day, the Leader of the Opposition, said that that kind of an attitude is a colonial attitude. That was his

Mr. Lundrigan.

exact word that he used. My colleague today from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), my colleague from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) both indicated that there has to be more decentralization of government in Labrador. This has been recommended since day one in the Province. It has been recommended during the last several years as well, and going back to the early 1970's, that decentralization be more present. It is not that the people of Nain are going to feel any more at home or any less isolated if we have got an office of Fisheries in the Eastern part of Labrador. That is not going to be the reason, but the fact is that, I believe, and we believe, if you have more presence and closer proximity to areas of decision by government, that you will get a better service, that you will be able to take more advantage of the opportunities to help people identify their own potential a good deal more than you can from the city of St. John's or from the region of Corner Brook. That is one of the reasons that this move is going to be made. It is going to take some time. You do not press a button and tomorrow morning move people into Eastern Labrador that will carry on this major role.

My colleague from Western Labrador will indicate his feelings and the feelings of government about enhancing and elaborating on and extending the presence of government and the service capability of delivering services to people in his region of Labrador as well. And I leave that to him to indicate and to elaborate on.

What does this mean as far as the government programmes, particularly on the coast of Labrador? The Throne Speech indicated, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Rural Development would be given a vocal role to staff for and make available to the coastal parts of Labrador more extensively the programmes with a good deal more flexibility than perhaps even we have today so that we can take our

Mr. Lundrigna.

programmes with the philosophy that we have in that department and extend them to Coastal Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would take me the best part of an hour to explain some of the things that underlie the philosophy of Rural Development. What it is based on and what the programmes are to compliment the philosophy. I am sure that hon. members will agree with the Leader of the Opposition a few days ago when he said that some of the individuals who have received assistance from the programmes are not benefiting. I am sure he can take the thousand loans that we have made, in round figures, the thousand loans in Rural Development assistance and pick it apart and find quite a number of people who have not benefited. I am sure this is true. But the philosophy of making available incentives and grants and loans and community project funding that my friend - he is not in the House today - from upper Trinity South Development Association

MR. LINDRIGAN:

could elaborate on and my colleague touched on from the Bonavista North Shore Development Association in Greenspond a few days ago. That concept, these programmes properly put in place with the input from coastal communities, we feel, can make a significant difference over a period of time to the development opportunities in a lot of the coastal regions.

The government have also, Mr. Speaker, decided to look at Labrador Services perhaps as it applies to the whole Coast of Labrador. Not in any way to detract from or to back away from or to renege on any kind of agreement that is in place for the Northern Coast. This is not the intent or the thinking. But in many parts of Coastal Labrador I get the feeling, and I am advised by people who have been advising me, that the traditional kinds of free enterprise systems have not worked and it might be necessary for government to play a little more progressive type of role in some of our communities in that respect as well.

I am going to just touch on, because my colleague of course who represents the communities that have had a tremendous setback in the past twelve months particularly as it relates to the harvesting of timber, he indicated that today or tomorrow I believe it is, tomorrow being Thursday, I guess, that we do have a team of people who -

PREMIER MOOPES: Friday.

MR. LINDRIGAN: Friday is it. They will be in the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area and will be looking at putting together - we have already drawn up the terms of reference - a feasibility study for sawmills or a sawmill or some form of manufacturing wood in that community, and beyond what we already have. We have also had a tremendous amount of effort gone into the international scene. I have had one of my people full-time since the Fall dealing with a dozen countries in Europe and trying to identify areas of potential and people who want to buy wood. We have a number of countries who

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

have indicated their desire for wood, who have spelled out some of the specs or whatever the word is that they want for wood out of Labrador. And one country have indicated their desire to want to visit the Province in the very near future. We will of course be trying to work directly with Labrador Linerboard, if they want to deal with Labrador Linerboard, with the wood that is already there or with new wood harvesting which is of course more inspirational to my colleague and ourselves. These things are progressing as well.

What I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that in the last number of months, not in any way to resolve the problems tomorrow morning but in a way to plan ahead and think through what we are doing we have spent a significant amount of time in Cabinet, in government, in caucus, looking at the problems of Coastal Labrador, Eastern Labrador, Western Labrador, the problems that were alluded to today with the unemployment, not the unemployment but some of the opportunities that we feel should be in Labrador City and Wabush area. There has been a tremendous amount of energy spent in concerning ourselves with the part of our Province, not because of the problems but because of as well - and I will be accused of being a selfish bayman from across the bay here by some of my colleagues, I am sure, across the way when I say it - but because of the tremendous potential that can add to the way of life of every person in the whole of our Province, tremendous potential.

There are a tremendous number of things happening. His Honour alluded in the Throne Speech to some of the interest in looking at a port Labrador concept which was again touched on by my colleague today which again is something that will not pay dividends tomorrow morning. My colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, can bring us up to date with a progress report on some of the potential mining developments and expansion that could take place and there is a significant interest in all of the potential and the problems of Coastal Labrador and Labrador as a whole.

My colleague, the Minister of Health, before the session is out I feel - and I cannot do any more than just allude to his department

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

today - but I think in respect to rehabilitation and the like he may be having some feelings and some comments as well. I just would like to say that it is the easiest thing in the world - and I have been guilty of it frequently over a period of time - to talk about the problems, to enhance the frustrations, to lead the negative feeling. And I believe that people, especially leaders, I can sort of understand my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) who wants to stand up and get his frustrations out as a politician. When he goes to Hopedale the people get on his back and say, "What is happening to the people in our community we have got all these problems?" When he goes to Makkovik they say, "What about uranium and what about the problems there? What about the water coming gushing out around my home? What about the fact that this project is not finished?"

When he goes down to his home town of Nain he has got the same type of feeling, the isolation, the poor transportation and it is going to take a long time. I believe it is going to take a tremendous time before all of the isolation, all of the roads, all of the railways, all of the electrical lines and all of the things that you land aircraft on - what are these things? I believe the first one was ever built in Labrador is being built right now by the government of

MR. LUNDRIGAN: this Province. It is going to take a long time before all these things are eliminated, in some parts of our country they will not be eliminated in our lifetime. But I believe it is a dangerous precedent and I am going to make reference to this, Mr. Sneaker, for the people who are the leaders of our political parties, the people who get the press, the people who get quoted on television, the people who get the great globs of newspaper press. Not us guys, we are only the - you know we are just the - I was just going to use a word that my colleague the Minister of Fisheries always refers to but it is not parliamentary. We are just the little guys in a system but the leaders who are elected and who stand up as the Premier, or the aspiring Premier, in the case of the Leader of the Opposition, it is a dangerous thing for one to neglect and forget the responsibility of that type of leadership and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that on the four or five hours that the Leader of the Opposition took to deliver his speech that his constant effort to try to present to the people of Canada, to the people of the whole of our Province that there is this great separatist feeling and if we do not do something about it he is going to, you know he can almost be behind this separatist feeling.

I agree there is alienation. There is alienation - I am from Upper Island Cove. You know I had to listen for a long number of years that perhaps there was an alienation with St. John's. I get madder than blazes. There are times when my feelings about Ottawa would be a pale imitation, or Rene Leveque's would be a pale imitation to my feelings on a daily basis, we are 1500 miles, people up in Ottawa, who have never seen the Province, make decisions about us, make decisions in a vacuum. Do not make decisions they could make. Do not bring us into their confidence. Do not ask us for our involvement.

I believe my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, can tell you that when the bilaterals were negotiated with the Russians and these

MR. LUNDRIGAN: people, I do not believe Romeo, and I have got a little bit of knowledge of Mr. Romeo LeBlanc and I have sat down with him for half a dozen years in the chambers and so on, I do not believe he came down and said, Now Province how do you feel about all of this and all of this and all of that?" That was our fish. I do not feel good about that. I have been making some comments the weekend in Montreal with a number of my counterparts about our frustrations. I feel them and they should be said. But I am not going to stand up tomorrow morning and say to the people of Canada that because of these frustrations I am going to lead the mood and the feeling of alienation that exists right around this Province.

The former Premier got on the other day, I saw him on with one of his, one of those love ins he has with his favourite son and he was there on television, he was telling the rest of the Province there is not one separatist in the Province. There is not one person who would not vote for Confederation today. They went on and told all that. Power of positive thinking. He was trying to convince the world there is neither bit of alienation, there is none of this. A month before I heard him on an interview from down in his sunny south home when he indicated that he felt he had second thoughts now about this relationship he got us into with Ottawa in 1949. Did anybody hear that? I did. I heard him on saying that he had second thoughts, he was not sure that he did the right thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman yield for a moment?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I will let him ask a question.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No I do not want to make a point of order, if the hon. minister does not want to give me a moment it is all right.

I was in Florida it is true, and I got a phone call from a radio station reporter it is true, who told me something that was completely wrong and inaccurate and it was on the basis of what he told me that I made my comment in anger. What he told me was



MR. SMALLWOOD: that the court, the authority in Ottawa or wherever it was, had given Quebec the right to export Labrador power to New York at this high rate, whereas in fact what they did do was give it for a short temporary period of time. All the difference in the world.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, that is a pure example of leadership because the hon. gentleman recognizes he made the statement in haste. He made it in a moment of passionate concern for his Province, has now said that he was misinformed by the media, that it was not really the truth when we are exporting power to New York and all this sort of thing and he says, "Well look I was not really feeling that way. I really love Canada and I am a great nationalist." I understand that and I accept it. And I stick with that. But I am just indicating that this kind of -

Mr. Lundrigan:

There is an alienation. The hon. gentleman could not rise to the occasion just because some newsreporter phoned and said, "There is the story on the wire." And all of a sudden say, right out of the blue, "That I think maybe I made a mistake." What was his book called? I, what? I Chose Canada, I Chose Canada just a few years ago, Joey I Chose Canada, and all of a sudden he is a separatist? What he is really saying is there is a frustration. Every politician feels it. I feel it right down to my toenails, and about Ottawa too. But it does not give us the right to stand up and try to lead a sentiment of frustration as I saw the Leader of the Opposition do in this House in the last few days. That is the kind of Leadership I do not have any respect for. And that is the reason the hon. gentleman who looks at me from across the way from Burin-Burgeo or Burgeo or wherever he is from, the hon. gentleman who stands up, this is the kind of feeling and I continue to say it with a bit of anger that does not get us anywhere in this Province, this is the kind of feeling that leads people of the Province to say, "We do not believe politicians". That is the thing I told my hon. colleague this afternoon. He is a friend of mine. I talked with him. He talked to me. He walks into my Department of Rural Development as if he owns it, and I say, "Go to it." That is what I want everybody to do. Go to it. Get in and take full advantage of it. And take advantage of the programme. Become knowledgeable. But do not come into the House and be a great statesman, and tell us how you feel, that we have got to be more concerned, we have got to allow the people to participate more, which I think we are doing through our Advisory Council as a first again for this Province, by the government of this Province last year. Do not say that here, and be a statesman, and then go on television and say, the Premier is lying because he said this. "The Premier said, you do not want water and sewer service on Coastal Labrador." He indicated in his statement that the people have nothing on Coastal Labrador. We know that the economy is not as healthy. We know there

Mr. Lundrigan:

is alienation. We know we have got to be able to try to divert more of our resources, financial and otherwise, to try to get people in the mainstream of things again, to help them get their economy back on stream. But you are not going to do it by taking a bunch of government money and just throwing it at the system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is perhaps what separates the people on that side of the House today from the people right here. We are, I believe, Mr. Speaker, we are today and tomorrow people. I believe the people across the way are yesterday and today people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yesterday and today people. anybody can be a today person. That is not leadership. That is not what politicians are all about, talking about something you have got to do today, the LIP mentality. Sure I want LIP money. But that is today's stuff. That does not develop economies. That does not look ahead. Politicians are getting paid, and I think a fairly decent wage, to try to provide a bit of leadership, to stand out in front of the public, of their country, and the public of their Province and say, "This is how we feel things should go right here." And a lot of the people will stand back and say, "We think you have got rocks in your skull." The politician who continues to say to the public, "Here is what you want, here is what you are going to get," without regard for the long-term public welfare is one of the biggest reasons why we have got some of the economic problems we have got in this Province today. Politicians who are today people are causing most of the problems. And do you know something? The public are beginning to figure it out very quickly. The public are beginning to figure it out. If we say today -

MR. SMALLWOOD: What about Gander-Twillingate?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Never mind your Gander-Twillingate Old Top. Never mind your Gander-Twillingate. One of your biggest problems is that you do not know when to keep your mouth quiet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Closed.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I got defeated in Gander-Twillingate. It did not hurt me a bit. It taught me a lot of lessons, a lesson you have got to learn yet. A lot of the people here have been defeated.

MR. HICKMAN: You were not defeated there in Gander-Twillingate.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You are a spoiled politician aside from anything I could tell you.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, let me continue.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you have anything nice to say?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: No I have nothing nice, Mr. Speaker. I have got a lot of feeling in the pit of my stomach too, like the member for Eagle River, and the member for Menihek because I worked fifteen or eighteen or twenty hours a day at this stuff. Full-time at it, not involved in any business, not involved in anything else, full-time at politics trying to help the people of this Province. Not providing a lot of leadership, a little bit, but I think, Mr. Speaker, if all of us did that, buried a little bit of the foolish hatchet, got involved in recognizing we are making some moves. I think this year of 1977 indicating the regional presence, the first time ever. Is it not something that the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who sat with his colleague the former Premier for all those years, never made a single move to put anybody in an area that could serve the people of Coastal Labrador. We are saying we are going to do it. We have done it substantially. We have done it

Mr. Lundrigan.

substantially, and the leader says, it is colonialism.

MR. ROBERTS: Name the departments.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, we will name the departments. We will name them. We are making our moves, and we will name them. We will put our people in place. The difference between this government and the hon. Leader of the Opposition is that he is a philosopher and a theoretician and a fellow who has spent a lot of his time with his nose in books. We are practical politicians with a good deal of practical behaviour providing a bit of leadership.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have indicated a few of our thoughts on it, the regional stuff, the department, I suggest, will play a major role this year. All of my colleague, I am sure, can stand here and indicate some of the moves that they have in their department to try to deliver a better service, better economic opportunities. I might suggest in closing that there is a feeling - and it is being worked on now - there will be a committee struck, a federal/provincial committee who will work with my colleague, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, a committee struck of federal/provincial people to take the challenge of Mr. Marcel Lessard, who has been a co-operative person in the last number of months, very co-operative, to take the challenge he threw at us, and put in place a group of people who can negotiate an agreement for the entire Eastern and Coastal regions and any other kinds of benefits for the entire Labrador area, because there are tremendous significant opportunities. One of the great frontiers - even with the types of things that have happened - one of the great frontiers. And I hope that some time this year - I know these things take a bit of time, we have to be a bit patient - that we can see much more than really what will be a big intra move by this government take place in Labrador.

Mr. Lundrigan.

I also feel, Mr. Speaker, that the concept of the Labrador Development Corporation will not be dropped entirely. We have looked at it. I do not think we are ready for it. Certainly the people are not ready. That is a reasonable comment. My colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) will have to agree that that concept can be carried forward. Perhaps there can be more work done on it, cost it out, and it might eventually be a year or two down the road, a kind of instrument that can be used to take action more directly, particularly in the areas which need less red tape and more decisiveness, and that is the kind of thing that we are working on. I think we are making a bit of progress. I would not suggest to my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) or the Leader of the Opposition that if a year from now all the problems are not resolved that we have broken our promise, because it is going to take a lot of time in all of our Province, particularly the coast of Labrador to make a significant impact on problems that have been generations, but certainly the last quarter of a century, developing. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It being nearly six o'clock I shall in a moment move the adjournment of the debate. I would just like to take a moment, if I may, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is a very simple motion, very simply worded for a very deliberate reason. I am a little taken aback by the rather documented defense of government action in government performance in Labrador we have heard during the past few minutes. We had hoped in our caucus that that kind of thing would not have happened. Indeed we deliberately worded the motion so has not to have any inferences or direct references to alleged government failures and that kind of thing. We had hoped that we would rise above the normal partisan confrontation that we are so adept at getting into, and

Mr. Simmons.

that we would address ourselves to what is a very real problem, a problem that is becoming more real and of greater magnitude with every passing day. And, Mr. Speaker, in that spirit I would appeal to all of us, as we get into this debate, not to make the mistake of pretending the problem does not exist, not to make the mistake of pretending that we are moving fast towards a solution to the problem. Because while we may think that here from the vantage point of St. John's, there are people in Labrador who think very, very differently on that point. I would appeal to all of us not, Mr. Speaker, to turn this into a partisan debate. I believe this is a problem which concerns everybody, whatever our political label, all of us who have faith in the future of this Province, and who see Labrador as a continuing part of this Province. I would see, Mr. Speaker, this motion, as a plea from the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), one who sees firsthand that we are headed towards a fairly precarious precipice if we do not do something about it fairly soon. I see this as a motion and a plea from the people of Labrador generally to listen while there is time. I cannot think of a better vehicle at this time by which they can listen since we cannot bring them all here than for us, through the medium and the mechanism of a Select Committee, to go to them. That is all we are suggesting, Mr. Speaker. We have not made any indictment

MR. SIMMONS: of government on this matter and we do not intend to. We would appeal to members on both side of the House to enter into the spirit in which this motion is put down on the Order Paper, "To consider rationally the wisdom or otherwise of a Select Committee so we can allow the people of Labrador to, first hand, have some input into our thinking, we the legislators of the Province." I move the adjournemnt of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Thrusday, February 10, 1977 at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Before adjourning the House I have received a letter form the Auditor General, today's date. It arrived in my office a short while ago and I think at the earliest opportunity I should read it to hon. members.

"I have to inform you that in paragraph 23 on page 19 of my report to the House of Assembly, tabled by the Minister of Finance yesterday the 8th of February, the name St. John's Housing Authority has been wrongfully used by me and that the reference should have been to St. John's Housing Corproation.

As you are aware the two are completely separate entities and it is with considerable embarassment and regret that I acknowledge and apologize for my confusion of the two names.

I would sincerely appreciate it if the error could be brought to notice, and as well, that in the further printing of my report I will be authorized to make the appropriate correction."



MR. SPEAKER: It is signed by the Auditor General so I would ask on his behalf for the authorization to make that change in further printing.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

On motion the House at its rising  
adjourned until tomorrow Thursday, February 10, 1977 at 3:00 p.m.