



Province of Newfoundland

THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XXXIX

Third Session

Number 60

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable James Russell

Wednesday

5 December 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, several days ago I indicated that I would consider making public the Province's position on several fundamental issues which involved the Province's development and which obviously involved the federal government.

Soon after the new federal government came into office, the provincial government prepared a document which it presented to the Mulroney government which outlined our position on fundamental issues. I am tabling with this statement a copy of that document entitled Discussion Paper on Major Bilateral Issues, Canada Newfoundland. This document covers the following topics: (1) A strategy for development; (2) Fisheries; (3) Offshore Mineral Resources; (4) Hydro-Electricity Development; (5) Regional Development; (6) Transportation; (7) Technology Development and Human Resources; and (8) National Defense.

This government believes that future success in our economy centres to a great degree around three resource sectors, the fishery, offshore resources and

hydro power. The forestry sector, of course, must continue to operate at near capacity and is vital to large areas of the Province.

In fishery matters the government continues to hold strongly to the view that constitutional change is essential in the long term if the fishery resource off our coast is to be developed fully for those who live nearest to it. Until this amendment is realized meaningful consultation must occur between both levels of government covering all areas of the industry including: resource management, harvesting, processing, infrastructure, marketing and trade.

Rather than take up the time of the House, because it goes into it in great deal here on every one of those subject matters, I am just mentioning them and leave it to hon. members to read the more elaborate dissertation on them contained on the resource management side, constitutional change and everything that is in the document itself.

The government maintains, secondly, that an agreement on offshore resources is essential and must incorporate an elaborate upon the principles contained in the exchange of letters between myself and Mr. Mulroney. Since this document was written, negotiations have begun on this vital issue and the government is optimistic that an agreement will be reached early in the New Year. Following an agreement, legislation will be introduced in both parliaments incorporating the agreement. The Province then intends to seek a constitutional amendment so that the agreement will be beyond change by any one

government.

There is a big long section on hydro power, and I will do it all in only four lines here, but I will leave it to hon. members again to read the document because what I am saying here now is no substitute for the document.

The Province will continue to pursue changes in the Upper Churchill contract. New approaches along this line will be considered and they are under consideration by the government right now and it is our intention to examine ways in which the federal government may become involved in the matter. As time progresses in the Winter we will be in a position to make more substantive statements concerning that matter.

Regional Development is an important component for the successful development of the Newfoundland economy. May I say that I was pleased that the Prime Minister agreed with me in our meeting at Meech Lake to have regional development as one of the four items to be discussed at the First Ministers' Conference on the economy, because I thought it was important that that became a separate issue. It never got necessarily blurred in trade, investment and training, but it could, and therefore the have-not provinces could easily lose out again. So I was very insistent that it would be included on the agenda as a separate agenda item for the First Ministers' Conference on the economy. I was very pleased that the Premier Minister and a lot of the other provinces purported the view and I was able to get it put on the agenda when in the first instance it was not going to be there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So regional development is an important component for the successful development of the Newfoundland economy, as we all know in this House, and there must be a joint approach by the two governments.

There are a number of principles which must apply to regional development policy, as far as the Government of Newfoundland is concerned, and they include: (1) Regional development programmes should be based on the principle of the comparative advantage of each region. A specific strategy should be developed for each province, and, not necessarily each region. but each province.

(2) Regional development is a long process. Policies and objectives must therefore be steadily pursued and consistently funded, rather than the situation that we had through the late 1970s and early 1980s where we saw a dip. If you are going to do that, you are just going to fall further and further behind and not play the catch-up mechanism that regional development is suppose to do.

(3) Federal and provincial governments both share a common interest in regional development. Coordination and co-operation between the two orders of government is essential.

(4) The federal government must commit itself to long-term, adequately funded joint initiatives with the provinces whether through ERDA or another process.

In addition to the seven agreements already signed, the

Province will pursue new agreements immediately on highways, pulp and paper modernization - which should be signed in the next couple of days - fisheries, infrastructure, agriculture, forestry and St. John's urban region.

Transportation is such a crucial part of our development that it must be considered a separate issue, in our view. We mentioned this in the discussion paper, as a separate issue, and not to be confused as it gets into larger issues. The Province maintains that a comprehensive transportation plan must be devised covering all aspects of the issue and we will be pursuing such a plan in discussions with the federal minister. Continued work on the Trans-Canada Highway and the Trans-Labrador Highway specifically through new agreements will be immediate priorities.

The Government of Newfoundland maintains in this document that we must pursue technology development and human resources development along the lines of making Newfoundland a "Centre of Excellence" in marine industry and technology closely linked to the fishery and offshore mineral resources. We must build upon such agencies as C-Core and NORDCO. We must highlight and expand upon the research capability and educational capability being provided through the new Arctic Vessel and Marine Research Institute and the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology. New skill training, in line with our new Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies, new skill training in our post-secondary institutions is a must.

I would ask hon. members on both sides of the House to take particular notice of the section in the document on National Defence and the statistics that are there.

MR. NEARY:

A full military base is all we want.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, exactly. I agree.

And in the latter part of the document, not in the summary, in the latter part of the document which deals with the defence. I just bring the members' attention, on page 37, the expenditure per capita on defence in Canada with all of the Provinces. Nova Scotia gets \$836 per capita from National Defence, we get \$81, we are the lowest.

MR. TULK:

They are the highest, are they?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They are the highest.

In the area of National Defence the document argues that Newfoundland is not getting a fair deal. Per capita spending in Newfoundland is the lowest for any province, yet our strategic location is obvious. Defence dollars should be increased involving; improved search and rescue, which we are now working on with the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), as well as the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) and Newfoundland Hydro, and we are hoping to see some improvement in that very soon. Increased use of Goose Bay by Canada and NATO forces and other defence bases in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
With this brief overview, Mr. Speaker, I table the document referred to and invite hon. members' support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, we have not yet received a copy of the main document so it is difficult to comment on the position that the Province is taking vis-a-vis the new federal Conservative government. I have now received the discussion paper. We will take a look at that and analyse it, Mr. Speaker, and we will be making a complete statement on it. The Ministerial Statement just delivered by the Premier is basically as empty as the first Throne Speech that we got this year. It seems to be the setting out of the second five-year plan. I guess we are several years into the last five-year plan, but it seems to have stalled a little. But we will pay particular interest to the presentation made to the Government of Canada with respect to the Upper Churchill contract. I am a bit disappointed that the statement says, 'New approaches along this line will be considered and it is our intention to examine ways in which the federal government may become involved.' I may be wrong because I have not read the main document just having received it, but it indicates to me that the Province has not yet made a request to the Government of Canada for that

government to become directly involved in assisting to resolve the dispute with Quebec on the Upper Churchill. It seems to me that is an unnecessary waste of time, that the Province should have known how the Government of Canada could assist, and should already have made representation requesting assistance along those lines. I note that the Premier is suggesting that regional development programmes should be developed for each province separately, and it is interesting to note there, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Canada seems to already have developed a different approach even with respect to the offshore, where in the reference to the Atlantic Accord rather than to an offshore agreement with Newfoundland, the Government of Canada continuously refers to the fact that it will be working out an agreement for all the Atlantic Provinces and not just for Newfoundland. It seems to be taking an Atlantic approach rather than an approach for each separate province, and this is a matter that may be at some odds with this desire of the Premier to have a specific programme developed for each province in regional development or in other areas. Again, Mr. Speaker, we have a shopping list of requests by the Province, and this is understood. There is always a need for continuous assistance from the Government of Canada and we hope that we will see the continued investment in this Province that there has been in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the reference to fisheries, also, I should mention, seems to be very definitely muted and much less definitive than has previously been the case when this government got up to state what its position should be with

respect to the fishing industry, and I will have to take a close look and see what the Province is saying when it says 'it continues to hold strongly to the view that constitutional change is necessary'. Is it saying that it should have first access to the Northern Cod, before Nova Scotia and before other provinces? I will have to see how the main document deals with this. It is not set out in the Premier's statement and he seems to be down-playing this now as well. We support, Mr. Speaker, the concept of greater investment in this Province in the area of National Defence. We have not been getting our share of the defence dollar, and we look forward to some progress being made in this area. Generally, Mr. Speaker, we will have to analyse closely the Province's discussion paper and we will be commenting further.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the hon. House a preliminary report on meetings, held over the past several months, by provincial ministers concerning reforms applicable to pension arrangements across our nation. Other such meetings are planned in the near future.

The purpose of the meetings is to attempt to achieve as high a measure of harmony and uniformity as possible in provincial pension reform legislation. Such legislation primarily is related to pension arrangements in the private sector, that is between businesses and their employees. In addition, later meetings will deal with a hopefully harmonized approach to the federal

government, especially concerning public pension arrangements including the Canada Pension Plan. In June of this year, provincial ministers achieved a high measure of consensual agreement on a large number of points including such important issues as the portability of pension benefits between plans, interest rates applicable to employee contributions, pension benefits relating to divorce and remarriage, sex differentiation in regard to pension benefits, employee representation and disclosure of information, and so on..

On Monday last, a meeting which I attended in Toronto dealt with such matters as vesting and locking in of benefits, minimum contributions of employers and employees on employment termination, pre and post retirement survival benefits, and membership of full-time and part-time workers in pension plans. A considerable measure of unanimity was achieved amongst ministers from each province attending.

I should add that all such consensual agreements are subject to final Cabinet approval in each province. A further meeting is planned for January next, probably followed by a federal-provincial meeting. Certain aspects of possible pension reform remain outstanding, particularly inflation protection of pension benefits.

In view of the importance of this whole subject to all our people, at appropriate times I will be making public statements on proposed pension reforms, and inviting public comment.

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

MR. HODDER:
Mr. Speaker, we see nothing objectionable in the minister's statement. We support what the minister is doing. We have heard of a lot of problems with pension plans, particularly in light of high inflation in the country. And the federal government brought down a report on pensions some time ago. So we have no problem with the statement. We do hope that the minister will have discussions with various employee representatives, as well, to have their views made known as well as the employers.

Oral Questions

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has recently met with Mr. Wilson, and I believe the entire Province is waiting to hear whether the federal minister has agreed to modify some of the adverse decisions which were taken in his mini-budget. I wonder if the minister would tell this House whether Mr. Wilson has agreed to reinstate the elements cut from the fisheries programme, avoid the cutbacks in the unemployment programme, avoid the cutbacks in youth job creation programmes, avoid the Gulf ferry increases, avoid the cutbacks in CBC services, avoid the shutdown of the Argentia Vessel Traffic System, and the cutback in the Port aux Basques facility? Has the minister made representation

and gotten a response on these points from the federal minister?

MR. HODDER:
A good question.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is asking me did Mr. Wilson tell me that his statement there a few weeks ago in the House of Commons was all a mistake and now he wants take it all back. No, he did not say that at all. Mr. Wilson came down here as he promised shortly after he made that statement in the House of Commons, because he was going to visit all the provinces. He wants a picture put to him of the state of the economy in each province, of the financial situation with regard to each provincial government. He wants an outline of the economic developments each province sees in the future, including the near future, and especially those towards which his upcoming federal budget, his new federal budget, will have some impact, and this is the way we structured our meeting this morning. We made him aware of the fragile nature of our economy here at the present time, we made him aware of our expectations in many areas, in the fisheries, offshore, hydro and, in particular, forestry, mining, and these types of things. He expressed an awareness of it, but he also expressed some gratification that we gave him extra details that he will carry back with him and he will put into his preparation for his upcoming budget. He also indicated that there will be papers coming forward from various federal ministries on matters like job

creation, unemployment benefits, and a wide range of subjects which need to be reviewed and new thrusts take place in. We told him that we will look forward to receiving those papers, we will give them careful study, and we will reply in detail to them at future meetings at the Finance Minister level, at the First Minister level, and at any further economic or financial meetings between the two levels of government.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A supplementary the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) would tell us whether he raised the matter of the amount of money, I think it is \$6 million, which has been allocated to assist fishermen who have not had sufficient earnings to qualify for unemployment insurance, and I wonder if the minister believes that that amount is sufficient to meet the needs of the numbers of fishermen who have not obtained sufficient stamps and, if not, whether the minister made any representation with a view to having this amount increased?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I believe it has been stated that most of that \$6 million will indeed come to this Province. We will be getting the major part of that new assistance to fishermen who have run into difficulties with the extended UI benefit arrangement. I have not,

nor would I, I suppose, be expected to have details on that, that is a matter that is more clearly in the area of responsibility of the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and possibly the Minister of Fisheries (Acting) (Mr. Goudie), I would imagine. We think that that is a good move, it is a move showing sensitivity on the part of the federal government. As to whether it is enough, it has only been recently announced, we will have to study it and see, and if it is not sufficient, if it does not take care of the situation I am sure that necessary representations will be made.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

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

MR. BARRY:

I will address this to the Premier or to whomever he would care to designate to respond. Since the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) apparently did not even ask the federal minister as to the calculations they had made with respect to the numbers of fishermen who would need assistance, is there any minister over there who knows how many fishermen are out there who are in the position of not qualifying for unemployment insurance? Does anybody care? Could anybody over there tell us how many fishermen have not qualified for UI, and whether this \$6 million will be sufficient to meet the need that is out there?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We are assessing that matter at the present time to ensure that we have the right numbers to see whether the \$6 million is sufficient or not, and we will be in touch with the federal government as soon as we see whether in fact this new amount of money is going to be sufficient in Newfoundland. If it is not, we will be requesting more.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier was in Ottawa yesterday, and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) met with Mr. Wilson this morning. I think I will direct my first question to the hon. the Premier about his visit to Ottawa. Now I know it was promoted as a meeting of the First Ministers involving the status of women, but let me ask the hon. gentleman if he took advantage of his trip to Ottawa to give Ottawa a broadsides, to give the ministers a broadsides about the devastating effect that the Wilson budget is going to have on this Province, especially on CN Marine employees, TerraTransport employees, students and the like? Will the hon. gentleman tell the House if he had any meetings aside from the one that he went to attend? Did he meet with any of the ministers? Did he make any demands on the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser), for instance, about the Northern cod and about the quotas this year? Did he make any demands on the Minister of Transport (Mr. Bouchard) about CN Marine and the

devastating impact that their policy is going to have on CN Marine? - we have already seen twenty-seven layoffs in Port aux Basques. Did the hon. gentleman meet with any of the ministers at all to talk about these matters?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, on the matter of some of the statements coming out of the budget or the economic statement, right now there is a working committee between the Ministry of Transport and the Department of Transportation locally, who are working through that statement as it related to CN Marine and negotiations and discussions are ongoing between the two levels of government concerning that to ensure that we are not unduly hurt by these announcements, and to see what we can do about them. So that is underway.

The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser) is coming to the Province, I think, on the weekend, Sunday, to begin a series of meetings with the Minister of Fisheries here (Acting) (Mr. Goudie) concerning fisheries matters. If the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will look up in the document that was sent to every minister in Ottawa, the pages which were relevant to his or her department were noted in the letter. And the whole question of fisheries and allocation of fish is all in that document as well. We are following up now from that document with meetings with the individual ministers. So where there are problems they are being addressed immediately through meaningful negotiations with the appropriate ministry in Ottawa.

Yesterday I was in Ottawa. It was not First Ministers, it was the ministers from across Canada who were responsible for the status of women, and in this Province yours truly happens to be responsible for the status of women. So we had meetings concerning the upcoming First Minister's Conference on the economy and how, as ministers responsible for the status of women, we could indicate to the other first ministers the concern that a lot of women's groups have in Canada as it relates to economic matters and how women could be plugged more into the system, and it was a very successful meeting. That was yesterday morning.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I did take advantage of the opportunity. I did not meet with any of the ministers, I met with the Prime Minister and reviewed federal/provincial relationships as it related to this document and other matters flowing out of the economic statement.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for that little piece of information. Now we have established the fact that the hon. gentleman met with the Prime Minister. I do not wish for the hon. gentleman to break a confidence, but did the hon. gentleman give the Prime Minister a red-hot poker or a broadsides for the devastating impact that the Wilson budget is going to have on this Province? Did the hon. gentleman express grievous and

grave concern about the serious impact that the Wilson budget is going to have on the economy of this Province and on the well-being of the people of this Province? If so, would the hon. gentleman give us a few examples?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that the first time that I have spoken to a Prime Minister on the phone has been since Mr. Mulroney became Prime Minister. The former Prime Minister never, ever returned any of my phone calls, and never answered a letter in less than three months, but usually it was six to eight months. In this particular instance, since this gentleman became Prime Minister, I have been speaking to him on the phone more times already, I guess, than I can remember, both during working hours and after working hours, and when I requested to see him it was done in less than an hour. So there is a big difference. I had never spoken to a Prime Minister on the phone before until after September of this year. Believe that if you can, but it is true.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, as Premier of the Province and Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs and taking information from all the other ministers in the Cabinet, I did indicate to the Prime Minister deep concerns that we have about the state of the Newfoundland economy as it related to our major resource industries, some of the areas where I thought the federal government could assist, and indicated our concern as it related to CN Marine and some of the other particular items that flowed out of the economic

statement. That meeting between the Prime Minister and I will be followed up with other meetings with the two ministers on these matters to ensure that Newfoundland is treated fairly and not unfairly as these decisions flow out of the April budget. We have from now to April on most of these decisions, and so we are in the process of meeting to ensure that we put forward arguments which will see some of these policies amended and modified so as to lessen the impact that they would have upon this Province.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is giving us a little bit of information there about his meeting with the Prime Minister. I am sure if he wanted to he could go further, but I am glad to hear that the matter of CN Marine was raised. Could the hon. gentleman just make a couple of notes? Because you are only allowed two or three supplementaries, I have to put a whole lot of questions into my final supplementary. I want to ask the hon. gentleman, because of the five years grace that was given the Newfoundland Railway after the Sullivan Royal Commission recommended that it be abandoned - Otto Laing gave him five years to carry on, and then do a review after five years - would the hon. gentleman indicate if that was one of the items he mentioned to the Prime Minister, that the Newfoundland Railway carry on as a permanent service in this Province? And what about the Upper Churchill? Did the hon.

gentleman demand of the Prime Minister, the same as he did of the previous Prime Minister, that they force Quebec to re-open the Upper Churchill Falls contract? And what about the corridor across Quebec? Did the hon. gentleman demand of this Prime Minister the same as he did of Mr. Trudeau, that they force Quebec to give us a power corridor across the Province of Quebec? And did the matter of getting the question of the offshore enshrined in the Constitution of Canada come up? And could the hon. gentleman indicate if the matter of hydro development in Labrador came up? And one final question, Mr. Speaker, did the hon. gentleman find out at the meeting that he went to Ottawa to attend if there are any other provinces which consider the male to be the traditional breadwinner in the family?

MR. SIMMS:

There is a good question, by God! It is about time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I hope I do not get a point of order now when I try to answer that question. The member for LaPoile took an awful long time to ask it. Number one, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY:

Just yes or no, that is all.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes or no now, sure! You want to have your cake and eat it too. What else is new for a Liberal in Newfoundland if they do not want to have their cake and eat it too?

Mr. Speaker, as I continue to have

these meetings with the Prime Minister of Canada, I obviously cannot, on certain sensitive matters, report completely and totally to the House at any one given time, especially a day or so after. There are certain things in train, and obviously it would not be in the public interest to make all of those discussions public right afterwards. You know, this is a new experience for me. I have not had the experience of being able to sit down with a Prime Minister and review federal/provincial relationships. This is a brand new experience so I have to get my feet wet first, I have to get used to this. This is a whole new game.

MR. NEARY:

Did you kiss the hem of his garment?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No. I must say I did not act towards the Prime Minister as the hon. member acted toward Mr. Trudeau when he was Prime Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I did not suck up like the hon. member did, and like the Liberal Party of Newfoundland did. If it had to be left to the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and not to the people of Newfoundland, we would not be close to having an offshore agreement today, Mr. Speaker, it would have been another sell-out, another great Liberal sell-out.

MR. NEARY:

That is not what the polls noted.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, I have a number of polls, Mr. Speaker, that one of these days I

will show to CBC television to see whether they will carry them.

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Sir, every day. CBC television every day.

MR. NEARY:

The message is beginning to get through, they are getting paranoid up there.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, CBC are paranoid.

MR. NEARY:

Right.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Back in September we presented to the Prime Minister the document that I tabled and made public today, so all the issues between the federal government and the provincial government, both the broad policy issues contained in that document, the narrower specific areas for federal/provincial agreement which is contained in that document, and, in addition, all of the issues that have come up since that document was written, was part of the meeting, obviously.

Now, the individual items, obviously I am not going to get into them. As I say, certain matters are in train and would not be in the public interest to release, but I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that we now have a Prime Minister in Canada who is willing to talk to the various premiers of the various provinces, and we can sit down and meet, and we can establish certain agendas for ourselves and get on with the job of running Canada in a sensible and consultative way.

And I was extremely happy with the meeting. There will be others, obviously, in the next few months and weeks, and I look forward to that positive dialogue that has been established with the new Prime Minister. But all of the issues that the hon. member mentioned, and more, were discussed yesterday with the Prime Minister.

I would not sit down with the Prime Minister of Canada and limit myself to the small number of items that the hon. member for LaPoile brought up. I would be doing a disservice to the people of Newfoundland if that was all I brought up, those three or four issues. We brought up a multitude of other issues and discussed them, and have established certain agendas for ourselves as it relates to those items. So it was an excellent meeting. I know it disappoints the members of the Opposition to think that this can happen now in Canada, but how good it is, Mr. Speaker, to see the Trudeau era over, a new kind of confederation in Canada, where the Prime Minister will sit down and talk to a premier and not unilaterally say, 'I am going to do this, or I am going to do that, or I am going to do something else.' And, believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, very, very soon the Government House Leader, the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall), and his counterpart in Ottawa, and all of us here in Newfoundland, will be sitting in St. John's, Newfoundland, signing an agreement which the Liberal Party of Newfoundland was opposed to for the last ten years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. A week or two ago I asked, on behalf of the Ministerial Association in Labrador West, if the Province could put into place a dollar for dollar donation system for Ethiopian relief. At that time the Premier informed me that they would take it under advisement and, at the same time, that they felt that the restrictions that were in place were perhaps too difficult to overcome. I would like to ask the Premier today if they have made a decision on it yet and, if they have, what is that decision?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, but shortly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FEWNICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My supplementary question to the Premier is that I would like to suggest that the provincial government would be in an excellent position to donate the sum of \$934.61, at least, to Ethiopian relief. I refer to that exact number because, as I understand it, that is the exact cost of this extremely partisan advertisement which appeared in The Evening Telegram today, 'Bill 37, An Act To Protect Jobs'. I would suggest that the Premier may get the money by asking the PC Party to pay for the advertisement, which should have

at the beginning, and take the money that would then be freed up and donate it to Ethiopian relief.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The Chair recognized the hon. the member for Menihek on a supplementary question and he is proceeding to make a speech. I would ask him to direct the question.

MR. FENWICK:

The question is, will the PC Party pay for this ad and the money released from it, the \$934.61, be donated to Ethiopian relief.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not think any of us in this hon. House appreciates the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) trying to preach to us here, Mr. Speaker. We are quite capable of making up our own minds and making our own decisions on matters relating to world famine, world relief, world peace, nuclear freeze, and all the other things which the hon. member advances as if they were his own personal cause and nobody else's in this hon. House. As I indicated to the hon. member, a decision on that matter will be made very, very shortly. The government reserves the right, as no doubt the hon. member, and his party, and his friends in the labour movement do, to make their positions known to the people of Newfoundland, and we intend to do likewise.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I might suggest that when the Premier is finalizing his

position on that he might give consideration if it is possible, I know it is difficult with lack of freezing facilities and so forth, but whether there might be some sort of arrangement with respect to some aspect of the fishing industry, protein that might be made available through the Canadian Saltfish Corporation or some other means, that will identify the donor as Newfoundland.

But, Mr. Speaker, the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) anticipated a point that I wish to make. I would like to ask the Premier whether he is prepared, whoever pays for this ad, I would like to ask the Premier whether he is prepared to see that the Opposition is given equal access to funding to convey its position on this bill and any other bills that are in the course of debate in the House of Assembly on which the provincial government decides it wants to issue propaganda.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Two points, Mr. Speaker: As it relates to world food aid, as it relates to the fishery, we have been for a number of years arguing - and I am not sure, but I think it is somewhere in the document; it may have been in another paper that we sent up to the federal government recently. My memory may be bad, it may not be in this document now. But, in any case, we have been negotiating on and off for years and years on this whole question of trying to plug into the federal system and into their trade.

MR. BARRY:

It is on page fifteen.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, page fifteen, that is the one I am referring to. I figured it was here. My memory is not all that bad.

It is not a simple matter. One would think, because there are so many people hungry and all the rest of it, that it could be done a lot easier, but it is not a simple matter. A problem with it every time, as we have seen in the latest Ethiopian experience up until it reached crisis proportions, is the distribution problem. It gets on the wharf somewhere and does not get to the people. It was only a few weeks ago in the latter stages of all that food lift that the food actually got moved. The other problem, as I have seen from a couple of foreign correspondents who were reporting from Addis Ababa, is that a lot of people right in Addis Ababa were not all that much concerned about the people up North who were hungry. It was an unreal report. It is a difficult matter but we are working on it, and we would love to be able to plug that into the system.

On the question of the ad, the government, Mr. Speaker, reserves the right from time to time, on a given matter which is of importance to the people of the Province, to make its position known through such ads. The Government of Newfoundland paid for that ad in The Evening Telegram, it paid for all the ads in all the other papers throughout the Province, and it will continue to do so. We are not convinced that the people of the Province fully understand what we are doing with Bill 37, that it provides the best protection in Canada for temporary layoffs, the best,

better than B.C. or Alberta or Saskatchewan or Manitoba, or Ontario, or Quebec, or New Brunswick, or P.E.I., or Nova Scotia. And there are a number of groups in the Province, including the Opposition, who are trying to camouflage and blur what the government is trying to do. We have a responsibility to inform the people. If we do not think that has been done adequately through CBC television, we reserve the right to use public money to inform them of provincial policies that their provincial government is instituting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I am tempted, but I am not going to do it - after the Premier's meeting with the Prime Minister yesterday and the poll coming out just prior to that meeting, if he tried to get for himself the Newfoundland vacancy for the Senate when he heard about that poll - but I am not going to ask him that question, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask him about a proposal that was put on the table by the unions in Corner Brook. In view of the fact that when Kruger comes in No. 4 machine may shut down for ten months or so and, in view of the fact that there is going to be a layoff of around 400 people, so we are told - we do not have the facts of it yet, but I imagine when the bill comes in we will hear about it. I think they were told that on January 1, 198 employees will be laid off - in view of these facts

and the fact that the unions in Corner Brook asked for the support of the provincial government to try to get the MILAP programme instituted in Corner Brook, to try to get Corner Brook included under MILAP so that some of the affected employees could take early retirement, the same as they did in Labrador City and Wabush under ILAP and in Port aux Basques under ILAP, would the hon. gentleman tell us what action has been taken on that? Because the union's Pensions Committee has asked both levels of government to implement this early retirement programme. Could the hon. gentleman tell us if anything has been done about it since?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is moving on all fronts. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) wanted to ask me something about the poll. I think I found out this morning that one of the hon. gentlemen involved in that poll is a real good Liberal. Did you know that?

MR. NEARY:

There is no such thing as a bad Liberal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

But there are not very many of them.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, that is how I understand it, and that he is very close to Mr. Regan in Nova Scotia. That is what I understand. I just found it out this morning. I do not know if it means anything or not.

Now, on the more serious issue of the day that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has advanced, yes, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) in consultation with the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) and the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) and the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), have made representation under that programme. But we did not stop there, Mr. Speaker. We were in the process of doing it anyway. That has been done and it has been followed up on vigorously by the ministers concerned. But the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) also, not satisfied that that programme might assist, wanted to assist more, so we are trying to advance under the present forestry agreement the silviculture programme which provides many, many jobs also, and to advance and intensify the silviculture programme in 1985 to accommodate some of these other people who may not be going to early retirement and who still want to work, and therefore, we would provide that through the silviculture programme for 1985. Then, in 1986, when the No. 4 machine comes back onstream again with new twin-roll formers on it, producing a high quality product, they would be rehired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is confirming then that as of January 1st, 198 employees will be laid off the No. 4 machine?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I did not say anything of the like.

MR. NEARY:

Well, that is what the hon. gentleman just said. The No. 4 machine shuts down for ten months, I understand. Now, could the hon. gentleman tell the House when the Pensions Committee of the unions and when the unions in Corner Brook can expect a decision on MILAP? It is very, very important. Time is of the essence now, because of the number of people involved, those who want to think about early retirement, etc. The hon. gentleman knows, I think, the human factors that are involved. When can they expect a decision on whether or not the MILAP programme will be implemented in Corner Brook? And who will pay the cost? Will it be 100 per cent funded by the Government of Canada or will it be cost-shared by the Province and by the Government of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on the first part of the question, I do not know what the layoff figure is for machine No. 4, but it should be understood - because the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) again is sort of misleading about it - if we do not shut down the machines and upgrade them, then there will be no mill in Corner Brook. Right now, you have a mixture of sulphite and TMP going to produce the paper in Corner Brook. That produces an inferior paper. Kruger or no other company that is going to compete in the 1980s and 1990s is going to be able to sell for anything more than \$150 or \$200 a ton, paper that is now coming out of Corner Brook, whereas they are

getting in their other mills, \$520 to \$560 a ton. The machine has to close down because they are going to close out the sulphite mill. Kruger is not interested in going into Corner Brook and having one inch of paper produced with any sulphite in it. Now, they want to close down immediately. There is enough TMP coming from what they have there now, the capacity of TMP, to keep three machines going. So it will be totally TMP paper, and that is all they want to sell. They do not want to sell any paper which is in any way inferior.

Now, they have to enlarge the TMP capacity so it can also feed No. 4 machine because the TMP capacity can only feed three machines. So while the machine is down, in order to enlarge the TMP capacity so it can feed No. 4, they are also going to put a twin-roll former on No. 4, which makes it a modern machine with a very high speed, producing very high quality paper. When it opens up, then they have at least one-quarter of their output being a very modern paper, and will then move into No 3, No. 2 and No. 1 machines in the same way, so that they will have all four machines done. I mean, that is the whole idea. And, once again, it is a temporary layoff. I do not know what the number is.

The answer to the second part of the hon. member's question is, as soon as we can.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The time for Question Period has expired.

I would like to welcome to the gallery, a delegation from the Council of Jean de Baie, Mayor

Bill Coady and councillors Martin Adam and Isadore Fitzpatrick, in the District of Burin-Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

I would also like to welcome to the Speaker's Gallery, Mr. W. J. Smart, the Vice-President of Operations for ICG Resources Limited, Mr. Cec Palmer, Vice-President of Land of ICG Resources Limited, Mr. George Scott, Vice-President of Frontier Production, Canterra Energy Limited, Mr. Bernard Benny, Manager of Human Resources Canterra Energy Limited of Calgary, Alberta.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present to this hon. House a petition containing 407 names from the towns of Lethbridge, Bloomfield, and Musgravetown, in the district of Terra Nova.

The prayer of the petition reads: 'We are of voting age and reside in Lethbridge, Bloomfield, and Musgravetown. We agree that much useful work can be done to improve the forest in our area. However, we strongly object to the way that the Department of Forestry is presently clear cutting timber in the area of the Bloomfield forest access road.'

I have spoken to the minister of Forest Resources and Lands, and I trust that we will have a favourable solution in the near future.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I believe, the hon. gentleman just made his maiden speech. Has the hon. gentleman ever spoken in the House before? I would have liked for the hon. gentleman who just made his maiden speech to elaborate on the petition. The hon. gentleman did not even read the prayer of the petition. He did not say whether he supported it or not. Mr. Speaker, could I have a look at the petition? Could the page bring me the petition so I can see what the prayer is?

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wishes to get up and support the petition he can. The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening) has presented the petition. He did not bring it in to be lectured by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). He asked that it be laid on the table of the House, and he did it in accordance with proper procedure. Now, is the hon. gentleman going to be running the proceedings of this House, Mr. Speaker, or are we going to comply with normal practice?

MR. NEARY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile to the point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that that is not a point of order, that it is merely a difference of opinion between a couple of hon. gentlemen. The hon. gentleman is still smarting under that poll that was released yesterday, Mr. Speaker. He does not want the Opposition or the Liberals to score any more Brownie points. The hon. gentleman is trying to shoot us down at every opportunity. But he is not going to succeed.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

To that point of order. It is certainly a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, that was an excellent ruling. I congratulate Your Honour. I do not wish to embarrass Your Honour, but I congratulate Your Honour for that excellent ruling.

I have the petition in front of me. And it says, 'However, we strongly object to the way that the Department of Forestry is presently clear cutting timber in the area of the Bloomfield forest access road.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish that the hon. member had elaborated on that, and told the House whether or not he was

supporting the petition. But I presume what the hon. gentleman means, I do not know now, I can only try to read the hon. gentleman's mind, Mr. Speaker, and that is very difficult.

MR. TULK:

Maybe he does not have one.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman does have one. I was not going to be that unkind. I presume what is happening is that the Department of Forestry is cutting the right-of-way for an access road and are doing it in a very sloppy, irresponsible manner. Is that what the hon. gentleman means?

MR. GREENING:

No, it is not.

MR. NEARY:

Well, what does the hon. gentleman mean? We would like to support the petition, if we only knew what we were supporting.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, there are proceedings. The hon. gentleman here is asking questions of the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening). I know the hon. the member for Terra Nova would like to answer them, and he can answer them well and sufficiently.

MR. TULK:

Well, let him answer them. By leave. By leave. Get up and answer the questions.

MR. MARSHALL:

But we are on petitions, Mr. Speaker, and I shall read the rule to you. 'Petitions'.

MR. TULK:

You do not want them answered, do you, boy?

MR. MARSHALL:

'There shall be no debate on a petition.'

MR. TULK:

It is not a debate.

MR. MARSHALL:

And Standing Order (92) indicates that 'Members will speak to a petition.' The hon. gentleman is not speaking to a petition.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

To that point of order. It would appear that the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is somewhat astray from the prayer of the petition and entering into a debate on the matter.

MR. NEARY:

All right, Mr. Speaker, I will try again. I presume then - the hon. gentleman indicates no - that is not what is happening, they are not cutting a right-of-way. they are clear cutting timber, which means that they are mowing down everything. That is what the hon. gentleman, I presume, means. And the people down there are very concerned about that, they are very concerned about the way that the Department of Forestry is levelling the timber, the forest in around Lethbridge, Bloomfield, and Musgravetown. They are levelling it to the ground, and the people are concerned about it. I wish that the hon. gentleman had spelled it out in a little more detail.

MR. TULK:

Let him answer the question. We will give him leave.

MR. NEARY:

We would certainly grant leave for the hon. gentleman to tell us what it is the people are concerned about.

But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we support whatever it is the people down in Lethbridge, Bloomfield, and Musgravetown want. They are all honest, straightforward, decent Newfoundlanders, and they are almost all Liberals, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:

They are all Tories, too.

MR. NEARY:

So whatever they want in this petition, Mr. Speaker, they should have. And whatever it is that the hon. gentleman is trying to tell the House they wanted, we will support it.

MR. MORGAN:

You know what they wanted, a PC member. They got a good one out there right now.

MR. NEARY:

Well, if they could only send one in that could tell us what it is that the people want I think we would be much happier about it, Mr. Speaker. But we support the prayer of the petition.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member's time has expired.

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to respond to the petition presented by my colleague, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening). It is a bit

disappointing that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who is a veteran, would attack the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening), who is relatively a rookie. But I say to the member for LaPoile that the member for Terra Nova is a man of action as opposed to the member for LaPoile who is a man of words. And I suggest the member for LaPoile would be very wise to remember what Albert Einstein once said about the formula for success, the formula for success is, 'A equals X plus Y plus Z'. X is work, Y is play, and Z is keeping your mouth shut.' That is what Albert Einstein said.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile on a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the hon. gentleman is speaking to the prayer of the petition. I would not mind so much, but the hon. gentleman is a former Speaker of this House who should know and observe the rules, and who would be the first to stand in his place and scold and lecture members of this House for breaking the rules. And just to prove that the hon. gentleman was a former Speaker of the House, Mr. Speaker, his coloured portrait is hanging - the hon. gentleman has been hanged, is hung, the last one to be hanged in this House, and, Mr. Speaker, he should have better sense.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Forest

Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is one member on the opposite side who went around this Province for the three years that I was Speaker of the House of Assembly and praised me to the hilt - the best Speaker he had ever seen.

MR. NEARY:

That is right. And what a disappointment after you got out of the Chair.

MR. SIMMS:

And he has said to me privately - he will not say it in front of his colleagues - what a wonderful fellow I am over here now, and what a wonderful job I am doing as Minister of Forestry.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, his point of order is meant merely to take away the time that I have to explain the petition presented by the hon. member. There is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

To that point of order I must say that the hon. the minister was straying somewhat from the prayer of the petition. Perhaps he could be more relevant.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I am aware of the situation that the hon. member has raised, because he has talked to me privately about it. In addition to that, about a week or a week and a half ago, I met with the Newfoundland Lumber Producers Association, and they said that in their opinion some of our silviculture programmes in the Bloomfield area were not being undertaken properly. But I can

say to the member and to the NLPA, as I did to them a week or a week and a half ago, that the silviculture programmes that we undertake are meant to do a number of things, not the least of which is to try to enhance the forest resource, itself, for the long-term, and also to provide employment for people in the area. And in that particular area, which is Unit 2, last year we spent over \$600,000 on silviculture projects which employed 636 man weeks of work for silviculture workers. So that programme is going to continue.

MR. NEARY:

Well, what are they doing that has the people upset?

MR. SIMMS:

Well, generally speaking, what happens is that silviculture projects are not undertaken in areas that have already been previously cut over. They are saying in this particular area that that is not happening in this particular case. So that is the general criteria. The other thing is that generally speaking silviculture projects are undertaken in areas that could not support an economically viable commercial operation so that is the area that we target. In any event, all projects are approved by a federal/provincial committee under the guidelines consistent with the department's silviculture policies. As I have said, I have discussed it with the member, I have discussed it with the NLPA and I am quite prepared, in view of the petition that has been presented, to take it under consideration, and, in fact, go further than that. Due to the great persuasive powers of my colleague, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening), I am prepared

to go out with him, take some officials with me, have a look at the area, and if there is a way we can resolve it to their satisfaction, we will certainly try to do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

It being Private Member's Day we proceed with Motion No. 5 which was moved by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). The debate was adjourned the last day by the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). He has two or three minutes left.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the clerk's desk that I have three minutes left. I adjourned this debate last Wednesday at 6:00 o'clock. I am cluing up my few remarks on this resolution which was placed on the Order Paper by my colleague from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). This resolution asks that the government immediately start negotiations with the Native peoples of Labrador so as to arrive at an equitable settlement over their land claims and to insure unhindered development of Labrador resources to the benefit of all the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Of course, the WHEREASES in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, talk about the terrible conditions that some of the Native peoples are forced to live in in Labrador. Mr. Speaker, almost twenty-four hours ago myself and my friend, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), were sitting in an hotel room in Ottawa watching the daily proceedings of the House of Commons on television, and who should be speaking in the debate there but

Keith Penner. Keith Penner is known, of course, for the Penner Report, and Mr. Penner was talking about Native people throughout the country and how, after years and years of just throwing money at them and so on, the Native peoples across the country are still living in situations which are sometimes unbelievable. We have seen that ourselves, of course, on television and so on, with the people of Labrador. At 6:00 o'clock this afternoon this resolution will be talked out.

Mr. Penner suggested that rather than talking out the resolution and then just forgetting about it, why not set up a select committee of the House to investigate and to study the problems of the aboriginal peoples. In this case, of course, we are talking about Labrador. Mr. Speaker, last week I made an amendment to this resolution and what I would like to do today, in the minute or so that I have left, is suggest, as Mr. Penner did yesterday in Ottawa, that this is an excellent idea for this resolution. Mr. Speaker, there are resolutions that have come before this House which do not deserve to be studied by a select committee, and of course, what saw happen in this House last Winter when a select committee was set up for a far less important reason than this one here, the aboriginal and the Native peoples rights; we saw a select committee of this House travel across this Province talking about, examining, and looking at food prices, and when the report came in, after costing several thousand dollars, it said nothing and did did nothing to bring down the price of food across this Province. It really amounted to nothing. But here is something that everybody knows

about, the unnegotiated settlement of Native land rights in Labrador and the terrible conditions under which the Native people live. Mr. Speaker, in concluding in concluding my remarks let me suggest, as Mr. Penner did yesterday, that what we do here, and the government can do it if they want to, is set up a select committee of the House of Assembly to travel to Labrador to sit down and talk to and listen to the concerns and the problems and so on that these people have in Labrador. Mr. Speaker, I support the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) in his resolution.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak briefly on this resolution. I am a little bit confused. I am not sure if the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) can clarify the situation for me, but he indicated in his comments that there was an amendment proposed last week by his colleague the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) with respect to the wording of one of the WHEREASES. I have been trying to check with the Chair, through the Clerk, to see whether or not that amendment was seconded and if it is, in fact, what we are now debating. We are debating the amendment?

MR. CALLAN:

It is a very minor amendment, all it does is change three words.

MR. SIMMS:

We are, in fact, then, debating the amendment?

MR. CALLAN:

Yes

MR. SIMMS:

Is that the understanding? The Chair is going to be ruling on that?

MR. SPEAKER:

Correct.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you for that clarification. I appreciate the support and the co-operation of the member for Bellevue (Mr.Callan). The three words are, "very serious problem."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments on this particular resolution. The topic for discussion is obviously a very, very important matter. Now, that is not to say whether or not I agree with the 'resolve' part of the resolution. I will try to formulate some argument for my position as I go through. But I wanted to, initially, say just a few words, pass on some comments, perhaps, in a philosophical sort of manner about some of the background and history of the relationship between the Native people of Labrador and the white settlers of Labrador, if you want, and how they have been getting along in the past and how they have, in fact, worked together. I have tried to formulate this historical background, if you want, through discussions that I have had with people who, in fact, have lived with Native people in Labrador, and worked with them for various periods of time. In fact, I have talked with Native people myself most recently. I recall a year or so ago, when I was in Labrador for the first ever Labrador games, and had an opportunity to have some discussions with those people. The resolution in essence, I suppose, presented by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr.Warren)

is asking us to move quickly to try to settle Native land claims in Labrador. I think it is on the record that this government has for a long, long time been anxious to arrive at some sort of fair and equitable settlement which would then open the way for financial and other arrangements for resource development in Labrador. And we are talking about the kind of development that would make life a whole lot better for the Native people in Labrador, as well as for other people who live throughout the Province of Newfoundland. I think we have said time and time again, certainly the Premier has and the Minister of Northern Development (Mr.Goudie), that we are interested in developing the resources of Labrador for the good of the people who live there, as well as for the lasting benefit of the people who live on the Island portion of the Province, both portions of the Province. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, as it applies to the WHEREAS in the hon. member's resolution respecting the Lower Churchill, I think if we can ever reach some sort of reasonable agreement with the province of Quebec for access to more power from our own Churchill Falls, and to try to get a fair share of those massive revenues that are now flowing into the coffers of the province of Quebec from the sale of our power to American consumers, then, obviously, we will be more than ready to start talking about an efficient development of the Lower Churchill, as the hon. member states in his resolution. An orderly development of the Lower Churchill, Mr. Speaker, would bring major benefits, obviously, to the Native peoples in Labrador who want to take advantage of the opportunities that might be

offered through a power supply that is endless and, of course, available at a very stable price. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the beauty, I guess, about a development like the Lower Churchill is that once it is in place -

MR. CALLAN

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the member for Bellevue on a point of order.

MR. CALLAN:

Call a quorum, Mr Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

There is a quorum present. Is it agreed to allow the minister to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Agreed.

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, and I want to continue without interrupting my train of thought, if that is at all possible, we are talking about one of the WHEREASES in the member's resolution which deals with the development of the Lower Churchill. I was saying that obviously an orderly development of the Lower Churchill would bring a great many benefits to the Native people who want to take advantage of the many opportunities that would arise through a power supply that is available at a very stable price and a supply, of course, that is

endless. I am glad to see the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is here. I said at the beginning of my comments that I wanted to talk for a few minutes in a philosophical way and talk about the background and history of the way that people in Labrador have lived and worked together for many many years and perhaps he will be able to correct any misimpressions I may have. As I go through my comments I would appreciate any comments he might wish to make to indicate whether or not what I am saying is a general understanding that most people would have. I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that the beauty of the development of the Lower Churchill is that once it really is in place it would not do anything to harm the environment, an environment, of course, that means so much to the Innu, the Inuit and, of course, the white settlers as well, all the people of Labrador. I guess it is fair to say that really it has only been during the last decade or so that Native peoples have really come to realize that they have to lay claim or make claim or have rights, if you want, to a land claims settlement. In the more distant past, the Native peoples probably, and rightly so, took it for granted that the land they lived on was theirs to travel over, on which to hunt, to fish, to cut wood or whatever they might want to do, and the early explorers who first went to Labrador and the forebearers of the present white coastal settlers who moved to Labrador to be close to the great stocks of cod and the great stocks of fur-bearing animals, never in those days made any treaties with the Native people. The ordinary working fishermen who decided to live on the Labrador Coast, the skippers

of the famous Newfoundland schooners whom we have all heard about, who went to the Labrador every Spring, and the people - I suppose you would call them stationary people - who basically lived there in the Summertime, on the coast, all saw in those days no particular need to establish treaties with the Natives because by and large they all worked together, they got along well when they traded and when they helped each other, which they frequently did. We certainly have never had any major wars, at least not since the days of the Basques in the sixteenth century or thereabout, and possibly all contact in those days was quite peaceful. We certainly had nothing like the land grabs that have taken place, and the massacres that have taken place in the US, and going on to this very day in places like Brazil. We have had a more peaceful contact with the Natives in Labrador than did white settlers in all other areas of British North America.

While we did not formalize our dealings in those early days with the original inhabitants of Labrador, I do not think you can say that there was any conscious effort, ever, to try to cheat them out of their lands or anything else. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, no doubt many sharp trading practices were undertaken when it came to bartering for goods and furs, but that was the style of the times.

So, the point is, Mr. Speaker, that even without being aware of it, in the old days the white man and the Natives in Labrador never did regard themselves as enemies or anything of that nature. Considering the history of the white man's contact, I suppose, with Natives in other parts of the world, each side has a good reason

for a certain amount of pride. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the people who have come lately avoided in Labrador the cultural misunderstandings that helped lead to the extinction of the Beothuks, for example, on the Island.

As I said in my introductory remarks, my intention was not to give a lecture on history or anything of that nature, but, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to somehow illustrate that we have always had a good foundation on which to build a fair deal with the Native peoples of Labrador, and I wanted to try to lead up and address some of the WHEREASES outlined in the hon. member's resolution. I indicated at the outset that the resolution itself contains a topic that is of extreme interest and very, very important and critical.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another point in the hon. member's WHEREASES dealing with the issue of the establishment of a commercial caribou hunt in Labrador, utilizing the resource that is contained in the largest caribou herd in the world, in North America, the George River caribou herd. Now, we all know, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the policy decision taken by the government that this is going to take place. I would assume that all of us as responsible members and individuals recognize that to develop a non-renewable resource of any type, generally speaking, carries with it a certain amount of social pain. That is inevitable, whether it is with oil or minerals or whatever it might be. So we all have to determine for ourselves how to face whatever problems come about as a result of the development of non-renewable resources. In Northern Canada, where there are few commercial

endeavours ever undertaken, in most cases it is important that we try to develop the resources that we do have. Many people, because of lack of employment and so on, have to leave their homes to try to find something new, to try to find a new role for where they are, or, generally speaking, they have to turn to social benefits and social programmes. But that is not the case, Mr. Speaker, with properly managed renewable resources. Those benefits, we all know, are really unending and over the long run, I think it is fair to say, these resources are the ones that will nourish our people and allow them to continue their special lifestyles wherever they may live. So with respect to the George River caribou herd, and it relates to this resolution, it is not only the world's largest herd of caribou, but it is one of the fastest growing herds in all of North America. In 1954, for example, Mr. Speaker, the herd was estimated to have only about 5,000 animals in it, but in 1982, the most recent available Fall census, it was revealed there were over 300,000. That herd is now growing at a rate of about 12 per cent, or 36,000 animals per year. The annual increase, for example, of that herd is larger than the total population of caribou on the Island portion of Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN:

I thought it was 10 per cent.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, I am using approximate figures now, the hon. member wants to get specific.

MR. WARREN:

10 per cent, and 10,000 drowned this year in the flood.

MR. SIMMS:

What I said was, the herd was estimated to contain in excess of 300,000 and the herd grows at a rate of about 12 per cent, which is approximately 36,000 animals.

MR. WARREN:

And all of a sudden 10,000 are lost.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, 30,000 animals, whatever, if he wants to get technical. The point is it is growing at a very, very large rate, and he knows that, of course, I am sure.

So I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, as I did when I announced the policy, by the way, in Labrador, as the hon. member is aware, that this government will ensure that the outfitting industry that will be created for the benefit of the people in Labrador will, at least as long as I am around and have any input into it, take second place to hunting by the local people. We fully recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the George River herd is vitally important to these people, it is a source of essential food and recreation and traditional and historical ties for these people. Mr. Speaker, a recent study indicated that the business of outfitting hunters could eventually provide somewhere in the area of \$6 million annually to the Labrador economy.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Tell the truth.

MR. SIMMS:

I am telling the truth and the hon. member knows it.

That will probably create somewhere in the area of a couple of hundred jobs, seasonal and permanent, for Labrador

residents. Mr. Speaker, just to put it in perspective, that \$6 million value to the economy of that area, for that industry, would represent about two times the \$3.3 million as generated by all the fishing and hunting outfitters in this entire Province. It is a significant economic boost to the area and I am surprised the hon. member does not recognize that. And we believe, Mr. Speaker, as I said, the people who will benefit will be the people of Labrador.

MR. WARREN:

The outfitters..

MR. SIMMS:

No, the people of Labrador who have the interest and the willingness to participate in such a programme. Mr. Speaker, a similar outfitting operation in Quebec has been depending on caribou from that herd for the past number of years, as the hon. member knows - right? - the George River caribou herd, on the Quebec side of the range we assume. And that has been done without detriment to the growth of that total resource and, in fact, the business in Quebec is annually generating somewhere between \$10 million and \$15 million for the Quebec economy and employing more than 400 people.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And we are not getting one thing.

MR. SIMMS:

And we are not getting anything out of it at all.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that an industry cannot exist without a thriving, well-managed renewable resource and so I want to go on record as saying that our first concern with respect to

development of that resource and that industry has to be for the maintenance of the herd, next we have to look after the Labrador subsistence hunting, and, thirdly, we have to give some consideration and interest to the outfitters.

So first, we have to maintain the herd, secondly, we have to look after the subsistence requirements, and, thirdly, only then do we look after the requirements of the outfitters.

MR. WARREN:

You are doing that in reverse.

MR. SIMMS:

No, we are not doing it in reverse. The hon. member argues that but he is losing his argument. The hon. member is a great fighter for the people of his own constituency, he is the defender of Native rights in this Province, that is how he likes to put himself forth and he does a very, very good job of it, but at the same time, the hon. member will not listen to the arguments that are used to talk about the benefits that could accrue to his particular area, the area that he represents. He used to throw out a red herring and talk about the other issue that has been raised by the Native people. I met with them myself, the hon. member knows that, and we are pursuing that particular request of theirs to co-operate with the Native people on the Coast of Labrador, the LIA.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, my time is running out because the hon. member interrupted me and had quorum calls and everything else, but I think, and I feel safe in saying that there is wisdom behind that particular policy. I said it at the time and I still say it, I think the potential benefits that

could come from such an industry are considerable both for the Province as a whole and particularly for the people of Labrador who want to take an interest in getting involved in the outfitting business either as entrepreneurs or as employed guides.

MR. WARREN:

Are you going to support the resolution?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is patient he will find out what my position is on the resolution. I have been trying to develop an argument for what my final position will be.

MR. TULK:

Do not be arrogant.

MR. SIMMS:

I am not being arrogant. The hon. member misinterprets my intentions. My intentions are well intended, The hon. member knows that. I asked for his help as I went through the history part, he never indicated at all that I was saying anything that was incorrect, or that my interpretation was anything different from what most people feel. I want to carry on with respect to the issue of the caribou herd, because that is one of the WHEREASES that he put in his resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the development of that particular industry, aside from the benefits economically that I talked about, will also provide other benefits: It will bring national and international attention to the area, and to the herd itself, of course, as a vital renewable resource. Mr. Speaker, I think that is obviously very

important. But we have to remember the proper management of the herd itself is the key to that future, and we will give it the full attention that it requires. And in the long run, Mr. Speaker, that new programme should help keep the herd in balance, because the management of the herd and the resource is vitally important in any event.

So all I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we should use this type of renewable resource development. It is most appropriate in Northern communities, in particular, where there is, generally speaking, lots of high unemployment, very few opportunities for jobs, and very few opportunities for income. And this is, of course, unlike non-renewable resources, Mr. Speaker, which are eventually exhausted. The caribou of Northern Labrador I believe, if properly managed, can provide benefits to an infinite number of generations of Labradorians, particularly the Native people, if they want to get involved in the development.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we talked about the resolution itself, the meat of the resolution. The 'THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED' part of the resolution is really what needed to address and I indicated that the issue and the topic was extremely critical and important. But I want to say now to the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) with all due respect -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave. By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed that the hon. minister have leave to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands by leave.

MR. SIMMS:

Agreed, Mr. Speaker? I just have a couple of minutes. In fact, I did not get a five minute notice, I might draw that to the attention of the table.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, what I was trying to say was that presumably the hon. member for Torngat Mountains drafted this resolution last January or February, almost a year ago, and perhaps when he drafted that resolution he maybe did not take into consideration some of the activities and things that had been ongoing, which were alluded to by the Minister of Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) last Wednesday when he spoke to the resolution. Maybe he was trying to hurry things along, and that kind of an approach is very admirable and commendable. But, Mr. Speaker, we are ready to negotiate a comprehensive land claims settlement. We are ready to do that. That position has been known for some time, in fact since 1980, in statements that the hon. the Premier made on a number of occasions. Part of the necessity was for a bilateral agreement - a bilateral agreement had to take place between the two levels of government before anything else could proceed, and I think the Minister of Northern Development spelled that out quite clearly.

MR. WARREN:

You have dealt with the 'WHEREASES', 'NOW THEREFORE'.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, it is the resolve part that we are talking about. The whereases really mean nothing in terms of debating a resolution. So that bilateral agreement, as I understand it, now has been pretty well finalized and so the position of the government is, as it has been for the last four years, that we are prepared and ready to negotiate a comprehensive land claims settlement with the Native people in Labrador. That position could not be any clearer. The other point, by the way, is that the federal government generally keeps a list of about six land claims that it deals with each year, and we are not yet on that list, unfortunately, but there are a lot who are not, a lot of others. I mean, the federal government obviously negotiates dozens and dozens of land claims.

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

But the government knows our position, right, and if we can get on that list of six we will be ready to pursue it.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the final point I want to make is with respect to my position on the resolution. I have said that we could not negotiate an agreement on our own because of the agreement that we had to establish with the federal government, but I think that is now pretty well finalized, if not finalized. Therefore, we are ready to proceed and have been for the last four years. And we all know, of course, there was little chance of getting anything done with respect

to the previous administration.

MR. NEARY:

The total Peckford mind.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, we had a lot of difficulty. The hon. member knows we had a lot of difficulty negotiating. For whatever reason, we had a lot of difficulty negotiating and hon. members know it. But now, Mr. Speaker, since September, we have a greater opportunity than ever before, with another administration and another government, of responding to the needs of the Native people of Labrador in the sense of the spirit as offered in the resolution by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains. However, the obvious point is, having explained everything that I have just explained, the BE IT RESOLVED part of the resolution itself is obviously redundant because the activities are already underway. We are already prepared to negotiate. We have indicated our willingness to negotiate with the Native peoples of Labrador. So it is obvious - the Minister of Northern Development has made it clear, I just made it even clearer - the resolution itself is totally redundant and for that reason I cannot support the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take very long to add my few words to this resolution. I would, if it is in order, Mr. Speaker, straightaway like to move a subamendment. My subamendment is this, that all the words after 'that be added' Be It Further Resolved that the matter of aboriginal land claims be referred

to a Select Committee of this hon. House for further consideration.'

MR. TULK:

Will the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) second that?

MR. NEARY:

When I get a ruling on that, Your Honour, then I will proceed.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who moved it?

MR. NEARY:

Moved by me and seconded by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Just a question for clarity now and for information purposes. My understanding of an introduction or an amendment, or a subamendment in this case, to a resolution is that it cannot negate the intention of the original resolution.

Now the original resolution clearly says, 'Be It Resolved that government immediate start negotiations with the Native Peoples of Labrador.' Now that is clearly different from the intention proposed in the subamendment which is to refer the whole matter to a Committee of the House, a Select Committee of the House. It is totally different.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No.

MR. SIMMS:
Well, I am putting forth the argument that maybe it is.

MR. NEARY:
I will answer you.:

MR. SIMMS:
I am not interested in the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) answering it, I am interested in the hon. Speaker answering it. He is the one who will make the final decision.

In any event, it does negate the original intent of the resolution, which is to immediately start negotiations. Now here is a different approach suggesting it all be referred to a Committee of the House. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the subamendment is not in order.

MR. NEARY:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):
The hon. the member for LaPoile, to that point of order.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, let me enlighten the hon. gentleman. The whole idea of a Select Committee is to put a mechanism in place to see that this is done. That is the whole point of the Select Committee to see that the negotiations are started with the aboriginal people.

MR. SIMMS:
Read the subamendment.

MR. NEARY:
I just read it. I gave it to the Speaker.

So what this does is put a

mechanism in place to see that the negotiations are commenced and to give the matter further consideration, if necessary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

For the hon. minister's clarification, 'Be It Further Resolved that the matter of aboriginal land claims be referred to a Select Committee of the House for further consideration.' That is the subamendment.

MR. SIMMS:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):
The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, to that point of order.

MR. SIMMS:
Well, Mr. Speaker, in my view, what Your Honour has just read is not at all what the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) just said it was intended to do. The member for LaPoile says the whole idea is that they would set up a mechanism to carry on these negotiations which would then be in line with the resolution. But that is not what the subamendment says. The subamendment simply says it will 'be referred to a Select Committee of the House for further consideration.' And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is not at all what the hon. member tried to say it meant. It totally negates the intent of the resolution, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker. I thought Your Honour might want to take a few minutes to consider the matter.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order, the Chair

will take a couple of minutes to consider the subamendment.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):
Order, please!

On the subamendment moved by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I wish to draw members' attention to page 156, paragraph 441, subsection (2). 'A subamendment must be relevant to the amendment it proposes to amend and not to the main motion.' Therefore, this cannot be considered a subamendment because it is an amendment. The Standing Order says the House can consider only one question at a time. So in order to accept another amendment to the motion, the first amendment has to be dealt with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
A good ruling.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A subamendment, yes. A subamendment is permissible as long as it amends the amended motion. The subamendment as stated here amends the main motion. The subamendment should have amended the Whereas that was amended before, the amendment that was put into it before.

MR. NEARY:
If Your Honour would permit me?

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

MR. NEARY:
On page 40, paragraph 123, Your Honour, 'The Speaker may rule out any question which violates the

procedures of the House in the same way as he deals with irregularities in motions and amendments. He may make alterations to proposed motions or he may refer them back to the Member for correction.' I believe Your Honour knows what it is I am getting at. And if Your Honour wishes to change my subamendment to make it in order then I am in Your Honour's hands in that regard. Your Honour can do that under Section (123) page 40. 'He may make alterations to proposed motions.' I would like for Your Honour to consider that. I explained to Your Honour what it is I am getting at, I want the mechanism set up. Perhaps Your Honour could make the necessary alteration so that it would suit the occasion.

MR. SIMMS:
No, no, no.

MR. NEARY:
Yes, he can do it.

MR. TULK:
He can do it, if he wants to do it.
MR. NEARY:
Page 40, Section (123).

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):
Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
The hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) can try all he wants to negate the resolution.

MR. NEARY:
It is Beauchesne.

MR. SIMMS:

The Speaker has just ruled that the hon. member's subamendment is out of order.

MR. NEARY:

No.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member's subamendment is out of order.

MR. NEARY:

He can change it.

MR. TULK:

He got ideas, he can change it.

MR. SIMMS:

The subamendment is out of order, because it does not amend the amendment, and the subamendment is suppose to amend the amendment. And the amendment, as I recall it, just changed three words with respect to the quality of life of Native Peoples from the words 'is a national disgrace' to whatever the correct words are - if the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) can give them to me - but he changed and rephrased those words.

Now the subamendment that the member for LaPoile proposed has absolutely nothing to do with that particular amendment, and that is what the hon. Speaker ruled the amendment out of order for. I submit that it is out of order and the hon. Speaker has already ruled.

MR. NEARY:

But the Speaker can alter it or change it to make it conform.

MR. MARSHALL:

He may.

MR. SIMMS:

He does not have to. So we are on the amendment still.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

I have ruled that this subamendment is not a subamendment and I have ruled it out of order. There is also a rule brought to my attention that if a second amendment is to be raised, the first amendment must be dealt with.

MR. SIMMS:

That is right.

MR. SPEAKER:

Now the first amendment is still being discussed in the House, it has not been voted for or against. The first amendment to this motion is still being discussed and it has to be disposed of. Therefore, I cannot accept this as an amendment.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is rather tragic and unfortunate indeed that the hon. gentleman who spoke prior to my rising in my place to have a few remarks on this matter should, after telling us how pious and how interested and how sincere he was about aboriginal claims and Native claims in this Province, and that the door was open, that they could start negotiations any time, that when I offered the House the mechanism to see that it is done, lo and behold who is the hon. gentleman who sabotaged the mechanism? Who called his bluff? The hon. gentleman obviously, Mr. Speaker, was being very insincere.

MR. SIMMS:

The Speaker called your bluff.

MR. NEARY:

No, the hon. gentleman could have allowed it to stand, the hon. gentleman got up on a point of

order and through some technicality, Mr. Speaker, I was not allowed to move my sub-amendment because of the action of the hon. gentleman. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was insincere in his -

MR. BARRY:

Not leadership quality.

MR. NEARY:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, he does not have leadership qualities.

DR. COLLINS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is saying that the hon. minister is insincere. That is a clear questioning of his motives which cannot be sustained in this House. He is even going further and he is reprimanding the hon. minister because he wants to run this House according to parliamentary rules. If this House is not run according to parliamentary rules, we cannot have a House, we cannot have a legitimate parliament. We must run by parliamentary rules. It is not an inconsequential technicality, it is an important basic rule of parliament that you cannot bring in a so-called sub-amendment of this order and there is no reprimand on that, that is clear common sense and certainly it is within the hon. minister's right to bring it to the attention of the House if the House is in danger of getting into a total state of disarray.

MR. NEARY:

To that point of order, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Let me point out to Your Honour that the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) knows as much about the rules of this House as he does about fiscal matters in this Province. I suggested to the hon. gentleman he go out and buy a \$2 pocket size calculator and that he forget this nonsense about you buy an item for \$1, sell for \$2, 1 per cent. Now that is the hon. gentleman's thinking, that is the extent of his thinking. What he should do also when he is going out to buy a \$2 calculator he should buy Beauchesne. The hon. gentleman made his point of order, by the way, without reference, without quoting from the Standing Rules or from Beauchesne, or from May or Roberts or anybody else, just gets up to try to interrupt me, try to use up my time. Beauchesne says, Mr. Speaker, "It has been ruled parliamentary to use the following expressions," and there are a whole lot of them listed, and 'insincere' is one of the expressions that you can use.

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, there is also another reference in Beauchesne, and I just cannot find it now at my fingertips but I am sure the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is aware of it.

MR. NEARY:

Write it tonight when you go home.

MR. SIMMS:

It refers to questioning the motives of an individual member and to suggest that a member opposite is insincere in what he is saying, I submit, is a clear break of parliamentary practice and not worthy of the hon. member for LaPoile, and certainly not something that I have heard him use in the twenty-odd years that he has been here, and the few years I have been here. And I think the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) raised that as the point of order, that you cannot question the motives of another hon. member. And the hon. member for LaPoile clearly said that I, when I was speaking, was insincere in what I was saying. And that is totally inaccurate and unbecoming a member of twenty-two years in this House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, the reference by the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is frightening when you turn back the hands of time and you realize that that hon. gentleman who just got up, grasping and scrabbling trying to justify his getting on his feet, at one time was Speaker of this House, Mr. Speaker, and it would make us wonder on this side of the House if the hon. gentleman was giving us a fair shake when he occupied the Chair, or was he making rules according to himself, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BARRY:

Move that his picture be taken down.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I am almost tempted to move that his picture be taken down off the wall and that he be hanged out in the square and not on the walls of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is I did not question the motives of the hon. gentleman, I just said that he was insincere. And that is not questioning his motives, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! To that point of order, I would refer hon. members to Beauchesne, page 110, and at the bottom of that it says, "Since 1958, it has been ruled parliamentary to use the following expressions:" and if you look at the centre of page 112 the word "insincere" is now parliamentary.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what I was attempting to do when I was so rudely interrupted by the member for Grand Falls, I was attempting to beef up, to give some substance to my hon. colleague's amendment and to my colleague's resolution. I wanted to put a mechanism there to make sure that the government were sincere since the hon. gentleman is telling us that the administration there opposite, Mr. Speaker, would welcome a round of negotiations.

But these are just pious words, Mr. Speaker, that do not mean

anything. And what I was trying to do was get the House to agree to a select committee. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no other subject I suppose in Canada today that has received the coverage, has received the publicity that Native claims and aboriginal rights have received. And rightly so.

DR. COLLINS:

Are you accusing the hon. minister of being a Nazi?

MR. NEARY:

No, if I was going to call the hon. gentleman anything, I would refer to the hon. Minister of Finance as Lord Haw-Haw. Certainly I would not say that he was a Nazi, but Lord Haw-Haw, yes, I would say the hon. gentleman reminds me of Lord Haw-Haw.

MR. SIMMS:

Who is that?

MR. NEARY:

The Minister of Finance.

MR. SIMMS:

No, who is Lord Haw-Haw?

MR. NEARY:

Lord Haw-Haw was Hitler's propaganda minister.

MR. SIMMS:

No, I never heard of him.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Finance on a point of order.

DR. COLLINS:

In Beauchesne, the Fifth Edition on page 109, it refers to unparliamentary expressions, and towards the end of the page it says, "Nazi". Now, Mr. Speaker,

this was ruled unparliamentary in debates February 22, 1962, page 1145. So the hon. member is implying that I am a Nazi when he says that I am like Lord Haw-Haw, whom he claims was the propaganda minister to Mr. Hitler. And this therefore is trying to say indirectly what he will not say directly and I therefore make the point that he is out of order.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, obviously I hurt the hon. gentleman's feelings, and to show the hon. gentleman what a man I am, I am prepared to withdraw the title Lord Haw-Haw and say that he was not Hitler's propaganda minister, he was a British traitor who went over to the Germans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

You cannot say that he is a traitor.

MR. TULK:

He did not say he was a traitor.

MR. NEARY:

I did not say that the hon. gentleman was a traitor but he resembles Lord Haw-Haw.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, that was another excellent ruling.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that no other subject that I can think of in recent times has received the publicity that the Native claims and aboriginal rights have received, and justifiably so. And they are making progress in Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, I question whether or not we are making very much progress in Newfoundland. We saw a situation develop in 1982, two years ago we saw a situation develop where the Government of Canada wanted to enshrine Native rights in the Constitution of Canada, they wanted to amend the Constitution of Canada, and who was the Premier who objected to it and had to be shamed into it? Who was the Premier who stuck out like a sore thumb in Canada against having Native rights enshrined in the Constitution?

MR. BARRY:
Rene Levesque?

MR. NEARY:
Not Rene Levesque. No. Was it Premier Bennett? No. Was it Premier Davis? No. Was it Premier Hatfield? No. No, Mr. Speaker, it was none other than the Fuerher himself, the Premier of this Province. Our Napoleon said, no, you are not doing it. And who is against self-government for Native people? Who is against it? Is it Hatfield, Bennett or the fellow in Nova Scotia, whatever his name is? No, the Premier of this Province. So the hon. gentlemen can get up, a minister in the administration and use all the pious words he wants, use all the platitudes he wants, pleasantries - he is a nice pleasant fellow. Mr. Speaker - he can say all these things and yet be insincere about the whole matter. Because, Mr. Speaker, I have grave doubts whether the

administration will do anything about this. They are going to vote against the resolution, they tell us. That is another example of insincerity.

MR. SIMMS:
That is not necessary.

MR. NEARY:
It is necessary.

MR. SIMMS:
What for?

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, we have a situation in Conne River, we have a situation in Flat Bay and we have Labrador, and all have to be considered for Native claims, for aboriginal rights.

MR. SIMMS:
That has nothing to do with the resolution, Conne River natives.

MR. NEARY:
I am just tossing that in as an aside. Mr. Speaker, all of these areas have to be considered and I doubt if very much is being done about it. I doubt if very much will be done about it in the foreseeable future. I would say the government is dragging its feet on these matters. And, Mr. Speaker, let me go on record as saying that there is no other group of people that I know in this world, in this Province, that should get their claims processed than the aboriginal people. They have been here for how many years - 20,000 or 30,000? The hon. gentleman for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) should know.

MR. GOUDIE:
In Labrador, as I understand it, the aboriginal peoples go back 8,000 years.

MR. NEARY:

Eight thousand. I think they are on the North American continent longer than that. I believe they came across 20,000 or 30,000 years ago.

MR. BARRY:

You are referring to the theory there was a land bridge. But the Alaskan Indians say the footprints were going in the other direction.

MR. NEARY:

Well, anyway, it is about time that the administration there opposite faced up to their responsibilities and dealt with this matter in an honourable fashion.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas):

The hon the Minister of Environment.

MR. ANDREWS:

I would like to say a few words on this motion, Mr. Speaker, because I think I am one of the few members in the House who do have people in their districts who are presenting land claims, particularly in Bay d'Espoir. The government's position on that, of course, is that we do not acknowledge them. The report that was prepared for government, the assessment and analysis of claims by the Micmac Indians, shows definitely that they do not have a substantive claim. And, of course, this is largely based on the Baker Lake decision. Not being a lawyer, I would beg the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) not to nit pick with me, but in 1979 the federal court decision relating to the Inuit at Baker Lake in the Northwest Territories had a major impact on the immediate issue of land claims. Judge Mahoney presented a schema for four criteria on which

Native title could possibly be established. Number one, they and their ancestors were members of an organized society; (2) that the organized society occupy the specific territory over which they assert their aboriginal rights or title; (3) that the occupation was to the exclusion of other aboriginal societies; (4) that the occupation was an established fact at the time sovereignty was asserted by England. And with this stated policy of the Supreme Court, the Micmac claims in Conne River fail, and indeed anywhere else on the Island Newfoundland, as the research that has been done by the provincial government indicates. We are not saying that there are not Native people on the Island of Newfoundland, but we are saying that they do not meet these criteria, particularly the criterion of having lived on that land before the Crown of England took possession. Of course, it is the position of the Province also, as indicated in 1982, I believe, by the Premier's statement of that time, July 7, 1982, that we do recognize claims by aboriginal people in Labrador, namely the Inuit and the Innu. And for this to be settled, Mr. Speaker, there has to be a tri-party agreement, on one side the Natives and on the other side the federal and provincial governments, three sides really. It is my understanding, although I am not on top of this in every detail, that the federal and provincial governments have largely done their homework. They have done their homework to the point where they can now sit down with the Native groups and debate this issue. The Inuit people of Labrador, I do believe, are ready to talk but the Innu associations are not. Indeed, they say that they will not discuss any land

claims.

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Call in the members.

There is a quorum present.

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. ANDREWS:

Mr. Speaker, as I said the LIA are quite willing, I do believe - the minister responsible for Northern Affairs (Mr. Goudie) would know a lot more about this and he has indicated to me that they are - but the NMIA do not seem to be prepared. They say that all resource development should be halted in Labrador until their claims are settled. Now that could be a considerable amount of time considering what we have recently heard from the federal minister responsible, that they can only handle about six claims a year, and indeed there are cases running into the hundreds I do believe. But not only that the NMIA group are not even satisfied with that. It is my understanding that they want self-government to the point that they want an independent state set up in the land that they are claiming. They have made representation to Geneva and to the United Nations in New York to be declared an independent country. I do not know where that would leave the two Opposition members from Labrador, whether they would sit in this House or sit in the United Nations or in Geneva.

MR. BARRY:

Let me ask where you would sit if that happened.

MR. ANDREWS:

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I do

not think the Minister responsible for Northern Affairs (Mr. Goudie) would vote for such action because he likes to sit in this House.

Mr. Speaker, that is the situation to date. Mr. Speaker, there are various types of land claims. Of course, there is the comprehensive claims and the specific claims and I think it is the comprehensive claims that are the category that would relate to Newfoundland, and these are overall claims where there were no past treaties in effect and there are treaty Indians or Native people in Newfoundland and Labrador. So that would be the type of negotiations that would proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go through the motion by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). Of course, other members on this side have spoken to the first WHEREAS, "WHEREAS the Lower Churchill and other resource developments in Labrador should proceed in an efficient fashion;" I support that. Our problem was finding the way to proceed at all in the first place because of the difficulties of dealing with the previous federal Liberal government in Ottawa and, of course, we were looking for the right to wheel transmission through the Province of Quebec and were successful in doing so.

Mr. Speaker, "WHEREAS Aboriginal Land Claims remain unresolved and a fair and equitable land claims settlement is important to improve the status of our Aboriginal peoples;" we believe that is true and, as I said, we have our homework done on that and are ready to sit down at any time and negotiate this issue. The problem seems to be with one of the Native groups and, indeed, the federal

government with its lack of ability to squeeze it in their schedule.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the George River caribou herd, I think we can all be very proud as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. I heard it said many, many years ago, in my CBC days, in my travels throughout Canada and some places in the United States, that we have one of the best wildlife management schemes in North America in this Province, in particular on the Island part of the Province where it is a lot easier to handle being an Island, but I think this is also true in Labrador, that we can take that ability and translate it or transport it or transpose it to the Mainland part of the Province, Labrador. The wildlife in this Province, big game, moose and caribou, are very well managed and they are kept at a constant level. Indeed, some of the herds have been resettled to places where they were before and these herds, in particular caribou, are increasing in size so much so that some small hunts have been organized, for instance, on the Great Northern Peninsula and the Avalon Peninsula and I think a few animals have been taken legally also on the Burin Peninsula.

Poaching, of course, continues to be a big problem but that is all taken into the account of the wildlife management process. So whereas we are talking about 6,000 caribou as the maximum to be taken in the first season, this, as our scientists indicate, is not a number that would endanger the herd in anyway. The herd is increasing by about 35,000 or 36,000 animals a year. The mortality rate itself would take considerably more than 6,000, I am

sure, Mr. Speaker. The beneficial effect - and I am very surprised by the attitude taken by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) - the beneficial effect would be that some \$5 or \$6 or \$7 million, a ballpark figure, would flow into Labrador. A substantial part of that would go to the Native people in Labrador as outfitters and guides and so on, part-time and full-time jobs for some people. A lot of precautions are being taken by the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development in regards to the meat. I believe that one of the groups, the LIA, received a \$50,000 grant recently to construct a community food store. This would deal with all native foods, I would imagine, seal, caribou meats and so on, meats that would be killed legally right now by the Native people themselves, who are allowed to take so many animals - I think in some years there has been an unlimited number - and it will be against the law to leave any meat on the country even if the hunter himself happens to be a trophy hunter. The meat will have to come out of the country and possibly go through this system of the country food store where it will be butchered and distributed as the LIA sees fit.

MR. WARREN:

That is against the law.

MR. ANDREWS:

This will be, as I understand, in regulations in the act. Mr. Speaker, this is a commitment on the part of government that this be done.

So this would be very beneficial because I am sure there are a lot of hunters who may not be all that interested in the meat, in many

cases I am sure that they do come here to Newfoundland and kill just for the trophy itself, too, but very seldom I think that the meat today is left in the woods, be it moose or caribou, on the Island. So I would not have too much fear there particularly considering that this \$50,000 is being set aside and I would say that would be initially to get this food store underway. So, Mr. Speaker, the caribou that come from this commercial hunt will be an element in the food supply and the resources that will pass through that store.

Mr. Speaker, on the whole thrust of this motion, as we said before and I will say again, the motion is redundant. We are willing, able and prepared at this point in time to sit down and deal with the claims. There are two claims as the hon. House knows, the Labrador Inuit Association and the Naskaupi Montagnais Innu Association, and our policy is very clear on it and we recognize the claims of the Native people. I do not think that the settlement of claim should halt any development activity if we can find a way to have development activity in Labrador for the benefit of the whole Province and all of the people in this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot bring myself to vote for this motion. With those few words I reiterate that I cannot support it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I find very little difficulty actually supporting the resolution and I intend to support the resolution because I think it is an important problem. It is a small constituency. If we actually went and added up all the votes of the Native people in the Province, both in Conne River and the West Coast, the Glenwood area, the Coast of Labrador and Labrador, we not talking about a lot of votes, we are not talking a lot of people and I think that that is probably the reason that we got only about thirteen or fourteen people in the House. I hope it is at least fourteen anyway. It is probably a reflection of the real urgency that the House puts on it. I do not want to cast aspersions on the Liberals because it is their motion and I will assume that they are sincere in putting it forward. I know certainly the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) certainly is, I have heard him talk about it and the other speakers on it. I am not so sure that the verbal sincerity that we have had from the people who have spoken to the motion is matched by the actual presence of the other members opposite in terms of sitting here and at least participating in this debate. So there seems to be, as we used to say when I was teaching, a lack of congruence between what is said and what is actually being done and the physical presence of people here. There is a question there.

But I would just like to touch on a few issues because, unlike the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), I cannot claim to be that well-informed of all of the problems of Native groups in the Province. I have been in parts of Labrador where there are

sufficient numbers of Native people. The district that I represent, although in Labrador, has probably a very, very tiny proportion of Native people, at least that is the experience I have had in the time that I have been there, but there are a few. And I have had the experience, I think that is the best way of putting it, of going to Goose Bay and going to Sheshatshit before actually it was renamed that. For the members of the House who have been there, I am sure I speak for all of them, it is a particularly difficult experience to go through, looking at a people who have obviously suffered from, I think the words used by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) were 'cultural disillusion' or 'the breakdown of their culture'. And I think the evidence is there in a lot of the settlements there.

I think we have all seen the television programmes that have shown the kind of conditions in some of the settlements. I think we have all been quite concerned that we as a Legislature, and the government opposite really must take a degree of responsibility for those conditions that are there, because indeed we are the ones who set up the rules on how things are done and obviously there is something wrong, even if it is not a deliberate culpability in the part of either the government or in the House itself.

Having said that, it seems to me that the approaches that have been taken over the last year - I am not talking specifically of this government, but more at the federal level - to the whole question of self-government for Native groups seems to be some sort of progress. It always impressed me that it is difficult

to make people responsible for their own future without indeed giving them the resources to become responsible. And this direction, this idea of turning over the resources to the individual groups concerned, is probably the best approach that we could possibly take. And that means, I think, turning over to them the resources that they would need in order to live comfortably. And that would mean, I would suggest, that if we have 350,000 caribou in the George River herd that that certainly looks like the kind of resource that may provide for a reasonably decent standard of living, especially for the Native groups that have lived off it for the last number of years or the last hundreds of years.

So when I heard about the George River hunt it seemed to me that, although I could approve of the whole idea of exploiting the resource more fully, one of the things that we would try to make sure of is that not only is the food supply secured for the Native groups concerned, but if there are jobs in there that somehow we could force a linkage whereby they were the ones who got the jobs if that is indeed what they particularly wanted to do. I say that not knowing the intricacies of how it is doing. I have listened to the ministers opposite and I read the transcript of the previous debate, and it does seem to me that the government is willing, or it at least says that it is willing to use its best intentions to make sure that the Native peoples in the area are involved. But I am afraid that we have a couple hundred years of treaties that when people were signing them there was this feeling that we would use our best

intentions to make sure that these were enforced. And we all know that in a very large number of cases when it came to a conflict between groups that did have power with the particular government and those who were the Native people, the Native people tended to lose out on an almost consistent basis.

So I think with the best intentions, even given that the best intentions are sincere intentions by this government, we cannot assure ourselves that the succeeding governments would also be of a like manner. So it is worrisome to me that there is nothing at this point in terms of that hunt that would ensure that by far the employment opportunities - we have heard some estimates of quite a bit of employment opportunities, which I think is a good idea - but these employment opportunities would not be, at least in the initial phase and on a priority basis, directed towards the Native groups that, in my opinion, are at a position where they need as much employment as they can possibly get. That is the way I would approach that particular question. If it is an exploitable resource I think it should be exploited. But I would really like to see more than what I have seen so far in terms of assurances that the Native groups would be the people who would benefit to the greatest degree.

There has also been some mention, it is not a motion that has been put in yet, that maybe a select committee should be established in order to look into it. I think initially that that is probably an excellent idea. Obviously the government's stated intention was to do something about land claims and so on. Even given the fact that the ministers have now said

that something is about to come of it, but if in four years very little has been done, it makes one feel that we have to do something a bit more concrete than proposing a resolution, which looks like it may get defeated anyway, and just spending two days out of probably a year or two debating this particular issue. So the whole idea of having a select committee to look into it it seems to be very logical, very reasonable, and maybe it would indicate to us our commitment is more than just a verbal thing, that we are actually willing to put some resources and time into it. I endorse that suggestion. I am not sure exactly who was making it, but it seems to me a good idea.

I would like to spend a little time on a group of Native people that I know a little bit about, not a huge amount as well, but at least I have been in contact with, and that is the group in Conne River. I am sorry that the minister who represents that district is not here. I mention it because he brought the fourfold scheme under which they would be recognized as a Native people under, I guess, the rulings that have been made by the Supreme Court of Canada and so on. He mentioned 'members of an organized society' which I believe they are, at least in my observations they were. Another component is they had occupied specific territory. I think that is reasonable to assume that. On the exclusion of other groups, I think that is accurate. I am getting to the fourth one because I am pretty sure judging by the comments that the minister made, that is probably the argument under which the present government does not recognize this as a Native group, whether they were there prior to

the Crown taking possession of land. I would assume that is the particular item.

It becomes difficult for me to accept that when you mull it over in your mind. It is true there is no anthropological evidence to show that that particular group of people existed in Conne River prior to several hundred years ago, I am not sure of the exact date. We may see in the future that we will find that there is evidence that they were there using it prior to that, but we do not know that yet, so that is a tenable position.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Have you been there lately?.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, I have actually.

The point, though, that I think we should look at, and I look at it from a different point of view right now, is when can we actually say the Crown took possession of that particular territory, Baie d'Espoir? I know that we can go back to Sir Humphrey Gilbert, who, quite frankly, in what was actually a tragic mission, came over and claimed Newfoundland for Britain back in, I guess, 1588 or somewhere around there.

AN HON. MEMBER:

1583.

MR. FENWICK:

1583, I am sorry 1588 was the Spanish Armada.

Actually Sir Humphrey Gilbert's expedition and his claim was not used by Britain for at least 150 years to establish any kind of claim to the Island, so looking back to it as a starting date I think is somewhat foolish.

The other question that strikes me on this is what exactly was being claimed? In 1583, if we use that as a bench mark, we are talking about a claim that probably included only the Avalon Peninsula. It included none of the West Coast, the Northeast Coast or any of those other areas, mainly because if we had looked at it the West Coast and the Northeast Coast would have predominantly been occupied by French speaking people, and there were also other Native groups on the Coast of Labrador and so on. What I am trying to say here is that if we look back to the time when we could legitimately say the Crown had claimed that particular part of the Island, and I think we are looking at Bay d'Espoir, an interior section of the Island, because that is really where the land claim seems to go, and it is difficult to show that English or British people had any business in there, or any meaningful business before about 1832 at the time that Cormack made his trip across the interior there. If you read his accounts you will find that he came upon three or four encampments of Micmac Indians at that time and of course the whole trip was important from the point of view that this was the first time any white person had actually traversed the area. So if you do not accept that a claim is for the whole Island, and I think it is hard to accept that claim because of the problems that we have with it, then I think we are into it in a much muddier area than has been put forward by the government. I think that the Conne River group may have a very legitimate claim in the sense that they could argue use of a large portion of the Island of Newfoundland well prior to any meaningful use by English people or British people and I

think on that basis we should be very reluctant to throw out a claim that may indeed have some substance if it was investigated a little bit more fully.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Have you read it?

MR. FENWICK:

I have read both that one and the other one.

What I am trying to suggest is that the reason I push it forward is because the Conne River group is a group that I have talked to, I have talked to their leadership and the people there, and I can compare it in my own mind to what I have seen in Labrador in some Native groups there. In the last eight or ten years, there has actually been, despite the rough times that have occurred, a certain degree of self-government that has occurred down in Conne River. There is a degree of it that occurred, I think perhaps because nobody really knew what to do with them and they started breaking new ground and somehow it just worked out. It got to the point actually where, if you compare the group, you will see a considerably larger amount of independence in that group, a much more cohesive spirit there, a feeling that they want to control their own destiny, to make some progress to become more independent and more resilient and reliant on their own resources. It is a marked contrast to the cultural disasters that seem to have occurred in Labrador, at least from the groups that I have had some limited amount of experience with. The major point I would like to make here is that I suspect the research was conducted to support the government's position on the Conne

River group, and I doubt it had been properly thought out. I think that the Conne River group has a much better claim than the government is willing to concede them.

MR. ANDREWS:

For one-third of the Island of Newfoundland.

MR. FENWICK:

That happens to be a negotiating position and I think the member knows that and I think he should stop making fatuous comments that are not true.

MR. ANDREWS:

That is what they claim.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, but you also know that they have to claim it based on their maximum occupation of land and that there is no intention whatsoever of claiming that as a final territory.

MR. ANDREWS:

No, I do not.

MR. FENWICK:

In that case you are not speaking for your own constituents and you deserve to get thrown out the next election.

Anyway, getting back to the whole question of Labrador -

MR. ANDREWS:

Are you for an independent state in Labrador?

MR. FENWICK:

I think what we have to do about Labrador is decide which way we go with a group that has obviously had a very difficult time with the kind of society they have been living in. If this particular hunt that goes ahead would provide

a large number of jobs for this particular target group, so that they would in the future be in an excellent position to become independent people who can rely on their own resources and so on, I would say that the hunt would be a good idea. I am very much afraid, given the experience that we have had in the past, that what we are likely to get is a small number of outfitters doing extremely well and a whole large number of other people who are sort of hired on a casual basis. If it could be done through the particular groups that represent Natives in that area, I think that that would be an excellent idea and I am hoping that some day in the future that they will be involved in negotiations to do that sort of thing.

Anyway, just to sum up, a few comments here. I find that one of the hallmarks of our society is how we treat the powerless in it. I know we have made those comments with regard to groups of people who are disabled physically or even mentally, we have made that comment with regard to the young, to the very old and so on. I think that we should elaborate on that concept, I think that we as a people, we as a province, we as a legislature and the government opposite, should in the long run be judged to a great degree on how they treat a group of people who do not have electoral power to speak of. There is not enough of them to really have it and as a result whatever is done is done because we think that this is in the proper thing to do.

I would like to endorse the resolution and hope that the suggestion that has been bandied around here about a select committee being involved with

seeing how that can move forward is picked up so that we can move forward and that hopefully we will end up with a much better situation for those Native groups concerned.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. member realizes he only has six or seven minutes?

MR. RIDEOUT:
Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I realize that the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution will have a right to speak to it again in six or seven minutes time, but there are two or three comments I would like to make as one of the preambles of the resolution impacts on my department and I think it is incumbent upon me to have a few words to say about that. Before I do, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief comment as well on the sort of sanctimonious attitude of the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). You would never say that butter would melt in the hon. gentleman's mouth to hear him speak in the House, Mr. Speaker. He scolds us all and lectures us all for going out to the men's room or going out to the common room to have a cup of coffee or going out to the common room to return a constituent's phone call, scolds us for not being in the House, Mr. Speaker. We have a speaker system, we can hear what is going on in here. Sometimes we are out

having meetings with our own constituents or with constituents from people across the way. So it is not unusual for members to be just outside the confines of the House. So the sanctimoniousness of the hon. gentleman sometimes bothers me because this is the same hon. gentleman who from time to time throughout the Province would advise people to go around displaying civil disobedience, painting aircraft or blocking roads or things of that nature. So the sanctimonious attitude of the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, sometimes just makes one wonder what is happening to him. Maybe it is the House that is doing it to him.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo on a point of order.

MR. TULK:

There is such a thing as relevancy in debate. I wonder if the minister - they are smarting over there under those polls - but I wonder if he can confine himself to the resolution that we are talking about rather than talking about an hon. member of this House?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

It obviously is not a point of order. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is very, very upset because the Minister of Culture,

Recreation and Youth (Mr. Rideout) was recognized to speak with only six minutes left.

MR. TULK:

Ha, ha!

MR. SIMMS:

That is his whole purpose. The minister is making some good points and he is addressing the comments made by the last speaker and that is perfectly in order, Mr. Speaker. I submit there is no point of order but merely a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

To that point of order, hon. members are very well aware that the rule of relevancy is very difficult to make a firm decision on. There certainly has been quite a bit of latitude allowed in the debate on this particular Private Members' Motion and the Chair will permit the hon. minister to continue.

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly I do not want to take anymore time on it but the hon. gentleman made those references himself so I thought it was just as well to refer them back to him rather than have to sit here and listen to that kind of thing.

There is a WHEREAS in here, Mr. Speaker, as I said, which has some implications for my department. You know, I have all the respect for the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), he is one of the hardest working,

dedicated members that I have met in the ten years that I have been here, but he sometimes goes off the deep end, like this, "WHEREAS Government has arbitrarily decided to harvest the Georges's River caribou herd without consultation with the Labrador people". Now, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be allowed to stand on the record of this House because it is just not true, the hon. gentleman knows it is not true, the hon. gentleman knew it was not true when he included it as a preamble in his resolution. This government, Mr. Speaker, have spent more than two years consulting with the Native people of Labrador over whether or not there should be a commercial caribou hunt in Labrador and whether or not -

MR. TULK;

Have you ever been to Sheshatshit?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not interrupt the hon. gentleman. I only have a couple of minutes so let him be quite and let him follow the rules that he just raised a point of order about.

We have spent two and a half years, Mr. Speaker, consulting with the Native people over the potential sport hunt and the commercial hunt. I heard the hon. gentleman on the radio, back about three weeks ago after the announcement was made about the sport hunt, again talking about no consultation. And, Mr. Speaker, the very day that the hon. gentleman was making those wild accusations that were carried on the airways of the Province, the day before I had met with the President of the Inuit group from his own area discussing the commercial caribou hunt and their input into it and how their study

was going and all that kind of stuff, assuring them of the continued support of my department, assuring them that our ears were open always to whatever they wanted to recommend to us, assuring them that the avenues of consultation that were started by my colleague a couple of years ago would continue. They were delighted. Mr. Anderson was pleased. As a matter of fact, he went out of his way to compliment the department and the government on how good a job we were doing in making sure that we were listening to what the Native people of Labrador had to say about this particular endeavour that we were about to embark on. So, Mr. Speaker, it is just not right, it cannot be left on the record to have those kind of statements made. Now there are a lot of other things in the resolution that I agree with, there are a lot of other things in the resolution that I have no problem with, and there are a lot of things in the resolution that are redundant and the hon. gentleman knows that. To set up a select committee, for example, to go around making decisions or recommendations that could become binding decisions on land claims, I think is a bit naive. You would not want to delegate that kind of authority. That is very delicate stuff and has to be dealt with accordingly.

MR. WARREN:

I did not say that.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No, but you colleague made the amendment to that effect. Like I said, there are a lot of things in the resolution that I agree with, a lot of ground remains to be covered, but the fact of the matter is that on this issue that I am speaking to that is so

important to a lot of the people whom the hon. gentleman represents, this government and this department have bent over backwards to try to insure that the voice and the concerns of the Native people of Labrador was heard and was incorporated into any policy decisions regarding the future use of that George's River caribou herd. Stewart Luttich, of whatever his name is, who is stationed up there went with the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, for example, through every community in Northern Labrador and sat down talking to them about the potential of this harvest and how they would like to see it done, whether the Native groups would like to get involved themselves and all that kind of thing, and I understand some of the Native people do want to get involved.

Mr. Speaker, I know I have to end up now. I want to give the hon. gentleman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No, I would not even accept leave. The hon. gentleman may very well want his full twenty minutes to speak on this resolution. I just wanted to make those few comments as it relates to my department.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains closes debate on this resolution.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, in cluing up I will probably start off with the last speaker first. The minister just

making his statement said that he spoke a day before this statement came in with the President of the LIA, Mr. Speaker, or met with him in his office, I do not know exactly what he said. Now I believe the minister should be ashamed to say such a thing whereas I also talked to the President of the LIA and he never even discussed this statement, the statement was not even discussed with him. The statement was not discussed with Mr. Anderson.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I did so.

MR. WARREN:

I talked with Mr. Anderson on the phone and Mr. Anderson was shocked to know that the department, that this government was going to have ten outfitters operating in Labrador. The minister has the gall to say that he spoke to him and he agreed with him. That is downright incorrect and it is downright untrue. What the minister just said is untrue.

MR. RIDEOUT:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

It might be a difference of opinion between two hon. members, but, Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody else can say it is untrue. If it is untrue it is a lie and I have not lied to the House. I met with the gentleman, he complimented the government on our process of consultation and so on like that. He may have told the hon. gentleman another story, that is a difference of opinion between two hon. members, but it is certainly not a difference of opinion to say what I said is

untrue. That means I am telling lies and I certainly am not lying to the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, certainly the member cannot say indirectly what he cannot say otherwise. I would ask the member to withdraw it. In fact, he inferred the hon. member was telling a lie.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, if I said that the hon. the minister was telling a lie I withdraw it. However, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Anderson left me the impression that if he did talk with the hon. the minister, the hon. the minister did not tell Mr. Anderson that they were going to have a commercial caribou hunt and that this statement was going to be brought before the House. The hon. the minister did not tell Mr. Anderson that. I say that, Mr. Speaker. Now, furthermore, the hon. the minister also said that Mr. Luttich, the biologist went around Labrador with the LRAC to find out the input from the community. But I believe the minister should also say it was this government that already got rid of the LRAC, decided that the LRAC was no more in existence. This was the same government that got rid of the LRAC. So why go around with a body and all of a sudden get rid of that same body? The LRAC does not work any more in Labrador because this government decided to get rid of them. They are no longer in existence, the government would not fund them any longer. So, Mr. Speaker, there is another example of listening. Now the minister also said they were consulting. Mr. Speaker, they do not consult. I have said that time and time again, they do not consult. Mr. Speaker, the only people that they consult with, and

I will not name the names in this hon. House, but they are four or five businessmen in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. I can tell you who they are. The hon. Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Goudie) can tell you about his buddies and who they are also. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, the former minister responsible for wildlife (Mr. Simms) did not know, Mr. Speaker, how to consult with the Native people, he did not want to consult with them. Now all of a sudden they decide to come in with a sports hunt. This is not a commercial hunt, Mr. Speaker, it is a sports hunt and I think there are a lot of questions to be asked. The minister responsible for wildlife has gone now. I guess he is listening in the common room. However, it is ironic to know that all over the Island the big game season opens from September up to March. However, in Labrador for some reason, Mr. Speaker, the big game season for sports hunting is opening up June, July, August and September. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is only one reason that this government is going to go ahead with this sports hunt and I will tell the hon. House the reason. The reason is that during the Summertime on the Coast of Labrador, where the majority of the Native people live the only employment that they can find is fishing and subsequently in July and August it is going to be very, very difficult to get Native people to work because they are already employed. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the main reasons, this is the guilt reason behind this government deciding we will have the sports hunt in July and August, then we will have to hire on some other people instead of the Native people because they will be already employed. This is

one of the dirty and guilty conditions behind this move.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at another very dangerous situation that could occur. If the season is open from June to October, it is the time in Labrador when there is no snow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

I would like to be heard in silence, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, if that season is allowed to open from June to October, I am glad that the hon. the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is listening because the member knows what I am saying is a very serious matter. In fact, it was only just last weekend, in the weekend edition of The Evening Telegram, I think it was Bill Power was writing on wildlife, and the minister probably read it, there is a concern expressed already on the Island about the all-terrain vehicles. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to warn this government of one thing, that the only time in Labrador there is no snow or very little snow is from June to October, the same time that this sports hunt is scheduled for. Mr. Speaker, if this allowed to go the only way for sports hunters when they go in the country in a small plane and they land on a small lake or a pond, if they want to get their caribou they are going to have to use an all-terrain vehicle. And that all-terrain vehicle is going to do the same damage to the territory in

Labrador as it is doing to the Island now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

We have people now complaining on the Island.

MR. GOUDIE:

You and I would not need a vehicle.!

MR. WARREN:

Oh, Mr. Speaker, yes. There are only just two people that will walk in Labrador to look for a caribou and that is the hon. member there and myself, because we have been up there so long we are used to it. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious matter because you are going to have to go miles and miles and if an all-terrain vehicle is allowed to be carried into the country it is going to have a devastating affect on the wildlife. That is number one.

Now, secondly, which is more and more important, I have a letter here, I think the minister has a copy of it, I notice his name is on here, and the hon. minister for wildlife has a copy, it is from a fellow John Kennedy and he wrote it to Neil Windsor, the hon. the Minister of Development, and he had three objections against this caribou hunt, and I would like to highlight some of his objections. 'Your department's intention to side with sports hunters and special interest groups' - meaning guys with dollars in their back pockets who will receive them rather than the Native Labrador people - 'for us it is deeply troubling.' That is what he says here.

Mr. Speaker, why would somebody outside looking at what is going on in Labrador all of a sudden show that kind of an interest? It shows, Mr. Speaker, that this government, and he has said it here time and time again, has not consulted enough with the people. In fact, Stu Luttich, the wildlife biologist has said in a letter that was addressed to the former Minister of Wildlife that there has to be more consultation and, in fact, he was not satisfied about what was going on.

Now I have another letter here from Ian Goudie, I do not know if he is any relation to the hon. minister, a wildlife biologist with the federal government, pertaining to low flying aircraft in the Goose Bay area when an environmental study was asked for and everybody was saying no. This is the same thing; once we start having outfitter camps in the interior of Labrador they are going to have the same effect. Here is what it said: There appears to be circumstantial evidence to suggest that negative impacts are occurring. However, it remains a dilemma because no studies were designed to determine and measure these impacts. Furthermore, the effects of low level flying on wildlife are unknown as no published studies exist. Now, Mr. Speaker, unless there are studies done and unless the studies are released to let the people know, how can we determine if low flying aircraft are going to have any affect or not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, not very often the hon. member and I agree, but he is

at least agreeing to a study on low flying aircraft. It is very ironic, Mr. Speaker, because the Premier came in today with a study on Major Bilateral Issues with eight issues outlined, Mr. Speaker: A strategy for development, fisheries, offshore, hydro-electric, regional development, transportation, technology and national defence. As the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) said, because they are only a small group of people they are put back on the back burner by this Premier. Why did not the Premier have one more issue and call it Land Claims? The minister said that this government is seriously thinking about land claims. If they are, Mr. Speaker, surely goodness with the Premier's attitude now towards the new government in Ottawa he would have had nine issues here today instead of eight. But no, Mr. Speaker, instead what he said, he has national defence here to boost up the military force in Goose Bay, which I also agree with, but not at the sacrifice of the Native people, not at the sacrifice of land claims. I have to give the Premier credit where credit is due. The Premier said that one of the burning issues is Native land claims. But how can we let other outfitters go into the interior of the land - the LIA is presently negotiating with this government about that - and give them fifteen year leases? How can we give them fifteen year leases on a piece of property on which negotiations are ongoing?

Mr. Speaker, you cannot build a house in St. John's anywhere unless of you have a permit to build it, and all of a sudden this government is deciding to give fifteen - year leases to ten outfitters to build and to

construct houses, camps, and what-not, maybe airstrips for that matter, in various parts of Labrador without the land claims settlement being taken care of.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my time is running out very fast.

MR. PATTERSON:

You can stay all night.

DR. COLLINS:

We are waiting for you to get into the body of your remarks.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the body of my remarks is that this government has to move much faster, much quicker and has to recognize that the Native people of this Province, the first settlers of this Province, the inheritors of this Province, need to be recognized.

MR. GOUDIE:

That is me.

MR. WARREN:

And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can refer to himself as one. However, I believe with all due respect to the hon. gentleman, that before he got in Cabinet with Mr. Frank Moores, he made a threat to Mr. Frank Moores, "You either put me in Cabinet or else." Now he is in Cabinet and he has not said anything since he has gotten in there.

My problem is the hon. the minister has not been vocal enough. The hon. minister has to be more vocal, and excuse the pun, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. minister has to show his true colours and has to speak up for the Native people of this Province.

I am going to clue up, Mr.

Speaker, by reading a couple of paragraphs which probably give a consensus of what the Native people think. 'There was a misguided hope in the past that the settlement of land claims would speed up the assimilation of Indian and Inuit people into a large society. This was one of the concerns expressed in the past, that the Indian and Native people would be absorbed into the white man's society. Indeed in the 1950s' - I think the hon. minister said that it was about ten or fifteen years ago, actually it has been on the go since the 1950s' - 'the United States Indian Claims Commission was busy settling Indian land claims in the United States while Congress was busy trying to terminate the special status of the Indian reservations and of tribal government.' At the same time one thing was going on on the back burner and there were conflicting reports happening. 'Indian and Inuit people have made it abundantly clear in Newfoundland and Labrador that they are not seeking to be taken up with government's propaganda or taken up into a society and just put into a corner.' In fact. Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. minister just said the right word, they do not wish to be assimilated together and all of a sudden squeezed together like you would take an orange in the morning before you eat it. Mr. Speaker, 'They see a settlement of land claims as getting an economic and political basis for continuing Indian and Inuit life in Canada.'

And finally, Mr. Speaker, 'We politicians have a natural impatience, a wish to move and achieve. I think if we look at both sides of it is that we have an ambition to move and to achieve

something. It has taken us hundreds of years to come to our present assessment of the Native and non-Native issues in Newfoundland. The process of settling land claims has brought enormous pressure to bear on Native communities in this Province. That has to be remembered by both the federal and the provincial governments. It requires sensitivity and an enormous amount of work to achieve just and reasonable settlements of Native land claims. It is not easy and it is not fast, but it is sensible, it is necessary, and it is just.'

Thank you, very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Is the House ready for the question? All those in favour of the amendment "aye", those against the amendment "nay", the amendment is defeated.

All those in favour of the resolution, "aye", those against the resolution, "nay", the resolution is defeated.

It being Wednesday, I do now leave the Chair until tomorrow, Thursday, December 6, 1984 at 3:00 p.m.