MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Services des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

CANADIAN THESES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

THÈSES CANADIENNES

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-33387-1

ATTEMPTS TO ESTABLISH NATIONAL PARKS IN CANADA:
A CASE HISTORY IN LABRADOR FROM 1969 TO 1979.

by

Richard Eric Bill, B.A.

Copyright 2 April 1982 by Richard E. Bill

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate
Studies and Research in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of Master

of Arts

in Geography

Department of Geography

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

2 April 1982

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate
Studies and Research acceptance of the thesis
"ATTEMPTS TO ESTABLISH NATIONAL PARKS IN CANADA:
A CASE HISTORY IN LABRADOR FROM 1969 TO 1979"
submitted by Richard Eric Bill, B.A.
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts.

_____
THESIS SUPERVISOR

_____
CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY

Carleton University

April 27, 1982

ABSTRACT

The Mealy and Torngat areas of Labrador were proposed as national parks in 1976, following seven years of exploration. The proposals, innovative public participation and projected cooperative planning were complicated by geography and history, federal, provincial and Labradorians' concerns, indecision, misunderstanding, and native peoples' opposition; they were halted at provincial government request in 1979.

The research objectives were to identify strengths and weaknesses in the process, draw conclusions, potentially applicable elsewhere in Canada, and suggest future approaches in Labrador. Research involved reconstruction and analysis of the process using newspaper, government and other records, personal observation and participation.

Conclusions reached included: Good, ongoing communication is essential; care, sensitivity and flexibility in timing and approach are crucial; the onus rests with national park proponents. Cooperative planning is required to integrate provincial, national and local values, objectives and priorities; early political commitment to both process and results is essential.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I acknowledge with sincere thanks and gratitude the help, direction and support given by my dissertation advisor Duncan M. Anderson, the other members of my committee and of the Department of Geography.

To Susan, and our three children Allison, Nicola and Alexander, I offer my thanks for their forbearance as this thesis has evolved over the last six years.

To Mary Gillis, Angus MacIntyre and Ray Chipeniuk I offer a special thanks for the stimulation they have offered in considering both public participation and Labrador as a combination worthy of research.

My thanks for the unconscious contribution to, and support for, my strong attachments to Labrador and its people to John and Judy McGrath, Tony Williamson, the MacLeans from Carter Basin, Winston White, Doris Saunders, Bart Jack, David Lough, Hans and Susan Felsberg. They and many other Labradorians have helped me to understand just a little about their land which I have visited over some twenty three years.

My thanks to the Parks Canada staff who have provided assistance during the evolution of this thesis. Particular thanks is made to John Carruthers, Mahlon Robinson, Brent Coates, Linda Rooney and her staff (particularly Mary Leblanc and Sylvie Richard), Don Cooper, Ian Joyce and Sharon Budd.

My thanks to Dr. F.G. Hannell who made it possible for me to return to university.

Lastly, an acknowledgement is made to the senior administrators of Parks Canada who permit a freeflow of thought and discussion to occur within the organization. This contributed to the spirit of cooperation in Parks Canada which facilitated this research.

PREFACE

The first conference on Canadian National Parks: Today and Tomorrow took place in Calgary in 1968. Ten years later J.G. Nelson again presided over a second conference, this time in Banff. These two conferences provide a wealth of material about the achievements, hopes and omissions of Canada's national parks system over a decade. That decade coincides with efforts to create national parks in Labrador. It is appropriate therefore to consider Labrador as an example of explorations, thinking, approach, discussions, policy and practice in the new park establishment process from 1969 to 1979.

Labrador was selected by the author for several reasons: he had first visited Canada in 1958 and stayed some seven weeks in the Mealy Mountains. Chance and design had placed him back there some eighteen years later and he has been involved in the subject of proposed national parks in Labrador since 1976. He identified a need to document that work that could be used by others who may follow in working to create Labrador's national parks. Labradorians also deserve some record of the work which went on in public and 'behind the scenes' to identify the parks, and to change

vi
the new park establishment process so as to permit their participation.

The work approaches taken varied over the decade in response to public pressure at both the national and local level; a record of this variation can be of value in other parts of Canada as well as Labrador.

The study area is thus of personal interest, work interest and offers a good case history for developing methodologies for future attempts in Labrador which may have application elsewhere in Canada.

The thesis has been difficult to write because the extent of the author's involvement may lead to questions of accuracy and objectivity in the synthesis. It has also been difficult to write because the author's continuing involvement in the Labrador case history, and his evaluation of the process in this public forum, may adversely influence its outcome. The intent of the thesis is just the opposite: to record the events, to include the author's judgement and to propose ways in which a difficult process can be improved.

Such criticisms as do occur have been limited to those aspects of the region and the process, which are likely to reoccur and which should be handled differently in the future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Preface.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables.....	xi
List of Diagrams.....	xii
List of Abbreviations.....	xiv
List of Appendices.....	xv
1. Introduction	
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 The Study Area.....	4
1.3 The Research Project.....	6
2. Parks Canada: Its Search to Expand 1968 to 1979	
2.1 Introduction.....	10
2.2 Historical Background to 1968.....	10
2.3 The Status in 1968 and the Promise of Expansion.....	16
2.4 The Search for Expansion - 1968 into the Seventies.....	24
2.5 The Systems Approach to Expansion.....	24
2.6 Factors Thwarting Expansion	
2.6.1 A fundamental problem.....	28
2.6.2 Administrative problems.....	29
2.6.3 Financial impacts.....	30
2.6.4 Other Factors.....	32

	Page
2.7 Summary and Conclusions.....	36
3. Labrador: A Background	
3.1 Introduction.....	39
3.1.1 Geographical Situation.....	42
3.2 Physical and Biological Background	
3.2.1 Biophysical Setting.....	44
3.2.2 Geology and Physiography.....	46
3.2.3 Climate.....	52
3.2.4 Water.....	53
3.2.5 Soil.....	53
3.2.6 Vegetation.....	55
3.2.7 Wildlife.....	58
3.3 The People	
3.3.1 The Population and Current Settlement Patterns.....	59
3.3.2 The Settling of Labrador.....	70
- Aboriginal Prehistory.....	71
- European Exploration, Contact and Settlement to 1941.....	72
- The Modern Period: 1941 to 1979....	80
3.3.3 Constitutional Background.....	85
3.3.4 The Feelings of Isolation, Neglect and Exploitation.....	89
4. The Search for Potential National Park Sites in Labrador	
4.1 Introduction.....	96

	Page
4.2 1970 Field Survey.....	97
4.3 1972 and 1973 Field Reconnaissance.....	101
4.4 1974 National Park Potential Field Study.....	107
4.5 1975 National Park Options Study.....	111
4.6 1976 National Park Feasibility Studies.....	119
4.7 Summary and Conclusions.....	131
5. *Public Participation: The Labrador Experiment for Parks Canada	
5.1 Introduction.....	134
5.2 Growing Public Awareness of National Park Proposals, 1973 to 1976.....	137
5.3 Initial Public Announcements and Reactions in 1976.....	144
5.4 Parks Canada's Systematic Attempts to Plan and Activate a Public Involvement Process in 1976 and 1977.....	159
5.5 Open Public Discussions and Involvement, 1977 and 1978.....	182
5.6 The Cooperative Planning Proposal, 1978 and 1979.....	194
5.7 The Grounding of the Cooperative Planning Proposal and of National Parks upon the Shoals of Politics.....	207
5.8 Summary and Conclusions.....	211

6. Political Aspects and Problems	
6.1 Introduction.....	215
6.2 Roles of Elected Representatives.....	219
6.3 Role of the Provincial Tourism Minister.....	223
6.4 Role of the Minister Responsible for Parks Canada.....	226
6.5 Other Political Participants.....	229
6.6 The Role of Parks Canada in the Political Arena.....	234
6.7 Other Political Aspects.....	237
6.8 Conclusion.....	241
7. Analysis, Conclusions and a Tentative Methodology for Future Attempts in Labrador	
7.1 Introduction.....	243
7.2 A Review of the Case History in Labrador.....	246
7.3 Recent Events, 1979-1981.....	259
7.4 Options for the Future.....	263
Appendices.....	267
Selected Bibliography.....	319
Selected Correspondence.....	337

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
2.1 Establishing a national park: procedure in 1966.....	25
5.1 Process Flow Chart Phase I Cooperative Planning Report.....	200
5.2 Process Flow Chart Phase II Cooperative Planning Report.....	201
7.1 Simplified process followed in attempts to establish national parks in Labrador.....	247

LIST OF DIAGRAMS

	Page
1.1 National Parks or Equivalent Reserves Possibilities in Labrador identified between 1970 and 1976.....	5
2.1 Physiographic Regions of Canada.....	18
2.2 National Parks and their Natural Regions in 1968.....	19
3.1 Generalized Geological Map of Labrador.....	47
3.2 Physiographic Subdivisions of Labrador.....	49
3.3 Physiographic Subdivisions of Labrador according to Bostock (1970).....	50
3.4 Permafrost Zones and Subzones.....	54
3.5 Forest Regions According to Rowe (1972).....	56
3.6 Labrador Communities.....	60
4.1 National Parks or Equivalent Reserves (Coombs (1970)).....	98
4.2 Koroc River-Ungava Bay national park study area (Carruthers (1970)).....	100
4.3 Wild Rivers Survey of Canada.....	102
4.4 National Parks Areas of Interest Identified in 1973 in Southern Labrador.....	105
4.5 Areas of National Significance in Northern Labrador in 1974.....	109
4.6 Natural Areas of National Significance in Labrador in 1975-1976.....	117

	Page
4.7 Mealy Mountains Study Area.....	124
4.8 Torngat Mountains Study Area.....	128
7.1 National Parks and their Natural Regions in 1978.....	244

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A.R.C.	Agreements for Recreation and Conservation Branch of Parks Canada
D.R.E.E.	Department of Regional Economic Expansion
I.A.N.D.	Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Innu	The name the Montagnais and Naskapi appear to call themselves
I.B.P. Areas	International Biological Program Areas
I.T.C.	Inuit Tapirisat of Canada
L.I.A.	Labrador Inuit Association
L.R.A.C.	Labrador Resources Advisory Council
M.H.A.	Member of the (Newfoundland and Labrador) House of Assembly
M.P.	Member of Parliament
N.A.C.S.	Natural area of Canadian Significance
N.I.B.	National Indian Brotherhood
N.M.I.A.	Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association
provincial Tourism	Department of Tourism of Newfoundland and Labrador

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
I. Unpublished paper by N. Munro listing 14 reasons for the failure to establish a national park at Ship Harbour, Nova Scotia.....	269
II. M.M. Gillis Report of September 8, 1976.....	273
III. Recommendations of Angus MacIntyre.....	279
IV. Tourism Minister Hickey's statement in House of Assembly June 2, 1976.....	285
V. Extracts from the summary of the Labrador open community meetings in the fall of 1977....	287
VI. Results of public meetings in thirteen Labrador communities August and September, 1977.....	293
VII. Rigolet brief to Tourism Minister Hickey in the fall of 1977.....	309
VIII. Extract concerning national parks from the L.R.A.C. pamphlet "As If People Mattered - Resource Issues in Labrador". October 1977....	312
IX. List of tasks to be accomplished in the cooperative planning project proposal. January 1979.....	314
X. The Memorandum of Intention concerning the Cooperative Planning Project Proposal. February, 1979.....	317

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the problem, purpose and objectives of the research, the research methodology, scope and limitations.

1.1 BACKGROUND

The first Canadian national park was established in the Rocky Mountains in 1885. By 1930 the number of National Parks had increased to 14, by 1969 to 19, and by 1979 there were 25 national parks and 3 national park reserves.

The accelerated growth in the number of new national parks in the decade from 1969 to 1979 aggravated a number of problems which were to become so serious as to threaten both public acceptance of, and the actual philosophy underlying, national parks. This philosophy as stated in the National Parks Act is:

The National Parks of Canada are hereby dedicated to the people of Canada for their benefit, education and enjoyment, subject to this Act and the regulations, and the National Parks shall be maintained and made use of so as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations (Canada. National Parks Act, 1974. Section 4).

These problems were, and remain, centred around the attempts to remove local inhabitants and their activities

from within new national parks;* the inadequate financial resources for an expanded parks system within the existing government financial system, the reluctance of provincial and territorial governments to transfer lands and waters to federal control, the apparent conflict with traditional land claims, and the failure to incorporate regional impacts in the new park identification and establishment process.

In response to these problems, there were many attempts by Parks Canada, (the umbrella organization administering three functional branches, including the National Parks Branch) in the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s, to change the methods of establishing national parks in Canada from early ad hoc to more systematic approaches that better reflected local, regional and national concerns. These changes can be associated in the 1970s with greater pressures upon Parks Canada to justify the establishment of new national parks. These demands have been made particularly by local people, by their elected representatives, and by provincial and territorial governments. Parks Canada has gradually responded to these demands, firstly by recognizing the roles that the public and other governments can play in the new park establishment

---

* The primary objective for national parks in Canada is protection and conservation of their natural heritage resources, the secondary objective is presentation of these natural resources. A tertiary objective has been to protect any cultural heritage elements. Unfortunately, the preoccupation with natural heritage protection has led to the deliberate destruction of many cultural heritage resources in national parks.

process; secondly by recognizing the effect national parks have upon their economic and social regions; thirdly by improving the system of financial planning and forecasting.

While the numbers of national parks increased, most spectacularly in the decade between 1969 and 1979, a survey of the literature in Canada suggests there have been only a few attempts to document the actual process of park establishment. Specific problems of interest have been analyzed, particularly the role of public participation by O'Brien (1973) and by Olsen (1976).

There has been a recent study by Nation which "critically analyses the processes of both land acquisition and land use decision making in the national parkland context" (R. Nation. 1979, p. 1) in Canada. This study by Nation, on her own admission, was kept at a fairly general level (Ibid., p. vii).

There remains, therefore, a need to review and analyze specific selection and establishment processes for new national parks, which when placed in the context of an overall and Canada-wide program, can throw some light upon the various planning processes which have been and are being used to enlarge the current system of national parks.

At any one time during the 1970s a number of proposals have been under discussion to complete a system of national parks in Canada. Consequently, there is a selection of such proposals which can be evaluated.

During the 1970s a proposal for one or two national parks in Labrador was actively discussed by the federal and provincial governments and the people of Labrador. Labrador was selected by the author for several reasons.

The Labrador park proposal is of interest in that during the period 1969-1979 a number of approaches were taken in planning, and some of these were tried in Labrador and were documented by the author as they occurred. The impacts of these approaches warrant evaluation for their comparative effects and successes where they have been adapted to local circumstances in Labrador.

The Labrador proposal presents a good case history for developing methodologies for any future new park proposals in Labrador which also may have applicability elsewhere in Canada.

1.2 THE STUDY AREA

The study area consists of the Labrador portion of the province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Over the period from 1969 to 1979 a number of studies and related field expeditions were made to identify areas in Labrador which might meet the criteria for national parks in Canada. These areas were located within the two natural regions identified by Parks Canada into which two thirds of Labrador fall. These areas are indicated on Map 1.1. As a result of the studies and expeditions between 1969 and 1976, the choice of potential sites was narrowed to the Torngat

Map 1-1

**NATIONAL PARKS
OR EQUIVALENT RESERVES
POSSIBILITIES IN LABRADOR**
As Identified between 1970
and 1976 for further research
discussions with the province
and local people.

--- Natural Region

Mountains in the Northern Labrador Mountains Region and to the Mealy Mountains in the East Coast Boreal Region. These became the focus of attention between 1976 and 1979 in political and public discussions.

1.3 THE RESEARCH PROJECT

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the planning processes used to enlarge the current park system, by documenting, and examining the attempts made from 1969 to 1979, to establish new national parks in Labrador.

Specific objectives are to:

1. Document the full process and incorporate a description of Labrador's cultural heritage.
2. Identify difficulties, effective and less than effective steps in the process.
3. Make recommendations for improving future park establishment efforts.

The approach will be to examine the relevant literature and all known records, including the author's own, which shed light on the attempt by Parks Canada to establish national parks in Labrador from the beginning in 1969 to the spring of 1979, when the proposals were allowed to slip into abeyance.

In order to evaluate the process so as to identify the difficulties and successful components, it is necessary to consider and analyze the following factors:

- 7
- (a) an explanation of why Parks Canada is trying to expand the system of national parks in Canada;
  - (b) the geography of Labrador and its people;
  - (c) the search for national park potential in Labrador;
  - (d) systematic attempts to involve the public in discussions and planning for these national parks and other potential uses for the Mealy and Torngat mountains areas of interest;
  - (e) an analysis of the political aspects and problems encountered or anticipated;

From the evaluation of those aspects, and the conclusion reached on the relevance of the experience to successful park establishment, it is intended to propose options for future attempts at national park establishment in Labrador, and perhaps in other parts of Canada.

There will be some limitations to this thesis and the assessment it can attempt. The thesis will be limited to a review of the national park proposals in Labrador. Other proposals or activities in Labrador which have influenced the direction of these national parks proposals and the public participation process will only be mentioned to indicate their relevance to this proposal. It will not be possible to re-interview the participants in the proposal due to the costs and distances involved.

Since 1976 the author has been deeply involved in undertaking much work, as a Parks Canada employee, on these Labrador proposals, and thus may be subject to limited perceptions, subjectivity and partisanship in writing this paper. Where possible this has been avoided.

It should be noted at this point that, without access to the correspondence, notes, and observations made by the author as a participant, much of this case history would have been difficult to recreate, and record and analyze.

The analysis will attempt to distinguish between the subjectivity and objectivity of views and opinions expressed by participants, including this writer, in the evaluation of the events over the ten-year period 1969-1979. Subjectivity will be evident in opinions expressed by local people in Labrador who feel threatened by change and who seem to express helplessness in controlling or even directing that change.

Three factors -- perception, subjectivity and partisanship -- appear to play major roles in this case history. The thesis will attempt to record the events and attempt to describe, separately, (a) the differences in perception which are evident; (b) the impact of subjectivity; and (c) the partisanship which was omnipresent.

In addition, the role of politics at the local, regional, provincial and national levels in establishing national parks will be evaluated. The work between

conception of the idea of a national park and its inception and inclusion in the National Parks Act takes many years. The work has been organised into a process. This process is significantly political in nature because decisions have to be made by elected representatives on behalf of their constituents. Consequently, politics -- as distinct from partisanship -- will also be considered as a further factor in the process which has to be documented.

Much of the political process which is described in the Labrador case example has not been recorded elsewhere. It is therefore based upon the notes taken and observations made by the author. Discretion has been used in order to avoid breaking any confidentiality which might have been present in the discussions, notes and correspondence between the participants.

Given this introduction, the steps identified earlier will each be considered separately in the following text.

In order to interpret events in Labrador, it is necessary to understand the circumstances which led to, and influenced, the approach to national park exploration in the 1970s. This context is provided in the following chapter.

commitment were essential to the successful expansion of the park system.

Yet there was one notable omission, and this represented a problem that was to become a major stumbling block in efforts to establish national parks over the next decade. Examination of the conference proceedings reveals that there was no attention devoted to the question of social and economic impact of a new national park upon the local population in a proposed park area. The conference proceedings convey a clear impression that to the participants at the conference, national parkland was seen to be devoid of people, save of course for the visitor.* This perspective was perhaps to be expected, given the context in which the mountain national parks, and subsequent national parks, had been established. The tradition of the national park as a natural, non-populated landscape was long established, and had in fact been reconfirmed in the National Park Policy statement of 1964.

However, this pre-occupation with the natural landscape, and the lack of concern for local, affected populations - their traditional land uses and values, was to cause controversies and confrontations that would haunt attempts to create new national parks in Labrador and other regions.

---

* A stark contrast to the realities of park acquisition and management of a human landscape in European parks.

federal legislation. All were on federal lands and all but three were in Western Canada. The first National Parks Act, which marks the beginnings of a national system of parks, was not passed until 1930.

The 1930 National Parks Act designated most of the varied existing parks and reserves, as National Parks. The National Parks Act dedicated the national parks "to the people of Canada for their benefit, education and enjoyment," and further stated that these park lands were to be "maintained and made use of so as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations" (Canada. National Parks Act. 1974. Section 4). Thus the National Parks Act created, and has maintained, the basic paradox of both "use" and "preservation", which has been a fundamental challenge in park management and planning from 1930 to the present.

Up to 1930 park lands had been used for a variety of purposes additional to recreation and conservation, but following passage of the National Parks Act, other economic uses such as resource extraction were reduced or eliminated wherever possible. The 1930 Act included the power to purchase or expropriate land within a reserve, and to exclude lands within such reserves from the provisions of the Act. Thus the pattern was set in 1930 of having all lands within national parks federally owned and conservation and recreation as the only uses which were encouraged.

The year 1930 was a significant point in the evolution of Canada's national parks since from 1930 on, a major attempt was made to redress the geographical imbalance. This created an entirely new dimension to the problems of park acquisition, since it created the need for negotiation with the provincial governments for new national parks. It is a significant reflection of this new problem that all of the five national parks established between 1930 and 1968 were located in the Atlantic Provinces.

It is a valid observation that the growth of the system of national parks has been very uneven, spatially and chronologically (Nation, R. 1979. p. 20), and in the early stages, lacked any systematic rationale. As of the mid 1960's the park system comprised nine parks in Alberta and B.C. (pre 1923), three former Naval or Indian Reserves in Ontario (1914 to 1929), one park in Saskatchewan (1927), one in Manitoba (1929), and four parks in the Maritime provinces (1936 to 1948). With the exception of Wood Buffalo National Park, which straddles the Alberta, North West Territories border, the national parks were limited to provincial territories. It is also true that parks policy had been unwritten, and was largely based on precedent and usage for each park, with minor variations and inconsistencies across the system.

This was the situation until 1964, when the first attempt to introduce a broad national parks policy was announced by the Honourable Arthur Laing, then Minister of

Northern Affairs and Natural Resources. This articulation of policy reflected the increasing visitor pressures on parks in the post WWII period, increasing problems of park management related to visitor pressures, and a growing perception of a need to expand and systematize the collection of national parks.

The 1964 policy, which was to remain in force until 1979, reflected the recognition that the National Parks Act provided only the broadest of guidelines for both public use and preservation. (A. Laing. Statement on national park policy at the House of Commons. Sept. 18, 1964). For the first time objectives for national parks were stated, and criteria spelled out for the establishment of new national parks. Individual national parks had to meet two distinct national objectives:

- (a) To preserve the Canadian heritage
- (b) To ensure this and future generations of Canadians the opportunity to use, enjoy, and benefit from the values of natural wilderness. (National Parks Policy, 1964, p. 31).

Accordingly, the policy criteria established for a national park were:

1. To be considered as a potential National Park an area must be worthy of preservation. This means it should:
  - (i) be an outstanding example of the best scenery in Canada, or
  - (ii) have unique scenic, geographical or geological features of national interest, or

(iii) have outstanding examples of flora and fauna of national interest, or

(iv) provide outstanding opportunities for enjoying appropriate non-urban forms of outdoor recreation amid superb surroundings.

2. Preferably, and in accordance with its purpose, it should be large enough to support indigenous flora and fauna.
3. Depending on the size of the area and the purposes of the proposed park, it is usually desirable that the area or part of it be suitable for recreational purposes and for accommodation or other visitor services.
4. It must be evident that the area is of sufficient value now or for the future to justify the expenditure required for preservation and development. (Ibid. p. 32).

The 1964 policy was doubly significant, as it set out both definition for the objectives of national parks, and criteria for establishment of new parks. The new policy reconfirmed that national parks were to be both "enjoyed" and "preserved". Most significantly, if the criteria for new parks are taken as an indicator of the kind of Canadian heritage intended, it seems clear from the reference to "scenery", "unique geographical or geological features", "flora and fauna of national interest", that heritage was implicitly defined in terms of natural, not man-made, landscape. This was in keeping with past perceptions of park reserves as areas of rare and unusual natural landscapes. This emphasis was to pose a significant problem to some of the new parks proposals in the 1970's where man and his landscape had to be removed to create a 'natural wilderness'.

A significant stimulus to the new parks policy was the general perception of need for substantial expansion of the national parks system. This was illustrated by the statement of the Minister, Arthur Laing, in June 1967:

It will require forty to sixty new National Parks to round out the system and achieve adequate representation of Canada's heritage on a suitable scale. Ideally, we should be acquiring two or three new National Parks each year. If we are to complete our system by 1985,* this is what we will have to do (A. Laing. June 1967).

The 1964 parks policy provided a direction, but it did not provide a framework or a rationale for the creation of a genuine national park system across Canada. The first document to demonstrate a rationale for the creation of a system of national parks in Canada appears to have been "National Parks and Outdoor Recreation Reserves" (National Parks Service, Ottawa, December 1966). It was this document which formed the basis for the work which led to the spectacular increase in the number of National Parks in Canada from 1968 to 1972.** Before considering the implications of this document, it is important to recognize several other factors which were significant to the exploration for new national parks in the 1970's.

---

* It should be noted that 1985 would be the centenary of Canada's national parks system.

** In practice many of the parks were not fully established, in law under the National Parks Act for many years afterwards and some remained in legal limbo up to late 1982, e.g. Kouchibouguac, Gros Morne, Pacific Rim.

The parks policy elucidated in 1964, and the rationale for a system of national parks generated in 1966, laid the groundwork for substantial expansion, but this process took time, and a number of other factors played a role.

2.3 THE STATUS IN 1968 AND THE PROMISE FOR EXPANSION

The year 1968 provides a useful perspective from which to identify factors significant to the expansion period of the 1970's, for two reasons. Firstly, 1968 marked the threshold of the expansion period which led directly to national park exploration work in Labrador in 1970.

Secondly, a major conference, "The Canadian National Parks: Today and Tomorrow", organized by the National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada, provides an excellent view of the perception of the pressures on the existing parks system, perceived needs and anticipated problems relating to expansion.

The Honourable Jean Chrétien, the Minister responsible for national and historic parks stated at the 1968 conference, and elsewhere, that demand for using national parks had increased tremendously over the previous ten years and there was every reason for this to continue in the future. The demand for the use of national parks exceeded the total supply of parks in the system. (Chrétien, J., in Nelson and Scace. 1968. pp. 9-11). J.I. Nicol, Director of National and Historic Parks Branch, stated at the Parks for Tomorrow Conference that there were three factors which

had led to an increase in use of Canada's national parks and to the recognition that the system had to be expanded.

First, the public recognized their collective responsibility for the management of the environment and the preservation of its value. Second, because the power of man to alter the landscape is so great and change is so rapid, reservation and preservation of the larger resource-based parks should be done soon before the opportunities disappear or become prohibitively expensive. Third, through the provision of public outdoor living space, people could find recreation of body and spirit as a part of their quest for the best possible living standard. (J.I. Nicol, in Scace. 1968. pp. 35-36).

Jean Chrétien expressed a sense of urgency for the following reasons. It was taking too long to extend the system throughout Canada; and yet there was a sense of urgency to create forty to sixty new national parks* required to complete the desired system. This urgency was based upon two factors. First of all, the increased costs of acquiring land for park use were reaching prohibitive levels. Second, past experience had shown that areas of natural beauty could be quickly spoiled for potential park use by different forms of economic and social development. (Chrétien, in Nelson and Scace. 1968. pp. 9-11).

Problems facing the park system were identified by Chrétien, Nicol, Brooks and others. Chrétien pointed out

---

* A repeat of Laing's Statement two years earlier.

Map 2-1

Map 2-1
Physiographic Regions of Canada

Source: National Parks and Outdoor Recreation Resources, National
 Parks Services, Ottawa, December 1966

Map 2:2

NATIONAL PARK NATURAL REGIONS

that not only expansion was needed; without limits to the development within parks to meet the pressures of people, the national parks would soon cease to be parks as they were originally intended to be. Chrétien further observed that the existing system was incomplete in two senses: it was not representative of all the different dimensions of the country and there was only one type of park to meet many different needs. Other problems were pointed out by Lloyd Brooks. For example, the Canadian national park system was practically static. As of 1968 only one new park, Kejimikujik, in Nova Scotia, had been announced in the last ten years. Existing parks represented only four of the eight major physiographic regions of Canada (Map 2.1). The status of the national parks system in 1968 is shown in Map 2.2. The park system included national parks which, with hindsight, would not have been located where they were, and it failed to relate preservation fully to the needs of people and the location of Canada's population centres. Brooks emphasized, however, that the primary problems were to preserve what was in the system (in 1968), intelligently to round out the system, and "above all to develop a public conscience and concern over the fate of Canada's National Parks". (Lloyd Brooks, in Nelson and Scace. 1968. pp. 869-870).

The problem of acquisition of new parks in provincial jurisdiction was pointed out by Lloyd Brooks. In his paper "Planning a Canadian National Park System - Progress and

Problems", Brooks argued that the dearth of new national parks over the previous forty years (1928-68) was clear evidence that the requirements placed upon the provinces to purchase and transfer all lands for a national park free of encumbrances, and at provincial cost, to the federal government, were too stringent and that within such a framework, effective national parks system planning was impossible (Ibid., p. 872). According to Brooks, the provinces jealously guarded their power of resource management, to the point of being suspicious of transferring lands to the federal government for "even so noble a purpose as a national park" (Ibid., p. 874). Further, the provinces were (and remain) reluctant to relinquish control over lands which might encompass important, but as yet unrecognized, resources of value in the future. Brooks also argued that national park system planning had to be integrated with the planning of parks at other levels of government. In other words, the future was seen to be fraught with constitutional complications of a practical nature that Canadians were to become all too familiar with over the next decade and beyond: reluctance of provincial governments to give up powers over land in their jurisdiction without any voice in the management of those lands.

As was evident in the Canadian National Parks: Today and Tomorrow proceedings, a substantial momentum existed in 1968, for several reasons, for the expansion of the Canadian National Park system. A number of other factors less easy

to document, were none-the-less significant to the intentions to expand the park system. There was a growing public awareness of the environmental consequences of unbridled growth, a growing clientele of park visitors, and a strong feeling of national identity carried over from Centennial Year in 1967. Most importantly, there was active support from a small but vocal national organization which was dedicated to the principles of public open space and park creation, the National and Provincial Parks Association. The 1968 conference sponsored by the Association, was itself a significant impetus to the expansion.

Additionally, within the government milieu, establishment of an annual Federal-Provincial Park Conference provided a forum for information exchange between senior federal and provincial park officials: At the political level not only did Parks Canada have in Chrétien a minister strongly committed to the principle of enlarging the park system, but also in Pierre Trudeau, a new Prime Minister who displayed a clear interest in national park principles.

The 1968 conference recorded the pressures on the existing national park system, perception of needs for a larger and more representative park system, and awareness of difficulties faced in the expansion of the Canadian national park system. Throughout the conference proceedings, many comments were made that public interest, understanding and

commitment were essential to the successful expansion of the park system.

Yet there was one notable omission, and this represented a problem that was to become a major stumbling block in efforts to establish national parks over the next decade. Examination of the conference proceedings reveals that there was no attention devoted to the question of social and economic impact of a new national park upon the local population in a proposed park area. The conference proceedings convey a clear impression that to the participants at the conference, national parkland was seen to be devoid of people, save of course for the visitor.* This perspective was perhaps to be expected, given the context in which the mountain national parks, and subsequent national parks, had been established. The tradition of the national park as a natural, non-populated landscape was long established, and had in fact been reconfirmed in the National Park Policy statement of 1964.

However, this pre-occupation with the natural landscape, and the lack of concern for local, affected populations - their traditional land uses and values, was to cause controversies and confrontations that would haunt attempts to create new national parks in Labrador and other regions.

---

* A stark contrast to the realities of park acquisition and management of a human landscape in European parks.

2.4 THE SEARCH FOR EXPANSION - 1968 INTO THE SEVENTIES

A favourable milieu for expansion of the national park system clearly existed in 1968. The need for expansion was widely felt, both within and without Parks Canada. Political support and a degree of public support for new parks made both expansion and financing that expansion seem feasible. A rationale for a genuine system of national parks was crystallizing.

None-the-less, there were a number of problems which emerged as the search developed, within Parks Canada, as well as in the relations with provincial governments and in responses of local populations in areas considered or designated for National Park status. The following sections identify some of those problems, which were to affect significantly the Labrador proposals, as well as other areas. The new approach toward a national park system is the logical starting point.

2.5 THE SYSTEMS APPROACH TO EXPANSION

By 1968 the search for additional park lands had become more systematic. It was based upon

...a review of the current relationships of parks to physiographic regions, forest regions, waterways, mammal ranges, human development patterns and so on. From this analysis, general needs on a national scale can be narrowed down to more specific detail through map and air photo analysis and, finally, field work. Once completed this information can then be synthesized on a national scale. (National Parks Service. 1966. p. 7).*

Table 2.1

ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL PARK:PROCEDURE

Source: National Parks Service. National Parks and Outdoor Recreation Resources. p.3. Ottawa. Dec. 1966.

It was clearly stated that this was an ideal process. For even at that time the process was being upset by "... growing public demand coupled with insufficient time and lack of personnel..." (Ibid., p. 7). To meet the challenge, Lee made a recommendation that "studies should be initiated immediately to determine where... areas of national significance lie" so that once located they could be "... properly designated so as to fall under the proper management agency". Particular attention was to be paid to "... the Nation's shorelines" with major emphasis in selecting priorities to be determined by proximity to "regions of urban concentrations in an effort to improve the park-to-people proximal relationship" where demands would be greatest. (Ibid. p. 73-75).

This report* appears to have been the first attempt at a systems planning framework for national parks in Canada, and it laid out the general framework upon which subsequent reports and plans of action were built.

An example of the framework laid out is the simple diagram of the procedure followed in 1966 for the establishment of a national park. This is illustrated in Table 2.1. No consideration was given to the indirect costs (e.g. social relocation costs) associated with national parks, unless they fell within the description of "Boundaries, Other Details". Given the subsequent

* The author of that report was G. Lee but no reference or credit is given to him in the report.

experience in the 1970s it is apparent that indirect costs were not considered.

The diagram of the process had changed considerably by 1979. The major steps of Initial Request, Joint Study, Action and Legislation remained, but their makeup was to become extremely complex to accommodate the need for more and more information before decisions could be made. Table 7.1 in Chapter VII illustrates how complex the process became in Labrador.

Lee's report was important from another point of view, in that it recommended demand studies on use be carried out to estimate future trends (Ibid., p. 75) and it recognized that "areas of the far north, despite their low populations, still warrant inspection for parks of the near future. Already, a growing group of individuals are heading further and further north in their search for wilderness" (Ibid., p. 74). This was to be the justification for the search for new national parks in areas like Labrador. In fact the report (pp. 61-62) suggests that future studies along the Labrador coast might yield potential sites. These studies are considered in Chapter IV of this thesis.

To overcome what Carruthers called "reactive planning" (Carruthers, J.A. 1977. p. 5), two further advances were made in 1971 to develop a more systematic and comprehensive approach to national parks systems planning in Canada. Both marine and terrestrial environments were studied, and a Parks System Planning Manual was developed. "This manual

divided up Canada into 39 terrestrial and 9 marine natural regions". (Carruthers. 1977. p. 5). These natural regions, which are identified in Map 2.2, were based on physiographic, biologic, geographic, geologic and/or oceanographic factors. Definition of natural regions provided a framework for carrying out studies to assess Canadian significance, and it also suggested a limit to the national parks system and thereby defined a major objective for the completion of the system. The objective was to have at least one national park in each natural region, to encompass the natural diversity found within it. In addition, natural themes, (which are groupings of like natural features or phenomena), were identified and defined in the 1971 Manual. These themes were used as the tools for studying the natural regions and for making cross-regional comparisons (ibid., p. 5).

2.6 FACTORS THWARTING EXPANSION

2.6.1 A FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM

The acquisition of new parks within provincial areas was faced with a very basic problem. The basis of a national park has been, with one exception, in Forillon in Québec, that the lands be held with clear title in the name of the Queen "in right of Canada" (Canada. National Parks Act, 1974. p. 1(2)). In other words, lands in a province have to be transferred in fee simple to the federal government for the creation of a national park.

To transfer lands from a province to the federal government requires the full cooperation of the former. Because such a decision requires the giving up, in perpetuity, of any rights to those lands (with this codicil, in some cases: 'until these lands are no longer required for national parks purposes'), the provinces have come to expect some form of compensation. The resultant trading has meant that the establishment of a national park has been, is, and will likely remain a political decision based upon political, social and economic accords. This can be demonstrated in virtually every example of a national park created since the first National Park Reserves were established in a province (Yoho and Glacier Reserves in British Columbia in 1886). (Lothian, W.F. A History of Canada's National Parks. Volume I. 1976. p. 30). This process of political decision-making is discussed in Chapter VI, but it is emphasized here that the provinces were to become increasingly reluctant to give up lands for purposes of a national park without considerable compensation in one or more forms.

2.6.2 ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

As a result of the expanded search for new parks in the early 1970's, the annual budget for Parks Canada, both in operating and capital expenditures, increased dramatically. This gradually led to a concern within some quarters in Parks Canada that new park proposals were taking money away

from the maintenance of the older, established parks. The result had been some resistance from within Parks Canada to further proposals for expansion until the existing facilities are properly maintained and interpreted to park visitors.

J. Michael Heit, (1979) in studies which examined the capital, operation and maintenance cost of national and historic parks from 1963 to 1978, concluded that "The conventional wisdom that the new National Parks created in the '60's and '70's were brought on stream at the expense of the older established National Parks is hard to prove. Almost all Parks received more money" (Ibid. Executive Summary). While it is thus difficult to confirm such a generalization on resistance to the new park expansion process, it is natural that Parks Canada had to place sufficient emphasis upon operation and maintenance for both conservation and visitors services to meet existing program commitments.

2.6.3 FINANCIAL IMPACTS

One of the significant developments of the expansion program was the way in which Parks Canada has grown as an organization and how important it has become as a distributor of federal monies across Canada, particularly into the underdeveloped regions of Canada, where many national parks are located. Between 1969 and 1979 there was a five-fold increase (from \$20.8 to \$108 million) in direct

expenditures by Parks Canada. (Canada. Indian and Northern Affairs. Annual Reports, by Year 1969 and 1979). Further, these direct expenditures made by Parks Canada present only part of the total public investment in facilities such as municipal infrastructures, access roads, tourist accommodation and entertainment, and transportation facilities that has been made by the federal, provincial, territorial and local governments and by private investors.

The significant aspect of these increased park expenditures has been that National and Historic Park facilities have been seen, increasingly, to be of financial benefit to the regions and provinces and territories in which they are located. While there has been sufficient documentation during the expansion period to indicate that such financial benefits have often been exaggerated in their potential return to local people, it is none-the-less true that the optimism of Parks Canada, in emphasizing the regional economic benefits, has helped to sell new national park establishment to the provincial and local governments. Emphasizing the economic benefits was done to offset at least some of the social and economic costs recognized during the establishment process.

It is, however, difficult and sometimes misleading to attempt to justify national parks upon purely economic grounds. Such justification should not be attempted without considering how the economic return may vary between the local, regional, provincial and national levels. In the

optimistic emphasis on economic benefits of new parks in the early 1970's, these distinctions often were not made, and this has resulted in criticism of Parks Canada and frequent resistance to new park proposals.

2.6.4 OTHER FACTORS

Despite the optimism at the beginning of the decade (1968-79), it had become very clear within a few years that little hope remained of meeting the goal of establishing a complete system of national parks in Canada by 1985.

When the expansion program started, Parks Canada as an organization was promoting the large-scale and widespread expansion of the system, but without a justifiable rationale. It took time for the organization to develop a systems approach and to provide the public with information about the hoped-for expansion. Parks Canada had not managed to create a public awareness of its systems approach; no attempt has been successful to date.

The primary factors which thwarted the systems approach to expansion appear to be that the broad principles underlying Parks Canada, namely Parks Canada Policy, remained too rigid, and in particular, did not recognize or allow for the social and economic impacts of new parks on the regional population. Neither local peoples nor their elected representatives, nor the provincial and territorial governments, were prepared to accept that their social and economic losses were offset by the lofty ideals of a system

of national parks which protected representative elements of the nation's natural heritage. Parks Canada remained "reactive" and not sufficiently adaptive to offset the growing awareness of people and governments alike of the social (and therefore political) costs associated with establishing new national parks.

In the discussions and negotiations leading to the creation of new national parks, particularly in the first half of the decade, the attitude of Parks Canada, and of the provincial governments involved, towards local people and their use of, and feelings about the lands and waters which were to become national parks, resulted in notoriously bad reputations for the government agencies involved. The methods of communication with local people, together with the methods of evaluation, and levels of compensation offered or given, for property or interests lost, were sometimes so bad as to cause concern among local people wherever the possibility of other new national parks was raised, including Labrador. Opposition to new national parks became well known throughout the country irrespective of where the new parks were to be located. With few exceptions, efforts to assuage local feelings do not appear to have reduced local antagonism toward government and what was perceived to be its impartial but insensitive attitude.

Other critical factors in the discussions, negotiations and establishment processes for new national parks were not anticipated in Parks Canada's expansion efforts. The

relations between Parks Canada and the provincial governments tended to be conducted on an adversary rather than cooperative basis at the start of the decade. National parks were being set up as a system apparently without reference to provincial, regional and local parks systems. Competition for users of the various parks systems was thus inevitable. National parks became the cause of political debate between governments because of the value of investments expected by provincial governments in return for the lands devoid of people and their local uses. The conditions set for the establishment of a new national park in one province were likely to be treated as precedents for later new park proposals in the same or other provinces.

Among the major factors which were to thwart the attempts to create a complete system of national parks was the changing attitude of Parks Canada itself. Very early in the decade (1968-1979), the costs -- political, social, economic and operational -- of a complete national parks system began to be seen as impossibly large. An addition of at least thirty new parks was gradually perceived to be impractical over a short period of time because the costs would be impossible to justify. Total costs were to prove impossible to justify because of the influence of inflation and escalating demands by provincial governments for financial packages to more than offset their loss of their rights in the lands and water in perpetuity. In other words, Parks Canada officials quickly became aware of the

costs involved, and while maintaining the objective of protecting "... for all time representative natural areas of Canadian significance in a system of national parks..."

(Parks Canada. Policy. 1979, p. 39), the speed with which it was to be achieved began to slow down.

Yet another factor limiting the search to expand was the desire to maintain a high level of "political opportunity" in the pursuit of new park proposals. - A common analogy used in Parks Canada is the desire to maintain as many potential park proposals as possible "on the back burner" so they are ready if and when the political climate for each proposal becomes favourable. Consequently, there is no publicized list of priority areas which Parks Canada would like to pursue with greater vigour than other areas.

Unfortunately, this has meant continuity in the pursuit of specific proposals is difficult to maintain due to two further factors: changing priorities, and personnel turnover over the many years of planning and negotiation. This applies both within Parks Canada and to those organizations which carry out the negotiations for each province and local people. This lack of continuity and lack of information has had serious effects on attitudes of local people. They have been rarely kept informed of developments yet their life style is threatened. Such uncertainty in a particular region can last for decades and does little to develop local support for national parks proposals; Labrador is an example of this local uncertainty.

Progress in completing the park system was also complicated by other problems. These included the increased reluctance of provinces and territories to consider the transfer of lands to the federal government, the level of cost-sharing for acquisition of lands, native land claims, continuation of traditional land uses by local people within national parks, social issues relating to effects upon individuals in designated park areas, as well as the lengthy period required for negotiation between governments. In addition to these 'external' problems, Parks Canada has its own internal problems: the degree of protection offered to national parks and the quality of facilities and services within them was declining. This was mainly due to financial and staff restrictions which did not permit the existing system to serve properly the needs of an ever increasing number of visitors. Nor did these restrictions allow for a planned expansion of the system of parks better to serve the dual mandates of recreation and conservation. (Parks Canada. Strategic Overview. July 1980. pp. 6-8).

2.7 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It took eighty-three years to create the first nineteen national parks, but only four years to add an additional nine. The great change was due in part to strong political will and commitment to national park objectives, in part to changes in the policy of compensation and cost sharing and

in part to the growth of an environmental consciousness among Canadians.

The costs of expanding the parks system so fast were to prove high once the realization spread that local people were being adversely affected and inadequately compensated. Local people in areas where other new parks were being created began to resist. Labrador, as will be demonstrated later in this thesis, was to be a region where local people resisted also. Parks Canada remained reactive and not sufficiently adaptive to offset the awareness of people and governments of the social (and therefore political) costs associated with establishing new national parks.

A systematic approach to the identification and selection of areas with the potential for national parks was introduced in the early 1970s. But this approach was introduced after the great expansion. Few areas have been identified in the middle and late 1970s which have proved feasible for new national parks, despite the systematic approach. This is because the subsequent new park feasibility approach has not been able to pay sufficient attention to the social, economic and political factors involved. Many of these factors are outside the domain or responsibility of Parks Canada, but they are sufficiently important to require careful consideration by Parks Canada if the search for expansion of Canada's park system is to be successful.

The following case history in Labrador attempts to recount many elements which were common to other parts of Canada and which were to prove very difficult to overcome: local people's concerns, loss of provincial control over resources, inadequate compensation, and the use of national park proposals by others to serve the latter's ends.

CHAPTER III

LABRADOR: A BACKGROUND

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The intent of this chapter is to provide a summary of the physical, economic and social geography of Labrador. As this thesis is based on the precept that the introduction of any new resource use into Labrador will affect the land and people of Labrador, the value of this chapter lies in providing the necessary description of both land and people to permit the reader to understand why the creation of a national park has to be considered carefully.

It was explained in Chapter II (Section 2.5) that the systems approach to secure a finite number of national parks in Canada is based upon identifying the combination of natural themes which can describe the characteristics of that region, and then delineating natural areas of Canadian significance (N.A.C.S.) which contain the best natural occurrence of these themes. Once the N.A.C.S. are identified in a natural region, they are ranked in descending order according to the decreasing proportion of natural themes which occur within them. A new national park is usually proposed for at least one N.A.C.S. in each region. Then serious negotiations and site specific research are started, with public participation, to determine the social, economic and political feasibility of establishing such a park.

The amount of effort expended to determine the extent and quality of natural theme representation within a N.A.C.S. is thus determined by the likelihood of securing local and provincial support to undertake a feasibility study. While the actual efforts to identify N.A.C.S., and thus potential national parks, in Labrador are described in Chapter IV, the opportunity is taken in this Chapter to briefly describe the biological and physical environment of Labrador in which national parks were being considered. In addition, as described in detail in Chapter V, the lack of public participation in the selection of N.A.C.S. and potential parks sites meant that an opportunity was lost to incorporate the areas of natural and cultural value to Labradorians. The extent of this cultural heritage is shown in the second part of this chapter.

The amount of information available to describe Labrador is remarkably limited, as is evident in this chapter. This is in part a reflection of the lack of interest shown by Canadians in this region and in part a reflection of its harsh and demanding nature. There appears to be neither an history nor a geography text for Labrador. Yet both are of value in trying to present Canada's natural and cultural heritage found in this region and therefore are incorporated into this thesis.

The harsh and demanding landscape and climate of the Labrador region, combined with the history of settlement and long periods of seasonal isolation, seem to have shaped the

attitudes of people towards themselves and their lifestyles, towards outsiders, and towards change, particularly change imposed or suggested by outsiders.

Until some 35 years ago, Labrador people, also called Labradorians, were largely isolated from the outside, and from outsiders, by climate and geography. Labradorians were heavily dependent upon their own resources to survive economically, physiologically and socially. Because the land and the sea could only support extensive rather than intensive use, this author believes that the introduction of any intensive new use will have profound ecological and social impacts. To introduce change, even change in cooperation with Labradorians, under such conditions, demands a sensitivity towards the existing balance which has been reached at great cost and over a long time in both human and ecological terms. Even a proposal as environmentally sensitive as a national park can have adverse impacts, and these have to be anticipated and avoided wherever possible. Anticipation and avoidance can only be successful if the impacts of change are explored, measured, and minimized. Thus there is a need to develop an understanding of the geography, ecology and people of the Labrador region of Canada for the reader to understand the processes which were to be pursued in attempts to establish national parks in Labrador.

The introduction of air transportation, radio, television and the telephone, wage employment, education and

health services, together with numerous other outside ideas and practices which have been implanted in the Labrador region have had a profound impact in the last 50 years, but particularly in the last decade. While these changes will not be examined themselves, their impact cannot be ignored. Nor can the methods by which they were introduced be overlooked, because they have had an impact upon subsequent attempts to introduce changes to local lifestyles and perceptions. Discussions in Labrador about national parks came quickly to the concept that the resources of Labrador are finite. This was a concept well known to Labradorians who live in a land of hardship as well as beauty. This has led to the recognition by Labradorians that the pressures for development are placing an economic value on all of Labrador's resources, and that Labradorians will have to participate if they are to ensure such development will provide benefits for themselves.

3.1.2 GEOGRAPHICAL SITUATION

Labrador is a political region. Labrador's boundaries, though to a great extent physically determined, are the creation of the British Privy Council decision of 1927. Labrador forms the eastern part of the Labrador-Ungava Peninsula and possesses many of the characteristics of the Canadian Shield: a heavily glaciated landscape with a harsh climate, and flora and fauna with characteristics ranging from the boreal forest to the arctic desert.

Labrador, as indicated on the map 3.1, stretches from latitude 52°N on the southern coast to latitude 61°N at the northern tip. The eastern boundary of Labrador is longitude 56°W on the Labrador Sea to longitude 67°W to the west.

Labrador is some 112,826 square miles (292,219 square kilometres) in area (Canada. Facts from Canadian Maps. 1972. p. 2). As such, it comprises between two-thirds and three-quarters of the area of the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Labrador is roughly triangular in shape. Of the 8,548 miles along its boundary, 2,810 miles abut on Quebec and 10 miles on the Northwest Territories. The remaining 5,728 miles are coastline, along a line some 700 miles long between the Straits of Belle Isle and Cape Chidley. This coastline is very irregular and indented, with many islands and islets.

Labrador is summarized by W.C. Wilton as --

...a land of paradox. It was probably the first portion of the new world to be sighted by Europeans; yet it has remained perhaps the least known part of North America. It is perhaps unfortunate that the bulk of the literature pertaining to Labrador is based upon observations made along the outer coastline; this has given the whole region a reputation for bleakness and desolation which is not entirely in agreement with the facts. (Wilton, 1964, p. 5).

Access to Labrador from the outside is limited to five airfields, one rail line and two sea ferry routes. Transportation within Labrador is largely by air and boat. There are few all-weather roads linking communities. Such a limited transportation system means relatively expensive freight and passenger costs, physical isolation and a strong feeling of regional identity.

Isolation and identity are the result of geography: the limited economic base, the lack of capital for investment in a region with an inhospitable climate, and, until the 1950s, the limited perception of Labrador's economic potential. Until the 1950s Labradorians themselves clung to the coast and went inland only to trap and hunt. The use of Labrador is now being reviewed, but its size and isolation cause it to remain largely unknown to much of the outside world.

3.2 PHYSICAL AND BIOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

3.2.1 BIO-PHYSICAL SETTING

David Zimmerly provides a summary description of Labrador:

From the air Labrador appears to be composed of lakes joined by connecting areas of land and ~~indeed~~, it has been estimated that one quarter of all Labrador is covered by water.

William Fitzhugh (1972:12) has described Labrador's principal ecological zones as they would appear to an airborne traveller flying from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to northern Labrador.

The southern coast of the peninsula rises slowly from the Gulf of St. Lawrence mantled with a thick forest of spruce mixed occasionally in burned areas with patches of alder, aspen, birch and whitepine. Numerous youthful rivers dissect the slope, rising in narrow channels north to the rolling plateau. The plateau itself is studded with amoeboid lakes and is often criss crossed by boulder trains and eskers meandering like mole runs under the forest floor. The relief is low and in general the land rolls away beneath the flight path in a featureless maze of water, trees, swamp and bog. An occasional granite knob rises a few hundred feet from the sea of spruce. This is the land of the woodland caribou, of beaver, fox, mink, and marten and has for many years been the home of the Montagnais Indians.

West of Melville, trees begin to thin on the peneplained surface, and the yellow-beige forest carpet of moss and lichens winks through the thinning blackness of spruce. Bogs are fewer, exposed ridges more common, while the thick forest hugs the river bottom and lake shores. Increasingly, caribou trails are seen beaten into the moss around lake margins and fording spots. Eskers proliferate, dividing shallow lakes, climbing over hillsides and diving into valleys. Besides caribou one finds in the lichen woodlands black bear, lynx, snowshoe hare, fox, partridge, and many species of fish.

Proceeding north of Lake Michitkamau, spruce begin to disappear from the glaciated plateau surface and are found only on southern hill slopes, in protected river valleys, and around lake shores. Soil is scarce and effects of glaciation and thermal erosion on the barren rock result in jumbled scree and boulder fields. Caribou trails are plentiful on sandbanks along the rivers and lineate the lichen-encrusted rock barrens. Still farther north, east of Indian House Lake, the plateau is devoid of all growth except lichens. Even on a July flight one is impressed by the desolation of black rock, frozen ponds, and still-extensive snowfields attempting, often unsuccessfully, to melt before winter which begins in September at this altitude. It is indeed a desolate land, unused even by the Barren Ground People -- the Naskapi Indians -- who fear life without fire in this timberless wasteland. Caribou are still plentiful, however, and occasionally Eskimo forays penetrate the northern barrens from the coast in search of antler, meat and fur.

As one approaches the plateau edge, long U-shaped valleys appear running east and west. Once carrying the glacial ice to the sea, they now hold lakes and rivers in which salmon spawn. In the valleys, glacial sand deposits permit the growth of stunted spruce and willows. To the northward above the plateau rim can be seen the snow-covered peaks of the Kiglapait and Kaumajet mountains; farther on still, the towering Torngat Mountains rise 5,500 feet from the sea's edge.

Flying east through a valley, one sees in the distance long narrow bays reaching from the coast. Soon the sea itself is reached, with its bold, indented coast, craggy peaks and island skerries. North of Mount Thoresby the islands cease and the only trace of vegetation are lichens and scrub.

Here, and to the north along the Torngat coast, only a maritime-adapted culture can survive, though caribou are present seasonally. This coast, more than any other in North America, resembles the fjorded coast of Greenland and Scandinavia. (Zimmerly, David. Cains Land Revisited. 1975. pp. 31-33).

While there are a number of such general but brief descriptions, there is a paucity of studies which consider the region in depth. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, this sparsity is reflected in the bio-physical description which follows.

3.2.2 GEOLOGY AND PHYSIOGRAPHY (GEOMORPHOLOGY)

According to Greene, "Labrador forms the eastern portion of the Precambrian Canadian Shield. It is divisible into four geologic provinces (Map 3.1), each characterized by a different orogenic history (B.A. Greene. 1974. p. 1). It is composed essentially of ~~intrusive~~ and high grade metamorphic rocks, overlain in several areas by less deformed sedimentary and volcanic sequences. It contains geologic sequences which are continued in Greenland to which it may have been joined in the past; these sequences have been tentatively dated at 3.6 billion years old and are among the oldest and least disturbed Precambrian rocks known on this planet (Ibid p. 1).

The result of the complex geologic history is a general characteristic of extreme flatness and monotony of skyline, evidence of long-continued and almost all-subduing erosion. The flat surface of complex origin uncovered during late

Map 3-1

Paleozoic and Mesozoic times has been little modified since that time, except for the scouring of Pleistocene glaciation, and for local uplift and dissection (Ibid, p. 4).

Greene suggests that the peninsula was one of the major centres of ice accumulation, dispersal and wastage on the continent, and the history of glaciation and deglaciation is very complicated. While the work to date is apparently far from complete, it indicates the resultant physiography is the result of complete ice coverage, subsequent partial coverage which left exposed nunataks in the Torngats and other evidence of earlier and higher ice coverage, and finally (in the third of the three ice sheets known to have covered Labrador) by outlet glaciers flowing through the valleys to calve in the Labrador Sea (Ibid., pp. 46-48).

The resultant physiography of Labrador permits its division into a series of fairly distinct regions which reflect the underlying geologic structure and the regional variations in the Cenozoic development of the peninsula, especially uplift, dissection, and glacial history. The peninsula is divisible therefore into plateaus, lowlands, uplands and highlands. (Ibid., pp. 4-7). This is illustrated in Map 3.2 and Map 3.3.

According to Lopoukhine et. al., Labrador's underlying structure is a tilted plateau elevated in the southwest and west which slopes to lowlands along the coast. In the northeast the plateau has been further uplifted into a

Map 3.2

PHYSIOGRAPHIC SUBDIVISIONS OF LABRADOR

LEGEND

BEDROCK CONTROLLED PLATEAUS

- A MAIN-GEORGE RIVER PLATEAU
- B MECATINA PLATEAU

DRIFT CONTROLLED PLATEAUS

- C LAKE PLATEAU
- D ROMAINE-DOUBLE MER PLATEAU

LOWLANDS

- E LAKE MELVILLE LOWLAND
- F ST LAWRENCE LOWLAND

APPALACHIAN TYPE UPLANDS

- G LABRADOR HILLS
- H NASKAUPI RANGE

MASSIF TYPE UPLANDS

- I KAMAPISKAU UPLAND
- J HOPE MOUNTAINS

HIGHLANDS

- K MEALY MOUNTAINS
- L LABRADOR HIGHLANDS
- L1-RIGLAPAIT MOUNTAINS
- L2-KAUMAJET MOUNTAINS
- L3-TORNGAT MOUNTAINS

Physiographic subdivisions of Labrador (after Douglas and Drummond, 1955; Hare, 1959; Bostock, 1976).

Source: Greene B.A. An Outline of the Geology of Labrador 1974.

Map 3-3

**Physiographic Subdivisions
According to Bostock (1970)**

Source: Lapointe et al. 1978 p.7

series of mountain massifs called the Kaumajet, Kiglapait and Torngat Mountains, which interrupt the monotonous skyline and rise to 5,000 feet. Two other distinct upland areas are the Benedict and Mealy Mountains (north-east and south, respectively, of Hamilton Inlet) (N. Lopoukhine et. al. 1979. p. 3).

The height of land between Ungava Bay, Hudson- James Bay, the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Labrador Sea forms the western boundary of Labrador. It is along this western boundary, particularly in the south-west and in central Labrador, that uplands are to be found. These uplands are segregated according to their origin: the massif type being carved out of igneous and metamorphic rocks, and the Appalachian type associated with areas of folded sedimentary and volcanic rocks with a developed valley and ridge topography.

Most of Labrador is a plateau cum peneplain varying from 1,000 to 2,000 feet above sea level and is divisible into bedrock-controlled and drift- controlled plateaux.

Lowland areas are confined to the Lake Melville Basin and the Strait of Belle Isle at the southern tip of Labrador (B.A. Greene. 1974. pp. 4-7).

The coastline of Labrador is some 5078 miles long with many inlets and islands. In the northern areas, there are relatively long fiords which continue inland as U-shaped valleys. Hamilton Inlet is the most prominent inlet,

extending some 240 kilometres inland (N. Lopoukhine, et al. 1978. p. 8).

3.2.3 CLIMATE

Although important, Labrador's climate is not well described in the literature. It is largely unmonitored. But it has been described as rigorous, with a late spring, short summer, early fall and long cold winter (W.M. Baker. 1975). Winter is the dominant season, with snow prevalent from November to early June. The sea is generally ice covered for five to seven months. This isolates the people from the outside. Summers tend to be short and temperatures remain cool (particularly along the coast), the sky is often cloudy and rain is frequent. Coastal fog is common on the coast in summer and is a major transportation problem. A maritime climate is found along the coast, with annual temperature ranges of 22°C. In contrast the interior has a continental climate with an annual temperature range of 33°C. The mean annual temperatures are between 5°C and 0°C depending upon latitude, elevation and proximity to the sea. Mean precipitation varies from 600 mm at northern latitudes to 1,200 mm at the southern Quebec-Labrador boundary (Lopoukhine, et al. 1978, p. 3). These generalizations do not have equal applicability throughout Labrador. The climate of the Torngats is unlikely to be the same as that experienced 200 miles further south, due to the impact of

the high mountains and the influence of the Ungava Bay to the west.

The climate is a distinct limiting factor for vegetation (Ibid., p. 3) as well as for fauna, and man and his economic activities.

3.2.4 WATER

Of Labrador's total area, 10,945 square miles are fresh water. (Canada. Facts from Canadian Maps. 1972, p. 2). This water area will have been increased considerably by the completion of the Smallwood Reservoir. Much of the remaining land is waterlogged. In western and southern Labrador, large complexes of sphagnum bog and open water occur which give way to numerous lake systems that are headwaters for large rivers such as the Churchill and the Eagle. Considerable hydro electric power potential exists throughout Labrador, but only two developments have taken place, both on the Churchill (at Esker and at Churchill Falls) (Lopoukhine, et al. 1978. p. 8).

3.2.5 SOIL

Much of northern Labrador is primarily rock with limited soil development. Coastal barrens with lithics and regosols occur along much of the coast. The mountains and hills of southern Labrador have similarly minimal soil cover. Frost action is intense, talus slopes are common and felsenmeer is prevalent.

Map 3-4

Permafrost Zones and Subzones

Source: Lapointe et al 1978 p 9

Podzols characterize much of the morainic outwash and marine deposits in central and southern Labrador. Hardpan development within soil profiles is frequent.

Organic soils are common in lowland and poorly drained marine deposits. String and blanket bogs sometimes cover vast expanses. Localized palsa bogs have been recorded as far south as the extreme south-east.

Discontinuous permafrost is found throughout Labrador and becomes common with increasing latitude. Continuous permafrost is found in the Torngat Mountains area and northwards (Map 3.4).

Dune development has occurred in several areas both inland and along the coast. Gentle upland slopes and alpine meadows are characterized by turbated brunisols (Ibid. p. 8).

3.2.6 VEGETATION

The vegetation of Labrador lies within both the Boreal Forest and the Tundra Regions as classified by Rowe. These regions are illustrated in Map 3.5. It should also be noted that vegetation patterns have been considerably influenced by permafrost throughout Labrador.

The boreal forest comprises the greater part of the forested area of Canada. Although the forest is primarily coniferous, there is a general admixture of broad-leaved trees such as birch, trembling aspen and balsam poplar. With increasingly "vigorous climatic and soil conditions",

Map 3.5
Forest Regions According
to Rowe (1972)

Source: Lapointe et al 1978 p 10

the closed forest gives way to the sub-arctic open lichen-woodland, which finally merges into the tundra.

(Rowe. 1972 p. 6)

The tundra is separated from the boreal forest by a transitional zone with characteristics of both regions: tundra "barrens" and patches of stunted forest, the latter usually found along the lake-shores and river banks and the former on upland interfluves. The pattern shows a gradient change from south to north as forests thin and shrink and tundra expands. In this transition zone the major controlling influence is climate, and the vegetation is an expression of such environmental features as exposure to wind, protection by snow, instability of soils under permafrost conditions, fire, and low air temperatures during the growing season. Forest survival is precarious and evidence shows that the treeline has fluctuated widely in the past. (Ibid. p. 62).

Lichens, mosses and low-lying shrubs are the dominant plant forms of the tundra region. Along much of the exposed coastline of Labrador, crowberry-dominated barren-lands prevail. Tree growth is confined to sheltered valleys and side slopes (Lopoukhine, N., et al. p. 8), which form occasional outliers of the transitional forest in the tundra.

Bog development is extensive in areas of poor drainage. Common associates include Labrador tea, bog laurel and bakeapple. Willows, dwarf birch and speckled alder occupy

disturbed sites (such as river and stream banks) throughout forested areas of Labrador. (Ibid. p. 11).

3.2.7 WILDLIFE

The amount of information available concerning wildlife in Labrador is quite limited and fragmentary. From information that is available it can be said that the harsh and demanding landscape and climate have a significant impact upon the wildlife along the coast and in the interior. This applies to all groups of terrestrial and aquatic fauna including birds, mammals, herptiles and freshwater fish. As a consequence of landscape, climate and the limited vegetation cover, species diversity is low in all groups, particularly when compared with other areas of the Canadian Shield at comparable latitudes. Many species reach the northern limit of their range in Labrador and most occur only in small numbers or in disjunct populations in the small pockets of good forest protected in coastal valleys. Harsh conditions exist as well for arctic species because of the snow cover which is much greater than many other parts of arctic and sub-arctic regions.

The greatest diversity of species can be found in coastal areas in both southern and northern Labrador where seabirds, shorebirds and mammals are able to benefit from the nutrient-rich waters of the Labrador current. But the volume of that diversity tends to decrease with latitude. As a result of the fewer species, food webs tend to simplify

with latitude. It should also be noted that the tundra ecosystems, which increase in proportion of the total area with latitude, are associated with dramatic population fluctuations. (J. Dobbin and Associates. 1982).

This brief description illustrates Labrador's diverse landscape which Parks Canada believed warranted representation in the national parks system. According to the National Parks Systems Planning Manual (1974) Labrador falls within four of the thirty nine terrestrial regions of Canada. These regions are illustrated in Map 2.2. Parks Canada concentrated its efforts between 1969 and 1979 to establish national parks in the two natural regions (21 and 24) which encompass much of Labrador. This was because these two regions appeared to be best represented in Labrador and not Québec and, for political reasons, were likely to be easier to obtain.

3.3 THE PEOPLE OF LABRADOR

3.3.1 THE POPULATION AND CURRENT SETTLEMENT PATTERNS

The population of Labrador in 1979 was 36,500,* consisting of 1,500 Inuit, 850 Indian, 10,150 Settlers and 24,000 'come from away', or newcomers, and who are the recent (post-1942) arrivals to the region. (McGrath et. al. 1979, p. 7).

* All subsequent population figures in the following section, unless otherwise noted, are as of 1979.

Map 3-6
Labrador Communities

Source: Report of the Royal Commission on Labrador, Vol. I, February, 1974, with some changes

Five ethno-geographic groups or regions can be delineated to describe the people of Labrador and their communities.

1. Western Labrador resource extraction communities
  2. Indian communities and their seasonal hunting, fishing and trapping regions
  3. Western Lake Melville communities of Settlers and the newcomers
  4. The Straits and Southern coast of Settler communities
  5. The northern coast of Inuit and Settlers
- The communities of Labrador are illustrated on Map 3.6.

WESTERN LABRADOR

There are three communities in Western Labrador with a total population of 19,800. All are of very recent origin (post-1950) and are tied to resource development.

Labrador City, with a population of 14,500, is by far the largest community and is, like Wabush, with 3,800 people, based exclusively upon the mining, concentrating and transporting of iron-ore. Churchill Falls (with 1,500 people) is based exclusively upon hydro electric power generation.

All three communities are populated largely by people who 'come from away'. This means there are few people from coastal Labrador. These communities are serviced by air and

rail. There is little connection between these communities and the other 16,700 people of Labrador, because of their recent evolution and because the vast majority of the 19,800 people of western Labrador do not become more than short-term residents in the region. Rather, there are particularly strong connections with the Island of Newfoundland and with Québec, where most residents originate and where they will return. "These communities are typical of the isolated, single-resource industrial towns found elsewhere in Canada -- with high wages, modern facilities and services, and transient populations." (Petro Canada. 1980, p. 8). Once communication links are improved, these communities may identify more closely with the other regions of Labrador.

These communities have not been involved in the discussions about national parks in Labrador. Plans in 1977 were that these communities be invited to participate at a later time than the other regions of Labrador.

There is a tote-road link between Esker, Churchill Falls and Happy Valley-Goose Bay. This road is not well maintained but it will form part of a trans-Labrador highway which is projected to link the western Lake Melville communities with Wabush, Labrador City, Fermont in Quebec, and thence the rest of Canada. It has become known as the "Freedom Road" in Labrador.

INDIAN COMMUNITIES OF SHISHASHIT AND DAVIS INLET

The Indian people in Labrador consist of two groups, the Montagnais and the Naskapi. There is today little cultural or linguistic differentiation between the Naskapi and Montagnais. In fact they prefer to be known as one people, the Innu of Labrador. Most Innu live in Davis Inlet (263 people), and in Shishashit* (587 people) on the south side of Northwest River. (Ibid., p. 9). Both communities have participated in discussions about national parks in Labrador.

The Innu have had relatively little close contact with the Settlers, unlike the Inuit or Eskimo people of the northern Labrador coast. They are largely Catholic. Until 1957 they were a nomadic people living in tents. (McGrath et. al. 1979, p. 31). Before the caribou migration routes changed around 1916, the Innu relied heavily upon the annual fall caribou hunt in the interior of Labrador for their winter meat supply, skins for tents and clothing, and sinew for sewing and binding. (Petro-Canada. 1980, p. 9). The Innu lost a large part of their traditional hunting and trapping area when it was flooded by the Smallwood Reservoir in the early 1970s. This flooding is given by the Innu as a reason why they do not go back into the interior from Shishashit as much as in the past. The Innu have integrated coastal resources into their lives very slowly and many still go on inland expeditions to trap and to hunt caribou.

---

* There seems to be no accepted version of spelling Shishashit.

In Shishashit community housing has been provided mostly by federal-provincial funding on a cost-sharing basis. This housing has been poorly maintained and in the opinion of this author contributes to an image of desperation and frustration of the community. The school and church are Roman Catholic. Apart from a community centre, an alcohol centre and a craft centre, all community services are provided from the north side from the community of North West River or from Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

According to Zimmerly (1975, p. 267), the provincial government was responsible for and subsidized the settling on the south side of North West River of several hundred Montagnais-Naskapi in the mid-1960s. The effect was to create a segregated community with the majority of Innu either permanently unemployed or only seasonally employed.

WESTERN LAKE MELVILLE

There are three communities in western Lake Melville: Mud Lake, North West River and Happy Valley-Goose Bay. All three communities have participated in discussions about national parks in Labrador. The Mealy Mountains are clearly visible from all three communities. Together the communities have a population of 9,098 (McGrath et. al. 1979. pp. 28-31). Shishashit forms a part of Northwest River, but was described earlier. Northwest River, with 421 people, is the oldest of these three communities. A

trading post was established there in 1743. The north side of the river is populated by Settlers, Inuit and some newcomers, the south side by the Innu. With the hospital run by the International Grenfell Association, the Hudson's Bay store, 2 confectionary stores and 1 food take-out service outlet on the north side and the road to Goose Bay and the Innu community on the south side, traffic across the river is constant. This traffic has been by boat, skidoo, by passenger cable car and on foot. A bridge across the river was completed in 1980. The road to Goose Bay has been rebuilt and given a hard surface over the last four years so that it is now usable throughout the year (Ibid. p. 31). The main industries are the hospital, the schools, fishing, trapping and work in Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

Mud Lake was settled more than 150 years ago and after a series of economic swings has settled to the current population of 90. The community has remained a village in outlook with trapping, fishing, and employment in Happy Valley-Goose Bay as the economic basis.

Access and egress is by boat or skidoo to Happy Valley-Goose Bay -- an unusual but hazardous commuting and shopping method. A two room school is located in the community. Within the community, which is built on two sides of a tributary river flowing into the Churchill, access is by boat, skidoo, by bridge and by footpath. (Ibid. p. 28).

Happy Valley-Goose Bay

This combination of two physically separate but closely related communities, now amalgamated as one municipality, had its origins in 1941 with the construction of a military airfield for ferrying aircraft, supplies and people to and from Europe. In a matter of months in 1941 construction crews built

...three 3,000 ft. concrete runways, seven hangars, two 150 bed hospitals, quarters for three thousand construction workers and service personnel, plus other necessary projects as bakeries, docks to handle ocean going vessels, central heating plants, steam laundries, sanitation, pumping stations --- in short, a city for 8,000 people and an airport beside (Burden, 1965:15). (D.W. Zimmerley, "Cain's Land Revisited." 1975, pp. 230-1.)

Settlers who came to work at the airbase had to adhere to the rule that they not be allowed to locate their homes "within a five-mile radius of the land designated military" (Ibid., p. 232). Further, these settlers had to meet their own requirements for water, timber for fuel and building, and reasonable access to the base. The site they chose is now the community of Happy Valley. (Ibid. p. 233.)

The 'Cold War' resulted in the development of an early-warning radar system from 1951 on along the Labrador coast, while the air base at Goose Bay saw major construction in 1951, 1954 and 1958 to replace the older buildings and add new facilities. With the gradual withdrawal of the American forces, which was largely complete by 1976, Happy Valley-Goose Bay has become a more integrated municipality. The old concepts of "the Canadian

side", and "the American side" as distinct and separate communities from the Valley have largely died as housing in each of the former two areas became administered by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation or Public Works Canada, or was sold to householders.

The current population is 8,000. The main economic base is the airport and its associated services. In addition, most federal and provincial government agencies with a presence in Labrador maintain offices or other facilities, or both, here to service the Labrador coast. Happy Valley-Goose Bay is the service, administrative and communications centre for the region. There are three hotels and over a hundred businesses (Petro-Canada. 1980. p. 8). Marine services connect Happy-Valley-Goose Bay with the coastal communities and the Island of Newfoundland.

The airbase is now administered by the federal Ministry of Transport. The Americans, Canadians, British and Germans maintain small training and support crews. While civil air traffic has dropped in volume, the airport is still extensively used for emergency repairs and refueling, and as an alternative to Gander for trans-Atlantic flights. In addition, the growth of air transportation in the Labrador region by float, wheeled and ski-equipped aircraft has been important. Happy Valley-Goose Bay has a 40-bed hospital, 4 primary and secondary schools, 2 nursery schools, a regional vocational school and a regional library service, and a university extension office serving Labrador.

The municipality is located close to the mouth of the Churchill River. This river has two major potential electrical power dams within a short distance of the municipality, and their construction will bring another boom to Happy Valley-Goose Bay. This construction will also mean eventually the creation of a highway to the 'mainland' (Canada) and the 'island' (Newfoundland), with all its attendant advantages and disadvantages. Once relatively cheap and abundant electrical power is available, other renewable and non-renewable resources of the region will be developed. For example, a year-round Port Labrador will become a real possibility in Hamilton Inlet.

THE STRAITS AND SOUTHERN LABRADOR

There are eighteen year-round communities with a total population of 5,210 in these two parts of Labrador. These are illustrated on Map. 3.6.

In the Labrador Straits, the eight communities are linked by a 50-mile gravel road. They are joined by a gravel road to some communities on the Québec North Shore, including Blanc Sablon. Blanc Sablon has a 3,000 ft. gravel airstrip and sea-ferry services to St. Barbe on the Island of Newfoundland and to other Quebec North Shore Communities. The eight Labrador communities in the Straits are L'Anse aux Claire (251 people), Forteau (475), L'Anse Amour (25), L'Anse au Loup (536), Capstan Island (50), West

Ste. Modeste (220), Pinware (338), and Red Bay (300). In addition to these, there are ten smaller and seasonal communities along the Straits.

The people in the Straits are Settlers and their communities can be traced back to Spanish, Portuguese, French and English (including Channel Island) influences. Evidence of early settlement (and prehistoric settlement by Inuit and Innu) and related activities continue to be discovered. Red Bay is the area of much archaeological activity concentrating upon the Basque whaling industry.

In Southern Labrador there are ten year-round communities. Access to these is by air and by boat.

The ten communities are Lodge Bay (Cape St. Charles) (130 people), Mary's Harbour (450), Fox Harbour (250), Port Hope Simpson (582), William's Harbour (83), Pinsent's Arm (56), Charlottetown (245), Norman's Bay (60), Black Tickle (194), Cartwright (860) and Paradise River (105). In addition, there are 40 or so smaller stations and seasonal communities on this stretch of the Labrador. Among these communities, Cartwright, Black Tickle and Paradise River only have participated in discussions about possible national parks in Labrador.

NORTHERN LABRADOR

There are six communities in northern Labrador. All these communities have participated in discussions about national parks in Labrador. One of these is Davis Inlet, an Innu

community which has been described earlier. The other five communities have a total population of 2134. These five are Rigolet (270 people), Makkovik (368), Postville (177), Hopedale (419), and Nain (900). Another station is Saglek, which was built as a Pine Tree radar station. It has been abandoned for that use but it is currently used as a seasonal land base for offshore oil and gas drilling because of its runway and associated buildings. The seasonal staff probably amount to fewer than a dozen people.

The majority of the people in northern Labrador are Inuit. There are 1,500 Inuit in Labrador. Some of these, 100 at most, are to be found in Northwest River and Happy Valley-Goose Bay. There are approximately 530 settlers and Indians (excluding Davis Inlet) on the northern Labrador coast. Nain is now the northernmost community on the coast. The former communities of Zoar, Hebron, Ramah, Okak, and Killinek (at Port Burwell) have been closed. Their people have been relocated, particularly to Nain but also to Hopedale and Makkovik and to a lesser extent to Northwest River and Happy Valley-Goose Bay. (McGrath et. al. 1979).

3.3.2 THE SETTLING OF LABRADOR

The purpose of this section is to provide a brief account of what is known of the settling of the Labrador by the Indian, Inuit and European, and of their relationships during that time. This is intended, together with the current settlement pattern (3.3.1), the lifestyle (3.3.3)

and the constitutional background (3.3.4), to help explain the feelings of Labradorians (3.3.5) about their cultural heritage.

ABORIGINAL PREHISTORY

Zimmerley has provided the following summary:

Human occupation of coastal and interior Labrador goes back almost 5000 years to the Indian Maritime Archaic Tradition. Eskimos appeared about 800 B.C., disappeared only 600 years later and reappeared in the later 1500's. Although Labrador was one of the first parts of North America visited by Europeans in the tenth century, and saw the passing of exploration ships of many nations during the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it remained... (for the French) ... to establish the first settlement in the early 1700's. (Zimmerley 1975 p. 78)

This slow European colonization was due in part to the hostility of the Eskimos towards Europeans. This may have been due to the legend of the first recorded contact between aboriginal inhabitants and Europeans, in which the Viking Thorvald Eiriksson was killed by an Indian arrow. It may be due to other stories that were preserved in oral literature and survived the next 500 years to influence ensuing aboriginal/European contact situations. (Ibid., pp. 42-3). "With both the northward retreat of the Eskimo" - from the Gulf of St. Lawrence and "the Moravian establishment of missions, after 1770 this problem was somewhat alleviated." (Ibid., p. 79).

EUROPEAN EXPLORATION, CONTACT AND SETTLEMENT TO 1941

The first Europeans appear to have come upon the Labrador coast by accident. They explored the Labrador coast when blown off course or while searching for new routes to the Orient. They then explored the area for its resources and found it wanting. What they discovered was a coast populated by unfriendly natives and a sea with plentiful fish, seal and whale. The sea attracted them back on a seasonal basis.

European settlement in Labrador was at first seasonal and confined to southern Labrador.

Europeans have usually found great difficulty in appreciating landscapes that did not appear attractive from the farmer's point of view. They looked for rich valleys, soft climate, and, if there was a forest, they imagined it already cleared and profitably planted. Most of the Europeans who had ventured far north did so because they were looking for new trade routes or for other Europeans who were lost. With the exception of fur traders, they expected little profit from the terrain itself. Indeed the terrain was often a source of dismay and even horror. Labrador was a typical case in point, and this coast inspired in its earliest discoverers a good deal of criticism. Jacques Cartier's reference in 1534 to "the land of Cain" is often quoted. (Hugh Brody. *Permanence and Change Among the Inuit and Settlers of Labrador*; in C. Brice-Bennett. 1977. p. 313).

Despite this view of the region, the fishery was to become, and remain, very important. It was a result of the fishery that Europeans "early exploited the area and early caused changes in the region's social life" (Ibid. p. 313).

According to Zimmerley

After Baffin declared in 1616 that "the North-West passage could never serve as a highway to India" (Tanner 1944: 49), few ships touched Labrador again other than fishing expeditions. The few... were mainly French fishermen who mostly remained in the Gulf of St. Lawrence or southern Strait of Belle Isle area. Basque, Portuguese and Spanish fishermen also frequented this area up to about 1700. Even though the English appropriated most of the good Newfoundland fishing grounds to themselves, they had not shown any interest in Labrador. From 1700, it was mainly the French who plied these northern waters in search of whales, seal and cod and trade with the Indians and Eskimos (Zimmerly. 1975. p. 43).

The influence of the French is still evident in the Montagnais, who remain Catholic to this day. This is in contrast to the Inuit, who were introduced to the Moravian rather than the Jesuit form of Christianity; and in contrast to the Settlers, who were largely to colonize the Labrador under English rule and various offshoots of the King James version of Christianity.

With the English take-over of Labrador in 1763, settlement was strictly discouraged in an attempt to preserve the salmon and cod fishing grounds for English vessels and also on account of bad relations with the Eskimos who made settlement a precarious and dangerous proposition. (Ibid., p. 79).

Settlement was to remain a dangerous proposition until a proposal to create reservations in Labrador was made by the Moravian Church to England in the 1760s to protect the Inuit from outside influences the Moravians deemed undesirable, and to establish a Labrador mission. This was attractive to British officials because the Inuit were proving to be a nuisance in southern Labrador and around the

Strait of Belle Isle, where Hugh Palliser, Governor of Newfoundland, was trying to build up an English transient ship fishery. If the Moravians could contain the Inuit in the north and civilize them, then the result would turn to the greater profit of the traders as well as to the greater glory of God. (J.K. Hiller in C. Brice-Bennett. 1977. p. 83).

In 1769, the Governor of Newfoundland, Sir Hugh Palliser, "granted" (Zimmerly. 1975, p. 50) the Moravian Mission 100,000 acres in Eskimo Bay to establish a mission and carry on a trade with the Eskimos with the hopes of making the latter peaceful and Christian. This land was taken up by the Moravians in 1770. The Moravians were granted a trade monopoly and the right to exclude all other Europeans from the mission land. (Ibid, p. 50). This right of exclusive trading was to be applied (unlawfully) to all their subsequent missions on the Labrador.

The Moravians constructed missions and encouraged the nomadic Inuit to trade and to settle in communities in northern Labrador. For nearly a century the Moravians tried to keep all European influence to a minimum.

Over the next 130 years "The Moravians created eight communities, or districts (Nain [1771], Okak [1776], Hopedale [1782], Hebron [1830], Zoar, Ailik and Ramah [1871] and Killinek [1904]). These became the centre of religious, social, educational and trading activities for the Inuit families along four hundred miles of the Labrador coast, from Killinek to Hopedale. Their source of income came primarily from cod, char, fox and seal". (McGrath et. al. 1979. p. 5).

The Moravians were to obtain further land grants in 1774, 1818 and 1901 under various Orders in Council. These later land grants were specifically to prevent any interference with the fisheries. Further, these land grants

"...do not by themselves give the Moravian Church a clear freehold title to the land surrounding Nain, Hopedale, Okak, and Hebron. As Lord Hillsborough pointed out, freehold could only have been granted, in the years before the Newfoundland constitution was regularized, by a patent under the Great Seal of England. The Orders appear to be, in effect, rent free leases, without term, of property of which the Crown assumed it had title by virtue of conquest. The obligation of lessee to lessor was presumably, to fulfil the purposes for which the land was leased: that is to convert and "civilize" the Inuit of coastal Labrador." (J.K. Hiller. Moravian Land Holdings on the Labrador Coast: A Brief History. in C. Brice-Bennett. 1977, p. 93).

It is undecided and therefore unclear whether the Moravians still have claims to these land grants. The Moravian Mission continues to press the claim but it has never been accepted by the Newfoundland Government.

It would appear that the Moravians were unable to protect their trading monopoly and any claim they may have tried to protect to waters off Labrador. The numbers of competing fishing vessels and trading vessels grew substantially through the late nineteenth century. This contact with outsiders was to introduce such diseases as whooping cough and smallpox, which took their toll of both Inuit and Settlers. The Spanish Flu epidemic of 1918 "...caused the death of one third of the 1,200 Inuit and the same amount in the other communities, from Cartwright north." (McGrath et. al. 1979. p. 5)

The Moravians lost control of the lives of the Inuit in 1926, when the cod fishery and fur industry were seriously affected by depressed markets during and after World War I.

....Their stores were taken by the HBC (Hudson's Bay Company) and the people scattered along the coast. Conditions did not improve much by 1942, at which time the HBC closed its stores (except Rigolet, Cartwright and North West River) and the provincial government undertook the responsibility of supplying the communities. (Ibid., p. 5).

While the Moravians held sway over the northern Labrador coast, they had no influence in southern Labrador. The earliest settlers were concentrated in the southern part, away from hostile natives and closer to the richer sea fisheries. As new settlers continued to arrive from Europe, they and the earlier settlers began to move north to populate Hamilton Inlet and the northern coast.

...This great influx of fishermen gave rise to a new social order... many of the schoonermen brought their families with them... In time, a core of permanent settlers established themselves. (Hugh Brody in C. Brice-Bennett. 1977. p. 314).

Those Europeans (particularly the English) who came without families found native wives and settled into the seasonal life of the coast. The early English chose to live this primitive life rather than be press-ganged into service with the Royal Navy. (Zimmerly, 1975).

According to Hugh Brody (Ibid. p. 311) the Labrador region became settled in a particular geographic pattern. The Indian held sway over the interior and the settlers made gradual incursions both to hunt and to trap for furs and trade for food on the coast or in Hamilton Inlet. The

Indians came to the coast only along regularly used and well established corridors. The Inuit stayed largely on the coast but roamed widely throughout the hinterland of the coast. Settlers established a way of life on the coast, especially in bays in which they could find wood and shelter, adjacent to and to some degree overlapping the lands of the Inuit. The influence of the settler was to change the pattern of life of both the Indian and Inuit by the settler's trading with both, by his encouraging trapping for fur, and by his gradually occupying the lands of both and by fishing offshore on a commercial scale to the detriment of the Inuit.

The settlers had to find a broader economic base than "fish" could provide. This search for a more diverse economy led them towards other fisheries (salmon and char), sealing and trapping. More generally, it resulted inevitably in a seasonal round of activities that was a blend of fishing, trapping and hunting both for trade and subsistence activities.

So the northern Settlers came to use islands, bays, river systems, and parts of the interior. They developed a complex pattern of mobility, a host of technical skills, and a compendium of knowledge that let them live off the Labrador land and sea.

Settlers added a third layer to two already in existence - related to but quite distinct from either the Inuit or the Naskapi. The geographical overlap between the three is not inconsiderable, and there has been some intermarriage between Settlers and Inuit, but the systems remain distinct. (Ibid. p. 314).

Although the settlers were apparently unwelcomed by the Moravians, by the mid-nineteenth century their presence seems to have been accepted in northern Labrador. In reality the economic poverty of all three cultures - Indian, Inuit and Settler - left little to distinguish between them in their attempts to survive the harsh land and sea.

Thus a general pattern of harmony and economic lifestyle was to remain in effect from the early nineteenth century to the 1930s. "Obviously, European institutions made a great impact on the inhabitants of Labrador" (Ibid. p. 316). The Moravians by discouraging the Inuit pattern of mobility tried to create permanent settlements. But "in the 1920s and 1930s...largely as a result of the low price of cod during the Depression, Eskimos turned towards trapping, and so reverted...to a more mobile way of life..." (Ibid., p. 317). The Moravian hold over the Inuit was broken and it was not to be restored.

The Inuit, the Indians and the Settlers suffered equally from the Depression. The poverty of Labradorians was not to be broken until the 1940s, when the cyclical nature of economic activity changed from one of subsistence to wage-labour employment. (Zimmerly. 1975. p. 174).

According to Zimmerly:

the trappers were fortunate that World War II came to Labrador when it did as rising costs and population numbers combined with declining fur prices had already forecast the end of the traditional trapping culture (Ibid., p. 174).

While Zimmerly was writing of the Lake Melville region, his comments appear to be equally valid for the remainder of Labrador.

World War I and other world wide trends saw a general expansion in business and increased attention to services in health, education and welfare, both spiritually and bodily. Improved communications brought greater awareness of the outside world and its opportunities that fostered some out migration. Itinerant entrepreneurs and high fur prices (between 1901 and 1921) provided

both the stimulus and the means for several trappers to attempt broadening their economic base through a variety of business ventures. For the majority of settlers though, trapping was their life and while they were afforded more amenities and lived a richer more secure life, it was still basically the life of their grandfathers. (Ibid., pp. 174-5).

The natural resources available to the settlers during the period from 1901 and 1941 were unchanged. To the list of general resources, however, must be added the International Grenfell Association. Through their medical aid the settlers' efficiency was increased due to less time lost through illness. During times of want the Grenfells could be tapped for certain amounts of food and clothing. Their various educational programs provided some new opportunities for a few although the "truck" or "credit" system of dealing with the merchants was still effective in keeping the settlers firmly tied to the trades. Marketing of settler produce, that is, fish and fur, was still through the Hudson's Bay Company or the competition traders in Northwest River and it was nearly impossible to find other outlets without incurring the wrath of the local traders. (Ibid. p. 192)

The modern period of Labrador history is one of gradual movement away from total dependence upon uncontrollable external forces: particularly the environment, and the whims of the market. But dependence upon these remains important even today in Labrador. The market may have changed but dependence upon it is still high, be it for salmon, char, cod, lumber, minerals, hydro electricity, or defence and civil aviation.

At the end of this period there were still enough elements of the statement Dr. Paddon made in 1914 to warrant its application as late as 1941. He saw Labrador then as:

2

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

...a country without cohesion, social or industrial; a country with labour not organized, with leaders undeveloped for lack of followers to lead; and with followers resigned to poor relief because of lack of leaders to pull them into moderate prosperity and independence and because of the lack of wage-paid work; a country without representation in any parliament and therefore one which has never "found itself"; a country with a very regrettable lack of "public opinion" and therefore needing some very drastic remedies where public opinion should suffice; lastly, it is a country of little spiritual unity and needs Christ substituted for "Religion" in many ways and places (Ibid., p. 185).

This statement still had elements which were applicable as late as 1971.

THE MODERN PERIOD: 1941 TO 1979

The Second World War years and the immediate post-war period saw more changes in Labrador than had occurred during its entire previous history. Defence requirements resulted in the construction of Goose Bay air base on Lake Melville in the 1940s. A network of communication stations were constructed along the coast in the 1950s. The entire peninsula was air-photographed in the late 1940s and accurate maps were prepared for the first time. Large numbers of people, both military and civilian, came to the coast and to Lake Melville. Meanwhile, extensive iron ore deposits in western Labrador, which had been discovered and investigated in the 1930s, were mined from 1954 on. A railway was constructed 360 miles from Sept Isles to Knob Lake (Schefferville) in Quebec. Later, a branch rail line was built to Wabush and Labrador City. A road was later

constructed from the rail line at Esker to Goose Bay to provide access to Grand Falls on the Hamilton River (renamed Churchill Falls and Churchill River). (W.C. Wilton. 1964. p. 7). Few Labradorians moved to western Labrador to work in these industries.

In the face of these massive changes to their environment, their region, the Labradorians undertook "trial and error adaptive strategies" (Zimmerly. 1975, p. 229) to handle these external impositions. These adaptive strategies which were not unlike those undertaken by the European immigrants to Labrador in the 1800s.

While the climate remained as a constant in the lives of the settlers, parts of the physical environment changed through massive face-lifting operations performed by bulldozers, dredges and saws. In the space of a few short years, the fur trade culture became submerged and engulfed by the onslaughts of the expanding war machine fabricated for World War II. The major centre of this change was in western Lake Melville, around Goose Bay airfield.

The impact was to have rippling effects along the coast, but those settlers most affected lived in the general area of Lake Melville.

Many settlers

...quit trapping on the spot when jobs became available for anyone willing to work and they learned of wages being paid that were unheard of for that part of the world. An indeterminable number decided to wait and see what was happening before committing themselves to wage labour. They remembered what happened before with the lumbering industry (earlier in the century) that promised jobs and security and they did not want to be burned again. (Ibid., p. 231).

The possibility of making a living from ~~furring~~ remained just long enough for the settlers to see that the wage-labour alternative offered during the construction and

maintenance of Goose Air Base was the more attractive possibility (Ibid., p. 314). The settlers adapted well to the wage-labour work conditions, although they did not like "working by the clock". Employment of Naskapi-Montagnais Indians was almost nil. "They would work a couple of days and then drift away". "Eskimos were hired too, but their numbers were always small with a large turnover rate" (Ibid., p. 237-8). This lack of adaptability is easily accounted for: the Indians had next to no previous exposure, the settlers had frequent exposure with the lumbering industry, the Hudson's Bay Company and the Grenfell Association. The Eskimos were somewhere in between if they came from a Moravian Mission. The security of steady work and the relatively high pay offered were enough inducements to keep the settlers on the job. (Ibid., p. 239).

After the war the Canadian forces assumed complete control of the base, but the Americans remained active.

As the RCAF presence diminished, the Americans' increased. The American fear of a Russian nuclear attack escalated activity at Goose Bay which became a support base for the Strategic Air Command. As the cold war continued, early warning stations (Pine Tree Line) were constructed along the coast of Labrador, Distant Early Warning Sites in the Arctic (DEW Line) and finally the Ballistic Missile Early Warning Sites (BMEWS) in Thule, Greenland." (Ibid., p. 239-40).

These various radar and radio systems were routed through Goose Bay along the Labrador coast the defence stations, offered limited semi-skilled and unskilled local employment in places like Resolution Island, Saglek,

Hopedale, Makkovik and Cartwright. Skilled workers were brought in from the outside on short-term contracts or postings.

Between 1943 and 1951 Happy Valley was almost entirely composed of Labrador settlers. After that time in-migration of Island Newfoundlanders dramatically increased the population. While services and facilities for local people in Happy Valley were introduced between 1956 and 1972, at the same time the town and its operation were taken over by the immigrant Newfoundlanders. This takeover and direction of activities and affairs from the Island became so evident through Labrador that Labradorians, still without a voice in the provincial government, began to articulate their grievances and talk of "cultural nationalism." (Ibid., p. 315).

This post-war period has been one of greater incursion by government into the lives of Labradorians. This is a consequence of a wage economy in a region which is tied to major government grants, investments and guarantees for all the basic community and individuals' services as well as employment. The result was net in-migration; the recognition of a decline in cultural identity and the feeling among Labradorians that they were a minority in their own land. Control was being exercised from outside Labrador and few benefits were being received by the residents of Labrador - settlers, Innu, Inuit and newcomers.

It is the author's impression that, for any change

to be acceptable to Labradorians it had to be seen to be of benefit to them, and there had to be ways for them to participate in the management of that change. Change would then become less of a threat and more of an opportunity.

With the withdrawal of the Americans in the mid 1970s, and the overall drop in the role of defence in the Labrador economy, various proposals to introduce new economic supports have been tried, including cutting and exporting pulpwood on a large scale. Happy Valley-Goose Bay in particular was hard hit by the economic depression.

Efforts being made in the late 1970s were less grandiose in scale and more pragmatic in scale and intent to stabilize the regional economy. Part of these efforts was to create a healthier political climate; and this included giving Labradorians more of a say in the future of their region.

Labradorians may claim to have lost an independence as they have lost their isolation; but this independence was to a great extent illusory. The independence they have lost is one of going by the seasons rather than by the clock; the independence they have gained is a general rise in their standard of living and a real freedom from a subsistence economy at best and starvation at worst. The way of life of the Labradorian now differs little from that of other frontier regions of Canada but the distinct regional identity is felt strongly and should be recognized as very important.

3.3.3 CONSTITUTIONAL BACKGROUND

Labrador is a region which has never had any form of political or constitutional independence. The region and its people suffer the fate of most territories remote from the centre of power: they receive belated and little attention. This was recognized by the Snowden Commission, which was set up by the provincial government in 1972 to enquire into the economic and sociological conditions of life in Labrador. (Newfoundland and Labrador. Royal Commission on Labrador. 1974. Vol. VI, p. 1291.

Henceforth referred to as the Snowden Commission). The Snowden Commission also recognized that such a fate as belated and little attention is modified by the factors of increasing population and concerned representatives.

It would appear that no formal claim was made to Labrador by a European power until, under the Treaty of Utrecht of 1713, Labrador was acknowledged as British. The first permanent form of government came with the appointment of Sir Hugh Palliser as Governor at about that time.

Following the end of the Seven Years War with France in 1763, Canada became a British possession. Because of administrative difficulties, in 1774 Labrador was transferred to the Government of Quebec by the Colonial Office. However, in 1809, after it was found that Quebec did not provide any administration, the Colonial Office transferred Labrador back to Newfoundland. Ownership of

Labrador by Newfoundland was confirmed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on March 1, 1927 and approved by the King in England on March 22, 1927. (Ibid., p. 1291). This decision has never been accepted by any of the provincial governments of Québec. Because of this dispute, no firm boundary has ever been surveyed between Labrador and Quebec. One of the two areas of interest for national parks in Labrador abuts on part of this disputed western boundary. As already noted, this western boundary follows the height of land between the Labrador Sea on the one side and Ungava Bay, James Bay and part of the Gulf of St. Lawrence on the other.

Until 1817 the Governors of Newfoundland and Labrador, appointed by the British Government, came out to Newfoundland each spring and returned to England each autumn. In 1803 the then Governor recommended some form of representative government to the Colonial Office. This advice was ignored and only in 1832 was representative government granted: an elected House of Assembly and an appointed Legislative Council.

Although the first general election was held in 1833, Labrador was classed as a dependency. Even when Newfoundland became a self-governing Dominion in 1850 Labrador remained a dependency. There is no record of its participation in elections until 1948, when a referendum was held to determine whether or not Newfoundland and Labrador were to join Canada.

Direct services to Labrador remained minimal until after Dominion status for Newfoundland was withdrawn in 1934 and a Commission of Government was created by the British to stave off outright bankruptcy. In fact during the 1934-37 crisis the very existence of Labrador was largely forgotten.

In 1942 the government took over control of the Hudson's Bay trading posts in northern Labrador because they could not be operated on an economic basis. The Northern Labrador Trading Operations (NLTO) was created as a branch of the Department of Natural Resources to manage these trading operations. The operation was resource-oriented. Efforts were made to provide Eskimo and other local people with boats and fishing equipment to earn a living. On the southern coast of Labrador there was only limited government involvement in education, wireless, mail, passenger transportation services, and police.

When Newfoundland and Labrador became part of Canada on April 1, 1949, Labrador for the first time in its history became a fully recognized part of the province and lost its status as a dependency. Greater efforts to provide better public services and employment should have been made in Labrador as well as the remoter parts of the island. Only northern Labrador benefitted from Confederation through the medium of the Federal-Provincial Agreement providing funds for native peoples. In western Labrador the large corporations assumed the role of providing government

services. On the south coast and in the Straits area very little was done other than to make marked improvements in health and educational services and to provide a toke (a suitable abbreviation for 'token') road.

Token representation for Labrador in government was provided by absentee members, who increased from one to three after 1949. In 1959 a Commissioner for Labrador was appointed. He was directly responsible to the premier and took up residence in Happy Valley. The task was impossible, given the budget and staff size. When a Department of Labrador Affairs was created in St. John's, the ex-Commissioner moved there to work in that department.

The most notable achievement of that department was to introduce subsidized air passenger service to coastal Labrador in 1970. This service was to have far-reaching social and commercial effects and has changed the lifestyle of the residents.

While the department was abolished in 1972, the Snowden Commission did conclude (Ibid., p. 1297) that the motives behind the creation of this department and the commissioner were genuine. The decision to create a separate department for a separate region was, probably, unwise: it was unlikely that it could meet the responsibilities of other (functional) departments of government. The Snowden Commission went on to affirm the principle that Newfoundland and Labrador was one province and the people one people, regardless of ethnic origin.

3.3.4 THE FEELINGS OF ISOLATION, NEGLECT AND EXPLOITATION

According to the Snowden Commission:

Both Federal and Provincial Governments are barely visible in many parts of Labrador.

Based on the generally shabby presence of Government in some parts of Labrador and the lack of presence in other places, it is little wonder that there has been so much criticism in the past. It is not that Government has vacated the field in Labrador; it has never occupied it.

The mental picture most Newfoundlanders have of Labrador...is the same as seen on official maps of the Province. The island is shown life-size, while Labrador is placed in a small insert (Ibid., pp. 1298-9).

It is hardly suprising, with this criticism of government services in a Provincial Royal Commission, that any attempt by either senior government to improve its services in Labrador has been greeted with deep suspicion as to motive and intent. The attempts to discuss national parks in 1976 and 1977, coming within two years of the release of this Snowden Commission report, will be considered in a later chapter. With hindsight and better knowledge, it is the opinion of this author that these discussions were premature at that time because they preceded the implementation of many of the other more important recommendations of the Commission. After close to two centuries of governmental neglect, Labradorians have created their sense of cultural identity, which is based upon independence and survival in a difficult and isolated social, economic, physical and political environment. The now generally recognized neglect of Labradorians by

government is part of the folklore; and folklore takes a long time, perhaps generations, to change.

For most of Labrador's history, there was no representation in the provincial government. When it finally arrived the members were hand picked by the government from men who had never lived in Labrador and at best, had only business interests there. (Zimmerly. 1975. p. 281).

Even local government was limited to a few communities. Most communities were unincorporated, unorganized settlements with only advisory councils; they could often only recommend changes or improvements; they had no fiscal powers and often they could not adjust priorities for spending set in St. John's, far to the south.

Most lands in Labrador are Crown lands; most Labradorians do not have title to the land upon which their homes, boat-houses, tilts, businesses or trap-lines are located. While there is a move to recognize such squatter's rights by government, few Labradorians can afford to have the necessary legal documents drawn-up. Yet with the reduction of transhumance to the minority now, rather than the majority as in the recent past, on the coast, such title has and will become more and more important.

The extent of exploitation by outsiders became serious in the eyes of Labradorians with the conditions which were negotiated in the mid-1960s by the Honourable Joseph R. (Joey) Smallwood, then Premier, for the construction of the Churchill Falls hydroelectric dam. The agreement seemed reasonable for the provincial government at the time, based upon a long-term contract to sell the power to Hydro-Quebec

at less than 3 mills per kilowatt hour. When the world price of oil and other forms of energy shot up in the mid-1970s, Hydro-Quebec was able to resell the power to New York for 32 mills a kilowatt hour. The Québec Provincial Government and Hydro-Québec have refused to renegotiate this contract. The Québec Provincial Government has also refused to allow the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador to export the remaining hydroelectric potential to other would-be purchasers unless Hydro-Quebec is allowed to purchase and resell it. Electricity from Labrador is thus largely untapped because it cannot be exported; because the only practical route is via Québec.

Labradorians now recognize the extent to which their resources were sold in a resource development agreement in 1953 to the British Newfoundland Corporation (BRINCO) and how that company failed either to explore properly or to utilize the very large mineral potential in the region.

As a result of the general recognition of neglect and exploitation of Labrador and Labradorians, a number of organizations were created in Labrador in the 1970s. With some federal and provincial government assistance, these organizations attempted to meet the internal pressures of Labrador for leadership, change and improvement, and to meet the external pressures to permit the exploitation of Labrador's renewable and non-renewable resources. These organizations include:

1. the Combined Councils of Labrador, in 1979 expanded from the Combined Councils of Northern Labrador to represent all communities in Labrador;
2. the East Shore Development Association;
3. the Labrador Craft Producers Association;
4. the Labrador Friendship Centre, to help native people cope with problems encountered in an urban society;
5. the Labrador Heritage Society, to identify, document, collect and generally help protect Labrador's history
6. the Labrador Inuit Association, "to promote Inuit aspirations and involvement through the democratic system with regard to all matters affecting Inuit people in Labrador and to preserve and protect the traditional ways of the Inuit" (this body also represents the Labrador Inuit in land claims negotiations with both senior levels of government)
7. the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association to protect the traditional rights of the Indian people in Labrador, to promote their aspirations and preserve their culture (this body represents the Indian peoples of Labrador in land claims, negotiations with the federal and provincial governments)
8. the Labrador Legal Services, to provide counselling to persons charged with an offence, carry out legal information and education projects, assist returning ex offenders, give limited legal representation and promote law reform

9. the Labrador Resources Advisory Council in 1976, to advise the provincial government on matters of resource use and planning for development in Labrador. It provides an umbrella for many regional associations
10. the Labrador West District Labour Council
11. the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation
12. the Southern Labrador Development Association
13. the Chambers of Commerce for Labrador (the Labrador West, the Labrador East, and the Labrador Straits Chambers of Commerce)

Many of these organizations are closely related to, and work closely with, each other.

Organizations such as the Labrador Resources Advisory Council have taken the initiative and become very assertive, daring to try to change provincial priorities and publicly to review the proposals made by the province for inclusion in a General Development Agreement between the two senior levels of government. Such power and such intervention could not have taken place in the 1960s, because there was little effective leadership from within, and little recognition by governments of the seriousness of the multitude of problems in Labrador.

The stimulus for change may have been partly induced by various federal and provincial government activities, particularly by the funding of Labrador Resources Advisory Council by the provincial government, the Innu and Inuit Associations by the federal Indian and Northern Affairs

Department, and the support of summer job programs by both the Secretary of State and Employment and Immigration Canada. The support for the Labrador Heritage Society has rekindled a strong interest in the history and culture of Labrador. The effect has been spontaneous in its spread and effectiveness.

As will be seen in later chapters, the effect of change upon Labradorians in the 1970s has been their awakening to their power and their ability to express their feelings for the future of the region. The broad range of recommendations made by the Snowden Commission required immediate reaction and activity by both senior governments to meet substantially the felt needs of Labradorians in such areas as health, communication, transportation, housing and education. These are still being introduced.

A recognition of the problems and significance of the Labradorians feelings was given political status by Premier Frank Moores when, in the mid-1970s, Joseph (Joe) Goudie, the elected representative for the Naskapi constituency in the Provincial House of Assembly, was given a post as special assistant to the Premier. The Office of the Premier was set up in Happy Valley to act as a direct link to the Premier in St. John's.

Another aspect of the feelings of Labradorians which has surfaced has been the general recognition that the separate land claims prepared by the Innu and Inuit of Labrador have some justification. Also there has been a

strong regional feeling that the settlers also have legitimate claims to parts of Labrador after European occupancy that can be traced back at least two hundred years. All three groups of people thus want to have a say in how the future of Labrador is to be planned.

Any decisions to permit long-term uses such as national parks require local understanding and acceptance if they are to be successful. Given the strong Labrador feelings of alienation from the decision-making process within governments and industry, the attempts to create such an alien, southern, and urban-based concept as two national parks were to prove very difficult. The attempts to start discussions leading to local approval are the subject of the subsequent chapters of this thesis.

CHAPTER IV

THE SEARCH FOR POTENTIAL NATIONAL PARK SITES IN LABRADOR

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to document sequentially the work undertaken between 1969 and 1976 to select areas which appeared to have the potential to represent best the major natural regions in Labrador and be considered as national parks. These natural regions are the East Coast Boreal Region (#21) and the Northern Mountains Region (#24), shown in Map 2.2. The objective is to provide a background for the Parks Canada selection of the Mealy Mountains in Region 21 and the Torngat Mountains in Region 24 (Map 2.1).

This chapter will point out that the selection process which identified these two areas was not well documented. Indeed, it is unclear to this author how many separate field trips were undertaken. Yet, despite the field work undertaken, at least one area which had potential for a national park in the author's view was not evaluated in the process, namely the Benedict Mountains.

It is unclear as to why Labrador was first considered in 1970. The criteria which were to become of direct importance by 1974 were, first, Parks Canada's own policy goals, secondly, pressure from other public and private agencies to explore economic alternatives for the Labrador economy which would offset the effects of the withdrawal of the U.S. military presence, and, thirdly, the Snowden Royal

Commission on Labrador. But the initial momentum may have been that 1970 was the year Gros Morne National Park was established on the Island of Newfoundland and it may have appeared appropriate to build upon what was then seen as a successful new park.

This chapter does not address the direct question as to what impact the evolution of Parks Canada objectives and policy had in Labrador; rather it attempts to describe sequentially the actual activities of Parks Canada in that region. The relationship between these two is addressed, albeit briefly, in Chapter VI.

4.2 1970 FIELD SURVEY

The first field work in Labrador took place in July 1970 when a five-day air reconnaissance study by D.B. Coombs of the Newfoundland Recreation Sector, Canada Land Inventory team (D.B. Coombs, 1971. p. 1), was undertaken for the purpose of making future plans for the mapping of the Labrador for outdoor recreation capability. A number of areas were suggested at that time for more detailed study for national park and equivalent reserve potential. These areas were selected on the basis of natural or physiographic characteristics appropriate to meet the criteria for inclusion in a national system of parks. Due in part to poor weather, only parts of Labrador were surveyed.

Map 4-1

**NATIONAL PARKS'
OR EQUIVALENT RESERVES
POSSIBILITIES IN LABRADOR**
As Identified by D.B. Coombs
in July 1970

Source: D.B. Coombs. National Park and Equivalent Reserve Considerations for the Labrador. A Preliminary Survey. January, 1971.

The six areas which were suggested for further study are identified on Map 4.1. The areas were 1. Torngat Mountains; 2. Kiglapait Mountains and Nain Area; 3. Harp Lake - Upper Naskaupi River; 4. Upper Goose River; 5. Lac Joseph - Atikonak Lake; and 6. Mecatina River.

Coombs noted that it was not practical to assume any more than a very general impression of such a large northern land mass in such a short period of time.

Coombs made a special effort at that time to look at the Mealy Mountains (Map 1.1). Their proximity to Goose Bay meant they had potential as a national park site. However, weather conditions left the study team with the feeling that "... the area was not too impressive and left one with a sense of bleak sterility" (Ibid., p. 2.). The study team felt that "under better weather conditions ... possibly a further look at the area would be justified" (Ibid., p. 2.). Until that future time the Mealy Mountains were not singled out for further study.

The Torngat Mountains, Kiglapait Mountains and Nain Area, and Harp Lake - Upper Naskaupi River were each suggested as having national park potential. The Upper Goose River had potential for a scenic waterway. The Mecatina River had potential as a scenic waterway or wild river. Lac Joseph - Atikonak Lake had potential as a National Recreation Area (Provincial Park) (Ibid., p. 3-4).

While D.B. Coombs was not working directly for National Parks when he undertook this report in 1970, he did travel

Map 4.2

**KOROC RIVER - UNGAVA BAY
NATIONAL PARK STUDY AREA
1970**

Source: J.A. Carruthers. Arctic and Sub-Arctic Quebec,
National Park Reconnaissance.
July, 1970.

with a Parks Canada employee, J. Carruthers, to Port Burwell on the Labrador-Northwest Territories boundary. Carruthers did not visit Labrador per se on that trip but did fly along the Quebec coast between Fort Chimo and Port Burwell. Along that coast Carruthers suggested the Koroc River - Ungava Bay area in Region 24 for more detailed national park feasibility study (see Map 4.2). Although a further field survey was undertaken along the Koroc River, in Quebec in the early 1970s by T. Kovacs and G. Couture, no notes or conclusions have been found, only some photographs taken by T. Kovacs (Parks Canada Photo Library, Ottawa).

The report and recommendations of this 1970 survey do not appear to have resulted in any action until 1973, when field survey teams went back to Labrador.

4.3 1972 AND 1973 FIELD RECONNAISSANCE

In 1972 Parks Canada undertook Wild River Surveys in Labrador on the Uggjoktok, Kanairiktok, Goose, Little Mecatina and Natashquan Rivers (see Map 4.3). The purpose was to identify those of particular wilderness appeal to form part of a national system of "Wild Rivers". (In addition, in 1975 the provincial Tourism conducted its own surveys of the Notakwanon, Uggjoktok, Kanairiktok, Naskapi, Goose, Little Mecatina and Eagle Rivers in Labrador. The purpose was to consider the value of promoting certain waterways for canoeing which would be suitable for novice as well as experienced canoeists). To date (1981) nothing has

Map 4.3

WILD RIVERS SURVEY REPORTS
RAPPORTS D'ÉTUDE DES RIVIÈRES
SAUVAGES

Map.4.3

1979

been done to implement a program to encourage the protection and use of these rivers by either government (Parks Division. June 1980. pp. 2-4).

The result and recommendations of the 1970 and 1972 survey programs were combined with an office analysis of the literature, maps and air photographs pertaining to the East Coast Boreal Region to produce a preliminary inventory and assessment of the region's natural character in 1973. This collected data then formed the basis for designing a detailed field reconnaissance of the region. This was undertaken in June 1973 by Parks Canada planners G. Lee and K. Wytock and Provincial Parks Director, H. Stanley.

Reference is made to the 1973 field survey in a report in 1974 (Parks Canada, 1974). Extracts from that report summarizing the extent of the record of the 1973 field survey are quoted below.

The goal of this 1973 reconnaissance was threefold: to locate and evaluate those areas which best represent the region's diverse natural character; to re-examine the areas identified in the previous surveys; and to locate any unique or spectacular features as yet unidentified in southern Labrador.

In order that the Provincial Park authorities could benefit from the survey and to facilitate greater understanding between the Federal and Provincial Park planning bodies, this 1973 survey was undertaken jointly by both park agencies (Ibid., p. 2)

This (1974) report described the East Coast Boreal Natural Region in some detail and then identified two areas, the Goose River and Mealy Mountains (Map 4.4), warranting further study as national park options in that region. The report then recommended future studies (Ibid. p. 4) in both the natural regions to provide a sound basis for selecting National Park options in this region (Ibid. p. 1-2).

The Natural History Themes, identified in the National Parks System Planning Manual (Parks Canada, 1971), which represented the regions (21) and (24) (Map 1.1) were used as the basis for the selection of the national park options. It was noted in the 1974 report (Ibid. p. 5) that "the marine component of this region's natural character has not been thoroughly studied...". These marine aspects of both natural regions were not to be studied until the late 1970s and the results not made available until 1981.*

With respect to the East Coast Boreal Region, prior to undertaking the June 1973 reconnaissance, office research analysis had revealed that the greatest diversity of regional characteristics occurs in the northeastern portion of the region (Ibid. p. 13). Consequently, the June 1973 reconnaissance was concentrated within a 125 mile radius of Goose Bay. Hence the areas selected in Region 21 were the Mealy Mountains and Goose River (Ibid. p. 6). However the

---

* The results can best be described as inconclusive and will require review at a later date when more marine information is available.

Map 4.4

**NATIONAL PARK
AREAS OF INTEREST
IN SOUTHERN LABRADOR
Identified in 1973**

Source: A National Park Reconnaissance of the East Coast
Boreal Region - Natural Region 21.
Parks Canada..
April, 1974.

survey was not strictly limited to this focus area, as satellite areas (which were not identified) throughout the region were reviewed. Among these was, presumably the Ugjohtok (sic) River area in Region 24 because it was recommended for future study (Ibid. p. 6). (It is unknown to the author whether or not the Ugjoktok River was studied further). Map 4.4 gives the location of the Ugjoktok River, Goose River and Mealy Mountain areas.

The Mealy Mountain Area selected, some 1500 square miles in area, embodied

... four distinct components, a marine component, a coastal plain component, a mountain component, and a plateau component. As such it appears capable of representing the diverse natural character of the East Coast Region. (ibid. p. 15).

The area contained excellent representation of the natural themes of the natural region, the largest caribou herd in the region, all the dominant faunal and aviary species and the Lake Melville marine ecosystem (although further marine studies were recommended) (Ibid. p. 17). Potential uses were identified, including "... a full range of wilderness recreative activities..." which were "... extensive rather than intensive in use area required." (Ibid. p. 17). Accessibility was considered feasible by air and by tour boat (ibid. p. 18).

The anticipated role(s) of the area in the National Park System which were listed were succinct but not necessarily clear:

- the Mealy Mountain Area appears to have excellent potentials for the development of a National Park designed to represent the East Coast Boreal Region.
- It also may be envisaged as a marine park with Lake Melville and the Labrador Sea as component areas (Ibid. p. 18).

The only competing land use in the area which was identified was the potential for commercial use of the stands of black spruce in the south and west peripheries (Ibid. p. 18).

4.4 1974 NATIONAL PARK POTENTIAL FIELD STUDY

In 1974 a further national park potential field study in northern Labrador was carried out by Couture and Kovacs, Parks Canada planners. This took place between September 9 and 16, 1974, using a helicopter.

According to Kovacs this survey had four purposes:

1. a preliminary survey of Natural Region 24 to assess its natural attributes and to identify possible National Park areas for further study.
2. to qualitatively compare these areas with those similarly identified in Natural Region 21 during the 1973 survey conducted by Lee, Wytock and Stanley, and with the areas previously covered by D. Coombs (1970).
3. to evaluate the entire Labrador region for its national park potential leading to the possible formulation of a Park proposal.
4. to utilize the information gathered for the preparation of a report on Natural Region 24 (T. Kovacs.

Memorandum to File: Trip to Labrador, Newfoundland.

September 9-16, 1974, Ottawa, 25 November, 1974, p. 1).

Kovacs went on to state that the rationale for Parks Canada involvement in this Labrador region was threefold (Ibid. p. 1). First, it was one of the major gaps in the National Parks system and as such it warranted attention. Second, it was a region where some field work had been done in the past and it required a more comprehensive treatment. And third, because Parks Canada had a commitment to the government of Newfoundland to examine the possibility of creating a Natural Park in Labrador for socio-economic reasons (emphasis on economic), as a counter-measure to offset the anticipated economic decline in the Goose Bay areas as a result of the diminishing presence of the U.S. air force (Ibid., pp. 1-2)

This study was done without Provincial participation because the provincial parks director was too busy to come at that time (Ibid., p. 3). The result of the survey was the recommendation that in Natural Region 24

- ... the most outstanding area is the Torngat Mountain area, followed by the Kiglapaits near Nain and the Kaumajets near Cape Magford (Ibid., p. 2).

While recognizing that further work was necessary to better define actual areas of interest, Kovacs concluded that

... the Torngats are uninviting and suffered from many physical and climatic limitations from a park visitor's point of view. Accessibility is poor and exposure is a problem. The Kiglapaits are more gentle, spacious, scenically pleasing. To a lesser extent the same can be said of the Kaumajets. More opportunities for a Park appear to exist in these mountain ranges. A National Park along the coast in either the Kiglapaits or

Map 4-5

**AREAS OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE
IN THE LABRADOR MOUNTAINS
REGION- NATURAL REGION 24
Identified in 1974**

Source: G. Couture. Terrestrial Natural Region 24
Northern Labrador Mountains.
May, 1975.

the Kaumajets is visualized as a distinct possibility. (Such areas can be expected to emerge from follow up field and office studies) (Ibid., p. 3).

Kovacs apparently felt he needed to qualify any optimism that Parks Canada might have about creating a national park in northern Labrador (Natural Region 24) by including a reference to Natural Region 21 (southern Labrador) where the Provincial interest lay

.... primarily to offset the economic loss of the U.S. air force cutbacks by the establishment of a Park (Ibid., p. 3).

Kovacs identified the need to set national park priorities for the two natural regions, and to obtain an indication from the province whether it would support a park proposal in either of the two natural regions. He felt on a comparative basis the establishment of a national park in Region 24 would be more desirable from a Parks Canada viewpoint, based purely on the consideration of natural features, diversity and attractions. But if the province was not interested in a park far removed from Goose Bay, then planning efforts for next year should be concentrated on Region 21. In Region 21 the Mealy Mountains and Goose River area had already been identified for further study. Both were inland areas. Kovacs felt that an inland park in this part of Labrador would be conceptually fitting if a coastal park were to be created in Natural Region 24 at some time in the future (Ibid., p. 3).

More aerial reconnaissance as well as more ground- work was recommended by Kovacs. He felt planning efforts should be concentrated on 1) a description of Natural Region 24, 2) seeking out the provincial position on national parks in Region 24 and then, 3) further field work (in cooperation with the Province) the next year, 1975.

4.5 1975 NATIONAL PARK OPTIONS STUDY

It should be remembered that the national parks in Labrador were being proposed at a time when many changes were being sought by local people, and developments were being proposed by industry, by the provincial government and by the federal government. These changes and developments were to have some impact upon the national park proposals. For example, the governments of Quebec and Newfoundland were asking for a financial contribution from the federal government for their proposed Quebec Trans-Labrador Highway. Parks Canada was asked to review the impact the highway might have on tourism development. Carruthers in 1975 said the proposed highway could have merit from a national park point of view because it would provide access to the Goose River and Mealy Mountain areas. Further, it would make the headwaters region accessible for the Petit-Mécatina, Natashquan and Moisie Rivers which were examined in the Wild Rivers Surveys for National Wild River designation at some time in the future. (J. Carruthers. Correspondence. March 19, 1975. p. 1).

As a result of this letter, J. Carruthers suggested on March 20, 1975, to S. Kun, Director, National Parks Branch that the Mealy Mountains were an opportunity for national park acquisition at a time when the then Minister, the Honourable Judd Buchanan, was advocating more parks. Further, Carruthers pointed out also that both the province and Parks Canada planners agreed the area should be considered. It was at this point that S. Kun asked for a written brief (which was the communication process normally followed to make the proposal to senior officials in the department, including the minister).

By April 22, 1975 G. Couture and K. Wytock had prepared the brief. This recommended that the two types of Labrador landscape (alpine tundra and boreal plain plateaux) each warranted representation in the National Park System. The Torngat Mountains area and the Mealy Mountains area within each landscape unit were proposed because each was "... preliminarily evaluated to possess excellent park potential and value."

Both areas were

... assessed to be wilderness use areas and capable of supporting this type of development concept.

With respect to development of either area, it is suggested that the economic impact on the surrounding area will be minimal, as extraction of natural resource potentials will be slight in value, and park establishment will result in minor economic increase of the tourist industry in the short term.

As to the establishment of the first National Park in Labrador, it is recommended that such should occur in the Torngat area. This area is considered superior to the Mealy Mountain area because

- it is the more spectacular of the two
- it is most representative of the Labrador natural character
- it possess a full range of Labradorian outdoor recreational activities
- it requires less 'lock-up' of potential economic natural resources.

(Couture and Whytock. April 22, 1975, p. 4).

The brief touched upon the existing uses of the areas by Labradorians, and the impact national parks might have upon local communities. This appears to have been the first recognition in writing that the park proposals would have to be related to local people. The only warnings of local impact were that the Mealys contained a portion of Labrador's timber resource, while mining leases may exist in both areas and traditional hunting areas might also be of concern (Ibid., p. 4).

The economic impact of national parks was seen to be slight, because, as then envisaged, park development concepts would be wilderness experience areas. In the short term, park establishment in either area would have little economic impact; however, long-term tourism development would be a result of park establishment (Ibid., p. 4). Few services would be developed within the park and traditional recreational income activities would be scarce.

There is no record of any specific decision or direction from S. Kun on Labrador as a result of the briefing prepared on April 22, 1975. However, on June 2, 1975, Couture wrote to Kovacs outlining a proposal for a follow-up study of the Mealy Mountains area to identify alternate park boundaries, their values and potential.

On August 11, 1975 J.I. Nicol, Director-General, Parks Canada wrote to William Rompkey, M.P., Member for Grand Falls - White Bay - Labrador, reminding him of their discussion about potential national parks in Labrador and attaching a brief report which Nicol had had prepared "... as a result of our conversation ..." that summer while in Newfoundland. This brief report entitled, "National Park Options in Labrador, Newfoundland" (the report was undated but was probably written in August 1975) talked of three areas: the Torngats, the Nain area and the Mealy Mountains. The three areas were put into an economic, social and political perspective. The areas were believed to be devoid of major resource exploitation or resource interest (though there were forestry interests in the Mealy Mountains), but traditional activities took place in all three. Road access did not exist, but the proposed Quebec - Trans-Labrador Highway would make the Mealy Mountains accessible. Access to both was feasible and could be considered within the framework of the ARC (Agreements for Recreation and Conservation Program of Parks Canada) scenic water route concept visualized for

the coast (Parks Canada. By ways and Special Places Program. Example Routes Warranting Study - Newfoundland. August, 1973. p. 18).

Highway linkage with the road system of eastern North America would establish the Mealy as a focal point in the larger recreation travel pattern in this portion of the continent. The Mealy would also serve the needs of the (then) sizable local population (though what these needs were and how they were to be served was not explained). The provincial government attitude was favourable to the idea of a Mealy national park, as the need did exist to offset the effects of the U.S. Armed Forces withdrawal.

In conclusion, this report "National Park Options in Labrador, Newfoundland" recommended the following:

- The Mealy, Torngat and Nain areas are desirable for National Park purposes. Since the Natural Regions serve as the primary basis for the selection of new National Parks, a proposal for two new Parks, one in each Natural Region would appear reasonable. In Natural Region 21 the selection of Mealy Mountains is supported by many, including Parks Canada. In Natural Region 24, the Torngat and Nain* areas require further deliberations. While the Torngat area may possess greater overall natural values, it also suffers from internal access and severe climatic restriction. Most importantly,

*The reference to the Nain area is believed to mean the Kaumajet and Kiglapait Mountains area to the north of Nain. Yet the map accompanying this report identified an area around Nain which did not include either mountain range. This ambiguity is not cleared up in later correspondence or research because a decision was made at some point in late 1975 to concentrate upon the Torngats. No record of this decision has been found.

however, it would not serve as a park where native people's lifestyles could be featured. The area is not now, nor has it been historically, occupied by human habitation. If the demonstration of native culture in a new northern park is an important consideration, then the Nain area* is regarded as the better choice. Thus depending on the relative value placed on the latter considerations, a proposal could contain the Mealy Mountains and either the Torngat or the Nain area (Ibid., p.).

No record of Rompkey's reply to Nicol is known to the author.

It is worth noting that the reference to no human occupation in the Torngats was inaccurate. While no people have lived there year round for at least forty years, Inuit do continue to visit it each summer to fish and hunt. Further, while the northern park was to consider demonstrating native cultures, no plans were suggested for consultation with local people (despite the earlier reference to the Snowden Commission recommendation, mentioned in Chapter III, for consultation in all phases of park planning).

In September 1975 a joint federal-provincial survey (the team including D. Hustins, H. Stanley, T. Kovacs and R. Pope) of the Goose River, Mealy Mountains and Eagle River areas was undertaken. Following this, Parks Canada staff (T. Kovacs and R. Pope) also visited the Kiglapait, Kaumajet and Torngat Mountains. As a result of this survey, Halcum Stanley, then director of provincial Parks, indicated that the Province was still receptive to the concept of a

Map 4-6

**NATURAL AREAS OF NATIONAL
SIGNIFICANCE IN LABRADOR**
- Identified in 1975-1976

Source: Parks Canada. Natural Areas of National Significance:
Newfoundland. Discussion Draft.
April, 1976.

national park in the Mealy Mountains, or in the more northerly areas of the Kiglapait, Kaumajet and Torngat Mountains.

Consequently, unidentified officials in Parks Canada in November 1975 concluded there was merit for a proposal for two new national parks, one in the Mealys and the other further north in Natural Region 24. A November 1975 paper by T. Kovacs and R. Pope (given the same title of "National Park Options in Labrador, Newfoundland" as Nicol's brief of August that year) also noted that Ian Strachan, then the local Liberal Member of the Provincial House of Assembly (MHA) for Eagle River, was very much in favour of a large National Park in the Torngat-Kiglapait-Kaumajet Mountains area.

This report, (Kovacs and Pope. Nov. 1975) did correct somewhat the impression left in the August 1975 report that there was no human occupation in the Torngats. It stated that traditional activities might also be carried out in the Torngat Mountains, but not to a significant extent (Ibid., p. 3). The conclusions reached were basically the same as those in the August report. The only new recommendation was that conditions appeared favourable to pursue national park opportunities in Labrador, and Parks Canada should now initiate negotiations with the province toward new park establishment (Ibid., p. 5).

4.6 1976 NATIONAL PARK FEASIBILITY STUDIES

Thus the stage had been prepared to negotiate two national parks in Labrador, one in the Mealy Mountains and the other in one of two locations in northern Labrador.

The next step taken in the new national park identification, planning and establishment process therefore was the exchange of formal correspondence between Canada and Newfoundland, between the minister responsible for Parks Canada and the minister responsible for Provincial Parks. This took place in January and February, 1976.

On January 26, 1976 Judd Buchanan as federal Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, wrote to the Honourable T.V. (Tom) Hickey, provincial Minister of Tourism. He referred to discussions held between J.I. Nicol and P. Thomson of Parks Canada and F. Manuel, Deputy Minister, Provincial Tourism "... concerning our mutual interests in the possible development of National Parks in Labrador" (Ibid., p. 1).

The letter continued:

Reconnaissance studies carried out in Labrador by Parks Canada over the past few years and more recently by members of a joint Federal-Provincial Task Force, indicate that several areas, most notably the Mealy Mountains and Torngat Mountains, are worthy of National Park status. These areas were selected because they contain excellent representation of the natural and cultural features characteristic of the East Coast Boreal Region and Northern Labrador Mountains Region, two natural regions which are not yet represented in Canada's National Park System.

National Parks in these areas will preserve landscapes of outstanding natural beauty. They will also preserve new and lasting economic opportunities for the native people and other residents of Labrador because of the need to develop guiding, outfitting and accommodation services. If a highway linkage with the road system of Eastern Canada and the United States becomes a reality, the economic impact of a National Park in the Goose Bay region would be even more significant.

We are very interested in undertaking a more intensive joint Federal-Provincial field study of the subject areas this summer to develop more specific park proposals, as a prelude to commencing discussions on new park establishment. Funds and staff will be available to carry out the study and we would be very pleased to arrange with your staff a time that would be mutually convenient to undertake this work. I am encouraged by the interest shown by your Department in developing National Parks in Labrador and look forward to hearing from you.

The reply from Hickey was fast in coming. The February 9, 1976 reply said:

You can be assured of our continued interest in this area and we look forward to more intensive joint Federal-Provincial field studies to be carried out this summer to develop more specific park proposals.

The letter then concluded:

I look forward to further discussions with you after these preliminary studies have been completed (Ibid.)

At about this time, the federal M.P. for Labrador, W. Rompkey, made a public announcement, (the source, content exact time and format is unknown to this author), concerning national parks in Labrador. This prompted a letter on 17 February 1976 from Stuart Luttich, Regional Biologist for Labrador, with provincial Tourism, supporting the concept of

a park, but recommending an area at least four times larger than the Torngats in northern Labrador. His substantiations for his recommendations were based upon natural values. Luttich's 'ideal' for a park included all of Labrador north of the south rim of the Fraser Canyon. His 'less than ideal' alternative was for a park extending from the North River of Okak Bay to the mouth of Noodleook Fiord. His main point was

... to establish a park of sufficient size and diverse features to protect the fragile ecology and to attract a viable tourist industry, and yet not act as a detriment to the people on whose land the park is built. In northern Labrador, a park could include much of the land north of the Fraser River, if the native people who traditionally used the land were allowed to retain their hunting and fishing rights within the park. To create a park that includes and protects only a small proportion of the potential would be both uneconomical and ecologically unfortunate.

(Letter from S. Luttich, Goose Bay, Labrador to W. Rompkey, M.P., dated 17 February 1976. p. 4).

This letter helps to identify some elements which were to become important in subsequent stages of the efforts to establish national parks in Labrador. The areas selected were a compromise between the ideals for natural resource protection and competing uses. These were a compromise between natural theme representation and traditional uses on the one hand, and on the other the realities of competing alternative uses and emerging political issues. These political issues related to (1) political representation and

an effective regional voice in resource use decisions (2) native land claims, and (3) the willingness of Parks Canada to review its policies on human uses of the natural resources within national parks. The subsequent work in Labrador in 1976 and 1977 was to demonstrate that establishing national parks had to be a process of merging the economic, social, political and cultural realities of that region with the ideals of natural region representation.

National parks are created within a time frame which reflects political realities. The decisions as to timing, area, park objectives and management guidelines are always likely to remain political decisions. This subject is examined more closely in Chapter VI. Given the forewarning of the low direct economic return from a national park in the region of Labrador, the decision to allocate land to such a use may be, in essence, a matter of identifying the political trade-offs between the two senior levels of government.

While the choice of a national park site in Region 24 had been based on natural representation criteria, the choice of the Mealys in Region 21 had been made in part because of economic factors. The timing of Parks Canada plans for the Mealys was therefore tied in part to the coordination efforts of the Goose Bay Project Group, a federal-provincial-municipal body formed in 1973. When this Project Group submitted its final report to both senior

levels of government in March of 1976, one of its recommendations was that a National Park be established in the Mealy Mountains. This recommendation added further support to the proposals and at a time when such support could prove invaluable.

In a comment upon the Goose Bay Project Group recommendation, J. Carruthers, Chief of Planning, National Parks Branch, in May 1976 wrote that one of the issues to be addressed was to be the impact that a national park would have on the people in the area, particularly in the Goose Bay/Happy Valley area. (J. Carruthers. Correspondence. May 6, 1976).

In early July 1976 S. Kun, Director, National Parks Branch; and P. Thompson, Director, Atlantic Region, Parks Canada and H. Stanley, the Director, Newfoundland Provincial Parks, were taken on a helicopter reconnaissance of the Mealy Mountains by R. Pope, a Parks Canada planner. The plan was to visit the Torngats also but this was cancelled because of bad weather north of Nain. The purpose of the field reconnaissance was to allow the three senior officials to meet and discuss their impressions of the two areas which had been selected. This visit to Labrador also included visits to a number of communities. This visit to the communities is described in Chapter V.

Within a week of the senior officials' field trip, a party of three Parks Canada planners (R. Bill, R. Pope and A. Boutilier) and one provincial Tourism planner (D. Hustins)

Map 47

undertook a helicopter survey of the Mealy Mountains and Torngat Mountains areas for two weeks between 20 July and 4 August 1976. For the purpose of this field work the areas of study (Maps 4.7 and 4.8) were extended beyond the option areas suggested in 1975. The extension was proposed by Bill to ensure that any proposed area of interest include as wide a variety of the representative natural themes as possible. (The 1976 summer work is summarized in Parks Canada.

"Preliminary National Park Considerations For Labrador: A basis for discussion". November 1976).

The Mealy Mountains Study Area

The Mealy Mountains Study Area (Map 4.7) included the lower portion of the Kenamu River watershed, all of the Eagle River watershed and all of the lands between the Eagle River watershed and Hamilton Inlet. In addition the study area also included some of the "estuarine" and marine areas in Hamilton Inlet, Groswater, Trunmore and Sandwich Bays.

It should be noted that the Eagle River was included because it had been identified in 1972 as a candidate wild river.

The study area was extensive in order to be as ecologically integral as possible and to consider the values of three large and one smaller International Biological Program (I.B.P.) areas which lay within it. The IBP sites (as they are commonly called) had been identified in the 1970s as areas worthy of protection.

The Mealy Mountains study area was selected because it was considered to be the most representative in the Natural Region 21. It contained boreal forest, coastal and mountain tundra ecosystems; distinct natural components (marine, lake, estuarine, island, coastal plain, wild river, plateau, mountain, forest and bog); rugged topography vividly displaying the geomorphic history of the region, including both its glacial and post-glacial periods; the highest mountains in Region 21 (approximately 3,700 feet); a small resident caribou herd and all the dominant mammalian and avian species of the region; and the general region of the (as yet unlocated) grave of a Viking killed circa 1,000 AD (Ibid., p. 6). In addition it included the highly productive salmon runs of the Eagle and North Rivers (Ibid., p. 6).

As a result of the 1976 field work in the study area and research undertaken in both Ottawa and St. John's, it was proposed that any national park in Labrador should be extensive in area in order to be representative, to ensure long-term environmental protection, and to provide for a variety of uses (Ibid., p. 6). From the recreational point of view it was suggested that opportunities could be provided for extensive wilderness experiences throughout the area (Ibid., p. 6). It was separately noted that the area offered the opportunity of protecting the Eagle River, one of the fine wild rivers and sports fishing rivers in North America (Ibid., p. 7).

As a result of the 1976 summer work three national park area-of-interest options were proposed within the Mealys study area (Map 4.7). They were proposed as three of many alternatives which could be considered, and which took into account park values, resource activity, environmental integrity and future use factors. But it was clearly recognized that further consultation with the province was necessary.

Consequently the options were

... a starting point for Provincial - Federal negotiations and further discussions with the local people leading toward establishing a National Park in the Goose Bay region" (Ibid., p. 15).

Among the resource activities which were noted were the activities of local people: hunting, fishing, trapping, wood cutting, and summer cottaging. No permanent dwellings were found or known to be in the areas of interest. Except for a small area of freehold property at the entrance to Carter Basin on Lake Melville, all of the area of interest was believed to be Crown land. It was, however, clear to the study team that local people had active interests in the study area. The physical evidence included tilts, fishing camps, vacation cabins and saw mills.

The third and smallest of the three options (Map 4.7) was selected as the area of interest within which a national park was to be considered. This decision was made in a telephone call (unrecorded as to date and conversation) between S. Kun, Director, National Parks Branch and

Map 4.8

H. Stanley, Assistant Deputy Minister, Provincial Department of Tourism during the winter of 1976/77. The rationale remains unrecorded. Apart from overflights when visiting nearby communities, this was the last time that Parks Canada and Provincial Parks staff were to visit the Mealy Mountains area of interest.

The Torngat Mountains Study Area

The Torngat Mountains Study Area (Map 4.8) selected for field study in 1976 included all of the land area within Labrador north of Saglek Fiord and south of Ryans Bay. In addition, it included the marine areas some distance out from the coast as well as within the fiords and bays along the coast. The delineation criterion for the study area was to have as short a terrestrial line as possible from the sea to the Quebec-Labrador border and along that border. This permitted inclusion of most of the major Torngat Mountains complex within Labrador from the Four Peaks massif in the north to Saglek Fiord in the south. The Torngat Mountains Study Area was selected because it was considered to provide an excellent representation of the natural values in the Northern Labrador Mountains region. The area contained the highest (some 5,400 feet) and most rugged mountains in eastern mainland Canada. The range had been eroded by glacial and periglacial activity which continues to the present day. There are relatively common glaciers or glacierette and glacial and periglacial landforms. Other

outstanding features of the area were an excellent fiord coastline and seascape, both continuous and discontinuous permafrost zones, a lichen tundra ecosystem with tree outliers, vegetation patterns changing with latitude (and, to a lesser extent, with altitude), considerable variations in geology, including some of the oldest (3.7 billion years) undisturbed rock formations known, numerous bird species, marine and terrestrial mammals, and insular arctic char. The study area contained part of the migratory route, the calving and the summer range of the large Labrador-Ungava caribou herd. In addition, the area contains considerable archaeological evidence of human activity, including much lying on the tundra surface (Ibid p. 24). At the present time, and for some years, there has been no permanent settlement in the study area (Ibid p. 24). Except for an approximately two square mile fee simple mining property near Ramah Bay, all the land within the study area remains Provincial Crown land (Ibid p. 31). However, the Inuit continue to visit the study area, largely by boat from Nain, to hunt, fish and trap each summer (Ibid., p. 31).

As a result of the 1976 summer field work in Labrador and research in both St. John's and Ottawa, only one area was proposed as the area of interest for a national park and this was the Torngat Mountains study area. No parts were added or deleted.

The Torngat Mountains area-of-interest has been visited by Parks Canada and the Provincial Tourism staff only once

since 1976. In September 1977, on a day of exceptionally warm and clear weather, the team of officials (visiting Labrador communities to discuss the concept of national parks) were able to fly (joined by Jim Lyall of the Labrador Inuit Association) as far north as Nachvak Fiord and land on Ramah Bay. All the team were greatly impressed by the scale, grandeur and beauty of the Torngats in their all-too brief two-hour visit.

No further field work was undertaken in Labrador because of strong local concerns expressed at public meetings in 1977 and at the (separate) annual general meetings of Labrador Inuit Association and the Nasapi-Montagnais Innu Association in February and March of 1979. The details of these concerns and of the federal and provincial reactions are explained in later chapters.

4.7 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As a result of field work and other research undertaken between 1970 and 1976 the natural regions 21 and 24 were extensively studied. The areas which were selected as having the potential to become national parks were the Mealy Mountains and Torngat Mountains in Regions 21 and 24 respectively.

The areas were selected with only limited information despite the amount of effort. They were selected for their natural representation values. But the selection process did not take into account either the social or the economic

impacts. The social impacts might have been anticipated if research had been undertaken into the recent history of Labrador.

The history of Labrador, as described in Chapter III, had led "quite predictably, under a provincial patronage government that looked to Labrador as no more than an ice-box of resources, ..." (Zimmerly. 1975. p. 315) to a political situation in the nineteen seventies which was not suitable to introduce development proposals which appeared to have little value to Labradorians.

The history of Labrador and the current mood among Labradorians in 1976 was not likely to favour national parks unless they were introduced with sensitivity for local feelings and opinions. The selection process had not carefully considered how the concept of national parks could be introduced to Labradorians; this was because the idea of public participation in new park selection and establishment was still novel in Canada.

While the role of public participation is the subject of the next chapter (Chapter V), this is an appropriate point at which to introduce it and the associated role of politics.

Once the areas of interest had been selected and as boundary studies were underway in 1976, the national park establishment process moved to the impact analysis stage. This stage would require a political response and a political agreement, if it was to be successful. Given the

unpleasant experience which Parks Canada was undergoing on the Island of Newfoundland with local people in and around Gros Morne National Park, Parks Canada officials were not willing to create another national park which would involve local unrest. For this reason and because a national park proposal required provincial support, the second half of the process moved into the realm of both public participation and politics; these are the subjects of the next two chapters.

CHAPTER V

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: THE LABRADOR EXPERIMENT FOR PARKS
CANADA

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The work to establish national parks occurred during a period in Canada in which there was a surge of interest in, and pressure for, public participation in the planning process. This participation occurred in the late nineteen sixties and through the seventies at all levels in Canada - municipal, provincial, regional and national. Like many aspects of Canadian culture, the idea of public participation arrived late in Labrador. It arrived in Labrador at about the same time in 1976 that the federal and provincial governments were reaching agreement to undertake some form of feasibility study for national parks in the Mealy and Torngat Mountains. Prior to 1976 Labradorians were often aware of development proposals mooted for their region but they appeared to have little input into the approval and implementation process. From that time forward they were able to voice their opinions through such organisations as the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, and they began to realize they were able to influence the outcome of development proposals and the development of priorities for Labrador.

It is with this background that this chapter concentrates upon reviewing the interaction between Parks Canada and the province and the people of Labrador concerning national parks. The interaction can be divided into the following phases: 1. The growing public awareness of national park exploration activities between 1973 and 1976; 2. Initial public announcements and public reactions in 1976; 3. Parks Canada's systematic attempts to plan and activate a public involvement process in 1976 and 1977; 4. Open public discussions and involvement in 1977 and 1978; 5. The cooperative planning proposal in 1978 and 1979; and, 6. the grounding of the cooperative planning proposal and further discussions of national parks in Labrador upon the shoals of politics.

An analysis of the political aspects and problems, including the vying for roles, credits and leadership, although an integral part of the process, is sufficiently important to be treated separately in the next chapter. The author recognizes the impossibility of divorcing completely the public participation process from political process but feels the two should be considered separately, in order to emphasize each process.

Parks Canada was undergoing a period of painful criticism during the park expansion period of the early and mid-1970s. This occurred in many areas of the Atlantic Provinces and Quebec because of the manner in which local ownership, rights, traditions, privileges and cultures were

perceived to be usurped. The usurpation was proving to be particularly unpleasant in eastern Canada because of the long and strong ties local people had to their lands and way of life, the few alternatives to which they were able to turn, and what was felt to be the poor compensation offered for the loss of these ties.

New parks being established at Kouchibouguac, Forillon, and Gros Morne involved the loss of ties for local people and the establishment of a notorious reputation for Parks Canada (not entirely fairly) which spread through Atlantic Canada to Labrador. The park proposals for Ship Harbour in Nova Scotia and for East Point, P.E.I. were scuttled partially by this notoriety.

The fourteen reasons for the rejection of the Ship Harbour park proposal have been listed by N. Munro in an unpublished paper (N. Munro, 14 Reasons, undated).^{*} The reasons were to be of relevance to the Labrador proposal; indirectly because of the notoriety already mentioned, and directly because many of them were similar to what was to occur in Labrador.

As a result of the extensive and sometimes intensive nature of local public hostility across Canada, Parks Canada began in the mid 1970s to recruit people with varying degrees of experience in public participation and involvement. Because this particular profession was new on the Canadian scene, people with relevant experience were

^{*} Included as Appendix VIII.

difficult to recruit. Parks Canada was to be particularly fortunate in its Atlantic Region in hiring Mary Gillis as the Region's public participation coordinator. It was the efforts of Mary Gillis, together with the strong support she had from Pat Thompson, her Regional Director, and other regional staff, which changed the approach of public involvement in discussions about fundamental issues in the idea of national parks in Labrador. The results of the Labrador experience were incorporated into Parks Canada Policy as it evolved.

5.2 GROWING PUBLIC AWARENESS OF NATIONAL PARKS PROPOSALS BETWEEN 1973 AND 1976

Up to 1976 the intent (but with apparently little positive action) seems to have been for Parks Canada to inform rather than involve the public in the planning process for national parks in Labrador. In practice, in the early stage, it appears that only elected federal and provincial representatives were kept informed.

Although there was to be no formal public announcement of national park explorations and proposals until May, 1976, there can be little doubt that people in Labrador were aware, by rumour and observation, of the existence of Parks Canada's activities in each of the areas of historic parks, wild river surveys and national parks between 1970 and 1975. Labradorians were not able to participate in these activities however.

The questionable advantage of no local involvement to Parks Canada was that the initial process could remain purely one of considering the natural themes as the basic criteria for these national parks within the national systems plan. The disadvantage was that the areas were identified by outsiders using criteria which were not tested with local people. The opportunity for discussing local values and identifying areas of importance to Labradorians was omitted from this first stage. This was a loss for both local people and Parks Canada and the province for several reasons. First, local peoples' values, objectives and priorities were not considered; areas of natural heritage value to Labradorians were not considered.* Second, local people were not given an opportunity to participate in, and learn about, planning as a management tool in the general sense, nor to understand the specific process of planning for these national parks proposals. Third, the spectre, and the rumour, of large government "land grabs" for parks spread efficiently and effectively, thus moving local people and Parks Canada and the provincial government toward adversarial positions. This adversarial situation slowed the process by raising local interest that quickly changed from concern to suspicion, and later to hostility and obstruction.

---

* For example, in 1971 Chesley Lethbridge had suggested a national park for the Porcupine Strand area, and, in 1972, the Happy Valley Branch of the Royal Canadian Legion suggested another for the Traverspine River area. No response to either suggestion was found.

The questionable advantage of this experience with Parks Canada was that it provided local people with the opportunity to be hostile and critical rather than at least supportive of, if not actually committed to the process of involvement. The experience also reinforced the perception by Labradorians that the same approach taken by all previous developments in Labrador would be taken by Parks Canada: - that the public was to be informed eventually of decisions taken on their behalf concerning their region, without their involvement. Thus this impression was neither unusual nor unexpected to Labradorians.

But the process underway in Labrador was changed by a number of other events in the mid 1970s. These events, which were described in the previous chapter, include declining wage employment opportunities in Labrador during the early 1970s, criticism of Parks Canada's approach to local people and their interests in other parts of Canada by the media, politicians and the general public, the growing recognition of a strong regional identity among Labradorians themselves, and the creation of strong representative groups.

These groups were opposed to the exploitation of Labrador's resources without consultation with Labradorians. Overall there was real and widespread antagonism towards provincial government, and the lack of provincial programs for Labrador. Other events in Labrador in the mid 1970s

included the rise of the native claims process (supported financially by the federal government).

Publicity about the idea of a national park was generated by the "Goose Bay project group" which was set up in March 1973

... to investigate the economic and social impact on the area of the withdrawal of the U.S.A.F. from Goose Bay, to report on future prospects and to recommend a specific plan of action." (Letter from Don Jamieson as Minister of Regional Economic Expansion to Jean Chrétien as Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs. April 18, 1973. p. 1)

At about the same time, William Rompkey, the Liberal M.P. for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador, began to publicly support the development of a national park, (mentioned in a letter from E.M. Anderson to S. Kun on 19 March, 1973). He wrote to Jean Chrétien, then minister of Indian and Northern Affairs on May 9th, 1973, to support efforts to provide economic stability to the Goose Bay area and to ask what approaches were being made to establish a national park in Labrador, what types of national parks there were and what type was envisaged for Labrador. Chrétien, in reply on May 17, 1973, explained that six sites had been identified in 1970 and three were within fifty miles of Goose Bay. Chrétien said that no further work was being done or contemplated until the proposed agreement to establish the Gros Morne National Park was completed. However, he explained that:

... provincial authorities were receptive to the idea of a Labrador National Park. Indeed, as soon as agreement is reached on the establishment of the proposed Gros Morne National Park, I am prepared to authorize further park studies in Labrador as part of a concerted federal/provincial effort in the Goose Bay area. (Letter from Chrétien to Rompkey, May 17, 1973).

By June 1973 Chrétien had received letters of concern from the Native Association of Newfoundland and Labrador and the National Indian Brotherhood. These letters referred to news reports about national park studies underway in Labrador. Jean Chrétien acknowledged that they were underway, and went on to say that

... should the results of these studies suggest the possibility of one or more National Parks in Labrador, I can assure you that the interests of the native people will be fully considered in the process. (Letter from Jean Chrétien to Jerry Wetzel, Native Association of Newfoundland-Labrador, dated September 1973).

By July, 1975, Rompkey, prompted by concern over the loss of Goose Bay employment, again made statements about national parks in Labrador. Both of the St. John's daily newspapers, the Evening Telegram of July 5, and the Daily News of July 4, 1975 reported Rompkey as talking of surveys having been done of a number of possible locations, and a team from national parks being in Labrador again that summer for further field work. He suggested that several hundred jobs would be created during the period (of 4-5 years) when the park is being established and that there could be about 100 permanent jobs. Goose Bay could not survive on a national park alone, but many Labradorians with background

in the woods and in the water would be ideally suited to many of the jobs in the park. Rompkey felt that the park would open up the interior of Labrador to tourists, and preserve a large tract of wilderness area. Rompkey expressed the view that there would have to be "consultation with the native association, the Inuit association and other interested groups in the development of a proposal for the establishment of a park." (Daily News, 4 July, 1975).

Because the system of distributing "outside" newspapers in Labrador was very poor between 1969 and 1979 it is unlikely that more than a few people in Labrador would have read either newspaper report. However, the radio (and television) communication systems would normally have picked up this story and broadcast it to those communities with local radio stations, repeater stations or short-wave northern program reception. The author has found no written record of these radio broadcasts. In Labrador much news is passed by word of mouth (including by radio-telephone or telephone between communities), and is not written down. Given this system of communication it was possible for news to become changed as it was being passed from person to person, so that by the time the tenth person, for example, heard the message it could have become embellished or otherwise changed and the original nuances lost.

It is against this background of concern, suspicion and speculation, which Parks Canada and provincial Tourism had unwittingly helped to engender, that these agencies proposed

a public participation element to the national park planning process. Labrador was a region where the old planning process was to be changed, as a result of experiences that Parks Canada (and to a lesser extent, the provincial government) had undergone in eastern Canada.

By 1976 the principle of public participation had been accepted in unwritten national parks policy. It mirrored, in part, public distrust of government. Freedom of information was being sought in order to facilitate national public involvement. Clearer guidelines for the public and certainly for the government staff appeared increasingly necessary. (D. O'Gorman, in Nelson. 1978. p. 758). The role of public participation in planning for new national parks was not set out in any formal manner, however, until the 1979 Parks Canada Policy, at about the time the work on Labrador national parks was suspended.

Prior to 1979 Parks Canada's policy and attitude toward public involvement moved through stages of ignorance of such an idea, avoidance, formal hearings, experiment and a gradual merging of the experience gathered on a case by case basis.

It is the author's opinion that in the initial stages in Labrador (prior to 1976) there was a reluctance to develop a dialogue for fear of losing control of the new park establishment process. Even in the later stages (post 1975) the lack of experience in public participation among Parks Canada officials was reflected in the lack of direction and continuity of information flow.

The new policy thus both reflected the Labrador experience and tried to anticipate the trends in demand for a continuation of local life styles in new park areas.

5.3 INITIAL PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC REACTIONS IN 1976

As mentioned earlier, both Parks Canada and the provincial government had been severely criticized in the early and mid 1970s because of their seemingly insensitive approach and attitude towards local people and their lifestyles in the Gros Morne National Park. This experience became known to the people of Labrador. This notoriety persuaded both governments to consider a specific role for public involvement in any further planning for new national parks in the province. Given this experience it is somewhat suprising that public participation in Labrador was not initiated before 1976. It was initiated at that time because Parks Canada officials were not prepared to go further in Labrador without holding local discussions early in any concept planning.

The first official public statement about the possibility of creating national parks in Labrador was made by provincial Tourism minister Tom Hickey* on 5 May, 1976 in the provincial House of Assembly in St. John's. (No similar statement was made by I.A.N.D. Minister the Honourable Warren Allmand).

* A province's commitment, it will be recalled from Chapter II, is essential if a national park is to be established in that province.

LABRADOR MAY GET 2 NATIONAL PARKS

St. Johns (CP) Federal and provincial parks personnel will study two areas in Labrador this summer with the aim of deciding whether national parks could be established there, Tourism Minister Tom Hickey told the Newfoundland legislature Wednesday.

Mr. Hickey said Parks Canada, the federal agency, had already taken a preliminary look at the Torngat Mountain area of northern Labrador and the Mealey Mountains near Goose Bay in the south.

He said the provincial parks division and Parks Canada would join forces this summer to further examine both areas.

"I wish to emphasize that before any final decision is made by government on land areas to be set aside for national parks, there will be full and complete consultation and involvement with residents of communities in Labrador that could in any way be affected by the establishment of such parks", Mr. Hickey said.

The Western Star, Corner Brook,
Newfoundland Thursday, May 6, 1976.

Given that the statement was made in St. John's and there was likely to have been little or no prior warning given to Labradorians, despite the political unrest in that region, it is not too surprising to find that reaction from within Labrador was not too positive to the idea. Even the local provincial government supervisor of lands, G. Roth needed to write to Parks Canada on June 10, 1976 to ask for basic information about the proposals. Neither Parks Canada nor provincial Tourism had made any plans to immediately initiate local discussions; these did not start until mid July, two months later.

Outside Labrador, however, active planning was underway to have two separate teams of federal and provincial officials visit Labrador, one to look over the areas and hold preliminary discussions with local people, and the other to undertake further extensive air and land surveys of the two areas.

Before these trips could get underway in July and August a meeting was held in Ottawa on June 3, 1976 at the request of B. Flowers, Field Worker with Labrador Resources Advisory Council (L.R.A.C.)*. At that meeting Flowers summarized concerns expressed at a local meeting of the Lake Melville members of the Council in May.

Local people felt left out of the process involved in creating a Park when they felt that they should have been consulted. Local people did not understand why a park was being considered for the Mealy Mountains, what type of park, and what impact a park would have on local residents and their traditional land uses (hunting, fishing, and trapping). The people of Mud Lake thought that definite boundaries had already been set. Flowers felt that it was very difficult to compensate, for example, a trapper whose

* The L.R.A.C. had formed only a few months before. The function of the L.R.A.C. is described briefly in Chapter III. The national parks proposal appears to have been, together with uranium mining in the Makkovik area, one of the first two issues the L.R.A.C. had to consider from an agency outside of Labrador. As such, it was teething ground for this Council which represented all of Labrador's 28 communities.

family had used a specific area for 150 years. (A. Welland. Notes of the Ad Hoc Meeting between Parks Canada and L.R.A.C.. June 3, 1976. pp. 1-2)*.

The Parks Canada staff who met with Flowers explained, that no park proposal had been made and no boundaries identified. Native people could carry on their traditional pursuits within a new park, within the principles of conservation, but for personal subsistence use only, not commercial. Traditional land uses by non-native residents would have to be discussed with the intent being to phase out such cases. Where traditional land uses were to be disallowed, people would be compensated. The park boundaries would take into consideration current residents' commercial land uses. Socio-economic considerations would be included in any park proposal. It was in both the federal and provincial governments' interest to cause a minimum of disruption on existing activities (Ibid.).

As a result of this and later meetings the L.R.A.C. became accepted as the major regional agency which helped to facilitate consultation about national parks between both the senior levels of government and Labradorians between 1976 and 1979.

*These concerns were to continue to be expressed from 1976 through to 1979, and were not to be allayed by Parks Canada's late attempts to provide information and assurances that both governments were at an early stage of considering the idea of national parks in Labrador; it seemed to be the local impression that governments were not to be trusted.

The need for early local consultation emerged as the main thrust of the meeting,* and Flowers suggested that Parks Canada officials should try to meet with L.R.A.C. members in the summer (of 1976) (Ibid. p. 2). While that meeting with L.R.A.C. members did not take place, Parks Canada and provincial Tourism senior officials did visit Nain, Cartwright, Northwest River and Happy Valley - Goose Bay from the 12th to the 16th of July 1976 where they met with various representatives of those communities.

This June 3 meeting with Flowers was particularly important in that it was the first with a Labradorian. It certainly contributed to subsequent relations between Parks Canada and Labrador Representatives. It is this author's opinion that Flowers, while trying to remain objective in his role as Field Worker (and later as Executive Director) of the L.R.A.C., was not sympathetic to the concept and need for national parks in Labrador.

Parks Canada had long been aware of the native peoples interests in settling their land claims in Labrador. However, it was only when both governments undertook joint studies and made public their national park intentions that Parks Canada took the formal step (in June 1976) of requesting the Office of Native Claims to spell out the implications of native land claims on prospective park proposals in Labrador.

* It would appear that the planning for public involvement did not get underway until August, 1976.

The provincial government did not recognize native land claims* in 1976 and so they were not prepared to discuss the subject at any public meeting called to talk about national parks. But they were aware of the attitude of Warren Allmand, the new minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, and that of the federal government, which included funding research by native peoples to substantiate their claims.

With hindsight it may well be asked was it appropriate in 1976 to pursue the proposal, given this scenario in Labrador. Parks Canada was pushing to create national parks in Labrador to attain its goal of a system of national parks throughout Canada, native people were concerned about (if not actually opposing) national parks and how they might affect their land claims, other Labradorians were concerned about what they might lose, and the province was refusing to recognize native land claims. The decision made at that time was to go ahead, to risk funds, staff and credibility in the hope of being successful.

The national park proposal was an experiment and a testing of the political winds at the local, regional,

* On August 30, 1976, Penate Antuan, the President of the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association, (an organisation which represents the interests of Labrador's Indians) wrote to Premier Frank Moores "... formally requesting that his government impose a freeze on any further industrial developments, ..., the creation of Provincial Parks, ... or any other activities such as constitute a clear illicit alienation of the as yet unextinguished Indian title to the territory of Labrador". (Evening Telegram Sept. 25, 1976). Moores did not do so.

provincial and national levels. Once the decision was made to pursue the proposal, both governments started a process which was to have some effect upon subsequent resource use proposals and other proposals for change in Labrador. From 1976 onward, local people were, more and more frequently, involved in planning at the beginning of each proposal for change in Labrador.

After a pre-trip exchange of views in Ottawa on July 6, 1976 between provincial Tourism minister Hickey, Tourism deputy minister Frank Manuel, provincial parks director Hal Stanley and national parks director Steve Kun (S. Kun. July 7, 1976), a field trip to Labrador got underway on July 12. The government representatives on the field trip (referred to on p.123) to look at the Mealy and Torngats areas were Stanley, representing the provincial government, Kun, national parks director, Park Canada Atlantic regional director Pat Thomson and a national parks planner, Dick Pope. Between July 13 and 16, the field trip took the representatives to Happy Valley - Goose Bay, the Mealy Mountains area of interest, Cartwright and Nain. They also tried to reach the Torngats but were turned back by bad weather.

Many of the people the government people met on that trip were to have major roles in subsequent meetings, discussions and positions taken by Labradorians about national parks.

These people included Joe Goudie, M.H.A., Gery Roth, the provincial government supervisor of Crown lands in Labrador, David Lough, Executive Director of the L.R.A.C., Bart Jack, then chief spokesman for the N.M.I.A. (Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association), Sam and Marion Broomfield from Mud Lake, Bill Edmunds, President of the L.I.A. (Labrador Inuit Association), Desmond Brice-Bennet, the L.I.A. Executive Director, Geoff Lester, the lawyer for the L.I.A. and Tom Goodwin, the mayor of Nain. However, it was agreed at the time and noted by Angus MacIntyre later:

... the participants did not represent a broad cross-section of the local people and a commitment was made to return in the Fall and continue the process. (MacIntyre. 1977. p. 5).

Each meeting started with government officials explaining the systems approach and rationale for national parks, the difference between national and provincial parks, and the economic benefits of national parks. In Nain a comparison was made between a potential Torngat Mountains national park and the Auyuittuq national park reserve on Baffin Island.

The local concerns which were voiced were similar to those expressed by Bill Flowers on June 3, 1976. These included consideration of hunting, fishing and trapping rights, and the exclusion of Mud Lake from any park. The local people wanted to have a joint federal/provincial public participation program, a slide program showing both the Mealy and the Torngat areas of interest, incorporation of traditional use patterns in any planning, and discussion

of boundary options before a formal proposal. It was felt by the local group that the major economic benefits would accrue to "big business rather than the little guy", but also that a national park in the Mealy Mountains could ensure the continuation of traditional land uses in the vicinity. It was perceived that park land could be preserved and protected from exploitation and serve as a "reservoir" for animals that could then be hunted or trapped outside the park boundaries. It was made clear to the visitors that local people made use of all the lands and waters in both areas of interest. (R. Pope. Correspondence. August 8, 1976, p. 2).

With respect to the Torngats, the two concerns raised by the local representatives in Nain were about native land claims and traditional rights, and economic benefits which might go to Fort Chimo and Port Nouveaux-Quebec because they were closer (Ibid. p. 3).

At Cartwright, on July 14, in addition to the points made in Happy Valley, Stanley also explained the role of the province in new park studies and said that the local council would be able to review the proposal if there were any significant land use conflicts (ibid pp. 2-3).

Kun said the planning team would meet with local people in Nain that summer and obtain information regarding land use, and he hoped another meeting would be possible with senior government officials in September or October.

While these meetings were taking place Rompkey, M.P. for Labrador, and I. Strachan, M.H.A. for the northern Labrador coast, made what appear to have been separate press statements in support of national parks. (Rompkey summarized what the federal and provincial officials were saying (Daily News. 15 July, 1976)). The local newspaper in Nain published by the Labrador Inuit Association (L.I.A.) gave its perspective of the hurried half hour meeting held in Nain by the government officials. The main points mentioned were that:

1. These senior officials know that it is essential to meet with the community in September for a proper meeting.
2. The proposed park in the Torngats is only in the very early planning stages and we do not need to fear that final decisions are already made.
3. The Government knows that they are going to have to make an agreement with the people about hunting, trapping and fishing.
4. The people who are looking at the area right now..." (the team of planners) "... who are not policy makers like the people we had a meeting with, will come to Nain after they have visited the Torngats, to tell the people what they are doing.

(Kinatuinamot Illengajuk. July 21, 1976).

By 24 July, the St. John's Evening Telegram had an editorial commenting on the proposal. It supported the Mealys but felt that the Torngats were too remote to justify a park there. Rather "... there are other areas of Labrador that could be just as suitable for one of the main purposes of national parks, i.e. a place for recreation". Little did that writer realize how much pressure was building from

exploration activities in the area, the nearby offshore oil and gas drilling efforts, and the potentially conflicting traditional land claims to the same area.

As though in response to this editorial, on July 29 F. Manuel was reported in the Evening Telegram as saying that while the planning team in Labrador was gathering information, this was "... preliminary work and at this time there has been no decision on where a national park should be located in Labrador". (Evening Telegram. July 29, 1976). The question of whether one or two parks were being considered was significant at that time because the joint team of planners was in the field (their work is referred to in Chapter IV, Section 4.6) looking at a potential site in each of two natural regions, potentially for two national parks. This seems to indicate that the provincial government was not yet clear in its objectives OR that it wanted to keep its options open.

The question of whether one or two sites were being considered was explored by the Evening Telegram, which attempted to put the story straight on August 16, 1976, by quoting tourism minister Hickey and Indian and northern affairs minister J. Buchanan as agreeing that both areas would probably be developed as parks.

The work of the planning team in the Torngats and Mealy's over a three week period in July and August has been described in Chapter IV (Section 4.6). After the field work in the Torngats, and on their way south to work in the

Mealys, the team stopped overnight in Nain. While there they did not attempt to organize any open meeting with local residents but they did talk to some members and staff of the L.I.A. as well as with I. Strachan, M.H.A.. The team explained, in general terms, what they had done and where they had been. The representatives of the L.I.A. showed the team the extent of the L.I.A. land use research on behalf of the Inuit and northern settlers. This land use clearly extended north beyond the Torngats.

Apart from that contact, the planning team did not attempt to organize or participate in any open meetings during their three week stay in Labrador. Whenever asked, however, the team members did explain their work to individuals in the communities they visited (Hopedale, Makkovik, Northwest River, Cartwright and Happy Valley - Goose Bay). As stated before, at the end of Chapter IV, this was to be the last systematic field trip into the study areas. Henceforth the work of both governments was to move largely into the realm of public discussion, discussions between Parks Canada and provincial Tourism, and politics.

With hindsight, it was over-optimistic for senior government officials to have suggested that they would try to return to Labrador to continue the talks that autumn. This conclusion is based upon the lack of progress in the work upon the proposal to that date, the hesitant and slow commitment of the province to public participation and the lack of specific planning for such participation. It

appears also to have been optimism on the part of Rompkey to have suggested that work on the parks themselves might start as early as the summer of 1977. (Evening Telegram, August 16, 1976).

After the planning team returned to Ottawa, Halifax and St. John's, the Parks Canada members put together a comprehensive summary of the national parks proposals for Labrador. At the same time, an audio-visual slide show was put together between September and October to support the park proposal document.* Both the report and the audio-visual show were being prepared so that provincial Tourism minister Hickey could take the proposal for two national parks in Labrador to the provincial cabinet for their endorsement. The public, however, was not being kept well informed, despite Hickey's statement on May 6, 1976 (quoted on p. 145 of this chapter).

The first public indication of what was "going on behind the scenes" occurred when provincial Tourism deputy minister Manuel was quoted in the Evening Telegram on September 24, 1976 as saying that provincial and federal

---

* In addition, in the fall of 1976 Parks Canada had four related projects initiated on the Labrador parks proposals. An economic survey of the anticipated levels of visitation and employment impact by the Socio-Economic Research Division of Parks Canada, an ecological survey of the two areas of interest by the Lands Directorate of Environment Canada, a bibliography of the two areas of interest by the Natural Resources Division of the National Parks Branch, and an analysis of the age of certain PreCambrian rock formations in the Torngats. Also R. Pope and this author continued to assemble information about existing and potential resource uses by Labradorians and others, and about the Labradorians themselves.

governments planned to make a joint announcement within a month, that the federal-provincial teams were wrapping up boundary studies, and that Parks Canada soon would be making a proposal to the province.

Manuel's announcement was made at the time when a debate was occurring "behind the scenes" between Parks Canada and provincial tourism officials as to what approach should be used to move forward on this project. The choices included the old process whereby a park proposal was formally submitted to the province after which consultation would take place with the local people. The alternative proposed was to include the local people in the planning process before submission of a proposal to the provincial government. The province preferred the former, and wanted a clearer understanding of the national park proposals before making any commitment of support (no formal proposal had yet been made by Parks Canada). Provincial concerns were as follows: Were there one or two parks being proposed, what were their size, their potential access points and methods, the likely expenditures, how many jobs would be created, and an indication of the time perceived in their implementation? The province was under great pressure to present economic (and social) development proposals to offset the closure of the U.S.A.P. facilities in Goose Bay and the closure of the wood-cutting operation around Happy Valley - Goose Bay by Labrador Linerboard during the summer of 1976.

It would appear that a compromise was reached: a formal proposal was to be made in writing by Parks Canada's minister as soon as possible (this was delivered on November 22, 1976) for provincial endorsement and a form of public involvement was to begin as soon as possible. A public involvement facilitator was to be hired* on contract to go to Labrador (Angus McIntyre was hired at the beginning of October and he went to Labrador in November, 1976).

It had been Parks Canada's intention to return to Labrador as soon as possible following the July visit by the officials, but the opportunity to do so with provincial officials had been postponed, first from September until October, and then November. In the end the next time that Parks Canada officials went back to Labrador was in August 1977. It was largely at the request of the province that these postponements were made. The support of the province in starting a feasibility study was essential, and that was not quickly forthcoming.

Given this background, it is considered appropriate to separate the description and analysis of what were essentially initial public announcements and initial local meetings in Labrador from the more systematic and planned approaches to public involvement.

There is an unavoidable overlap in time between these two phases as described in this thesis because neither Parks

---

* The province did retain the right to approve of the person who was to be hired and did not give that approval until November 8, 1976.

Canada nor provincial Tourism undertook to plan for the public reaction to the announcements in May, to plan for public involvement before August, and to reach agreement as to when and how this involvement was to be implemented. Thus this section concludes chronologically with the St. John's meeting of September 24, 1976 at which federal provincial agreement was reached to begin the next public involvement phase. This next phase, examined in the next section, actually began in mid August, prior to the September meeting in St. John's.

5.4 PARKS CANADA'S SYSTEMATIC ATTEMPTS TO PLAN AND ACTIVATE A PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS IN 1976 AND 1977

This section describes and analyses, the period of work in planning and activating a public involvement process which began in the middle of August 1976 and lasted until late August 1977. It was a period of discovery - how to communicate best with Labradorians, and then persuasion of both Parks Canada and the provincial government officials, and the elected representatives, of the utility of this approach.

Once the proposal to undertake a national park feasibility study and to involve the public was made (made public on May 5, 1976) the process became complex. A number of parallel but related activities were started by Parks Canada and provincial Tourism. These included: better definition of the areas of interest, determining their

natural values, the competing interests, the ways of involving the local people and other agencies in the feasibility study, and securing formal support for the study.

Three particularly crucial and central issues had to be considered together. These were the traditional uses and claims in the areas of interest by natives and other Labradorians, obtaining and maintaining political commitment at both the federal and provincial levels, and preparing and undertaking a public involvement process.

Because traditional land claims were an issue to be settled outside the discussion about national parks, despite the impact it had upon the process, it is not given equal status with the other two central issues in this paper. But it is appropriate to review the status quo on land claims.

The positions taken by the parties involved in discussions were set relatively early. The province refused to recognize that any particular group of people had a special claim to any part of that province - all were equal. The local people were divided on the issue. Many local people supported the Naskapi, Montagnais and Inuit claims but felt that the settlers also had some special claim. Other local people felt that no special rights should be recognized. Parks Canada recognized traditional fishing, hunting and trapping could be permitted by native people in northern park reserves but was reluctant (in 1976) to decide who was 'native' in Labrador for fear of offending the

province, or setting a precedent which could be introduced elsewhere in Canada. A compromise of considering a national park 'reserve' status, subject to the settlement of land claims in Labrador was discussed between government officials as early as September, 1976; it was never rejected explicitly by provincial officials.

It was in mid-August, 1976, Mary Gillis, the public participator coordinator for Parks Canada's Atlantic Region appears to have become involved first in the planning process. Her report of September 8, which has been attached as Appendix II, summarizes her perception of the work of public involvement to that date, the problems, her suggestions and the objectives for a public involvement facilitator in Labrador.

In summary Gillis recommended that both Parks Canada and provincial Tourism agree to undertake a public involvement process and that a person experienced in public involvement be sent into Labrador. This would enable Parks Canada to lay a solid foundation for its discussion on parks, and to set up meetings, so that the local involvement process could get off to a satisfactory start for all parties concerned. Although there appears to have been no written approval, this was the process accepted in principal by both government agencies on September 24, 1976, and put into operation in November.

However, the planning for such public involvement took place in an environment in which Labradorians were already concerned and asking more and more questions and searching for the answers. For example, on September 14, 1976 D. Brice-Bennett and G. Lester of the L.I.A. met with Parks Canada officials and staff in Ottawa to discuss Labrador Inuit land claims and their relationship to new park studies. The L.I.A. preferred not to see any park* created until their outstanding claims were settled and they felt that it was to be at least 18 months before any land claim could be ready. Part of that claim being considered was the resettlement of a northern community such as Hebron or Okak, and the creation of a park in the Torngats could affect such a move back north. The L.I.A. felt that putting a person into Labrador to work with the local people for at least six months was very valuable, provided the process was compatible with the intent of land claims; otherwise this presence could lead to confusion or confrontation.

At the Sept. 14 meeting Kun said that Parks Canada was prepared to recommend to the province that a clause recognizing the land claim issue be written into a Memorandum of Intent to create Parks, which might be signed sometime in 1977. The L.I.A. saw this rush to create national parks as being politically expedient for the province, so as to disregard Inuit claims. Lester expressed

---

* It should be also noted that the L.I.A. had interests in the Mealy's as well as in the Torngats.

the view that park creation was to be seen as inconsistent with their land claim at that time. (A. Welland. Correspondence. Sept. 14, 1976).

Another example of concerns among Labradorians was a meeting held in Mud Lake on October 2.

The meeting resulted in a unanimous decision to file a declaration outlining the communities stand with MHA Joe Goudie for presentation to The House of Assembly. It has been made clear by Parks Canada that Park developments cannot go ahead without Public input from persons and communities which might be affected. The Mud Lake residents and others will get an opportunity to make their views known at public meetings to be held by Parks Canada early next month (The Labradorian. Happy Valley-Goose Bay October 7, 1976.

The Mud Lake community felt it might have to move if the nearby Mealys area were to become a park. Residents felt that they could already be in the park because Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro did not install a new diesel electric power generator in the community that September (Evening Telegram. St. John's. October 15, 1976. p. 4).

The story was recounted by Angus MacIntyre:

A generator for Mud Lake was on route ... when it grounded on a sand bar. The boat captain wouldn't listen to a local resident sent along to assist. The barge had to be hauled to Goose and Parks Canada got the credit for the community not getting its generator. (MacIntyre. 1977. p. 10).

This was purely coincidental, but the incident did reflect a lack of local contact with either government at that time and illustrates a confusion that can arise from lack of communication. The issue of the park was to simmer for several months in Mud Lake and then erupt again in the new year.

Although it had been agreed by both Parks Canada and provincial Tourism on September 24, 1976 to send a public involvement facilitator to Labrador (the terms of reference having been drawn up on August 25, and Angus MacIntyre had accepted the contract October 12) his departure for Labrador was delayed until early November when he was accepted by the province. By that time, unfortunately, local feelings in the Lake Melville communities had started to harden against the idea of a national park.

In the meantime, during October, MacIntyre visited Ottawa to be briefed on Parks Canada's activities, particularly in Labrador. While there as a contractor, he made a number of suggestions for change in the approach then being planned by Parks Canada. These suggestions were not all accepted.

MacIntyre was finally able to meet with provincial Tourism minister Hickey on 8 November and to leave for Labrador the same week.

The importance of MacIntyre's work was not confined to his report and its recommendations for Parks Canada and provincial Tourism. Rather, it started before he visited Labrador, when he managed to meet with tourism minister Hickey and to persuade him of the utility of public involvement. This appears to have influenced the approach of the provincial government towards Labradorians at the time when there was considerable regional discontent towards

St. John's as the seat of provincial power (both political and economic)*.

He spent only two weeks in Labrador, but as a result of that relatively short stay, which was hampered by bad weather, he wrote a report (A. MacIntyre. Labrador Report. 1977)** in which he succinctly summarized a background to the Labrador parks proposal, his terms of reference and his field trip, his observations (both insights and concerns), his recommendations and acknowledgements, and a suggested reading list.

He recommended a particular public participation approach with which Labradorians would be comfortable and which would provide them with information to enable them to participate in the studies which were necessary before any firm decisions involving the park were made (Ibid. p. 15). While MacIntyre's recommendations are attached as Appendix III to this paper, a synopsis of them follows.

The report, in summary, explained how MacIntyre was confined to the west Lake Melville communities of Mud Lake, Northwest River and Happy Valley - Goose Bay by bad weather conditions, and how he sought out individuals who came from the coast or who had relatives or who had worked there. He

* This discontent and its historical basis is aptly summarized by William A. Fowler. (William A. Fowler. The Growth of Political Conscience in Labrador. Christmas 1976).

**The report was not released for distribution until 1977 because of delays in approval by the province.

was able to talk with people from some twenty communities by this means and by using the telephone.

He reported upon the strong ties that Labradorians have for their region:

... their identification with the land and sea must be treated with absolute dignity. Whether or not people actually depend on these for their livelihood to the extent they once did is not important. They identify strongly with it and expect those feelings to be treated with respect, especially by "outsiders". (MacIntyre. 1977. p. 9).

In my opinion, people in Labrador are not against progress or development. They are not anxious to return to a subsistence life style ... and being largely controlled by others. They want to maintain some of the conveniences of modern life but not at any cost. They want to maintain some of their basic values with a sense of pride and dignity in their history and traditions. They want a mixed economy which will take these values into consideration so they can always remain Labradorian "with everything it implies". (Ibid. p. 9).

MacIntyre felt in his opinion that:

... it is entirely possible for provincial and federal representatives to arrive at a "consensus" with the people of Labrador concerning the decision as to whether or not a National Park or Parks should be established there. The manner in which this decision gets made has serious implications for any future government involvement in Labrador. If the process is a good one it can go a long way towards building trust and some meaningful communication links between Labradorians and their fellow Canadians. If they think the experience is going to be a negative one it will help to increase the mistrust and add to the communication gap that now exists. (Ibid. p. 13).

MacIntyre concluded:

I am convinced that all the communities in Labrador are willing to carry on open, honest discussion on all aspects of National Parks in the belief that it will either confirm their

suspensions that the decisions have already been made, or, for the first time in their experience, establish some meaningful dialogue before decisions are made. At this point in time there seems to be a willingness to trust a process of public participation. I hope for the sake of government/people relations this trust will not be misplaced. The people of Labrador are quickly running out of patience. (Ibid. p. 13).

MacIntyre's recommendations were concerned with the practical but essential elements of public participation:

1. the meetings promised the previous July which had not yet taken place should be held between January 1 and April 15, 1977;* they should be open and informal in nature for all to participate; they should be organised by local communities and their record only become official when agreed by all to be correct); translation was to be provided in Inuit and Indian communities.
2. Information was to be in brochure form listing question and answers in laymans language and to be sent out a month before meetings. In addition a mass media program should disseminate the same information.*
3. Liaison should include employing an Indian in the Indian communities* and the possibility of using a "Labradorian" to carry on a process of public involvement.*

---

* Those parts of MacIntyre's recommendation which were not acted upon have been marked by an (*); this was in part because some of the recommended steps were not reached, or because they were overtaken by other events (i.e. by the cooperative planning project proposal in 1979, which is described later in this chapter).

4. Ongoing studies' terms of reference should be checked with local people,* (they may already have the information required), and wherever appropriate locals should be involved in the work itself. Some consideration should be given to providing the necessary resources for local people to seek an independent opinion in cases of disagreement over the findings of park planners.*

5. Exchange visits should be considered with people in other areas who have been affected by national park establishment* "(both pro and con)" (Ibid. p. 16). This especially interested the Indian people.

Government representatives should go too, for the first-hand experience.*

6. His report should be circulated to all he had met "... as part of a commitment to ongoing meaningful dialogue based on trust and open communication in both directions". (Ibid. p. 17).

During MacIntyre's time in Labrador he appears to have had a considerable impact, by his approach, upon everyone he contacted or met. Whenever subsequent discussion took place in Labrador about national parks MacIntyre's name and approach were favourably discussed. His work and that of

---

* Those parts of MacIntyre's recommendation which were not acted upon have been marked by an (*); this was in part because some of the recommended steps were not reached, or because they were overtaken by other events (i.e. by the cooperative planning project proposal in 1979, which is described later in this chapter).

Mary Gillis appear to have particularly influenced the relationship between Labradorians and proposals for resource development. This was done by assisting the liaison work undertaken by the Labrador Resources Advisory Council (L.R.A.C.), and by participating in a seminar organised by the L.R.A.C. to evaluate resource development proposals.

As well as preparing the report, MacIntyre also prepared three other documents in December 1976 to help the two governments return to Labrador in the manner he recommended.

While preparing these papers and the report, MacIntyre reported also on his trip to senior Parks Canada and provincial Tourism officials in St. John's on November 22 (at the same meeting when Parks Canada formally presented Hickey with their national parks proposal "Preliminary National Parks Considerations for Labrador**"). He felt that the provision of information (by the governments) could lead to good discussions and an understanding of national parks but it would probably take at least six months before local people would be prepared to evaluate using the land for a national park in comparison to present land use and before they would indicate acceptable conditions to the change, regardless of land ownership. He suggested that someone should be in Labrador before the meetings were held.

Because of the long delay, MacIntyre was not able to return to Labrador immediately (in fact he never did return

---

* See p.125 .

on Parks Canada's behalf). Instead he went to St. John's on 20 January 1977 to meet with Hickey and emphasize how crucial the timing was becoming and to get provincial approval for the release of his report. Although he received permission to send out the report, this was countermanded on January 26, until further notice, pending clarification of the provincial cabinet's discussion that week. The report was finally sent out on February 15, approximately three months after his visit to Labrador, and two months after it was made available to Parks Canada and provincial Tourism.

The report was sent by MacIntyre (in February 1979) to Parks Canada, provincial Tourism, chairpersons of Labrador community councils on the coast and along Lake Melville, to many Labradorian organisations as well as to the provincial and federal elected representatives and the media. MacIntyre's perception of the need to widely circulate his report reflected his considerable talent and his sensitivity to the cultural, social and political environment in which he had become involved.

The response to MacIntyre's report in Labrador was generally very positive. It appears that his way of determining the approach to discussing a resource-use issue in Labrador was new to Labradorians. It certainly set a precedent which was to have an impact upon other resource use issues. The response in Parks Canada was very positive but, as previously noted, the recommendations were not all

acted upon, nor within the recommended time frames. The reaction in the provincial government is not a public record but it was discussed by the provincial Cabinet during the winter of 1976-77.

During this period, because of the lack of public information, and the traditional expectations of non-involvement by Labradorians in resource development proposals, rumours and suspicion began to circulate about what was thought to be happening behind the scenes.

Sixty eight residents in the community of Mud Lake (with a population of about 180) brought their frustrations into the open and took the political route to resolve their concerns. Two petitions were circulated, one by the adults and another by the school students. The adult petition, signed by 53, stated:

The following residents and property owners of Mud Lake, in the District of Naskaupi, hereby declare that they are united in opposing any national park development in this area. We have used and respected the land without need of boundaries for generations, and we will not support any development plans which threaten the traditional use of this land.

15 students signed the following:

We, the students of Mud Lake Elementary, heard that you might place a park here in Mud Lake. We protest strongly against having a park here. We don't mind as much if you just put it in the Mealy Mountains; as long as it doesn't interfere with us and our living, homes and hunting.

Both petitions were submitted to their M.H.A.,

Joe Goudie on February 18, 1977. It should not be forgotten that Goudie was also the Executive Assistant to Premier Moores.

On February 23, Goudie presented 'a' Mud Lake petition (which one is unclear) in the House of Assembly and it was supported there by Strachan who said "there is no issue in Labrador that gets so close to the people as the land and hunting rights. The people must have their traditional rights protected." (St. John's News, 24 February 1977). The timing of this petition was such that it motivated some action and response from the provincial government, but not much.

In reply Hickey told the House that concern in Mud Lake was "a bit premature" (Ibid) and that there was a long way to go before any decision to pass over one inch of land. "We have taken the position that the people should have input" (Ibid). This was to be the last press mention about national parks until Hickey made a statement in the House of Assembly on June 2, 1977.

The parks proposal was seen to be an important issue by Parks Canada and one which should be considered by Allmand in preparations for his planned March visit to Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Northwest River (Shishashit) and Hopedale.* The Naskapi-Montagnais and the Labrador Inuit had both written to Allmand requesting that national parks not be established until land claims were settled in the Fall of 1976. They were likely to raise the matter when they met with him in Shishashit and Hopedale respectively,

* Allmand did not get to Hopedale for the L.I.A. annual meeting because of bad weather.

In preparation for his trip to Labrador in March 1977, Allmand was strongly advised that local discussions be allowed to continue in Labrador, even if these only announced the post-ponement of further work on national parks until the status of special rights are settled for the Inuit and Indians, and until the provincial Cabinet has come to some conclusion.

During his visit to Northwest River on March 4 Allmand said that any discussions about national parks were at a preliminary stage and that no firm plans had been made. He made it clear to the Indians that he would consult with them and that "... no new parks would be established before land claims were settled". (D. Tobin. Memo to file. Re: Minister's meeting with Indians of Northwest River. 14 March 1977, p. 2). This last phrase was to be used in discussions henceforth with both the Inuit and the Indians, and with the provincial government and other local people in Labrador.

Both Allmand's words and MacIntyre's work became quickly integrated into the Parks Canada plan to discuss the national parks proposals with Labradorians. But the opportunity for Parks Canada or provincial Tourism officials to return to the region was repeatedly delayed.

Provincial cabinet approval for the proposals had to be sought and, despite the optimism expressed at the November 1976 meeting, this approval was not given until well into 1977.

It gradually became clear to this author that the reasons for the apparent inability of the provincial Cabinet to reach any consensus were as follows: 1. the national parks issue was forcing them to make decisions about native claims which might prove to be inappropriate in the long run, 2. they were unhappy with the history of the Gros Morne national park establishment process, 3. there were strong opponents to the idea of the transfer of provincial resources, 4. there was not enough information about what resources existed in the two areas of interest, and 5. local people were not sure what a park might mean to them and their lifestyles.

Unfortunately, this information was not being imparted to Labradorians, therefore they were left in the dark. This was acknowledged by Allmand in a letter on March 30 replying to T. Alex Hickman, provincial Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (who had sent a copy of the Mud Lake petitions to Allmand) in which he said that he was aware of local concerns after his visit to Labrador that month.

This delay in going back to these communities is causing concern, and the lack of information among the local people has, I believe, contributed to the formulation of these petitions.

I am anxious that we set up and maintain continued contact with, and involvement of these people who could in any way be affected by the establishment of such Parks.

I look forward to hearing from the Provincial Government that it is interested in pursuing further the concept of National Parks in Labrador, and in undertaking a joint consultation process with the Labrador residents."

Despite pressure for a decision from Allmand and, apparently in turn, from Hickey himself, the provincial Cabinet continued to deliberate upon the subject. They appear to have discussed it each month between December and April. It is unclear whether or not they were aware of the difficulties facing those who would return to Labrador to reintroduce the idea of national parks. The involvement of local people and the efforts of Parks Canada and provincial Tourism to maintain even informal contact with Labradorians appeared to be of minor concern until all interested provincial government agencies were given time to review the proposal. The provincial Cabinet had apparently forgotten it had originally approved early public involvement, in the fall of 1976, when it had also requested a formal national park proposal from Parks Canada. The provincial Cabinet had given this approval but were apparently unaware of the consequences should involvement not be maintained.

Another reason for the pressure to return to Labrador during the winter had been because that was the time when many people were neither fishing nor trapping. MacIntyre had clearly specified that the preferred time was between January 1 and April 15, 1977. This timeframe was not met.

However, work continued to progress behind the scenes through the first half of 1977 in preparation for the eventual public meetings. Good rapport was building between MacIntyre, Parks Canada staff members Bill, Gillis and L.R.A.C. chairman D. Lough, and a two-way indication of what

was happening in Labrador and in Parks Canada was being maintained.

The slide show, although criticized strongly by Gillis and MacIntyre as being inappropriate for a Labrador audience, was translated into Innuttitut. Several attempts were being made to have it translated into Naskapi-Montagnais (without success, because of pressure brought by the N.M.I.A. upon potential translators). The information brochure originally created by MacIntyre was undergoing regular review and revisions, yet it still had not been approved by the province by June 1, 1977. A press clipping service had been contracted to cover the Labrador scene.*

The bibliography of Labrador under preparation since the fall of 1976 was distributed to provincial and federal agencies, to elected representatives, and to Labrador schools and community libraries in April, 1977.

During this period neither of the two native associations, the N.M.I.A. nor the L.I.A., were remaining quiet upon the issue of national parks, nor was Parks Canada forgetting their concerns. Although the N.M.I.A. and the L.I.A. had separately written to Allmand in November 1976, the replies to each did not go out until June 1977. In the replies Allmand repeated what he had said in Northwest River in March 1977: that he had the final say in this matter,

* These press clippings about Labrador were maintained from 1976 until 1982. They are available in the National Parks Documentation Centre in Hull.

3

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

and if he got a clear message from the people of Labrador that they did not want national parks in Labrador then, there would not be any established there. But he expressed hope that officials from both governments would be given a chance to explain before the associations come to any firm conclusions.

Both native associations wanted to continue to be party to any discussions. But the L.I.A. appeared to be more pragmatic; apparently they were better served by their non-native advisors and they had a much better understanding of the Canadian political process than the N.M.I.A.. The N.M.I.A. represented a people who had been greatly disrupted in their lifestyle by contact with other Canadians, and who appeared to this author to be in need of much better help than they were then receiving from government and other agencies; above all they seemed to lack purpose.

It was not until June 2, 1977 that official word came of the provincial position concerning national parks. That day, Hickey made a statement to the House of Assembly (this statement is attached as Appendix III). In summary both Parks Canada and provincial Tourism were to continue with public involvement and to show particular interest in the impact of any park upon traditional lifestyles. Community discussions were to get underway during the summer months. Parks Canada had been asked to provide a definite plan for each area by the end of 1977 with details as to "... type and level of proposed development and economic impact to be

expected, etc." (T.V. Hickey. Ministerial Statement. June 2, 1977). Each provincial department was to be asked to assess the impact of national parks which would help determine their net benefit in Labrador. Only when these were completed would the provincial government "... have adequate information upon which to make a final decision" (Ibid).

As of this June 2 statement, the provincial Cabinet had committed itself finally to reactivate the public involvement process. The statement unfortunately reflected some basic ignorance of Labrador: summer is not a time to hold meetings; most adults on the coast are busy, often most families are away from their communities in summer fishing camps, and they do not have time for meetings. The statement also appeared to reflect a misunderstanding of the proposed public involvement process which Parks Canada had explained to Hickey in September 1976. That process was to discuss the concept of parks with local people and learn how Labradorians felt about and used their region (and the two areas of interest in particular), then in cooperation to discuss what sorts of park developments might prove compatible to Parks Canada, the provincial government and local people. Parks Canada officials had not been asked, in advance of the Hickey statement, to provide a definite development plan by December 31.* Had they been advised, it

---

* Although they were given warning that Hickey was to make an announcement. The formal letter from Hickey to Allmand was not sent until 24 June and did not arrive until 21 July.

is likely that they would have pointed out the impossibility of meeting such a deadline (less than seven months away) while following the proposed public participation process.

The L.I.A. had apparently heard in advance that Hickey was about to make an announcement and on June 1, the day before, they issued a cautious statement on behalf of the L.I.A., the Elders of Nain and the Community Council of Nain. This summary said they had little information upon which to arrive at a wise decision. At that time they were neither for nor against a park.* They felt there might be value in a national park if hunting, trapping and fishing rights were protected and local people were involved in its planning and continuing management. Neither government should make any decision without real local participation. When the M.H.A. for the Eagle River constituency, Ian Strachan, was interviewed by the St. John's Evening Telegram on June 3, he felt that Hickey's statement was very similar to the feelings of Labradorians. This was the only recorded reaction in the press to Hickey's announcement.

Bill, as the planner responsible for these proposals, in following the suggestion laid out by MacIntyre, visited Happy Valley-Goose Bay on June 8 and 9 to seek local advice on the best approach and timing to reintroduce the concept to Labradorians. The general consensus within the L.R.A.C.

* This open approach of the L.I.A. was also reflected in the L.I.A. paper entitled "A National Park For Labrador" which was presented at the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, Barrow, Alaska on 13 June, 1977.

and others who were consulted was that any meeting should be postponed until September, that the draft information brochure should be distributed in the three languages. (500 Inuit, 300 Naskapi and 1000 English copies), and that close contact should be maintained between Parks Canada, Labrador officials and community representatives at least until the September meetings. The L.R.A.C. offered to distribute the brochure, and to arrange the meetings in communities.

By mid June Parks Canada and provincial Tourism were considering early July meetings in the Lake Melville communities and coastal community meetings in September. But the impossibility of having the brochure printed in three languages and distribution completed at least a month prior to any meetings precluded early July. Further, the Executive Director for the L.R.A.C., David Lough felt that the coast would feel left out if Parks Canada and provincial Tourism were not to go there until two months later.

On June 23, ten of the Labrador participants from a seminar held in Ottawa by the L.R.A.C. to determine what federal activities were underway or planned in Labrador, met with Parks Canada officials. They agreed that late September was the best time for meetings in the communities; July was, at best, marginal. (Two other unconnected groups of government officials were going to be touring the coast in October and there would be some conflict with the time Labradorians might be able to devote to these meetings).

Other communities in Labrador and northern Quebec would be visited at some later (but unspecified) time.

In mid July Bill and Gillis visited Happy Valley-Goose Bay and Northwest River to maintain the close contact mentioned before and, at Northwest River, met with Anthony Jenkinson, an advisor to the N.M.I.A., while trying again to have the information brochure translated into Naskapi-Montagnais. As a direct result of this contact Allmand received a letter from Tony Penashue of the N.M.I.A. In substance the letter stated that the N.M.I.A. could not consider the idea of a Mealy Mountains national park until land claims were settled and the Montagnais (note not Naskapi-Montagnais) rights to hunt, fish, trap or live in the area were protected.

The problem of communication with the Indian people on the south side of Northwest River (Shishashit) seemed to the author to be due to a number of causes. These included difficulties of language translation and communication between English and Montagnais, the apparently informal method of government within the N.M.I.A., a communication gap between the N.M.I.A. and the village (band) council, a feeling this author had that whatever correspondence reached the community was not always circulated among the leaders of the community, the advice provided by non-native advisor Anthony Jenkinson and, lastly but perhaps most importantly, the lack of understanding between the Indian and non-Indian cultures.

By the end of July it was clear that the information brochure (Parks Canada et. al. "Will There Be National Parks in Labrador?? Your Opinions will help decide" June-1977) would be ready, but only just, to be sent out ahead of the meetings to be held in the communities.

In order to accommodate those Naskapi-Montagnais in Shishashat who would be going into the back country in mid-September, and because the other west Lake Melville communities were not as closely tied to the seasonal lifestyle still found on the coast, the meetings were set for late August in Mud Lake, Northwest River and Shishashit. The other communities were to be visited in late September.

Over a year after the last visit, government officials were definitely going back to Labrador to talk to local people. The initial optimism, delays, lack of communication had affected all involved in the process of public involvement. It was going to prove very difficult to establish credibility after this series of misadventures in federal-provincial and government-public relations.

5.5 OPEN PUBLIC DISCUSSIONS AND INVOLVEMENT IN 1977 AND 1978

The planning efforts, both in public and behind the scenes in 1976 and 1977 to involve Labradorians in discussions about possible national parks came to fruition (albeit limited) in August and September of 1977. Meetings were held in thirteen communities along the coast and on

Lake Melville. For the first time, Parks Canada and provincial Tourism officials were able to hear first hand how local people felt about their lifestyles, their Labrador, and their concerns about externally-imposed change and threats of change.

The plans for the open meetings were prepared by Mary Gillis after consultation with the Province and the L.R.A.C. (particularly D. Lough). These plans followed a similar pattern in all the communities. Each was, wherever possible, to be chaired by a person from the community. A record of the proceedings was to be taken by Parks Canada (that was done by this author), and hopefully by the community (this was done only in Mud Lake and Shishashit). Translators were to be used in Shishashit, Davis Inlet, Nain and Makkovik.

The purpose of the meetings was to cover the following four steps (Parks Canada and Dept. of Tourism; Newfoundland and Labrador. August-September, 1977. p. 1).

1. to give information about the areas under consideration,
2. to provide information on the procedure to establish national parks,
3. to provide an opportunity for local communities to ask questions, express concerns and give suggestions,
4. to examine ways to continue discussions with local communities, the province, and Parks Canada.

The meetings were organised by Parks Canada and the L.R.A.C. and were all well publicized and attended (with the one exception at Black Tickle where local people had not

expected the meeting to take place until two days later and could not be gathered together at an hour's notice). These meetings, similar to those held the previous year, were intended (by Parks Canada and provincial Tourism) to be the start of a regular contact at the local community level. However, similar to the previous year, there was to be a large time gap before anyone would go back again on behalf of either government agency to continue the dialogue about national parks. In fact these meetings were not repeated, nor did a Parks Canada person return to the coastal communities to continue discussions.

These community visits raised local expectations about a process of real involvement in planning, and they provided the local people with a forum to raise their own priorities for planning and action to alleviate their problems. The visitors, both Parks Canada and provincial, came expecting to introduce the subject of national parks, to leave information, to hear initial reactions and to return the following winter. Instead the visitors found that they were faced with a much larger problem of communication and government action than they had imagined. They left Labrador with their ears ringing from the voiced need to have local priorities addressed before local people would devote much time to considering the systems plan for national parks in Canada and in Labrador in particular.

The meetings in Labrador were held in two time periods. The communities of Mud Lake, Shishashit and Northwest River

were visited on August 29 and 30, 1977 (by boat, road and cable-car). The communities of Davis Inlet, Nain, Postville, Makkovik, Rigolet, Black Tickle, Cartwright and Paradise River were visited (using an Otter aircraft on floats) and Happy Valley-Goose Bay (by ~~road~~) between September 19 and 26, 1977.* These communities are to be found on Map 3.6.

A summary of each meeting and an overall summary were prepared, by Richard Bill and Mary Gillis respectively, for both Parks Canada and provincial Tourism and sent to all known participants and elected representatives.** The most relevant parts of the overall summary by Gillis are attached as Appendix V. In addition to these summaries, Bill listed twenty three points he heard expressed by local people at the meetings in Labrador. This is attached as Appendix VI.

In essence what these two summaries listed were six general categories of local concerns:

1. Information. While recognizing that they needed more information, Labradorians could not understand the need for parks - the whole country was a park to them. They

* In addition to the open meeting, special discussions and presentations of the slide show were held with the students and teachers of the schools in Makkovik and Cartwright.

**Although all who attended the meetings were invited to correct any misrepresentation they felt had occurred in the summaries only Susan Felsberg wrote to criticize the record of the Mud Lake meeting and to enclose a copy of the record kept that night by Mrs. Donna Best. The N.M.I.A. sent a copy of their record of the meeting in Sheshashit

did not need parks set up for rich tourists, and a large influx of tourists was not welcome. Whatever information was gathered should be shared with local people.

2. Process of public participation. Labradorians reiterated that they previously had not been consulted for their views before a project had begun. This new approach did little to change Labradorians deep suspicion of government however because they felt it had failed them. Labradorians wanted to participate in the planning for participation but they felt they needed a lot of time to think over the parks idea. It would help if someone was to go to Labrador and stay awhile.
3. Regional identity. Labradorians were concerned about change; they had strong cultural traditions and identities they wanted to protect, and they wanted to retain the right to continue their 'traditional' activities in any future national park.
4. Local priorities. Before any parks were created, Labradorians wanted to have their basic needs addressed. To the Labradorians national parks were of relatively minor political importance, parks were not seen to be of major political benefit, but did appear to be demanding large areas of Labrador.

5. Land claims. Neither the Inuit nor the Naskapi-Montagnais were prepared to discuss national parks before their land claims were settled.
6. Conservation. Labradorians did recognize the need to protect their lands and waters and wildlife.

The results of these meetings included a much better perception by the government visitors of the people, the land and the lifestyles found in Labrador, and the very real problems which are associated with life there. It seemed clear that someone would have to be based in Labrador to talk about national parks, and to better understand the social, cultural, economic and political environment in which such talks would be conducted. Senior officials of both Parks Canada and provincial Tourism recognized that the approach to further the idea of national parks would have to be re-thought. This rethinking was furthered by a brief submitted to provincial Tourism minister Hickey on September 28, 1977 by the Community Council of Rigolet.*

Labrador parks, if they were to be created at all, appeared to require a change in Parks Canada policy on the subject of local resource harvesting. At most meetings in Labrador local people felt that they should be permitted to continue such activities as fishing, trapping, hunting and cutting wood in the national parks; this preferential treatment, in their very strong view, should not be given only to the Inuit and Indians.

* This brief is attached as Appendix VII.

The extension of this preferential treatment was supported by provincial Tourism representatives who attended these meetings in Labrador. The provincial Tourism representatives also said in the meetings that any decisions to be made to establish national parks would have to (jointly) involve the local people as well as both governments (J. Carruthers. Correspondence. 3 Oct. 1977).

A further point which was reiterated at some of these meetings (but which was not mentioned in the overall summary report) was the statement by IAND minister Allmand that national parks would not be established until land claims were dealt with (See p.174). This position was of concern to the province, as was a possible resolution to the issue: to establish parks which would remain as 'reserves' pending settlement of these land claims. As in the previous year's meeting in Nain, the example of Auyittug was used at these meetings.

A description of the series of meetings would not be completed without a brief comment upon the atmosphere in which they took place. Some meetings were constructive, in the quality of information which flowed between the visitors and local residents; some were disrupted by the anger of some local people, but all were held in an atmosphere of real concern. In the past, local people had not (so the visitors were told by Labradorians in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Nain and Makkovik) been consulted before any kind of development activities got underway. The process of

consultation was thus apparently new. Consequently, people had come to the meeting expecting to hear detailed plans for the new parks, and they were deeply suspicious of the visitors who did not have these plans with them (or who were perceived as not wanting to reveal what these plans were). It was later recognized by Kun that this public participation process it might set a precedent for other development proposals and that this might prove, in the long run, to be of benefit to the relations between Parks Canada and Labradorians. In the short run the process raised both scepticism and hope: scepticism because the process of involvement was new and was about a proposal which might not cause great environmental damage like the Churchill River power development and Makkovik uranium mine proposals, and hope that the government officials might be listening to local concerns.*

The record of these meetings and the overall summary were not, however, mailed out until 16 February 1978. This was due to the time and effort required to have all relevant summaries written as well as the overall summary translated and distributed at the same time in English, French, Innuitut, Naskapi and Montagnais.

---

* The L.R.A.C. published "As If People Mattered - Resource Issues in Labrador" in October 1977. This twelve page pamphlet was to advance the viewpoint of Labradorians on the use of their land and marine resources. The short discussion on national parks is attached as Appendix VII.

A day later, on 17 February 1978, Parks Canada wrote to the Publisher of the Them Days Magazine to sponsor four pages in future issues as a way of showing appreciation to the L.R.A.C. for their assistance in arranging public meetings in Labrador communities in 1977.

In addition to the government officials who visited the coastal Labrador communities in the fall of 1977, the L.R.A.C. had sent along Silas Bird, a young Labradorian student social worker to act as an observer. In 1978 he published a brief paper summarizing his observations of the efforts of both provincial Tourism and Parks Canada to meet with Labradorians the previous September.

Bird listed ways in which he perceived the public involvement process might be improved:

1. tighten-up the proposals to go back to Labrador;
2. provide a concept plan for discussion, so that people will have something to get their teeth into and discuss - the people seem to be happier discussing concrete issues rather than apparently vague and somewhat abstract issues;
3. ask people to discuss what type of park and what sort of uses and facilities and methods of access before asking them to decide whether or not they want a park or parks;
4. consult more with local organisations and provide more information, don't wait for the organisation to confront Parks Canada with either the information or rigid stances;
5. hire someone to work and live in Labrador;
6. look more intensively at the social, economic, and environmental impact of National Parks and alternative uses for these areas;
7. make public the Provincial studies on alternative uses;

8. the Province should respond to the Royal Commission on Labrador and devise a plan (tentative or otherwise) for a series of wilderness areas, game reserves, bird sanctuaries, and provincial parks. These could be viewed as potential alternatives to National Parks;
9. the L.R.A.C. could take more of a coordination and lead role to help Labrador organisations gather their own information about National Parks and their impacts in other places, including setting up their own study 'committee(s)';
10. keep people aware of what is going on by the use of whatever media will get the message across;
11. make sure whatever information is collected is given to the people;
12. the process should proceed at a pace that would allow people to have meaningful input

(S. Bird. 1977. pp. 16-20)

This was the only detailed review by a Labradorian of the series of public meetings and of the public participation process conducted by Parks Canada and provincial Tourism. It was an insightful report and was used in the preparation of subsequent public participation plans by Bill and Gillis.

The only criticisms of the report by this author are that Bird either forgot to mention, or did not understand, that the reasons why no conceptual plans were presented to Labradorians in 1977 were that such plans were anticipated as likely to be misconstrued as concrete and inflexible, with the possible consequence that the public participation process would be perceived as lip service (a veneer) rather than a genuine intent (R. Bill. Correspondence. 7 March 1978. p. 3). In addition Bird appeared to overlook the provincial role in the planning and establishment process

(ibid p. 1). This lack of acknowledgement had been complained about by the province the previous year, and at the meetings in Labrador.

Given that the process of public involvement had begun finally, in August and September 1977, it was important at this point that local discussions be allowed to continue. But, such was the frailty of relations between the two governments, over native rights, the conditions for the establishment of Gros Morne national park on the Island and the work to establish a joint ARC (Agreement for Recreation and Conservation) proposal for the Avalon peninsula, that further public involvement in Labrador came to a standstill during the spring of 1978.

Once again Labradorians had to await for political support for continuation of the process from the provincial Tourism minister, but, unfortunately, no announcement was made - not even of the postponement of further work. It was evident to the author by the spring of 1978 that it was to become a long-term endeavour to establish national parks in Labrador. In the meantime, the credibility of both governments was being adversely influenced by the lack of public information about what was going on behind the scenes.

Although further joint work in public involvement concerning national parks was held up, Parks Canada was able to undertake other work in Labrador in 1977 and 1978 to better maintain the two national historic sites at Hopedale.

and Hebron. Much of the work involved 'stabilizing' (protecting) the structures and exterior of the buildings from further damage. The Hebron Church and Mission House, located just to the south of the Torngats, was particularly important to the people of northern Labrador.* This work was done with the advice of the Elders of Nain.

In addition, Parks Canada in the spring of 1978, started a major effort to identify, protect and interpret the land and underwater archaeological remains of the Basque Whaling efforts centred in Red Bay in southern Labrador. Their protection was not only necessary but timely in demonstrating the responsibility that Parks Canada felt towards Labrador's treasures - both cultural as well as physical - in Labrador.

It is thus evident by this point that Parks Canada's attitude had evolved to the point of being willing to serve the interests of Labradorians, even where those interests were not necessarily fully in accord with its own mandate. The priority for Parks Canada became one of having local concerns addressed and actions taken to alleviate very basic community needs such as adequate housing, water, sewage disposal, communications, health and education. These would permit further discussions with Labradorians about national parks in a more positive and harmonious atmosphere. The

---

* It was the hope of former residents and their children to return one day to reopen the community at Hebron. A national park was discussed among the Labrador Inuit as a possible way to provide an economic base for this return.

problem for Parks Canada became how to translate that concern into action because the action required was beyond its legal mandate. The necessary work requiring thought and planning was how to address Labradorians interests, Parks Canada's objectives and other federal and provincial concerns.

5.6 THE COOPERATIVE PLANNING PROPOSAL IN 1978 AND 1979

Whether or not Parks Canada and provincial Tourism officials liked what they heard in Labrador (during their fall 1977 community visits), they committed themselves to return to continue to talk about the idea of national parks, to work with the people to determine their uses of the lands and waters in the two areas of interest, and to try to lay out the alternative uses which were of some potential (for example, forestry, mining, and provincial parks). They were committed to an ongoing public participation process to achieve at least one objective: allow Labradorians to participate in making a series of educated decisions whether or not national parks should be established in Labrador (R. Bill. Correspondence. Feb. 2, 1978, p. 1).

To allow the process of involvement to be dropped, except for very good reasons that were fully understood by Labradorians, would have had a serious and detrimental effect upon the credibility not only of Parks Canada, but of the entire federal (and provincial) government as well. (Ibid, p. 2).

The recommended process prepared by Gillis and Bill for Parks Canada was to continue in a slow and careful manner with the following tasks:

1. to continue to prepare carefully information about Parks Canada;
2. to maintain properly or upgrade Parks Canada's historic properties in Labrador to indicate its intention of respecting and protecting the human history of the region;
3. maintain contact with Labradorians;
4. fully brief other federal agencies about the successes and failures of Parks Canada's approach and the criticisms of their programs which were made to the visitors to Labrador in the Fall of 1977;
5. stimulate these other federal agencies to respond to Labradorians' requests for assistance;
6. indicate to provincial Tourism: (a) the intended public participation approach(es), and (b) what potential capital investments might be made;*
7. only undertake further field work with the clear involvement or knowledge of Labradorians (Ibid, p. 2).

It should be noted at this juncture that the Inuit and (particularly) the Naskapi-Montagnais in Labrador had continued to express their concern about the implications of national parks for their land claims. They remained unsatisfied with the assurances offered by Parks Canada and the Honourable J. Hugh Faulkner (who replaced Allmand as the minister responsible for Parks Canada) that national parks

* No direct reply had been made by I.A.N.D. minister Faulkner to Hickey's letter of 24 June, 1977 (referred to on p.179) until 23 February 1978, (by which time James Morgan had replaced the latter as Tourism minister) and even then no detail of the level of potential investment was made because their calculation was considered premature.

would not affect these claims. This concern was not overlooked in the plans being prepared to address all the Labradorians requests for assistance. Unfortunately, in the author's view, it appeared that neither the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association nor their advisors, were prepared to risk the possibility of success or failure and to commit themselves to further discussions.

After their fall 1977 visit to local communities the next time senior Parks Canada and provincial Tourism officials reconvened to discuss national park possibilities for Labrador was on April 13, 1978. It was somewhat ironic in view of the slow pace of the proposals, and the lack of public information about the officials' discussions, that neither government agency wanted to rush the matter but both wanted to continue. A slow approach was preferred which would allow the province to evaluate the proposal. From the provincial perspective, the future of the proposal hinged upon what happened elsewhere in the province with respect to Parks Canada, and what was found in mineral potential in the two areas of interest. So a method now had to be developed which would accommodate provincial preferences for time to consider the alternatives, tell the local people what was happening and keep the subject alive so that it could be reactivated at short notice.

There was to be no change in provincial Tourism's opposition to special rights for any particular groups (e.g., natives) nor in the support for the idea of all

people who have used the land being allowed to continue to do so (R. Bill. April 13, 1978. p. 2). The Parks Canada perspective was that they could not afford to keep up the time and effort involved in parks in Labrador without a clearer provincial commitment such as a 'Memorandum of Intent'. This Memorandum could set the stage for discussions as to where and what size these parks might be, and so permit other government agencies to plan accordingly.

As a result of the April 13 meeting Bill, Gillis and G. Roth (by now Chief, Planning and Development for Provincial Parks) were directed to put together a draft strategy. Roth's input helped to set the framework but the details for a draft strategy were largely developed by Gillis and Bill.

The work of Bill and Gillis was aimed at defining the tasks* which they saw as requiring attention. These tasks were gathered under the following five general categories:

- I Inventory of natural resources
- II Assessment of the potential uses of the areas of interest
- III Education of Labradorians about Parks Canada's policy and objectives

---

* The exact tasks which were identified by January 1979 have been included as Appendix IX. Many of these tasks were going to have to be undertaken at some point. This strategy was perceived by Gillis as an opportunity to have them done in a sequential fashion to serve the objectives of all participants.

IV Education of Parks Canada, provincial Tourism and other government agencies about the objectives, hopes and aspirations of Labradorians

V Public participation in the process leading to decisions about national parks in Labrador.

As a result of a further federal-provincial meeting to discuss this strategy in Halifax on May 18, 1978, it was agreed that both Parks Canada and provincial Tourism should fund planning, with continued public participation, in cooperation with other government departments and agencies (Bill, R. May 18, 1978). The plan became known as the Cooperative Planning Project proposal.

What Parks Canada and provincial Tourism were suggesting to their respective ministers was that they involve Labradorians and other appropriate federal and provincial agencies in a cooperative venture to plan for the use and management of the areas of interest to achieve mutual objectives. This was being suggested because (as noted earlier) the objectives and needs of local peoples were broader than the mandate of either Parks Canada or provincial Tourism. Further, this approach was a way of keeping the park proposals alive but spreading the cost of further work over a longer period of time and among all the potential participants according to their abilities and objectives.

It was intended that the tasks which had been identified should be carried out in sequence over a period of six years, between 1978/79 and 1983/84, at an initial estimated cost of \$3½ millions (Parks Canada and Departmental of Tourism. January, 1979). It was planned that a Memorandum of Intent would commit both agencies to undertake the project.

The project was to consist of discussing the proposals with others, inviting their cooperation, and identifying whether or not it was feasible for a federal and a provincial committee to direct or coordinate the work. If a Memorandum was to be signed, an additional step might be to enact legislation giving interim protection to the areas of interest until the 'best uses' for them were identified and implemented (R. Bill. July 26, 1978).

Even though agreement was reached in Halifax on May 18, 1978 (Ibid.) to prepare a cooperative planning proposal, national parks director Kun had lingering doubts as to whether this approach was the wisest way of trying to create national parks, because it was open-ended in both time and costs. For example, was it appropriate for Parks Canada to take the lead and was there a danger that agency might have to finance all the work undertaken by all parties involved? Parks Canada Atlantic Region director P. Thomson saw Parks Canada's role as "catalytic". (R. Bill. Nov. 2, 1978. p. 1), so the way to make the proposal happen was initially to coordinate all involved but not to retain the lead unnecessarily (Ibid. p. 4).

PARTICIPATING LOCAL COMMUNITIES, AGENCIES AND DEPARTMENTS

1. Non-Government
    - People of Labrador (Local Communities)
    - Labrador Inuit Association
    - Labrador Resources Advisory Council
    - Meekopi - Nainiagait Inuit Association
    - Memorial University
  2. Federal Government
    - Employment and Immigration
    - Energy, Mines and Resources
    - Fisheries and Environment
    - Health and Welfare
    - Indian & Northern Affairs
      - Northern Program
      - Office of Native Claims
      - Indian and Inuit Affairs
    - Parks Canada
    - Industry, Trade & Commerce
    - Regional Economic Expansion
    - Transport Canada
  3. Provincial Government
    - Adult Education
    - Consumer Affairs and Environment
    - Executive Council
      - Intergovernmental Affairs
    - Fisheries
    - Forestry and Agriculture
    - Mines and Energy
    - N.M. Development Corp.
    - S.L. Power Commission
    - Rural Development
    - Tourism
- (This list may not be complete)

PROCESS FLOW CHART

PHASE 1 COOPERATIVE PLANNING PROJECT

TABLE 5.1

Source: Bill, R. and Gillis, M. A Proposal to Plan for the Future of the Torngat Mountains and Mealy Mountains. January 1979.

Project Initiators

Mary M. Gillis
Public Participation Coordinator,
Atlantic Region, Parks Canada,
Historic Properties,
Upper Water Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia B1J 1S9
Telephone 902-426-7231

Richard E. Bill,
New Park Proposals - Eastern Canada,
National Parks Branch,
Parks Canada, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0M6
Telephone: 819-996-2945

TABLE 5.2

PROCESS FLOW CHART
PHASE II COOPERATIVE PLANNING PROJECT

Source: Bill, R. and Gillis, M. A Proposal to Plan for the Future of the Torngat Mountains and Mealy Mountains. January 1979

* This list may not be complete

Despite some reluctance among Parks Canada officials the decision was made to go ahead with the Cooperative Planning Project proposal, but to ensure close coordination with agencies such as federal Regional Economic Expansion and provincial Intergovernmental Affairs.

The Cooperative Planning Project was seen as a two step process (Ibid. p. 2). The first stage was to drum-up support, establish mutual objectives and prepare both an organisational framework and terms of reference. The process to achieve this is illustrated in Table 5.1. The second stage was to undertake the project itself. The process to achieve this is illustrated in Table 5.2

While this work was underway Bart Jack was expressing interest publicly in the concept of wilderness parks. His views were noted on C.B.C. radio in Labrador:

A Labrador Indian leader says a Provincial government should declare a large section of Labrador a wilderness area in a move similar to that undertaken ... in the Yukon. Last week ... Faulkner declared a large section of the northern Yukon where development will be prohibited. Chief of the Band Council at Northwest River, Bart Jack said that under his proposal the Labrador wilderness preserve would be open to hunting, but only by Indian, Inuit and Settler subsistence hunters. He says exploration for petroleum and minerals and other development activities should be banned in the preserve area. Enough of the interior has been destroyed already, like Labrador City and Churchill Falls. (C.B.C. News. Goose Bay. July 12, 1978).*

* Such an idea had been firmly opposed by S. Luttich, Regional Biologist for provincial Tourism, in a letter to Faulkner on April 25, 1978. But, a year later, Luttich wrote again to support it.

On July 18, 1978, Faulkner wrote to both the N.M.I.A. and L.I.A. to inform them that the federal government "... had taken the position ..." each of them had "... a claim based on traditional use and occupancy of lands in Labrador ... there is a basis for negotiations with a view of concluding a comprehensive settlement ..." (J.H. Faulkner. Letter to P. Michel, President, Naskapi Montagnais Innu Association. July 8, 1978. p. 1).

The implication of the above for the national parks proposals was that the native people appeared to have legitimate claims to any area they could identify as being of traditional use, including both or either of the Mealy and Torngats. It strengthened their case for resisting any development proposals, including national parks.

To test the idea of the Cooperative Planning Project, Gillis visited Happy Valley-Goose Bay and the Northwest River in late September.* There she informally discussed the idea of a cooperative planning project with citizen groups and non-government organisations including the L.R.A.C. and the N.M.I.A. to find out if they were willing to discuss participation, to explain the purpose of a Memorandum of Intent, and to alert them to the possibility there might be a press release telling about the Memorandum. Gillis reaffirmed:

* There had been some urgency in undertaking this trip because there was a possibility that Faulkner would visit Labrador in November. However, the Faulkner visit was postponed, first until January and did not occur until the end of February 1979.

The people of Labrador want to be involved in deciding the future of their communities. The objectives, the resources to achieve them, the decisions to be made, the methods to be used, and the actions to be taken are complex.

The ethical behaviour of responsible government departments and non-governmental organizations (and industry) is to work with Labradorians in a cooperative integrated planning project which will use human and financial resources effectively and efficiently to provide the guidance for action. (M. Gillis. Report of a Visit to Labrador 27-29 Sept. 1978 and Considerations for Future Action. Oct. 3, 1978. p. 4).

Her visit came a year after the previous visit of both Parks Canada and provincial Tourism officials. When she returned to her office in Halifax she recommended that some appropriate staff be given the authority to carry out the leg-work of finding out if the project was sound, to note any additions or deletions suggested by Labradorians, non-governmental organisations and other government agencies, and to come up with a structural framework to operate the project.*

It took several months more for both agencies to decide on the utility of the approach, but by January both Parks Canada and provincial Tourism were ready to undertake Phase I of the Cooperative Planning Plan proposal. Gillis, Manuel and Bill met in St. John's to present the proposal to senior officials in a number of federal and provincial

---

* To avoid any misunderstanding as to the intent, Gillis strongly recommended also that no undue publicity be given to Faulkner's visit should he plan to sign any park related Memorandum. Gillis felt that such publicity might suggest a park or parks had been created when this was plainly not the case.

agencies. These included federal Regional Economic Expansion, and Fisheries and Environment, and provincial Education, Rural Development, Forestry and Agriculture, Consumer Affairs and Environment, Mines and Energy.

The response was cautiously favourable to the concept as initially presented. No commitment was requested, other than that the proposal be studied. The intent of the team was to return to each agency in late February or early March and begin detailed discussions after every potential and identified participant had been contacted. At the end of January, 1979, once initial support seemed forthcoming from other government agencies, copies of the proposal under covering letters were sent to the L.R.A.C., L.I.A., N.M.I.A. and Memorial University Extension Service in Labrador. The covering letters explained the two step process and requested an opportunity to come to Labrador to present the proposal.

The reasons for the long delays in action between the initial proposal being conceived in April and May 1978 and the initial involvement of other agencies were largely tied to the process of obtaining approval for the project to get underway within Parks Canada and provincial Tourism. In addition, the potential roles of the two ministers were being carefully weighed to avoid giving too high a political profile which might cause concern among Labradorians as to the nature of the project and the decisions being made.

Based upon the initial positive response from other agencies and the need to get a firmer commitment from both Parks Canada and provincial Tourism to work towards determining the feasibility of establishing national parks, the decision was made by both agencies to recommend to their ministers that they sign the Memorandum of Intent. Since Faulkner had been invited to Labrador at the end of February to attend the annual meeting of the L.I.A. and the N.M.I.A., and Labrador was an appropriate place to sign such a memorandum, it was agreed that the provincial Tourism minister, the Honourable James (Jim) Morgan, would meet him in Happy Valley-Goose Bay on February 29th. A copy of the Memorandum is attached as Appendix X.

For reasons which are discussed in Chapter VI the provincial representative who went to Labrador on behalf of the Minister of Tourism was Joe Goudie, the Labradorian in provincial Cabinet.

Faulkner and Goudie did not meet as agreed in Labrador, although they had three opportunities to do so in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Border Beacon and Nain, and they did not sign the Memorandum. The reasons for this are the subject of the next section in this chapter.

5.7 THE GROUNDING OF THE COOPERATIVE PLANNING PROPOSAL AND DISCUSSIONS OF NATIONAL PARKS UPON THE SHOALS OF POLITICS

It has been noted in a number of places in this thesis, particularly in this chapter, that the N.M.I.A. was opposed to, and the L.I.A. was very concerned about, the idea of national parks in Labrador. Neither association wanted parks at all before land claims were settled. Their attitudes had been made clear on a number of occasions in writing to both ministers, and to both the premier and prime minister. They were supported by their respective national associations, the National Indian Brotherhood (N.I.B.) and the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada (I.T.C.).

Parks Canada had discussed the idea of national park 'reserves' at meetings in Labrador and had used the example of Auyuittuq, and Nahanni in the N.W.T. and Kluane in the Yukon. The idea of either sending Labradorians to Auyuittuq, or sending local people from communities near Auyuittuq to Labrador had been greeted with interest by the Inuit people in Labrador.

However, the provincial government remained opposed to special treatment for Inuit or Innu alone. Because of this very real block to any discussions with the provincial government, both the L.I.A. and N.M.I.A. chose to use the political arena to oppose any development in Labrador which threatened their claims for special status.

Given the attitude and statements by Indian Affairs ministers since 1973 with respect to park and land claims, it was easy to foresee that national parks in Labrador would become, eventually, the subject of political pressures by the native peoples. The opportunity for this came when both the L.I.A. and the N.M.I.A. received ~~their~~ copies of the Cooperative Planning Project proposal. Because of the time taken to transport mail in Labrador, it is possible that the L.I.A. did not receive their letter and copy until mid February.

The combination of the apparent lack of fore-warning of the purpose of the Memorandum of Intent for many Labradorians, the failure of the proposal document (at the request of the province) to explicitly address land claims and other native peoples concerns, the occasion of I.A.N.D. minister Faulkner's visit to Labrador, and a misunderstanding of the purpose of the Cooperative Planning Project proposal, was sufficient to arouse strong opposition and public statements from the I.T.C., L.I.A. and N.M.I.A.* The actions were designed to put off any signing of the Memorandum and so to put political pressure upon the province to respond positively to the land claims issue.

The I.T.C., for example, on February 28 issued a press release opposing an agreement which was apparently in conflict with lands claims progress by the Labrador Inuit.

* The N.M.I.A. did not make any immediate statement, that came later in March.

They wanted specific assurance that no decision about the Torngats region would be made before the land claims settlement was reached, that native interests in the land be considered first.

A land claims settlement with Labrador Inuit would meet all requirements of a wilderness park to protect land and wildlife especially from environmental hazards of any development (I.T.C. News Release. February 28, 1979. p. 2).

No record exists of the exact pressures used by either the L.I.A. or the N.M.I.A. to prevent the signing of the Memorandum but in the L.I.A. newspaper Goudie was recorded as saying in Nain on March 1 that "he was not going to sign the letter of intent for the National Parks until Land Claims is (sic) completed". (Kinatuinamot. March 1979. p. 2). Faulkner was recorded as saying (earlier that same day) that

He ... hoped that the Land Claims would be finished in less than five years so that they can go on and discuss National Parks. He also said that he is not going to sign the letter of intent until he knows what our decision will be. He added that negotiations will have to be between the government and the Inuit about Land Claims and National Parks. Land Claims will have to decide who owns; and who is eligible to own the land. (Ibid. p. 3).

Goudie was quoted in the Daily News on 6 March 1979 as feeling it was "a fortunate thing" that the signing to set up such a study was shelved. He said "I didn't know the people were opposed to the study ...". He was also reported as promising the L.I.A. that he would recommend to cabinet rejection of the proposal, and that in future meetings with the premier and cabinet he would express the concerns of the Inuit and Indians.

Pressure was put upon the federal M.P. Bill Rompkey as well. Bill Edmunds sent a telegram to Rompkey on behalf of L.I.A. 1979 Annual General Meeting Assembly:

We would like to reinforce our position on your agreement with the provincial government re. signing of memorandum of intent for proposed national parks in Labrador. We reject this memorandum and we are against discussions and research on the creation of parks being held independent of land claims negotiations. We consider such discussions to be in bad faith and a breach of trust and consequently will jeopardize impending negotiations. We urge you not to sign the memorandum of intent. Delay further consideration of park proposal until land claims negotiations begin.

Rompkey's reply confirmed the political decision that had apparently been made "Understand your position and will make sure minister does too. Confident no memo will be signed.

Shortly after Goudie returned to St. John's early in March 1979, provincial Tourism contacted Parks Canada to request that the proposal be placed in abeyance until provincial Cabinet had it reassessed. That reassessment had not taken place up to the end of 1981.

At this point all that was left for the two government agencies to do was to try to pick up the pieces and to try to reconstruct communication and rapport in Labrador. But other events were to prevent even that.

In March, both a federal election was called, and Moores was replaced by the Honourable A. Brian Peckford as premier in the province. Faulkner was defeated in the general election and left politics. Morgan was replaced by the Honourable Charles Power as Tourism minister. The local elected representatives, Goudie and Strachan (for a short

while longer) remained on the scene. With a new federal Conservative government elected, a new minister (the Honourable John Fraser), and Parks Canada moved to become part of Environment Canada, the Labrador national parks issue was allowed to slip into dormancy.

With the exception of the L.I.A. and the N.M.I.A., few in Labrador were given any information as to the status of either the Cooperative Planning Project or the national park proposals. No official notification was made by Parks Canada to the federal, provincial and other agencies who had been contacted to discuss the cooperative planning project proposal.

It is likely that the subject of national parks will be reopened at some point in the future. The two natural regions remain unrepresented in Canada's system of national parks. Should land claims negotiations begin, it is possible that Parks Canada would ask to participate.

5.8 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Parks Canada started field investigations for national parks in Labrador in 1970. But no attempt was made to inform the people of Labrador directly of these field investigations, nor of any other related research until 1976. However W. Rompkey, M.P. for Labrador, did attempt to keep his constituents informed of the work as it progressed.

In May 1976 Labradorians were publicly told of surveys underway in the Mealy Mountains and in the Torngat Mountains

area and they were assured that they, the local people, would be fully and completely consulted and involved before any final decision was made. Over the subsequent four years (1976-1979), attempts were made to initiate, build and maintain a systematic public participation process by Parks Canada. These attempts were supported by the provincial Tourism department.

Meetings were held with Labradorians, either in Labrador or elsewhere, at which local perspectives, interests and objectives were explained to government officials, and, at which, the role of the provincial government, and the purpose and objectives for national parks were explained to Labradorians.

This mutual education formed part of a process of public participation with which Labradorians, provincial Tourism and Parks Canada were not familiar. Labradorians were invited to participate in a process leading to decisions about whether or not national parks could be established in these areas of Labrador in a manner which satisfied their concerns, the provincial government concerns, and Parks Canada's objectives. For the first time they were not being invited to react to decisions that had been made beforehand by others on their behalf.

The public participation process was able to progress only at a slow rate for a number of reasons: Labradorians had not been involved in the park selection process which did not attempt to incorporate their knowledge and feelings

about their natural and cultural heritage; that mutual education opportunity had been lost and was difficult to retrieve. Labradorians were deeply suspicious of government and of proposals for development of their region which originated from outside Labrador. Many Labradorians of Indian (Innu) and Inuit ancestry were attempting to have both the federal and provincial governments recognize their traditional land claims; they viewed national park proposals as a potential threat to the achievement of these claims. The provincial government apparently was not convinced of the utility of public participation, nor of the value of national parks in Labrador at that time. Parks Canada was concerned that the investment they were placing in attempts to establish national parks in Labrador was both open-ended and in danger of exceeding their legal mandate.

The proposals for national parks were incorporated into a Cooperative Planning Project proposal to achieve the objectives of all who had interests in the Mealy and Torngats. This project proposal was fiercely opposed by Innu and Inuit and was placed in abeyance as a result of the political aspects and problems associated with this public participation process.

Given the nature of the collapse of the national parks proposal for Labrador, and its enveloping Cooperative Planning Project proposal in the spring of 1979, the present challenge is to devise ways and means to reopen the subject and to determine the appropriate time when this can be done.

The timing and the political difficulties associated with it are described in the next chapter, Chapter VI. The ways and means, and motivations, are the subject of Chapter VII.

CHAPTER VI

POLITICAL ASPECTS AND PROBLEMS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapters have attempted to present the context, background and history of attempts to include national parks in Labrador in a Canadian system of national parks. The political dimension of this process has been recognized as a major, if not the major, component. It thus warrants separate attention in this chapter.

Chapter V presented the history of attempts to involve Labradorians in the planning process, and in determining the impacts of potential national parks upon them. That chapter also helped to set the scene by illustrating the intricacies which are involved when a political dimension is added to the planning process. This political dimension was complicated in the Labrador situation through petitions, political announcements and animosities, competition for credit among elected representatives, and through the use of the political process to further native land claims.

This chapter examines more closely the roles of the elected representatives in the process of trying to establish national parks, and discusses the dynamic impacts of political climate, political opportunity, and political context. The roles of specific political players as participants in the process are assessed over the ten years of the case history.

It is the nature of politics that few records are made of the process leading to political decisions. It is for this reason that few references have been, or can be used. Consequently, much of this chapter is composed of the recollections and observations of this writer collected for the period between 1971 and 1982.

It is unlikely that there remains any area of Canada in which some traditional, actual or potential resource-use interests have not been declared or considered. These interests support either the conservation, or the extraction, of renewable and non-renewable resources in that area. This generalization applies to terrestrial and marine surface, subsurface and airspace. In this context, the earlier that any agency or group states its interests, the greater the chance that its interests will be considered and realised. Such a statement is particularly true for an agency such as Parks Canada. However, the opportunity for achieving Parks Canada's finite objective of representation of all of Canada's natural heritage has to be tempered by the realities of the Canadian political system. That is to say, the competing interests for the development and use of Canada's natural heritage will demand an equal right to be heard and to place their case before the elected representatives and their administrators and planners. Ultimately the decision as to which use the natural heritage will be put is made in a political arena.

Using a live theatre for an analogy, it is the authors opinion that national parks are often a pawn in the much larger area of federal and provincial relations. The idealism upholding the concept of national parks may play a major role in both the selection of the new and the protection of the existing parks. But this idealism can be easily swamped in the reality of the negotiations, both on stage and off stage, between the two senior levels of governments. While the centre of the stage in the drama of creating of a national park may be dominated by elected representatives and their advisors, often to the side and in the audience, there are others with strong and competing interests. To retain hold of national park objectives and ideals without allowing their dilution is the traditional issue in the dual goals of conserving the existing park and adding new parks to the system of national parks. This is the Parks Canada message which has to be imparted to all on the stage and in the audience.

To create a national park, political will and commitment on the part of elected representatives are particularly crucial in the process. For these to be effective, they are dependant upon the quality of the information, alternatives and advice available and offered to the decision-makers. Good advice will help the decision maker to balance the factors of timing, support, opposition, priorities, and competing uses of resources. The objectives for wise decisions are to maximize the benefit and minimize

the costs at each of the local, regional, provincial and national levels of interest.

The balancing of local, regional, provincial and national interests has to be particularly judicious in the establishment and management of national parks because strong proponents for alternative use of the resources are waiting "in the wings". It is in this context that national parks were considered in Labrador between 1969 and 1979 as a feasible use of certain lands and waters.

The process of creating a national park is not fixed in order of events, rather it is adapted to suit the circumstances* of the proposal. The adaptation is made upon the recommendation of the participants and is often the result of perceived or anticipated problems.

As stated before in Chapter V, the problems which occurred in Labrador were not unique to that region but rather were similar to experiences elsewhere in Canada, particularly in Atlantic Canada,** in attempts to establish new parks. They were also the result of the role the

* R. Nation has pointed out that this "... procedure is not prescribed by statute or clearly set out in departmental policy" (R. Nation. 1979. p. 22).

**An example of the problems which can be met in trying to create a national park was documented by N. Munro about the unsuccessful attempt at Ship Harbour in Nova Scotia. The paper "14 Reasons" by Munro is attached as Appendix VIII. Even though that attempt took place in the early 1970s and much of the experience did bring change in the approaches used subsequently, there were factors which were common in the Labrador experience.

provincial government chose to play in the Labrador process.

6.2 ROLES OF ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES

The functions of elected representatives involved in new park establishment are a reflection of the level of the office, the size and geographical distribution of their constituencies, and the roles each elected representative chooses (or is advised) to take at each stage of the process. The role is the dynamic factor and was seen to change at both the local, provincial and national level. The role is that part of the function of an elected representative that he chooses to fulfill. This role will also change with time and circumstances. Each representative has a function to present to his constituents, alternatives for growth and change as they occur. His role is to foster the well-being of his constituents.

In Labrador it was possible to see the role of the federal M.P. W. Rompkey and the provincial M.H.A.'s J. Goudie and I. Strachan change with time. Initially all three were supporters, if not actually proponents, of the concept of national parks as being of potential economic benefit and of cultural benefit. However their roles were to change perceptibly as each acquired more knowledge, or were subject to pressures by particular groups of Labradorians or their elected colleagues.

There were pressures in the early and mid 1970s to avoid the apparently imminent economic collapse of Happy Valley-Goose Bay and to offer alternatives to the uncertain economic nature of the traditional fishing, hunting and trapping way of life along Lake Melville and the coast. These pressures led to considerations of national parks as possible ways of introducing new income in Labrador without apparently affecting local lifestyles. National parks were therefore of very real interest to Labrador's elected representatives.

As details of the potential parks, which had been created, resisted or rejected elsewhere, began to circulate in the mid 1970s, Labradorians put pressure upon their elected representatives to reconsider their initial support.

Rompkey had been an active proponent of national parks since 1972 or 1973. It would appear Rompkey thought Parks Canada was a federal agency which had had a very limited activity in Labrador but which had the potential to inject federal monies and interest into the region.

When the province changed in 1972 from a Liberal to a Conservative provincial government, the new Cabinet greeted Rompkey's enthusiasm with suspicion as to his motive. This suspicion was both kindled and maintained by what they perceived as Rompkey's attempts to upstage provincial or joint federal-provincial announcements of developments or other decisions affecting Labrador. Rompkey, like any other

federal M.P., probably saw his role as a proponent for economic stimulation in his riding (one of the largest in Canada) and was naturally anxious to "sell" its advantages.

Rompkey's attitude with respect to national parks in Labrador appeared to change considerably at the time of Faulkner's visit to Labrador in February, 1979. His role at that time on centre stage was to be a political advisor to the minister responsible for Parks Canada; but it appears that he may not have appreciated or anticipated the strong negative reaction of the native peoples and their politics to the cooperative planning project proposal and the Memorandum of Intent. As a result, perhaps of the strong opposition aroused by the Cooperative Planning Project proposal among the two native peoples associations, Rompkey recommended that both the proposal and national parks be put aside.

Joseph (Joe) Goudie was a member of the provincial Conservative government which replaced the Smallwood Liberal government. He was quickly elevated to a position of influence by virtue of his Labrador birth and ties. In such a position it is likely that he was consulted in any decision which was made about, or likely to affect, Labrador. Therefore, it seems highly probable that he was consulted during provincial government deliberations and decisions about national parks in his region. Goudie was in the best position to reflect Labradorians' concerns to provincial Cabinet. Given the provincial, as distinct from Canadian, focus of his functions, and the sparse print-media

coverage of him, without an interview it has been difficult for the author to determine his personal stance on the parks issue. From the files and reports it appears that Goudie remained largely off "centre stage" in public discussions about national parks, except to present petitions from Mud Lake to the House of Assembly early in 1978, and to stand in for Tourism minister Morgan in February-March 1979 in the last attempt to secure federal-provincial agreement (both to delay decisions about national parks and to commence the cooperative planning project). It seems likely that any support he had for national parks was negatively affected by the desires of the two Labrador Native groups to stop any development until their land claims were settled.

Ian Strachan was the M.H.A. for much of the Labrador coast in the mid 1970s when public participation was at its height. Strachan was a Liberal member and thus part of the opposition in the provincial House of Assembly. Politically he was an ally of Rompkey and may have provided the latter with information about activities in northern Labrador. His role with respect to the national parks proposals appears to have changed in the summer of 1976 from one of a proponent to one of a silent observer. This may well have been as a result of living and working in Nain, the centre of the activities of the Labrador Inuit Association, where presumably he would have clearly and frequently heard their concerns. For unclear reasons Strachan remained off centre stage in the process from 1976 onward.

6.3 ROLE OF THE PROVINCIAL TOURISM MINISTER

The provincial government of Newfoundland and Labrador has traditionally conducted its relations with Parks Canada through its Department of Tourism. The advantage of this arrangement was that the Department of Tourism included the Provincial Parks Branch, which had at least some objectives similar to those of Parks Canada. (The disadvantage was that the department, and its minister, seemed to be handicapped in conducting federal-provincial negotiations single handedly, in that they did not directly represent the provincial cabinet. These negotiations appear to have been the prerogative of the provincial Intergovernmental Affairs group within the provincial Cabinet secretariat. It thus became evident in the discussions with Parks Canada, that the provincial minister of Tourism required Cabinet consultation or support before any form of approval could be given to undertake public involvement. For major negotiations with federal and provincial public servants the roles of the provincial deputy minister and minister of Tourism were to act as a link in the approval chain.

The role of the provincial Tourism minister appears to have been constrained also in part by the lack of continuity for the holder of the post. Between 1976 and 1979 the post was held consecutively by Tom Hickey, Jim Morgan and, during the March 1979 collapse of the Cooperative Planning Project proposal, by Premier Moores and Charlie Power.

This lack of continuity was complicated particularly when Tourism minister Morgan announced his candidacy for the office of Premier. Premier Moores had announced on January 19, 1979, he intended to retire and he set up a provincial conservative Party convention for March 16-17th.

Once Morgan declared his candidacy, Moores relieved him of his official responsibility for the duration of the 'interregnum' and assumed the Tourism portfolio himself. Thus the political continuity was broken at the provincial level at a crucial moment in the initiation of the cooperative planning project proposal. But the Premier was involved himself. By doing this Moores appears to have made the conscious decision himself to continue with the signing of the Memorandum, but he raised the profile of the event by having Goudie, Labrador's "own son" in Cabinet, sign for the Tourism minister.

From this it would appear that the provincial Cabinet members were unaware of the impending controversy which was to emanate from the N.M.I.A. and L.I.A.. It is unlikely that Goudie would have either supported the Memorandum of Intent or signed it himself if he had had any indication of the extent of opposition from within Labrador.

The lack of continuity at the political head meant that the Deputy Minister Frank Manuel, together with his Assistant Deputy Minister and former Parks Director Hal Stanley, had to provide both the advice and the continuity for the incumbent minister and attempt to

maintain communications with the very many aspects of Parks Canada's involvement in the nation's heritage protection and interpretation role.

It was Parks Canada's involvement in the province, coupled with the lack of financial resources for provincial parks which provided the provincial Tourism minister with another role: to negotiate for provincial objectives and conditions in Parks Canada's plans for expansion. In the case of Labrador, negotiations and necessary approvals were held up a number of times when impasses or apparent blockages were being reached on Parks Canada activities or negotiations in other parts of the province. Frequently these delays were due to the protracted and complex work to complete Gros Morne National Park. Others included questions of jurisdiction over the Bay of Bulls and Red Bay historic sites, the location of a golf course and the quality of its associated facilities at Terra Nova National Park, and negotiations surrounding the Avalon Peninsula Heritage Area.

Labrador itself appears to have been the cause of political discussion within provincial Cabinet over the winter of 1976-77 when it became transparently clear that Parks Canada could not progress without publicly repeating its minister's (Allmand) commitment early in 1977 not to establish national parks in Labrador until native land claims were dealt with by both governments. The function of the Tourism minister at that time was to reject such a

concept on behalf of the Provincial Cabinet; his role as Tourism minister, however, was to search for a solution. Such a solution was provided in 1977 with the public agreement that all traditional users of Labrador's resources would be sympathetically considered by both governments in any new national park.

The role of the provincial Tourism minister was further complicated by the practical (albeit political) difficulty of meeting his mandate to provide provincial parks for the outdoor recreation needs of most Labradorians. A similar concern existed with respect to provincial wildlife conservation for Labrador. It was perceived that both could be provided through national parks to some degree, at little or no direct financial cost to the province, through skillful negotiations. But Labradorians were already sensitive to, and vocal about, what they perceived to be the failure of their provincial government to provide adequate services and its already widespread reliance upon the federal government to improve provincial services. To have further utilized that avenue would not have enhanced the image of provincial Tourism within Labrador.

6.4 ROLE OF THE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR PARKS CANADA

During the period from 1969 to 1979, the minister responsible for Parks Canada was the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Parks Canada was a relatively small part of his mandate or function.

Between 1969 and 1979 there were four incumbents in this position. Each incumbent was to play a role in the Labrador scene: Chretien by setting the stage for the systems expansion in the early 1970s, Buchanan by initiating correspondence with the provincial Tourism minister, Allmand by placing a limit on how far national parks could progress before settlement of native land claims, and Faulkner by attempting to discuss the proposals with both the province and the Labrador native people. Of these four only Allmand and Faulkner became personally involved by visiting Labrador while they held this post.

It was the senior Parks Canada management group which conducted the discussions and directed the work of exploration, discussion and public participation in the 1970s. This group, consisting of the Assistant Deputy Minister A.T. Davidson, the Director-General J.I. Nicol, National Parks Branch Director S. Kun and Atlantic Region Director P. Thomson, provided both continuity and expertise in the mixture of discussions and negotiations between 1975 and 1979. The options and recommendations for consideration by each of the last three incumbent ministers were provided by this group through, of course, the Deputy Minister.

Such a process of presenting options, advice and recommendations is normal for a federal Cabinet minister to be able to function effectively at the head of so large a bureaucracy.

The minister of Indian and Northern Affairs was responsible also for the provision of funding for services to the Inuit and Indian people of Labrador. This funding was transferred to the provincial government who administered these services in a similar manner to those provided for other Labradorians. Given this function the Inuit and Naskapi-Montagnais people had both justification and motive to reach 'their' minister. It was a result of invitations to attend the annual general meetings of the Labrador Inuit Association and the Naskapi-Montagnais in 1977 and 1979 that these two groups managed to publicly influence Allmand and to demonstrate their concern before Faulkner. Other Labradorians did not have as easy access to the Parks Canada minister and so placed emphasis upon influencing their provincial government and their M.P., Rompkey.

The function and role of the Parks Canada minister was not as involved in the process conducted in Labrador as that of the provincial Tourism minister and Cabinet. The size and complexity of the Parks Canada minister's function prevented him from participating in the majority of the negotiations leading to a new national park. His senior administrators were delegated much of the responsibility for negotiating the details of a formal agreement. Usually, the minister only retained the final authority and only became involved if there were political problems or if there is an agreement to be signed. Until sufficient dialogue, rapport, empathy, and response to Labradorians' own objectives and

priorities had been built, little benefit was likely to accrue from political involvement.

It would appear that both times the incumbent visited Labrador in the late 1970s he did so as the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In other words he had to balance the interests of Indian and Inuit people and Parks Canada. His role became one of responding to these people and presenting Parks Canada's point of view. Some compromise became necessary in Parks Canada's policy to achieve its objective.

Faulkner seems to have tried to discuss the Cooperative Planning Project. But he was not able to prevent the L.I.A. reacting by passing motions opposing the parks in both the Torngats and Mealy's. That Association thus joined the N.M.I.A. in outright opposition.

6.5 OTHER POLITICAL PARTICIPANTS

The unfortunate feature associated with, and permeating, the case history in Labrador is the degree to which the process became politicized. This politicization appears to have been a function of the way the process was initiated, the way the process continued, and the Labrador social and economic environment at the time the process was initiated and got underway. The description of these aspects has been provided earlier in this and the preceding chapters but certain aspects warrant brief re-emphasis.

The degree of politicization appears to have been increased by the lack of frequent communication between the government and local people.

It was unfortunate such a process became politicized early because the proponents of national parks and the opponents polarized into two camps. This polarization was unnecessary because there was potential for compromise; such a compromise could be found in the cooperative planning project, or, if that method was not acceptable, some other ways could have been developed.

Perhaps the closest that any of the other political participants came to being rigid and uncompromising was the stance taken by the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association. The N.M.I.A. refused to recognize the right of anyone but themselves to make decisions affecting their lands and waters. They saw neither the right of anyone to create a national park nor the need for such an alien concept. They could not perceive how "if the Government is true to us and to themselves, can it study Parks and Native Land Claims at the same time"* (Bart Jack in Parks Canada and Dept. of Tourism. January 1978. p. 50). "Indian people feel that their land claim is their answer for preserving the land" (Ibid.).

Bart Jack said that he welcomed further meetings but he recognized that the Indians were a minority (in their own

* These words were to be reiterated by the I.T.C. in their News Release of February 28, 1979 with reference to the Cooperative Planning Project proposal.

land), with very little room for change in their views (Ibid. p. 53). It is this statement which appeared to this author to underlie the rationale for the Indians attitude. They had lost much already, they felt that they were not being listened to but they were determined not to allow the world to pass them by. "... this is the first time we have had a chance to speak our minds and make a decision ourselves" (Ibid. p. 60).

The Inuit, through the L.I.A. seemed to be more open to discuss national parks. But they were very conscious of the refusal of the provincial government to even discuss their special claim, and they were suspicious that national parks would only be created if Parks Canada went along with the province and ignored L.I.A. claims. This suspicion was not assuaged but was aggravated by news media reports which reached them concerning the Cooperative Planning Project proposal.

The settler people were not organised in the same way as the N.M.I.A. and L.I.A. but they were represented by a number of agencies* such as the L.R.A.C. and the Combined Councils of Labrador. Their views as reflected in the 1977 open meetings (Ibid.), changed little up to 1979: they were suspicious of change and particularly change to benefit others before them. They were publicly opposed to the loss of any of their uses of the areas of interest, particularly in the Mealy Mountains.

* These agencies are listed in Chapter III, Section 3.3.4.

The remaining groups which could have taken political positions or had a political effect include competing resource users (and potential users), the news media, conservation groups in support of national parks, and Parks Canada itself.

There is little evidence of any public position being taken by competing resource users other than local people. Offshore waters had been excluded from the study area so as to avoid conflict with the fishing industry. Potential conflict with the use of renewable and non-renewable resources by others had yet to arise; inevitably there was to be such conflict but the time for it had not come. Such potential conflict and the need for conflict resolution had been recognized in the Cooperative Planning Project proposal.

National conservation groups were not involved directly in the Labrador national parks discussions. These groups did have a potential role but they did not exercise it. This was in part because they had virtually no members in Labrador and in part because their participation from outside may not have helped their cause during the initial discussions in Labrador. The process of public involvement had been designed so as to introduce the concept of national parks first to Labradorians and later to other Canadians. The intent was to permit Labradorians to participate in a "mutual education process, flowing from the distribution of basic informational documents accompanying the invitation to

participate" (R. Nation. 1979. p. 218) under conditions in which they were comfortable. Conservation groups were only given information* when they asked.

The role of the media has been largely overlooked in the Labrador case history. Although the lack of an adequate print media has been mentioned, the radio and television media have had an important impact upon most Labrador communities. The role of the media in Labrador requires mention in the political arena because often it provides the major link between elected representatives and their constituents - particularly on the coast. It is this author's belief that the strong reaction to the cooperative planning project proposal which emanated from the L.I.A. and N.M.I.A. was a direct result of erroneous news reports.

The media gave misinformation about the Memorandum of Intent stating that the two governments intended to pursue the establishment of National Parks rather than that they were putting forth a proposal to plan for the best use of the areas of interest on a cooperative basis and that a decision on National Parks would depend on the results of the planning exercise. (R. Bill and M. Gillis. Attachment to a Memorandum. June 8, 1979. p. 1).

The misinformation is very difficult to confirm when dealing with radio and television reporting; no permanent record is kept. The import of the misinformation, whatever the source in Labrador, was the collapse of the Cooperative Planning Project proposal. If the media were in part

---

* The National and Provincial Parks Association only reported briefly on a couple of occasions about Labrador national park proposals to their members, for example in the winter issue of 1981 of Park News.

responsible for this collapse, its role as an observer and reporter in the political area requires criticism. This criticism should include a recognition by both Parks Canada and provincial Tourism that they cannot rely upon the quality and accuracy of the news information system in Labrador. They should plan for immediate correction of misinformation in any future national park discussions and public information.

6.6. THE ROLE OF PARKS CANADA IN THE POLITICAL ARENA

The role of Parks Canada in the political arena should not be overlooked. Such a role existed; but it was that which a bureaucracy should take. To propose a national park requires that Parks Canada take an advocacy position, but outside the political arena. Such a position requires courage and conviction if it is to be maintained by a public servant in the face of pressures to compromise on policies and principles, for his or her stance will be open to question in the political arena. There is little doubt that the controversy about the proposal, its history and the process, caused considerable concern to all the Parks Canada personnel who were involved. But they managed to avoid taking any political stand even though they were responsible for guiding a process in which there were many external factors over which they had little or no control.

Parks Canada was responsible to and took direction from its political head, the minister. The latter made the

political decision but based that decision upon the advice he received, in part, from his bureaucracy, and, in part from his political advisors and other elected colleagues such as Rompkey.

The relationship between a minister and Parks Canada is beyond the scope of this thesis but worthy of further research elsewhere, particularly because the relationship is perhaps closest in the area of the new park establishment process. This is where Parks Canada appears to be particularly innovative and thus where the minister can appear to be gaining political credit for expanding the national park system.

The danger for Parks Canada and the minister himself, as in the Labrador case, is to avoid being put in a position of making a decision which is either premature or based upon inadequate information. The internal bureaucratic process to keep the minister informed at all times is thus both costly and time consuming, but also essential given the complex nature and the multiple levels of Canadian government.

It is the nature of many political decisions that they are most controversial in the geographic area most affected. The appearance of any politician in that geographic area during the controversy can serve to either calm the situation (by achieving consensus or by making his position quite clear), or perhaps to raise the level of the controversy further. Allmand's visit to Labrador in 1977

served to make his position clear in the issue on the supremacy of native claims over national parks. It would appear that Faulkner was not given the opportunity to prevent the confrontation between these two issues.

In retrospect, it appears unfortunate that Faulkner's visit to a native people's association annual meeting in Labrador was chosen as the occasion to conclude an agreement which concerned national parks. National parks were unwelcome to the Innu and Inuit of Labrador in the form in which they had been discussed in 1977, thus their reappearance in 1979 - with little or no local dialogue in between - was, not suprisingly, greeted with concern. Parks Canada officials had advised the minister of the sensitive nature of the subject of national parks in Labrador but, at the same time, proposed that he use a political route to publicize attempts to meet Labradorian, provincial and federal objectives for the Mealy and Torngat Mountains areas of interest.

The extent of the misunderstanding as to the motive of the Cooperative Planning Project proposal was unknown to provincial Tourism and Parks Canada officials until Faulkner arrived in Labrador in late February. When he arrived in Happy Valley-Goose Bay from Ottawa (a day late because of a Cabinet meeting) his provincial counterpart Joe Goudie (who had not received the message about the delay) had already left for the Indian annual meeting at Border Beacon. That failure to meet augured ill for the Memorandum of Intent.

In the end the level of confrontation was only lowered by Parks Canada backing away from Labrador.

6.7 OTHER POLITICAL ASPECTS

The context in which political aspects and problems can be presented has been described by Bella:

When the Canadian government sets up a national park the traditional users of the area are likely to be adversely affected. Resource industries are also likely to oppose new parks, fearing that some exploitable timber, mineral and energy sources will be locked out of their reach. The provincial governments often support the resource industries, for as owners of the land and resources within their provincial boundaries they stand to gain financially if resources are exploited. So, whenever and wherever the (Canadian) government tries to introduce new parks, opposition is probable, and a (Canadian) government has to be strongly committed to parks expansion to pursue this policy in face of such opposition (L. Bella. 1979. p. 6).

An aspect of the new park establishment process which requires further consideration is the function and role of the provincial government. The function of the provincial government is to ensure that a national park be one of the best, if not the best, uses to which provincial lands and waters in a given area can be put.* The description of best use is in the context of social, economic, political and ecological criteria. This function to ensure best use is based on provincial priorities rather than national interests.

* For, in the end the province has to make the conscious decision to legislate the transfer of lands and waters from its jurisdiction to Canada subject to any conditions reached in a formal agreement between the two governments.

Once the provincial government is satisfied that a national park proposal meets these criteria for best use then the role of the provincial government changes.

When the proposal is placed before the public, particularly the local people, the provincial government then normally assumes two roles. Firstly, it tries to ensure that the proposal will be in the best interests of the local people. Secondly it seeks to persuade the local people that the proposal could be of benefit to them as well as the province. This duality often has the potential, in the eyes of local people, to be a conflict of interest.

In Labrador in 1977, officials from provincial Tourism complained that the role of the provincial government was misunderstood by local people. Despite repeated protestations at the open meetings, the provincial Tourism representatives were seen as proponents of the proposals along with Parks Canada representatives. The dual role was handled well by provincial Tourism representatives, but the honest broker aspect and the announced intent to protect local interests was greeted with a mixture of disbelief and scepticism. This reaction by local people was attributed to the failure of the provincial government to protect them in the past, and to provide basic services. Further, local people did not anticipate any change in provincial behaviour. They felt that Labrador would remain a (political) backwater for some time to come.

One example of this failure to serve Labradorians was laid by them at the feet of provincial Tourism itself. Labradorians had pushed for a number of years to have provincial parks established in the region. Apart from two small parks, one in the south east and one in western Labrador, there were none. Proposals had been made to establish a provincial park on Northwest Point in Lake Melville; they were discussed in 1976, and included in the provincial budget estimates for subsequent years, but were repeatedly deleted.*

The last political aspect which should be noted is that the maximum length of term for an elected representative at both the federal and provincial levels is five years. It is naturally of importance to these elected representatives that the work being undertaken at their behest, or with their support, at least appear to be progressing and bringing benefit during their term of office to their constituents, their province, or their national audience and supporters. It is thus often difficult to sell the idea of a new national park to a politician if it is clear that the tangible benefits will not be realized for some years. This is where the human traits of will, vision, dedication and commitment become more than words. It is the combination of these with the skills of negotiation and sensitivity to human cultural traditions in a team of people that can

---

* Funds were being provided for a local park to be constructed by the Lake Melville Tourism Association nearby on Goose Lake in 1982.

assist the elected representative to reason and rationalize the intangibles into early tangible results of the proposal. This was recognized by Gillis in the Cooperative Planning Project proposal. She suggested "Immediate Actions (Early Tangible Results of Project)" be included in the project proposal document to give potential participants an indication of what might be quickly achievable. (Parks Canada and Dept. of Tourism. - 1979. p. 14).

Gradually it became very clear in the 1970s that new national parks could not be created in such a short (political) time span as five years without very careful and sensitive planning before hand.

While the roles and functions of political participants have been described, the political stage upon which they have appeared requires some description also.

Newfoundland's political stage as it affected Labrador has been described in Chapter III. It was made complex by the external forces at work within Labrador and in provincial - federal government relations. But on the national parks stage the major political participants - the ministers of provincial Tourism, and federal Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and elected representatives Rompkey, Goudie and Strachan - interacted largely by mail, telephone, and occasionally by media debates. They appear to have met rarely to discuss national parks in Labrador. Much of the communication between the federal and provincial ministers was undertaken by their public servants. It was

the latter who presented alternatives, made recommendations and carried out the decisions made by their ministers.

6.8 CONCLUSION

This chapter has attempted to illustrate the political complexity associated with the new park establishment process. It is difficult to recount the precise nature of political complexity because of the lack of public information involved and the dangers associated with mis-interpreting event and imputing motive. Nevertheless, an attempt has been made to describe both function and role of the major participants or groups in the process.

A central point emerging from this thesis is the hypothesis that it is unlikely that there is ever an ideal political moment at which to propose a national park be established in an area. Yet such a proposal should be introduced as soon as either the need or the potential is identified. By laying a proposal before both the public(s) and their elected representatives as soon as practicable, it can then be discussed as a concept rather than as a fait accompli. To do so should reduce rancour and criticism about lack of consultation. Further, such a proposal can then be incorporated into any concurrent or subsequent regional planning or development.

One further factor which requires mention has been reserved for the end of this chapter. The length of time which is allowed for the public, particularly the local

public, to absorb a new proposal and react to it can be crucial in the political context. Time is required for people to understand the idea of a new use for a special area of land and water, or impacts on their community or lifestyles; to gain some insight into the perceptions and motives of those who propose the new use, and for them to react to the tentative proposals either positively or negatively by giving freely of their knowledge and perception of that special area.

It is likely that time may be saved in the initial planning process by consciously excluding the public. But this short term gain will likely be more than offset by the political consequences of trying to make decisions without the early involvement and understanding of those who either now use, or intend to use, that special area when it becomes a national park. This is where the value of past experience in Labrador and elsewhere should be fully appreciated.

CHAPTER VII

ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS AND A TENTATIVE METHODOLOGY FOR FUTURE
ATTEMPTS IN LABRADOR

7.1 INTRODUCTION

This research has attempted to describe the complex nature of the unsuccessful attempts to establish national parks in Labrador from 1969 to 1979. The history of, and plans for, the expansion of Canada's national parks system since 1968 have been considered, with attention being paid to the relevance of this expansion to Labrador. The study has dealt at some length with the geography of Labrador because an understanding of this is essential to follow the significant variables in this case history and the rationale for future methodologies. A major emphasis has been placed upon describing the long and complex nature of discussions and negotiations between Parks Canada and the provincial government leading to, but often interrupting, attempts to involve Labradorians. Lastly, the thesis has addressed the functions, roles and attitudes of participants in the political process.

This has been done to achieve the three specific objectives identified in Chapter I, which were to:

1. document the full process and incorporate a description of Labrador's cultural heritage.
2. identify difficulties, and effective and ineffective steps in the process.

3. make recommendations for improving future park establishment efforts in Labrador and possibly in other situations.

Over the ten year period between 1968 and 1978 an additional ten national parks were added to the system elsewhere in Canada. Where relevant, the lessons learned in these other parks were implicitly incorporated into the Labrador situation. The extent to which national parks represented all of Canada's natural regions at the end of that decade is illustrated in Map 7.1. The increase in representation can be seen when this map is compared with Map 2. in Chapter II. With more fortuitous circumstances the two major regions in Labrador might have been also included.

It remains for this chapter to consider all the human, the environmental, the cultural and the political factors so as to analyse the experience, to consider what is of value and has been (or should be) learned, to suggest when and in what ways the concept of national parks in Labrador may be reintroduced for discussion in Labrador. Some note will be made of the changes which have taken place between the spring of 1979, when the national parks proposal and the Cooperative Planning Project proposal were allowed to drift into dormancy, and the winter of 1981-1982 when this thesis was concluded.

7.2 A REVIEW OF THE CASE HISTORY IN LABRADOR

Labrador was an area of Canada where, in the first half of the decade of the 1970s, the newly introduced systems planning approach for national parks was overly preoccupied with area identification and new park establishment. Public participation was not at that time considered an integral element in planning.

The national park establishment process which was followed in Labrador is illustrated in Table 7.1. This indicates how the process can be divided in planning aspects and political decisions and public input. The interrelationships between these aspects over time is illustrated by the amount of effort which was exerted between 1976 and 1979 to accommodate the concerns of the participants. A summary of the process follows:

In Labrador a number of years of work were spent between 1970 and 1976 gradually winnowing down the many areas with potential to just one 'area of interest' in each of the two major natural regions in which much of Labrador was located. The two areas of interest were the Torngat Mountains in the Northern Labrador Mountains Region (#24) and the Mealy Mountains in the East Coast Boreal Region (#21).

Little consideration of public participation and of incorporating Labrador's cultural heritage was made in the identification and subsequent selection process. Yet the Mealys were selected for economic as well as environmental

SIMPLIFIED PROCESS FOLLOWED IN ATTEMPTS
TO ESTABLISH NATIONAL PARKS IN LABRADOR

1979

Preparation of cooperative planning project to address local priorities, and to consider provincial, Parks Canada and other interests.

Building of concern among Labradorians as a result of the lack of information about the proposals and their fears of decisions being made without their input.

Initial talks with some government agencies to seek approval in principle for a cooperative planning project. Proposal sent to Native Associations for discussion.

Preparation of a federal-provincial memorandum of intent to study alternatives for the future of the areas of interest (cooperative planning project).

Provincial Cabinet approval for cooperative planning project but continued opposition to special rights for Native people.

Memorandum of intent misunderstood by Labradorians.

Federal and provincial ministers fail to meet to sign memorandum of intent.

Building of strong opposition to signing from both Native Associations and their parent national organisations.

Provincial request to place cooperative planning project and the concept of national parks in abeyance until Cabinet discussed them again.

Native Associations Resolutions opposing national parks sent to Federal and provincial governments.

Federal minister restates no intention to affect land claims by park establishment.

Project and processes are allowed to wither. The public are not informed of the (unstated) agreement by both governments to not pursue the project and process until a more opportune time.

reasons. There the systems approach was only different from that applied elsewhere in Canada in that there were more field trips (five) spread over a longer time period (seven years).

What was different in Labrador was that the milieu in which the park proposals were being considered was already highly charged with tension, with the legacy of years of political and economic neglect. This neglect has been described in Chapter III. The tension had been accentuated in the early 1970s by five factors: 1. the substantial economic and employment impact of the withdrawal of most of the United States military presence from Labrador; 2. the decline of the traditional economic mainstays of fishing and trapping; 3. the failure of 'government' to attract and hold any other industry; 4. the refusal of the provincial government to recognize traditional land claims; and 5. the creation of a number of organizations (partially government funded) to better represent Labrador interests. Labrador had become politicized in the early 1970s, and a major objective among Labradorians was to have a greater say in the management to the region's human and natural resources.

In 1976, just as the areas of interest had been selected and the concept of national parks was first officially mooted in public, these five regional factors were at their peak. This was not the most appropriate time to introduce, to Labradorians, the concept of preserving some of Labrador's natural resources to meet national

objectives of a Canadian national park system. Many Labradorians were living under conditions of real deprivation by normal Canadian standards. Local people were not in a mood to discuss national objectives when their basic community needs were woefully inadequate and were not being addressed adequately. The inappropriate timing was exacerbated by the approach taken to initiate public participation. Labradorians did not consider it a satisfactory approach to have a political announcement followed two months later by a fleeting visit by government officials with promises of future involvement which did not really start until over a year later.

By 1976, the description of other new national park developments reaching Labrador was based largely upon Gros Morne National Park, the cause of much unhappiness of many west coast Newfoundlanders. Labradorians did not want such a situation created in their midst, and they had little reason to accept government officials' assurances of a change in approach: that things would be different in Labrador. They were to be different in Labrador; but the differences which actually occurred were not anticipated by Parks Canada and provincial Tourism, and they were not welcomed by Labradorians. Only the last collapse in 1979 may have satisfied those Labradorians who were opposed to national parks.

The attempts to initiate and maintain the public participation process between 1976 and 1979 have been

extensively documented in Chapter V. What requires reemphasizing is that while Parks Canada staff, particularly the author and Gillis, tried to maintain some public contact through the L.R.A.C., the Innu and Inuit Associations, and some individuals, most Labradorians were not aware of the efforts made by Parks Canada and provincial Tourism to keep the proposal progressing. The political problems were not known to the public, except to the few who were aware of, and keeping an account of, the failures of government officials to keep deadlines and to keep some element of continuity in public involvement.

Parks Canada officials went to the public quite unprepared and unaware of the tension into which they were moving. It was only when the report from MacIntyre and its recommendations were combined with the petitions from Mud Lake in February 1977 that it became clear to these officials that the national parks concept would be difficult to sell. This difficulty was exacerbated further by the provincial Cabinet's lengthy deliberations concerning the overall proposal, and by Parks Canada's deliberations as to the correct and utilitarian approach to the public. The difficulty of a simplistic approach to the public was heavily reinforced during the meetings held in the thirteen Labrador communities, and by the petition against a park from the Rigolet community around the fall of 1977.

As a result of hearing and documenting these difficulties, Parks Canada proposed and provincial Tourism

agreed to try out a method of addressing Labradorian, provincial and federal objectives through a cooperative planning project proposal for the areas of interest - the Mealy and Torngats. But it was not until January of 1979, a time lapse of some sixteen months after the fall 1977 meetings in Labrador, that invitations to participate went out to those people and agencies (government and non-government) with potential interest in Labrador. The intense and largely unexpected opposition from the Inuit and Innu associations was sufficient to deter both governments from signing a memorandum of intent and to cause the provincial government to back away from both the cooperative planning project and national parks proposals.

None of the three formal contacts made by Parks Canada with the people of Labrador is considered a success by this author because they failed to develop and maintain any form of dialogue which resulted in an open and two way flow of information. Together with more frequent and less formal contacts - direct or through intermediaries such as MacIntyre, the L.R.A.C. and L.I.A. - however, sufficient rapport was developed to permit Labradorians, as well as the two governments, to learn some good lessons about the processes of public participation, resource development planning and evaluation, and the setting of Labrador's own priorities.

In retrospect, each of the difficulties identified in this case history were avoidable, but whether they were all avoidable at the same time is debatable.

To undertake a project proposal such as a national park requires a recognition that basic criteria must be accepted by Parks Canada and other participants at the start. These criteria include will, courage (to say yes or no), commitment, continuity, flexibility, clarity (as to objective and policy), openness and honesty (in communication and information), sensitivity and empathy (to others points of view), timeliness, appropriateness and suitability. Some difficulties could have been avoided if each of these had been examined before and during the work on this national parks proposal, particularly from the political perspective. This is not to say that all of these criteria were missing but that, at times, each one was found to be wanting by this author.

The effective steps taken in the Labrador national parks proposal relate particularly to the abilities of many individuals involved to transcend their particular functions, or mandates, and to take roles upon themselves which involved courage, sensitivity, empathy, openness, honesty, communication and flexibility. An important element of this case history is the recognition of the importance of individuals to the process and their qualities. This author was able to work extensively upon these park proposals for nearly six years, thus providing

some continuity. Gillis, Thomson, Kun, Carruthers, Manuel, Hustins, Lough, Edmonds, Jack, Flowers, Felsberg, Bird were all involved also over much of this time. A common element in criticisms of Parks Canada seems to be that it is a faceless organisation to many Canadians, when, in reality, it is composed of many people dedicated to, and responsible for, their work. Yet, despite this dedication there were few people with experience in public participation or federal-provincial negotiation skills within the organisation who have worked upon new park proposals. This requires redressing.

The ineffective steps taken in the Labrador national parks proposal can be related to the shortage of public participation and federal-provincial negotiation skills. For example, the failure to maintain an information flow to Labradorians ~~can be tied back to an inability to realize~~ what was happening in Labrador between official visits.

This came to a head when the Innu and Inuit Associations successfully campaigned against the Cooperative Planning Project proposal in 1979. After that short campaign the Cooperative Planning Project proposal was placed in abeyance until provincial Cabinet support was reevaluated and reassured; there it remained. It will be recalled that the announced intentions in May 1976 to create national parks was greeted with concern and the intention to involve the public was greeted with scepticism by Labradorians; since neither was carried through in a manner

which was acceptable to them, Labradorians have shown little interest in the fate of either intention.

The lack of interest on the part of most Labradorians may well reflect their pre-occupation with other things of importance in their lives. The lack of interest may also be a reflection of the failure to communicate the reasons for the hold-up back to Labradorians and other agencies. This can be explained by the lack of experience of Parks Canada administrators in how to involve the public. Nation pointed out that both the public and the administrator need to recognize the potential power of the public in parkland issues (R. Nation. 1978. p. 284). Involvement of the public in the Parks Canada decision-making process is crucial but it can lead to confrontation where administrative powers of discretion conflict with the different objectives of local people or where there is such a lack of communication between the two that they believe a difference exists. Both occurred in Labrador: there were long periods of non communication and at least two occasions of conflict over objectives.

It is natural that some tension will occur whenever existing and proposed ways of life are brought into juxtaposition. The seriousness of this tension is directly dependent upon the extent to which the (opposing) parties can be brought together early with the same information base and with a means of clearly communicating their objectives and concerns to each other. There is some onus upon the

innovators to take the trouble to understand the milieu or environment into which they propose to introduce change, and to carefully introduce the idea of change to those who might be affected.

The speed with which an idea of change is introduced by an innovator should be discussed with those who might be affected. Too great a speed can result in decisions being made with inadequate information and consideration. Too slow a speed can result in apathy, loss of involvement and commitment by the 'affected'.

The lack of pressure and the slow speed was not entirely accidental in Labrador. Local people clearly said at a number of meetings with Parks Canada staff that they wanted more time to think through the idea of parks; this was certainly provided. What were not provided, however, were those essential elements to go with the time: information about national parks, and someone to communicate that information to all the communities and to record what people had to say about their values. Here the onus was clearly with the innovator or proponent of change.

The parallel with the process for national park establishment is close. Parks Canada has never put together a definite priority system for acquiring new parks, as proposed by Nation, to give a sense of direction to acquisition efforts (Ibid. p. 286), because such a list would be seen as a hindrance to flexibility in responding to political opportunities. This meant in the Labrador case,

when the efforts being expended were reaching a low point of potential return, Parks Canada officials decided to let the proposal drop until a more opportune moment occurred. The interest and energy was moved to other locations in Canada. The onus for, and the independence of, movement between natural regions and their associated national park proposals rests with Parks Canada - so long as there are alternatives available. But the difficulties and the costs of acquiring new national parks are increasing; so it can be viewed as short sighted to let a park proposal drop in such a way as to make it unnecessarily difficult to revive it at a later time.

The lessons which were learned in Labrador were numerous. The most obvious are listed here. It would be a mistake to look for 'one' key approach to establishing parks. The milieu in what a national park proposal is being made must be well understood. There is a danger in undertaking a national park feasibility study which lacks formal political commitment by both Parks Canada and the province; either or both can drop out of the study at any time. If the study is open-ended it lacks firm deadlines and cost criteria. If a proposal is being considered then local people, as well as the provincial government or other elected representatives, should be invited at the very beginning to participate in a two-way information flow so that decisions are made with the maximum amount of information. This can result in a sense of involvement and commitment from all to ensure the process and decisions are the best possible.

It is essential that Parks Canada identify the best ways of communicating with local people and maintain high quality continuity from the beginning. The placing of a person who is experienced in public involvement in the region can be a very effective way of initiating and maintaining local communication. It is important that such a person be given both authority and responsibility to undertake clear terms of reference. It may be necessary to underwrite the cost of provincial involvement in any ongoing studies and discussions. Likewise it may be necessary to encourage and at least partially underwrite the cost for local people to create a consultative committee which has clear and tight terms of reference.

While it should be recognized that most, if not all, of these lessons were not unique to the Labrador case, the experience gained there had an impact upon the wording and intent of the Parks Canada Policy which was published in 1979. The Labrador experience, when combined with other new park proposals, did result in a broadening of the provision which permitted local, and not just native, traditional activities to continue in any new park, providing these are agreed to at the time of park establishment and are written into the park agreement (Parks Canada Policy. 1979. p. 42).

There were lessons learned in Labrador by Parks Canada which also have application elsewhere in Canada. First, the public must be invited to participate in a continuous and

open process of selecting areas for potential national parks, in gathering and evaluating the social, economic, cultural, environmental and political feasibility of such parks, and in determining the management plan (at least in conceptual terms) prior to any formal establishment agreement.

Second, for the public to participate they must be offered the opportunity to understand the purpose of national parks, and to incorporate their own values and objectives for conservation, recreation, tourism and resource harvesting within the planning process (and future management) of a national park.

Third, for effective public participation to occur, elected representatives have to have the advantages and disadvantages of public participation presented to them. Once political will and support for public participation are gained at all levels, the opportunities for misunderstanding and controversy to move into the political arena are minimized.

The lessons learned in Labrador have been or are being applied in the northern Territories, in southern Ontario and southern New Brunswick.

7.3 RECENT EVENTS 1979-1981

Since 1979 the situation in Labrador has changed; some factors have changed but the majority have not. Those factors which appear not to have changed are listed first.

Parks Canada still continues to have, as its objective, the representation of all 48 of Canada's natural regions within a system of national parks. Since Parks Canada still intends to include at least one representative area from each of the East Coast Boreal and the Northern Labrador Mountains Regions, the reopening of discussions with the provincial government and with Labradorians is inevitable at some point in time.

The provincial government still intends to determine what would be the best uses for the areas of interest before it decides whether to support the establishment of national parks there. Further, it still intends to ensure that local peoples' lifestyles will not be adversely affected. There has to be recognition that traditional local activities will be the subject of further discussion. While Parks Canada had recognized the need for this by 1979, the details were never worked out.

Labradorians still want to have their priorities and their objectives recognized before they will feel comfortable discussing the concept of national parks again. This may be feasible through some form of discussion, planning and action in which the local people are able to participate effectively.

The two native peoples associations, the L.I.A. and the N.M.I.A., continue to press for settlement of their land claims before they are prepared to allow national parks to be established in Labrador. They will continue to use their

opposition to national parks as a way of forcing this settlement.

The provincial government will continue to press very hard for the maximum federal compensation for lands and waters given to Canada for the maximum investment in park related facilities and employment opportunities, and to give up as small an area of Labrador as possible in return.

These are the basic factors which are likely to remain in force. But time has been allowed for other factors to change and so become less stringent and obstructive to the concept of national parks. There is one exception, which is hopefully temporary, that federal-provincial relations are currently poor.

The factors which have changed or appear to have changed include a softening of the provincial attitude towards the traditional land claims of both Labrador native associations, an increase in the level of investment by the federal government in the Labrador region in community related and regional infrastructures and economic development, a decrease in the level of political tension and a clearer understanding among more Labradorians of their objectives, priorities and ways to achieve them. Tourism is, for example, now recognized by some Labradorians as an industry which can benefit their region, so long as they retain control. It appears to have been recognized by more Labradorians that the old way of life is likely to recede, when the region's non-renewable resources are extracted.

Given that the milieu in Labrador has changed somewhat, it may be possible to reopen some discussion about the concept of national parks. This is the subject of the next section.

Before moving into the future a further postscript should be added. In July 1981 Parks Canada awarded a contract to James Dobbin Associates to undertake a regional analysis study of each of the natural regions 21 and 24, to identify the characteristics of each region, to identify areas which are representative of their region and to suggest areas* which should be explored in the field once the timing is acceptable to Labradorians. The participation of Labradorians in future field work is an important element to be discussed with them. Two unique aspects of these studies are the inclusion of cultural themes and a re-evaluation of the Mealy and Torngats to determine their representativity in their natural regions. The study results are not due until the spring of 1982, after this thesis is completed. Provincial Parks, the L.R.A.C., L.I.A., N.M.I.A. Memorial University Extension Service in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, as well as other federal and provincial government agencies, were told of the study and sent copies of the terms of reference as the study was awarded. No reaction has yet been received by Parks Canada from Labrador.

* The Benedict Mountains area was considered for the first time (see 4.1 on p. 96).

7.4 OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

This thesis has recorded a practical exercise; therefore any option for the future has to be practical to have any relevance and any application. The elements of any future option have to be grounded in what has happened and been recorded in this case history.

The options for the future fall into three general groups: little or no action, independent action, and mutually agreed action. The first, little or no action, is to allow the current state of little action to continue with minimum interaction between the four 'parties' - Labradorians, the provincial government, other federal government agencies, and Parks Canada. The advantage of this option is that no one has to expend any effort. Parks Canada can continue to work in other natural regions in Canada and the other 'parties' can continue with their concerns without pressure until Parks Canada or one of the 'parties' reintroduces the proposal for the Cooperative Planning Project or the national parks on the Labrador stage at a more appropriate moment. The disadvantage is that none of the 'parties' can benefit from the Cooperative Planning Project proposal and its systematic approach to addressing all participants' priorities - least of all Parks Canada - as they relate to the areas of interest.

The second is to allow Parks Canada or any other party to pursue their specific interests without particular reference to any other interests, except where the latter

stand to be supportive, a problem, obstruction or conflict. The advantage of this option is that it would be possible for Parks Canada to work to achieve its objectives in its own time. The disadvantage is that to achieve this objective it may be necessary to sacrifice some of Parks Canada's principles or some of the principles of others; it certainly will raise strong opposition from all or some of the other 'parties'. This was the approach taken in Labrador by Parks Canada up to 1977; it does not appear to be the route that Parks Canada could successfully use to create national parks, either in Labrador or elsewhere.

The third is to work to identify the interests of all parties, to collaborate to achieve them by careful correlation of information gathering, sharing that information and agreeing to accept the eventual decisions about the 'best use(s)' for the areas under review. This was the approach which was being planned between 1977 and 1979. It failed because it did not address explicitly the concerns of the L.I.A. and the N.M.I.A., who then opposed it and successfully prevented its implementation.

The advantage of this approach is that, if it is properly and openly introduced, it should offer the potential to serve all participants and secure their cooperation and commitment. The disadvantage for Parks Canada is that the approach can be lengthy and it may not identify national parks as one of the 'best use(s)'.

This is the option which continues to offer Parks Canada the best opportunity in Labrador to achieve its objective and of assisting Labradorians to also protect some part of their heritage to their mutual satisfaction.

The opportunity to determine whether the situation has changed in Labrador will occur when the ongoing natural region analysis studies are completed and either sent or taken to Labrador. The process or methodology to do this will be to secure tacit approval from the provincial government to carefully explain the purpose and results of these studies, and to emphasize that the study results remain tentative until they are checked in the field with local people and the provincial government.

Now that the provincial government has recognized the possibility that native claims may be legitimate, it may prove possible to address this major block to discussions within some form of cooperative planning. Since 1979 some elements of information have been gathered which would assist in evaluating the alternative uses for the areas of interest.

By careful and sensitive use of the information and the changes in the Labrador environment, an opportunity does exist to reopen discussions. The exact approach should not be defined; rather it should be flexible, open, honest and committed to maintaining contact at a pace which satisfies Labradorians. By pacing contact so as to satisfy Labradorians, Parks Canada stands to improve its

credibility. Any danger that national park objectives will be lost to alternative development proposals can be lessened by the potential support Labradorians may give to Parks Canada for its efforts to recognize Labrador's natural and cultural heritage and their integral nature. The last word on Labrador's heritage is given to Premier Peckford

The special relationship of the people to the land must be accounted for. The traditional lifestyle of Labrador, based on the harvesting of renewable resources; fishing, hunting, trapping, etc., requires a sensitive relationship between man and his delicate Northern Environment. That relationship permeates almost every aspect of the society and culture of Labrador and has to be accounted for in future developments. However, we must also recognize the challenges, opportunities and rewards of new lifestyles which can be ours through a rational program of resource development. (Premier A. Brian Peckford. Extract from a statement on the question of Native Land Claims in the Province. The Labradorian. Sept. 1980).

It is in this context that future national park discussions will take place in Labrador.

APPENDICES

APPENDICES

- I. Unpublished paper by N. Munro listing 14 reasons for the failure to establish a national park at Ship Harbour, Nova Scotia
- II. M.M. Gillis Report of September 8, 1976
- III. Recommendations of Angus McIntyre
- IV. Hickeys statement in House of Assembly June 2, 1976
- V. Extracts from the summary of the Labrador open community meetings in the fall of 1977
- VI. Results of public meetings in thirteen Labrador communities August and September, 1977
- VII. Rigolet brief to Tourism Minister Hickey in the fall of 1977
- VIII. Extract concerning national parks from the L.R.A.C. pamphlet "As If People Mattered - Resource Issues in Labrador". October 1977
- IX. List of tasks to be accomplished in the cooperative planning project proposal. January 1979
- X. The Memorandum of Intention concerning the Cooperative Planning Project Proposal. February, 1979.

APPENDIX I

An unpublished paper by N. Munro listing the significant factors which led to the abandonment of the proposal for a national park in the Ship Harbour area of Nova Scotia.

Parks Canada Location 60 square miles park along the Eastern Shore of Nova Scotia within 40 miles of Halifax. The area you probably have heard about, but the numerous factors that led to the downfall of the park are probably less known. No one factor is responsible but the large number of issues that arose were overbearing. What went wrong? The following is a glimpse at the significant factors.

1. Lack of personal contact. There was no attempt to deal with people on an individual basis to inform and also to receive feedback so as to modify the proposal. Inability of the Province to set up an information centre contributed to the problem as well as the lack of a social animator on the scene.
2. There was extremely biased television and press coverage from local and national sources. It was extremely one-sided and our lack of public relations staff and reluctance to cultivate the press led to a credibility gap. It must be stressed that even when press releases were prepared, they always seemed to have critical errors in the text or were misinterpreted by residents.
3. Because of the biased reporting there was extensive public sympathy for the landowners particularly the permanent residents. This was not only local but national.
4. A strong local organization was formed called the Association for the Preservation of the Eastern Shore which was quite effective in utilizing the press to their advantage and also very effective in drawing political attention to their plight by

4. (Cont'd)

conducting two marches to the Provincial Assembly. They were also most effective in distorting information to their advantage and to our disadvantage through the local area.

5. The lack of any solid economic impact study of the park proposal thwarted efforts to convince anyone of the longer term benefits of a park.
6. There was no relocation, retraining, or any other socio-economic program designed or even considered for the residents.
7. The Provincial Department of Lands and Forests was from the start reluctant to assemble lands for a park and the voluntary Economic Planning Board, another Provincial body, was also against the park.
8. There was intensive lobbying from the forest industry and by a local senator against park establishment.
9. The lack of municipal involvement in the proposal and the lack of briefing the council alienated the majority of councillors against the park.
10. There was a relative apathy of the need for National Parks because of the relative ease of public access to both salt and fresh water shoreline at this time.
11. The National and Provincial Parks Association did nothing to aid the establishment of the park or even to lend support at the local level, or act as an intermediary.
12. The park was presented as a single package with no additional support from either federal or provincial agencies relative to funding to public services and infrastructure.

13. The difference in life style of the rural resident who has strong ties to the land and who finds the transient life style of urban dwellers disconcerting was also a significant factor particularly as many were elderly.
14. Even though many understood the modified proposal for continued residence there was a distrust of government evident as well as a fear of eventual community collapse.

The items indicated above are food for thought and should lead us in a direction of rethinking our policies when establishing a park.

APPENDIX II

Memorandum by M.M. Gillis on September 8, 1976
"Suggestion for Involvement of Local People in
Labrador New Park Proposals"

4 OF 4

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

Parks Canada

Halifax, N.S.

September 8, 1976

Assistant Director
Programming & Development

Your file   Votre référence

Our file   Notre référence

8300-3 - Nfld/lab

Suggestion for Involvement of Local People
in Labrador New Park Proposals

1. Background

Parks Canada and the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador are at present discussing the desirability of establishing a national park or parks in either or both of the natural regions of national significance # 21 and #24. It is the intention of both governments to involve the people of Labrador in the decision-making process relative to this matter.

The first step in carrying out this intention occurred when Messrs Kun, Thomson and Pope of Parks Canada and Stanley of Newfoundland Dept. of Tourism visited the area in June, 1976 and met with residents in a number of communities in Labrador. The purpose of the visit was

- (a) to make the local people aware that the two governments were looking into the possibility of establishing a National Park or parks in Labrador;
- (b) to discuss the purpose of a National Park and reach a basic conceptual understanding of what a National Park is;
- (c) to identify local concerns about National Parks;
- (d) to ensure the local people that they would be involved in the decision-making process relative to the establishment of a National Park or Parks.

It was noted at the June meetings that the participants did not represent a broad cross section of the local people and a commitment was made by the departmental representatives to return for the same purpose at a time that was appropriate to the communities. (This time was thought to be mid-September to mid-October by the departmental representatives).

It was also agreed that planners from both departments (Parks Canada and Newfoundland Tourism) would visit the area in July to identify specific significant natural features of national importance in regions #21 and #24 and that the information would be shared at the promised return visit. Therefore, an additional objective was added to the visit at the "appropriate time" - that is (e) to identify with visual aids critical areas for inclusion in a National Park and point out possible conflict in resource use.

Subsequent to the June meetings and the planners visit to Labrador it was agreed within Parks Canada (PHQ, Kun, Carruthers, Bradley - ARO, Harper, Gillis) that the responsibility of facilitating discussion with the local people would belong to ARO. Therefore, discussions were held at PHQ by the Public Participation Coordinator with Bradley, Carruthers, Welland, Bill, and Pope to gain an understanding on expectations, requirements, process and degree of cooperation - as PHQ has initial responsibility for the establishment of new parks and the only area of initial responsibility for the Atlantic Regional office to assume is that of facilitating the involvement of the local people. It is important to note that if this is to be carried out the utmost degree of understanding, communication, and cooperation with PHQ, must prevail.

2. Problems

There are a number of problems associated with this exercise;

- 2.1. We do not know if early October is an "appropriate time".
- 2.2. We do not know who represents a broad cross section of the local people;
- 2.3. We have no staff member in the Labrador area to see to it that we are meeting the necessary people in the right place, at the right time to ensure that the second series of meetings are taking place in a climate of understanding and that the mechanism to continue discussions will be put in place and continued in the future;
- 2.4. The process of bringing along the local people in discussions before a Federal/Provincial Agreement has been signed must be understood and accepted by the Province of Newfoundland (Dept. of Tourism) as it will be a partner in any agreement;
- 2.5. Although it is not the business of Parks Canada to settle native land claims it must be recognized that the claims are an important factor in the Labrador situation.

3. Suggestions

- 3.1. Officials of ARO and PHQ discuss with officials of Newfoundland Dept. of Tourism the preferred process and the need to have a Parks Canada staff member in Labrador to facilitate discussions on new park proposals. (See Carruthers memo to file - 1 Sept. 1976 suggesting Davey, Harper, Stanley meeting in mid-September);
- 3.2. Upon acceptance of 1 send in Parks Canada staff member experienced in public involvement to solve problems and 2 and to set up the meetings at the first possible "appropriate time" so that the local involvement process can get off to a satisfactory start for all parties concerned.
- 3.3. As the present schedule of the Atlantic Region Public Participation Coordinator leaves little time available for in-depth work in Labrador, a qualified person should be employed on a short-term or contract basis (3 to 6 months) to enable Parks Canada to lay a solid foundation for its discussion on a new park or parks in Labrador. This short term assignment will give time to explore the continuing need of a facilitator and the possibility of involving local people and the Province of Newfoundland in choosing such a facilitator for the long term.

4. Objectives for Parks Canada Public Involvement Facilitator in Labrador

The attached objectives for the Facilitator are those proposed for the Project Authorization and can serve as a basis for discussion with the Province and on the Facilitator's role. It is recognized that either a job description or terms of reference must be prepared should we proceed with implementation of the suggestions.

M.M. Givens

M.M. Givens

Public Participation Coordinator

Attachments

c.c. J. Givens

P.A.

Public Involvement Facilitator, Labrador area of Atlantic Region,
Parks Canada.

Under the direction of the Public Participation Coordinator, Atlantic Region, the incumbent will facilitate the involvement of the public in the decision-making process relative to the designation of a National Park or Parks in Labrador in either or both natural region #21 (Mealy Mountain area) or natural region #24 (Torngat Mountains), e.g. that is to collect data and facilitate negotiation between communities, Province and Parks Canada.

1. He/she will become familiar with the social structure of the communities that may be directly affected by the establishment of a National park or parks; and will identify the segments of the public to be involved; and communicate this information to Parks Canada and the Province.
2. Will work closely with Parks Canada Headquarters, and Atlantic Regional Office staff, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and the communities, to:
  - identify concerns relative to designating planning; developing, and managing a National Park;
  - create a climate in which communication will be open and understanding can be achieved;
  - ensure that relevant information is obtained and disseminated in appropriate form and time;

3. - will advise on the appropriate methods to use and achieve # 2.
4. - will facilitate meetings between appropriate levels of decision-makers in Parks Canada, the Province, and the communities and endeavour to obtain required resource persons and materials.

Term appointment: 1 September 1976 - 31 March 1977

M. A. G. G. G.
25 Aug 76

APPENDIX III

The Recommendations portion of the report made by Angus MacIntyre as a result of a field trip to Labrador undertaken in November 1976

LABRADOR REPORT

ON: A FIELD TRIP IN NOVEMBER, 1976

BY: ANGUS MACINTYRE

FOR: THE PURPOSE OF HELPING LOCAL COMMUNITIES TO
BE INVOLVED IN DISCUSSIONS ON PROPOSED NATIONAL
PARK OR PARKS IN LABRADOR

4. RECOMMENDATIONS:

RECOMMENDATION # 1

- follow-up meetings be held after freeze up and before break up, (approximately between January 1 and April 15, 1977).

RECOMMENDATION # 2

- meetings be arranged with: (a) people who were at the first set of meetings held in July, 1976; (b) representatives of the communities named in the circulation list; (c) other individuals and/or special interest groups who may have a direct interest in the matter.

RECOMMENDATION # 3

- the local community or organization be responsible for arranging a suitable chair person for the meeting. Local groups, etc. make their own record of what happens at the meeting. However, an official set of minutes must be acceptable to all parties. Therefore, minutes of the meeting (record of decision, commitments, information to be obtained, etc.) not be accepted as official until they have been agreed to by all parties.

RECOMMENDATION # 4

- meetings be held in a manner that allows the greatest degree of participation possible. It may be necessary at a later date to consider a more formal structure for carrying on the process (public hearing, independent inquiry, etc.) but at this time discussions be on an informal basis.

RECOMMENDATION # 5

- approximately one month prior to any meeting Parks Canada supply people with information concerning:

1. What is a National Park?
2. What are preceived benefits as seen by Parks and Tourism?
3. What are the limitations or disadvantages for Labrador?
4. What type of Park is being proposed?
5. What type of development could or could not be allowed?
6. What are the proposed boundaries?
7. How much money is Parks planning to spend?
8. What jobs will be available, locally and to outsiders?
9. Diagram showing the process of establishing a National Park, with special reference as to how it will apply to Labrador (when will decisions be made, by whom, etc.)

RECOMMENDATION # 6.

the information requested in # 5 be provided in a form so that it can be distributed to a large number of people (brochure), and that it be written in layman's language in sufficient detail to answer the above concerns without being so long that it will overwhelm the average person.

RECOMMENDATION # 7

a program of public information be implemented through the mass media dealing with the concerns raised in recommendation # 5.

RECOMMENDATION # 8

consideration be given to the possibility of involving local people in the studies (especially in areas the local community may have a special interest, such as hunting) as well as employing them where possible in the field work that has to be done. For example, studies have to be carried out before firm decisions are made concerning the type of parks and kinds of activities that may or may not be possible. Some of this information may, in fact, be available among the local people because of their knowledge and experience. The "terms of reference" for such studies could be discussed with some local residents before the studies begin in order to check if anything had been overlooked in their design. In addition, some of the local "experts" might be

RECOMMENDATION # 9

- the possibility of exchange visits between people in other areas who have been affected by the establishment of a National Park (both pro and con) and the community of Labrador be examined.
- the Indian people would be especially interested in exchange visits with other Indian, Metis or Inuit people who have been affected by a National Park.
- government representatives go with local residents to experience first hand the full extent of land use at present. Local residents go with government representatives to the Mealy Mountains for the same reason.

RECOMMENDATION # 10

- the possibility of obtaining the necessary resources for local communities, to seek an independent opinion where their knowledge or experience is in disagreement with the findings of Park Planners, be explored. This may not be of great concern if action is taken on recommendation # 8.

RECOMMENDATION # 11

- an Indian person be employed for the necessary time to carry on further liaison between the Indian people of the Montagnais/Naskapi Band and Parks and Tourism officials. Chief Bart Jack made it clear that any person who was not an Indian would not be acceptable to them. Similarly, consideration should be given to employing an Inuit to carry on liaison with the Inuit people.

RECOMMENDATION # 12

- a translator be provided for meetings in the Indian and Inuit communities. (These translators might also carry on the liaison work as recommended in # 11).

RECOMMENDATION # 13

- this report be circulated to the people I met in Labrador as part of a commitment to on going meaningful dialogue based on trust and open communication in both directions.

APPENDIX IV

The statement concerning national parks in Labrador made by the Honourable T.V. Hickey, Minister of Tourism to the Provincial House of Assembly, on June 2, 1976

June 2/77

MR. SPEAKER, I RISE TO MAKE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL PARKS IN LABRADOR.

AS THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE ARE AWARE MY DEPARTMENT HAS FOR SOME TIME BEEN HOLDING PRELIMINARY DISCUSSIONS WITH PARKS CANADA WITH REGARD TO THE POSSIBLE ESTABLISHMENT OF TWO (2) NATIONAL PARKS IN LABRADOR, HEALY MOUNTAINS AND TORNGAT MOUNTAINS. THE AMOUNT OF INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THIS TIME IS NOT SUFFICIENT FOR GOVERNMENT TO MAKE A DECISION ON THE DESIRABILITY OR OTHERWISE OF HAVING PARKS ESTABLISHED IN EITHER OF THE ABOVE AREAS. IN VIEW OF THIS THE FOLLOWING COURSE OF ACTION HAS BEEN APPROVED BY GOVERNMENT TO OBTAIN THE NECESSARY BACKGROUND INFORMATION TO FURTHER CONSIDER THIS MATTER.

BOTH PARKS CANADA AND MY DEPARTMENT WILL CONTINUE WITH A PROGRAM OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT TO DETERMINE THE ATTITUDE OF THE PEOPLE OF LABRADOR TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL PARKS. PARTICULAR EMPHASIS WILL BE PLACED ON HOW THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ANY PARK MIGHT AFFECT TRADITIONAL LIFESTYLES. DURING THE COMING SUMMER MONTHS DISCUSSIONS WILL BE CONDUCTED WITH THE COMMUNITIES.

I HAVE REQUESTED PARKS CANADA TO PROVIDE ME WITH A DEFINITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR EACH AREA, (HEALY MOUNTAINS AND TORNGAT MOUNTAINS) BY THE END OF THIS YEAR. (1977). THIS PLAN WILL PROVIDE DETAIL AS TO THE TYPE AND LEVEL OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC IMPACT TO BE EXPECTED, ETC.

ALL DEPARTMENTS OF GOVERNMENT WILL BE REQUESTED TO DO AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF NATIONAL PARKS BEING ESTABLISHED AT HEALY MOUNTAINS AND TORNGAT MOUNTAINS. THESE ASSESSMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED BY GOVERNMENT IN ARRIVING AT A DECISION WITH REGARD TO THE NET BENEFIT OF ESTABLISHING NATIONAL PARKS IN THE AREAS MENTIONED.

WHEN THE ABOVE HAS BEEN COMPLETED GOVERNMENT WILL HAVE ADEQUATE INFORMATION ON WHICH TO MAKE A FINAL DECISION.

APPENDIX V

A synopsis of public comments and the impressions left with the author as a result of the open meetings held in Labrador communities in August and September, 1976.

Note: Item #20 was added by M.M. Gillis in the Fall of 1976.

"Will there be National Parks in Labrador? YOUR opinions will help decide."

Results of public meetings in thirteen Labrador Communities,
August and September, 1977

1. People don't understand the meaning of National Parks.
2. People don't see the need for National Parks where the whole country is a park. Most are not interested in the subject at this time.
3. Most people are unaware of, and others are not prepared to accept, the likelihood of massive changes to their lands in the form of mines, dams, forest cutting, etc.
4. People want things to stay the way they are. The Labrador coast, known as 'The Labrador', has been isolated from the mainstream of Newfoundland life, and Canadian life to such an extent that the changes which will inevitably come in the next few years are going to cause even greater social disharmony than Labradorians can conceive. Development means change and change means a loss of both lifestyle and livelihood.
5. Parks Canada and Provincial Parks are, apparently, the first government agencies to ask Labradorians what they feel about a project, before it is authorized or started, i.e. Churchills Falls 'development'.

6. Consequently, people are deeply suspicious of any and all government officials. Local government is virtually non-existent because all decisions are made far away in St. John's, Ottawa, Montreal or the Atlantic regional offices of various agencies in places like Halifax and Moncton.
7. Naturally therefore because government is far away, there is strong criticism of government priorities. There is a real lack of adequate water, sewers, roads, airstrips, docks and adequate housing. Naturally people are therefore saying give us the basics and then we will consider national parks.
8. People feel very strongly that they should be able to continue to hunt, fish, trap and do all the other traditional things they have been able to do in the past and can do today in all of Labrador. So if National Parks are to be created this would apply there too.
9. Labradorians are a largely mixed cultural group of people who have Indian, Inuit and European blood. Because of this, and because they have been forgotten for so long, they feel that any new arrivals who come from Canada or from The Is'and, are all outsiders.
10. Indians, Inuit and some other Labradorians want the native claims settled before there is talk of National Parks.

11. People feel that National Parks would not give Labradorians anything they don't already have. Further, National Parks will likely take something from them, intangible things such as freedom to do what they like and tangible things such as lose control over part of their lands and bring in more outsiders, tourists.
12. People feel that only the rich tourists will be able to reach the two areas. Further, people suspect National Parks are being set-up for rich tourists to sports hunt and sports fish; it is only a matter of time before the government (it's all one government to the Labradorian) builds lodges in these parks.
13. Some people feel they will never again be allowed to hunt caribou in the Mealy's. The area has been closed for caribou hunting since the early 1970s because of a serious drop (for unclear reasons) in the herd size.
14. People want a great deal more information before they will say Yes to a National Park. Right now they are inclined to say No.
15. If Parks Canada and Provincial Department of Tourism are to go back, it would be best for the Labrador if they go sometime between mid January and February.
16. Public meetings are not the best method to get people to talk about something they do not understand. Another method has to be used to allow individuals to understand the issue(s) and to avoid the dominance of meetings by the vocal few who may, or may not, represent community feeling.

17. It's going to take a long time to reach a stage where even the thirteen communities already approached are satisfied that a National Park is either a good or a bad thing.
18. People first want to know how they can have a say in the management of a Park, second what sort of park will be created (will it be a wilderness or a developed park, for example), and lastly then decide whether or not they want a Park at all.
19. People want someone to come back and stay a while in each community and learn how they live, use their land, and, at the same time, hear what National Parks have meant elsewhere, what mistakes have been made, what corrective actions have taken place, and if no corrective actions taken, why not. People want to understand what it will mean to them as individuals.
20. The local people want information collected for resource potential and natural resource studies for the Province and Parks Canada to be shared with them as a necessary step in their involvement.
21. The people of the Labrador are different from other Canadians and even quite different themselves between communities.
22. If Parks Canada want Parks in Labrador, approach the matter slowly. There is no need to rush but there is a need to raise the issue now as one alternative use of some lands and waters in Labrador.

23. Parks in Labrador are a political issue of relatively minor importance in the economy and life of the Province. They will not be of major economic benefit but they do appear to be demanding large areas of Labrador.

Richard Bill

October 1977

APPENDIX VI

An extract from "A Summary Report of the Proceedings of Open Meetings held in Twelve Labrador Communities with Local Residents and Officials of Parks Canada and the Provincial Department of Tourism to discuss the possibility of National Parks in Labrador, August-September, 1977".

Note: The parts of the Summary which are not included are the mailing list to whom the reports were sent and the script of the slide show shown in these communities.

A Summary Report
of the
Proceedings of Open Meetings
held in
Twelve Labrador Communities
with Local Residents and Officials
of Parks Canada and the Provincial Department of
Tourism to discuss
the possibility of National Parks in Labrador

August-September 1977

Indian and
Northern Affairs

Parks Canada

Affaires indiennes
et du Nord

Parcs Canada

Department of Tourism
Newfoundland and Labrador

A Summary Report of the Proceedings of Open Meetings held in Twelve Labrador Communities with Local Residents and Officials of Parks Canada and the Provincial Department of Tourism.

This report summarizes the proceedings of the open meetings held in twelve Labrador communities with local residents and officials from Parks Canada and the Provincial Department of Tourism.

The purposes of the meetings were:

1. to give information about the areas, under consideration by Parks Canada and the Province for National Parks, in Labrador;
2. to provide information on the procedure to establish National Parks;
3. to provide an opportunity for local communities to ask questions, express concerns, and give suggestions;
4. to examine ways to continue discussions with local communities, the Province, and Parks Canada.

Meetings were held in the following communities;

Mud Lake	- evening, 29 August 1977
North West River (Shashashit)	- afternoon, 30 August
North West River (north side)	- evening, 30 August
Happy Valley - Goose Bay	- evening, 19 September
Davis Inlet	- afternoon, 20 September
Nain	- evening, 20 September
Hopedale	- evening, 21 September
Postville	- afternoon, 22 September
Makkovik	- evening, 22 September
Rigolet	- afternoon, 24 September
Black Tickle (home visits)	- afternoon, 25 September
Cartwright	- evening, 25 September
Paradise River	- afternoon, 26 September

The chairperson for each meeting was chosen by the community. The meetings were conducted in English with translation by a local resident into Montagnais, Naskapi, or Innuit at North West River (Shashashit) Davis Inlet, Nain, and Hopedale. The agenda included explanatory statements by federal and provincial officials; questions, concerns, and suggestions by the local residents; and responses by the officials. The proceedings of each meeting were recorded. (A copy is being sent to persons who indicated at each meeting they wished to receive the proceedings, along with the summary report of all meetings.)

A. Explanatory Statements

Officials gave the following explanations:

- o A decision to establish a National Park or Parks in Labrador has not been made;
- o The areas being looked at by the two governments are the Mealy Mountains and the Torngat Mountains. (The areas of interest were shown on air photo maps which were left in each community for further study by local residents. Maps are attached to this report for easy reference.)
- o The studies carried out by Parks Canada in the late 1960's and 1970's showed that the areas would make good National Parks. However, much more information will have to be gathered and assessed and it could be some time before a final decision can be made;
- o It will be necessary to carry out studies to find out exactly what natural resources are in the areas of interest; what these resources are being used for now and how these resources could be used in the future; how changes in the use of the resources could affect the local people; what the public would think about these changes; what effect traditional land uses would have on areas set aside to be preserved as National Parks; what effect activities for visitors to enjoy the National Parks would have on traditional users and uses; what effect the presence of a National Park would have on local communities;
- o All Provincial Government Departments and Agencies have been requested to assess the proposed areas to determine what alternative uses are possible.
- o The two governments want the local people to become involved in the assessment leading to any decisions. The public should become involved in studies and discussions with the public servants and directly with the federal and provincial elected representatives;
- o The idea of establishing National Parks in Labrador came from Labradorians, the Royal Commission on Labrador, the Provincial Department of Tourism, and Parks Canada;
- o A National Park is a special area of land and/or water that is set aside by an Act of Parliament to be preserved in its natural state for the benefit, enjoyment, and use of Canadians now and in the future;

Torngat Mountains Area of Interest

- o There are many different kinds of land in Canada. Parks Canada has made studies of the kinds of land, their vegetation and wildlife, and of the waters, and has grouped the areas that are alike into 48 regions. It is hoped to preserve and protect a sample of each region the way it is now.
- o The first National Park was established in the Rocky Mountains in 1885 (Banff National Park). Today there are 28 National Parks ranging in size from 1.6 square miles (St. Lawrence Islands in Ontario) to 17,300 square miles (Wood Buffalo in Alberta and the Northwest Territories).

<u>Province/Territory</u>	<u>National Parks</u> (year established)	<u>Areas in square</u> <u>Miles</u>
British Columbia	Pacific Rim (1970)	150
	Mount Revelstoke (1914)	101.4
	Glacier (1886)	521
	Yoho (1886)	507
	Kootenay (1920)	532
Yukon Territory	Kluane (1972)	8,500
Northwest Territories	Nahanni (1972)	1,840
	Auyuittuq (1972)	8,290
	Wood Buffalo (1922)	17,300
Alberta	Wood Buffalo	
	Elk Island (1913)	75
	Jasper (1907)	4,200
	Banff (1885)	2,564
	Waterton Lakes (1895)	203
Saskatchewan	Prince Albert (1927)	1,496
Manitoba	Riding Mountain (1929)	1,149
Ontario	Pukaskwa (1971)	725
	Georgian Bay Islands (1929)	5.5
	Point Pelee (1918)	6
	St. Lawrence Islands (1914)	1.6
Quebec	La Mauricie (1970)	210
	Forillon (1970)	92.8

New Brunswick	Kouchibouguac (1969) Fundy (1948)	87 79.5
Prince Edward Island	Prince Edward Island (1937)	7
Nova Scotia	Kojimukjik (1968) Cape Breton Highlands (1936)	147.1 367
Newfoundland	Gros Morne (1970) Terra Nova (1957)	750 153.1

Although there are two National Parks on the Island of Newfoundland, there are none in Labrador.

- o In the Reserves for National Parks recently established in Northern Canada the native people are able to continue their traditional hunting, trapping and fishing activities;
- o The Province of Newfoundland and Labrador would insist on Labradorians having the right to continue their traditional land uses;
- o The National Parks Act was amended in 1974 to permit areas of the Yukon and N.W.T. to be identified as Reserves for National Parks pending settlement of native land claims.
- o Many steps have to be taken before a National Park is established:
  1. an exchange of letters by the Federal and Provincial Governments allows public servants to begin studies and public discussion,
  2. after the studies, discussions and negotiations there may be a Memorandum of Intent entered into by the 2 Ministers.
  3. a formal agreement follows in due course,
  4. the land is acquired by the Provincial Government and turned over to the Federal Government according to the dates set in the Agreement,
  5. the transfer of the lands is made official by Orders-in-Council,

6. the Parliament of Canada amends the National Park Act to add the new National Park to the Schedule of the Act and the Park is then proclaimed.

- o Decisions have to be made at every step along the way. The governments here are at the first step and are asking the public to take part in the process with them.
- o A slide presentation was used to show the mountains, bogs, beaches, fiords, forests, tundra and wildlife that could be preserved in National Parks. Other slides showed activities in National Parks in other parts of Canada.

B. Questions, Concerns, Suggestions

The local people stated:

- o The local communities had priorities:
  - better transportation (access by road, improved coastal service and facilities, improved air service and facilities),
  - improved housing and health facilities,
  - water and sewer systems,
  - improved communication facilities (telephones in some cases, television and radio).

They did not want to see land set aside as National Parks which might have all these things when there are communities that have been in existence for years and are still without them;

- o The people want to use and protect their renewable resources and to have a say in the short term and longterm use of the non renewable resources and how the way of life of the Labradorian will be affected.
- o It was difficult to understand the need to set land aside to preserve it in its natural state - many felt that Labradorians had used and protected the land and its wildlife for years;
- o Labradorians are proud of their history and traditions and would not only want their heritage properly protected, but told properly, and might help tell their story in National Parks if they were established.
- o More information on National Parks was needed - some people had heard about hardships and restrictions on

local communities because National Parks were established in their areas and they wanted to talk with some of these people. They also wanted to talk with people who knew first hand about some of the opportunities provided by National Parks being established near communities;

- o Traditional uses for the land and sea had to be confirmed and traditional users would have to be guaranteed the right to continue these uses in areas set aside as National Parks;
- o A large influx of tourists was not seen as desirable - in any event, residents wanted to be able to benefit from any increase in tourism and wanted to be assured that tourists would not be able to have exclusive fishing camps in National Parks nor should the tourist be allowed to hunt or trap.
- o There could be no interferences with the fishery industry, especially the expansion of the Arctic Char portion of the industry into the Torngats.
- o Both the Naskapi people of Davis Inlet and the Montagnais people of Northwest River (Shishashit) said they were not prepared to discuss National Parks until their land claims were settled. - Once their claims were settled they felt they could protect the land, but prefer it to be used for fishing, trapping, hunting and travel rather than for tourists and recreation. They preferred to manage the lands themselves rather than have Parks Canada manage a part.
- o The Inuit wanted their land claims settled but once this was done they would be willing to discuss the possibility of Parks Canada managing a part of the land as a National Park;
- o In every community, some people were against National Parks in Labrador. While most people saw the need to preserve some of the beautiful lands and waters and their wildlife, they felt they needed to know more about how this could be done in National Parks. Some people were in favour of something like a National Park being established to protect the lands and waters.
- o At every meeting it was made clear that more information was needed, residents were willing to help get information and wanted studies made by the governments made available to them, and people wanted time to study and discuss the advantages and disadvantages of National Parks in Labrador;

Officials of the Federal - Provincial team present at the
community meetings in Labrador, August and September 1977.

Provincial Officials

Frank Manuel, Deputy Minister, Department of Tourism, 130
Water Street, St. John's, Nfld., A1C 1A8

Don Hustins, Director, Provincial Parks, Department of
Tourism, P.Q. Box 9340, Postal Station B, St. John's
Nfld.

Jerry Roth, Chief, Planning and Development, Provincial
Parks, Department of Tourism, P.O. Box 9340, Postal
Station B, St. John's, Nfld., A1A 3C9.

Federal Officials

Steve Kun, Director, National Parks, Parks Canada, 400
Laurier Avenue West, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0H4

John Carruthers, Chief, Parks System Planning Division,
Parks Canada, 400 Laurier Ave. W., Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H4

Richard Bill, Head, New Park Studies-Eastern Canada, Parks
System Planning Division, Parks Canada, Ottawa. 400
Laurier Avenue West, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0H4

Pat Thomson, Director, Atlantic Region, Parks Canada,
Historic Properties, Upper Water Street, Halifax, N.S.,
B3J 1S9

Doug Harper, Assistant Director, Atlantic Region, Parks
Canada, Historic Properties, Upper Water Street,
Halifax, N.S., B3J 1S9

Mary M. Gillis, Public Participation Coordinator, Atlantic
Region, Parks Canada, Historic Properties, Upper Water
Street, Halifax, N.S., B3J 1S9

- o The airphoto maps and topographic maps of the Mealy Mountains and Torngat Mountains were left in each community for further study,
- o Both the Province and Parks Canada would consider the suggestion to send a representative to work with the communities for an extended period and would let the communities know what they were able to do about the suggestion,
- o The team of officials would look into the possibility of returning to the same communities between January and March 1978.

E. Background to the Community Visits

After the Federal and Provincial Governments agreed to discuss the possibility of National Parks in Labrador, officials of both governments met with some representatives of Labrador communities in July 1976. Later, Mr. Angus MacIntyre, a public involvement-facilitator worked for several weeks in the area to find ways to start involving the local people in discussions on National Parks with the government officials. He presented a report to Parks Canada and the Provincial Department of Tourism and sent copies to all the people with whom he met while in Labrador. The two government departments accepted Mr. MacIntyre's recommendations in principle and have been trying to follow them. (Mr. MacIntyre's report is available on request.)

A brochure "Will There be National Parks in Labrador? - Your Opinions Will Help Decide" was prepared and distributed to every household prior to the community meetings (in Happy Valley - Goose Bay distribution was through the Libraries; the Friendship Centre, and the Labrador Resources Advisory Council and Adult Education offices.) (The brochure is available on request in English, French, Montagnais/Naskapi, and Inuttituit.)

A bibliography about Labrador was prepared for Parks Canada and was sent in June 1977 to the schools and libraries in each of the communities, to be made available to residents.

The airphoto maps and topographical maps have been left in each community at places agreed on at each meeting.

Three copies of the slide presentation are being given to the Adult Education Office and the Labrador Resources Advisory Council for loan to the communities.

Copies of the National Parks Act were left in some communities and are available on request.

At the invitation of the school principles, officials met with the students and teachers in Makkovik and Cartwright.

PLEASE NOTE:

Should anyone who attended the open community meetings feel that this summary report in anyway misrepresents what was said at the meetings please send your comments to:

- The Director
National Parks
Parks Canada
400 Laurier Avenue West
OTTAWA, Ontario
K1A 0H4

Attention: R.E. Bill.

Requests for further information or comments may be sent to the attention of Mr. Bill or to any other member of the team of officials who attended the meetings.

Elected Representatives

(who have been sent a copy of this record).

Hon. J. Hugh Faulkner, Minister of Indian and Northern
Affairs,
400 Laurier Avenue West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H4

Hon. J.C. Morgan, Minister, Department of Tourism
130 Water Street, St. John's, Nfld., A1C 1A8

Hon. T.V. Hickey, Minister, Department of Recreation and
Rehabilitation
Confederation Building, St. John's Nfld., A1C 5T7

Mr. J. Goudie, (Mr. J. Goudie attended the public meeting at
Northwest River (Shishashit) on August 30, 1977.)
M.H.A., Happy Valley, Labrador, AOP 1C0

Mr. I. Strachan, M.H.A., Nain, Labrador, AOP 1L0

Mr. W.H. Rompkey, M.P., House of Commons, Ottawa, K1A 0A6

Officials of the Federal - Provincial team present at the
community meetings in Labrador, August and September 1977.

Provincial Officials

Frank Manuel, Deputy Minister, Department of Tourism, 130
Water Street, St. John's, Nfld., A1C 1A8

Don Hustins, Director, Provincial Parks, Department of
Tourism, P.O. Box 9340, Postal Station B, St. John's
Nfld.

Jerry Roth, Chief, Planning and Development, Provincial
Parks, Department of Tourism, P.O. Box 9340, Postal
Station B, St. John's, Nfld., A1A 3C9.

Federal Officials

Steve Kun, Director, National Parks, Parks Canada, 400
Laurier Avenue West, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0H4

John Carruthers, Chief, Parks System Planning Division,
Parks Canada, 400 Laurier Ave. W., Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H4

Richard Bill, Head, New Park Studies-Eastern Canada, Parks
System Planning Division, Parks Canada, Ottawa. 400
Laurier Avenue West, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0H4

Pat Thomson, Director, Atlantic Region, Parks Canada,
Historic Properties, Upper Water Street, Halifax, N.S.,
B3J 1S9

Doug Harper, Assistant Director, Atlantic Region, Parks
Canada, Historic Properties, Upper Water Street,
Halifax, N.S., B3J 1S9

Mary M. Gillis, Public Participation Coordinator, Atlantic
Region, Parks Canada, Historic Properties, Upper Water
Street, Halifax, N.S., B3J 1S9

Officials of the Federal-Provincial team present at the community meetings in Labrador

Communities visited in August and September, 1977	Provincial Dept. of Tourism			Parks Canada					
	Mr. F. Manuel	Mr. D. Hustins	Mr. J. Roth	Mr. S. Kun	Mr. P. Thomson	Mr. D. Harpes	Mr. J. Carruthers	Mr. M. M. Gillis	Mr. R. Bill
Mud Lake		X	X	X	X			X	X
Northwest River (both sides of the river		X	X	X	X			X	X
Happy Valley	X		X						
Goose Bay						X	X	X	X
Davis Inlet	X		X			X	X	X	X
Nain	X		X			X	X	X	X
Hopedale	XX		XX			X	X	X	X
Postville	XX		XX			X	X	X	X
Makkovick	X		X			X	X	X	X
Rigolet			X			X	X	X	X
Black Tickle			X			X	X	X	X
Cartwright			XX			XX	XX	XX	XX
Paradise River			XX			XX	XX	XX	XX

This table explains which officials were present at each community meeting in Labrador in August and September, 1977.

APPENDIX VII

A typed copy of the handwritten brief presented to Tourism Minister Hickey by the Rigolet Community Council on September 29, 1977.

5

Minister of Tourism
Honourable Thomas Hickey

Dear Sir:

As this is our first time meeting you, we (the Community Council of Rigolet Labrador) would like to thank you for granting us this appointment. Our main concern at the moment is Parks. There are at the moment two places in Labrador suggested as possible areas for National Parks.

On September 24, 1977 Parks Canada representatives, along with one person from the Provincial Government visited Rigolet and held a public meeting. From that meeting, and also from other sources, we have learned that our life styles could be seriously affected if Parks are established in the areas suggested by Parks Canada. Also from reading a booklet sent out to us, by Parks Canada one can see, that Parks Canada is very interested and determined to establish Parks in the Mealy Mountains; and Torngat Mountains. They say in their booklet and also at the public meeting held here, that they want to preserve some areas of the country for all time in its natural state. They also say in that booklet, that by establishing National Parks in Labrador, that in no way will these Parks solve Labrador unemployment problem.

We know, that by having National Parks some jobs will be created. However we also know that by having these Parks in the suggested Areas, that in time, people will not be able to make a living in fishing and hunting as they do now all along the south shore of Lake Melville, Gross Water Bay, and the north side of Sandwich Bay. This area mentioned is one of the best salmon fishing areas in Labrador or for that matter the Atlantic East and are ? commercial salmon fishing.

So if the people who fish in these areas at the present time don't have jobs, or can't get jobs it is possible to make a living by fishing alone, and in many cases a very good one, providing they can hunt the birds, and animals as the (sic) always did as well.

The general feeling in the community now is that under no circumstances is a park wanted. This is just a little of why we do not want a Park. But we would like to discuss this further if you can spare us the time.

Thank you,

Yours sincerely,

Rigolet Community Council

Chairman
Vice Chairman
Councillor
Councillor
Councillor

William D. Shiwak
John C. Shiwak
Charles Tooktoshina (?)
Richard Rich (?)
Robert (?)

APPENDIX VIII

An extract from "As if people mattered - Resource Issues in Labrador" by the Labrador Resources Advisory Council. October 1977. pp 11-12.

NATIONAL PARKS

There has been talk of creating one or more national parks in Labrador for years. Recently, attention has narrowed to the Mealy Mountains, south of Lake Melville, and to the spectacular Torngat Mountains on the far north coast. Initial discussion of these possibilities has met considerable suspicion and resistance from the neighboring Labrador communities who fear restrictions on their traditional use of the land in question.

The issue is further complicated by the fact that both the Torngats and Mealties are within the territories subject to native land claims by the Indian and Inuit people of Labrador.

Parks Canada, which has been embroiled in bitter disputes during the creation of national parks elsewhere, seems prepared to go at least partway toward the process of consultation this problem demands. The province, too, after a much more heavy-handed treatment of local rights in the creation of Gros Morne National Park on the west coast of Newfoundland, seems anxious not to violate local feelings.

The irony of the current stand-off is that there may be no essential difference between the interests of the people of Labrador and the stated goals of Parks Canada. Both insist that their wish is to preserve these areas. The difference may be only in what they mean.

The people involved insist that if the areas in question are still worth preserving it is because they have used the land with wisdom and respect for generations. They have hunted, trapped, fished and camped in the interior for as long as men have lived in Labrador, and the land shows little evidence of their passing. What they seek to preserve, however, is not only the land in its wilderness state but their rights to continue in their traditional use of it.

It is here that they may collide with the position of Parks Canada. It seems to us there is an unresolved conflict within the philosophy of this agency itself.

One goal is to preserve unique areas of wilderness in Canada; the other is to encourage public recreation in these settings, to give more Canadians access to the beauties of their land.

In the interests of preserving the land, Parks Canada will forbid most traditional forms of land use - hunting, trapping and wood cutting, for example - within park boundaries. Yet to serve the recreation needs of Canadians they will assist and encourage visitors in other forms of land use - camping, hiking and sports fishing, for example - which may be more damaging by the sheer weight of numbers.

We believe there should be room within the philosophy of national parks for the traditional subsistence activities of people who are themselves a part of the land. The skills, knowledge and insight of people who have lived in harmony with this country are themselves a dwindling national resource, a fund of much wisdom, and to preserve these areas at the expense of this intimacy is a narrow view of the value of wilderness.

It is this harmony with the land, more than the chilly splendor of the land itself, which most deserves protection.

APPENDIX IX

The list of tasks identified and included in the document entitled "A proposal to plan for the future of the Torngat Mountains and Mealy Mountains of Labrador" which was distributed to some of the potential participants in January and February 1979.

A LIST OF TASKS

PREPARE DETAILED INVENTORY

- 1.1 Involve Labradorians in the co-operative planning project.
- 1.2 Inventorying existing knowledge of natural, archeological and historical resources in the areas of interest.
- 2.1 Identify the natural theme elements for inclusion in possible national parks..
- 2.2 Identify the natural resources in the areas of interest (for alternative uses).
- 2.3 Identify claims to land ownership.
- 2.4 Identify existing uses and traditional uses of the areas of interest.
- 2.5 Gather information about the cultural use history and prehistory of the areas of interest.
- 2.6 Provide assistance to Labradorians to gather information on their communities in order to assess social and economic impacts of development proposals and individual community initiatives.
- 2.7 Test and refine preliminary objectives of communities, Parks Canada, Department of Tourism and other co-operating departments and agencies.
- 2.8 Provide information on National Parks to Labradorians.

ASSESS RESOURCE POTENTIAL

- 3.1 Assess commercial mineral potential in the areas of interest.
- 3.2 Assess commercial forest potential in the Mealy Mountains area of interest.
- 3.3 Assess the areas of interest for hydro-electric power potential.
- 3.4 Assess the methods of access to possible national parks in the areas of interest.
- 3.5 Assess the natural resources in the areas of interest for potential use to the local peoples.
- 3.6 Assess feasible routes for transportation corridors through the areas of interest.
- 3.7 Assess commercial marine resources in the areas of interest.
- 3.8 Assess the recreation potential within the areas of interest.
- 3.9 Assess the areas of interest for national marine park potential.
- 3.10 Identify mutual or non-conflicting objectives and immediate action necessary to achieve them.

PREPARE ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS

- 4.1 Analyze and synthesize information gained from preceeding tasks to develop scenarios in which are identified decisions which can be implemented in the short and long term.
- 5.1 Add other segments of the public to discussions before preparing specific scenarios.
- 6.1 Prepare scenarios for National Parks.
- 6.2 Prepare scenarios for other uses.
- 6.3 Prepare scenarios for combined uses.

EVALUATE SCENARIOS

- 7.1 Assess social and economic impact of scenarios.
- 7.2 Present scenarios for public evaluation.
- 8.1 Implement acceptable short-term decisions.
- 9.1 Refine scenarios into feasible options.
- 10.1 Discuss options with the public.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 11.1 Refine options and recommend decisions concerning the best uses of the areas of interest.
- 12.1 Implement the decisions as to the best uses of the areas of interest.

Further information on these tasks (their objectives, resultant action, tentative major responsibility, tentative co-operating agencies, manpower and costs) is attached as Appendix I and II.

APPENDIX X

The Memorandum of Intention concerning the Cooperative Planning Project Proposal which was prepared in February 1979 but which was not signed.

This Memorandum of Intention is made between

The Minister of Indian Affairs

and

Northern Development, Canada

and

the Minister of Tourism, Newfoundland and Labrador

The Ministers recognize that the lands on the south side of Hamilton Inlet, called the Mealy Mountains area of interest, and the lands of northern Labrador, called the Torngat Mountains area of interest, have the potential to be constituted as National Parks of Canada. However, it is also recognized that alternative land uses are possible and these should be fully assessed before any decisions are made.

The Ministers intend to consider the various of land use options for the areas of interest and are proposing a cooperative 5 year planning project in which Labradorians, other Canadians, agencies and appropriate Federal and Provincial Government Departments pool resources to recommend the best use and management of these areas.

The Ministers intend to await the assessment of all alternative uses before deciding whether or not National Parks are, in fact, the best uses and therefore should be established. It is intended that such a decision will be made within 6 years of signing this document.

Signed at

in the Province of
Newfoundland and Labrador
this
day of   1979.

The Honourable J. Hugh Faulkner
Minister of Indian Affairs and
Northern Development
Canada

The Honourable D. Joseph Goudie
Minister of Rural Development
Newfoundland and Labrador

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baker, W.M. An Introductory Assessment of the Tourist and Recreation Potentials of the Biological Resources of Labrador. Department of Regional Economic Expansion, St. John's. March, 1976.

Baker, W.M. A Recro-Tourist Analysis and Classification of the Communities of Labrador. Department of Regional Economic Expansion, St. John's, January, 1976.

Baker, W.M. Tourist and Recreation Terrain Quality of Labrador. Department of Regional Economic Expansion, St. John's, January, 1976.

Baker, W.M. The Tourism and Outdoor Recreation Climate of Labrador. Department of Regional Economic Expansion. St. John's, October, 1976.

Baker, W.M. Sports Fishing Camps in Labrador. Department of Regional Economic Expansion, St. John's, January, 1976.

Bella, Leslie. "Partisan Politics and National Parks North of 60°." Park News, Vol. 15, No. 3, Fall 1979, pp. 6-13.

Berger, Thomas R., Mr. Justice, Commissioner. Northern Frontier Northern Homeland. The Report of the MacKenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry. Ottawa, 1977.

Bill, R. Labrador Press Clippings. (unpublished) Parks Canada, A series of volumes of selected press clippings dating from 1976 to 1979. Stored in the National Parks Documentation Centre, Hull.

Bill, R. Possible impacts of an expanded tourism industry in Labrador; A personal interpretation. Unpublished paper 1978.

Bird, Silas. Public Involvement in National Parks Development in Labrador: An Overview. Report prepared for the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, December 1977.

Blais, Marc. Winter Recreational Opportunities in the Torngat Mountains. (unpublished), report for Parks Canada, 1976.

Bowsan, James S. Attitudes and Orientations of Environmentally-concerned Citizens. Environmental Conservation, Vol. 4, No. 4, Winter 1977.

Breen, E. Labrador General Development Overview: a background paper for the Labrador interim subsidiary agreement. Department of Regional Economic Expansion, Development and Analysis Section, St. John's, 1976.

Brice-Bennett, C. ed., Our Footprints are Everywhere, Inuit Land Use and Occupancy Report. Labrador Inuit Association. Nain. 1977.

Brody, Hugh. The People's Land: Eskimos and Whites in the Eastern Arctic. Penguin Books, 1975.

Thomas L. Burton. "A Review and Analysis of Canadian Case Studies in Public Participation." Plan Canada 19/1 March 1979. pp. 13-22.

Canada. Discussion paper concerning a Labrador Development Corporation. Department of Regional Economic Expansion, St. John's, 1977.

Canada, Indian Affairs and Northern Development. The Economic Impact of National Parks in Canada: A Summary. National and Historic Parks Branch, Ottawa, 1970.

Canada, Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Annual Reports. Ottawa. 1969 to 1979.

Carruthers, J.A. National Parks System Planning in Canada. Planning Service, Québec Region. Parks Canada. Québec. July 1977.

Canada, Economic prospects for the Goose Bay area, Bureau of Management Consulting, Supply and Services Canada, Ottawa, 1973.

Canada. Facts from Canadian Maps: A Geographical Handbook. Energy, Mines & Resources, Ottawa, 1972.

Canada. Labrador Area Master Plan: Executive Summary. Transport Canada, Atlantic Region, Civil Aviation Branch, (1976 ?)

Canada. National Parks Act. Office Consolidation, R.S., c. N-13, amended by 1974, c. 11. Information Canada, Ottawa, 1975.

Canada. Public Accounts of Canada. Volume II, Details of Expenditures and Revenues, by year. Ottawa. 1969-1979.

Canada. Summary of the Tourism Overview Study. Department of Regional Economic Expansion, St. John's, 1976.

Canada. Tourism Scenario: Newfoundland. Bureau of Management Consulting, Supply & Services Canada, Ottawa, Project #5-1258, December 1975.

Canadian Council on Rural Development. Job Creation in Rural Canada. Seventh Review, Ottawa, 1978. p. 31.

Canadian Government Office of Tourism. The Tourism Program and the C.G.O.T. Ottawa, June 6, 1977.

Canadian Transport Commission. Isolated Communities Digest of Transportation Social and Economic Data. Research Branch, Ottawa, Report 10-77-5, 1977.

Carruthers, J.A.. Present National Parks and Future Needs in Canada. Paper No. 34. Proceeding of The Conference on "Productivity and Conservation in Northern Circumpolar Lands". (Edmonton, Alberta, 15 to 17 October 1969). International Union for Conservation of Nature and National Resources, Morges, Switzerland, 1970. pp. 297-299.

Carruthers, John A. Arctic and Sub-Arctic Québec national park reconnaissance, Parks Canada, Ottawa, 1970.

Carruthers, John A. Diary of a national park reconnaissance trip to Arctic and Sub-Arctic Québec. Parks Canada, 1970.

Carruthers, John A. National Parks System Planning in Canada. Planning Service, Québec Region, Parks Canada. Québec. July 1977.

Chipeniuk, R.C. Quebec Pirate Robs Newfoundland of Highest Peak in Torngat Mountains. Canadian Alpine Journal. Vol. 61, 1978, p.116.

Chipeniuk, Ray. Report of the 1978 Torngat Mountain Expedition to the Newfoundland Department of Tourism. Ottawa, (1978).

Clay, Grady. The Roving Eye: Trekking on Down to Kodachrome Town and Other Holy Places. Landscape Architecture, January, 1979.

Connor, D.M. "From partisan to partners". Community Planning Review, Vol. 22, No. 1.

Connor, Desmond M. Constructive Citizen Participation. Community Planning Review. Vol. 22, No. 1.

Coody, L.W. The Arctic Char Fishery of Northern Labrador. Environment Canada, St. John's, 1974.

Coombs, D.B. National park and equivalent reserve considerations for the Labrador: a preliminary survey. Parks Canada, Ottawa, 1971.

Couture, Ghislain. Terrestrial Natural Region 24, Northern Labrador Mountains, research notes. Parks Canada, Ottawa, 1975.

Couture, G. and Whytock, K. National Park Options in Labrador. Parks Canada, Ottawa, 22 April, 1975.

Crockett, Greg. A Sampling of Public Opinion on Oil and Gas Development in Newfoundland/Labrador. Third Draft, Environmental Assessment Division, Resource Management and Conservation Branch, Energy, Mines & Resources, Ottawa, November 28, 1978.

D'Amore, Louis J. An Executive Guide to Social Impact Assessment. The Business Quarterly, reprinted 1978.

Devine, Mary. An Overview Study of Historic Sites in Labrador With a View to Tourism Potential Ratings. Historic Resources Division, Department of Tourism, St. John's, July, 1974.

Division of Parks. Alternative Methods for Securing Park-land. Ministry of Natural Resources for Ontario, a report prepared for the Federal/Provincial Parks Conference, August, 1977.

Dobbin Associates, James. Regional Analysis of Natural Region 21, East Coast Boreal Uplands. Draft Report. Toronto. Dec. 18, 1981.

Dobbin Associates, James. Regional Analysis of Natural Region 24, Northern Labrador Mountains. Draft Report. Toronto. Jan. 22, 1982.

Driver, B.L. (ed.). Elements of Outdoor Recreation Planning. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1975 (1970).

Editeur officiel du Québec. The James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement. Québec, 1976.

Lief Ericsson. Death of Thorvald. Translation of an Icelandic saga by Adam De Breman: Descriptio Insularum Aquilonis, quoted in Olson and Bourne (eds.) The Northmen, Columbus and Cabot 985-1503, New York, 1906. Found in From the Ends of the Earth: An Anthology of Polar Writings by Augustine Courtauld, London: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Fay, Mike. "Towards a Definition of Parks Canada's Role in Regional Planning, A Discussion Paper". Parks Canada, Winnipeg, May 1978. "Draft Only".

Federal-Provincial Parks Conference. Park Classification System National and Provincial Parks. October, 1979, Winnipeg.

Fowler, William A. "The Growth of Political Conscience in Labrador". The Newfoundland Quarterly. Christmas 1976. Vol. 72, No. 4, pp. 38-44.

Gentilcore, R. Louis. National Parks Historical Theme Study. Parks Canada, Ottawa, February 15, 1978.

Gillis, M.M. "The Public - A Resource for Government Decision-Making". Unpublished paper in the Voluntary Session on "Public Participation" at the Parks Canada Superintendents Conference, Ottawa, 1 November 1978.

Goldberg, Michael A., and Webster, Douglas D. "The Atlantic Provinces: Canada's New Amenity Region". Contact, Volume II, Number 2, Summer/Fall 1979, pp. 91-111.

Greene, B.A. An Outline of the Geology of Labrador. Mineral Development Division, Department of Mines and Energy, Province of Newfoundland. Information Circular No. 15. St. John's, Newfoundland. 1974.

Heit, Michael J. How Much Do Parks Cost: An Examination of the 1963-78 Capital and O&M Costs of 7 Developing National Parks. Parks Canada (1979?). Draft Report.

Heit, Michael J. How Much Do Parks Cost: An Examination of the 1963-78 Capital and O&M Costs of 15 Developed National Parks. Parks Canada (1979?). Draft Report.

Heit, Michael J. How Much Do Parks Cost: An Examination of the 1963-78 Capital and O&M Costs of 18 Developed National Historic Parks. Parks Canada (1979?). Draft Report.

Herrick, Ramona. Wilderness Preservation in North America: A Conspectus and Annotated Bibliography. Contract 73-66 Parks Canada, Cornwall, May 1974.

Heyens, Leo E. Multiple vs. Single Use of Ontario Provincial Parks. Park News, Vol. 15, No. 3, Fall 1979, pp. 17-20.

Hoole, Arthur F. Public Participation in Park Planning: The Riding Mountain Case. Canadian Geographer, XXII, 1, 1978.

Public Participation in National Park Planning.

Comment No. 1, H.G. Kariel.

Comment No. 2, Richard N. MacFarlane.

Reply, A.T. Davidson.

The Canadian Geographer, Volume XXIII, 2, Summer, 1979.

Comments and a reply with reference to the paper by Arthur F. Hoole in the Canadian Geographer, XXII, 1, 1978.

House, J.D. "Local People and Transitional Technology". Text of an address to the Symposium on Research in the Labrador Coastal and Offshore Region on the topic of Socio-Economic Concerns in the Development of Offshore Labrador Resources. May 1979.

Huckvale, Neil. A discussion of some implications of intensified management of certain indigenous and introduced species of wildlife in Labrador. (unpublished paper). Carleton University, Ottawa, 1979.

International Biological Program. Conservation of terrestrial communities; report of region 8 (Newfoundland and Labrador). 1974.

Inuit Tapirisat of Canada. News Release. Ottawa.
February 28, 1979.

Inuttituut magazine. Special issue on Tourism in northern
Canada. Ottawa, 1976.

Jackson, C.I. (Editor). Canadian settlements - perspectives.
A volume in the series Urban Prospects, Ministry of State
for Urban Affairs, Ottawa, 1975.

Jackson, Laura and Bruce, Harry. Labrador, May-September
1971. Canada, Secretary of State, unpublished report of
summer student work, Ottawa, 1971.

Kariel, Pat. Public Participation in Planning the Lake
Louise Visitor Service Centre. Park News, Vol. 15, No. 12,
Summer 1979, pp. 24-29.

Labrador Inuit Association. Our Footprints are Everywhere,
Inuit Land Use and Occupancy Report. Editor:
C. Brice-Bennett, Nain, 1977.

Labrador Resources Advisory Council. Annual Report
1976-1977. Happy Valley-Goose Bay, 1977.

Labrador Resources Advisory Council. As If People Mattered -
Resource Issues in Labrador. Happy Valley, October 1977.

Labrador Resources Advisory Council. Community Priorities
for Development in Labrador. Undated (circa. 1978/79),
Happy Valley, Labrador.

Laing, A. Ministerial Statement. Ottawa, June 1967.

Laing, A. Statement on national park policy at the House of Commons. Ottawa. September 18, 1964.

Lambert, Carmen. Research Priorities in northern Labrador. McGill University, Montreal, December 1978. Written in collaboration with Audrey Anderson and Kaylean McNeil.

Lopoukhine, N., Prout, N.A., & Hirvonen, H.E. Ecological Land Classification of Labrador: a reconnaissance. Land Directorate, Fisheries and Environment Canada, Halifax, 1978.

Lothian, W.F. A History of Canada's National Parks. 3 Volumes. Parks Canada, Ottawa, 1976.

MacIntyre, Angus. Alternatives to fulfill July commitment to return with more information to further discuss proposed national parks in Labrador. 1976.

MacIntyre, Angus. Proposal for a mass media program to assist in the public involvement process: national parks in Labrador. 1976.

MacIntyre, Angus. A draft information brochure for distribution in Labrador. 1976.

MacIntyre, Angus. Labrador Report for the purpose of helping local communities to be involved in discussions on proposed national park or parks in Labrador. Sydney, Nova Scotia, 15 February, 1977.

McGrath, Judy; Foad, Judy; Cooke, Cindy; Smith, Robin.
Alluring Labrador. Them Days Magazine, Happy Valley,
 Labrador, undated (circa. 1979).

Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association. Submission by
 Bart Jack, to the January 1977 meeting of the Labrador
 Resources Advisory Council, Labrador (unpublished).

Nation, Rosemary. Canadian National Parks: A Critical
 Analysis of the Processes of their Acquisition and
 Management. (Unpublished LL.M. Thesis), Dalhousie
 University; September, 1979.

National Parks Service. National Parks and Outdoor
 Recreation Resources. Parks Planning Division. Ottawa.
 December 1966.

Nelson, J.G. & Scace, R.C. "The Canadian National Parks:
 today and tomorrow. Proceedings of a Conference. Organized
 by The National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada,
 and The University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, October
 9-15, 1968, in two volumes, Studies in Land Use History and
 Landscape Change, National Park Series No. 3.

Nelson, J.G., Needham, R.D., Nelson, S.H., and Scace, R.C.
The Canadian National Parks: today and tomorrow,
 Conference II: Ten Years Later. Proceedings of a
 Conference sponsored by the Faculty of Environmental
 Studies, University of Waterloo, National and Provincial
 Parks Association of Canada, and Parks Canada, Department of
 Indian and Northern Affairs, Banff, Alberta, October 8-13,
 1978, in two volumes, Studies in Land Use History and
 Landscape Change, No. 7.

Nelson, Reuben F.W. The Illusions of Urban Man. A volume in the series "Urban Prospects", Ministry of State for Urban Affairs, Ottawa, 1976. pp. 61-70.

Nettleship, David N. Distribution and Status of Seabird Colonies Along the Coast of Labrador. Department of Regional Economic Expansion, St. John's, October, 1975.

Newfoundland and Labrador, Government of. Labrador Development Proposal for Submission to the Government of Canada through the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. St. John's, 1977.

Newfoundland and Labrador. Royal Commission on Labrador. D. Snowden Report, Dept. of Public Works and Services, 6 volumes, St. John's, 1974.

Newfoundland and Labrador. A Tourism Development Strategy for Newfoundland and Labrador. St. John's, 1977.

O'Brien, John Joseph. Village Lake Louise - A Study of public participation in planning. (unpublished M.A. Thesis), University of British Columbia, May, 1973.

Olsen, Barry Lorne. The Role of Public Participation in Parks Canada Planning. Parks Canada and The Faculty of Environmental Design, University of Calgary, October, 1976. (Masters Degree).

Olwig, Karen Fog, and Olwig, Kenneth. Underdevelopment and the Development of "Natural" Park Ideology. Antipode, Vol. II, No. 2, 1979.

Paine, R. (ed.). The White Arctic: Anthropological Essays in Tutelage and Ethnicity. Memorial University of Newfoundland, Institute of Social and Economic Research Paper No. 7, St. John's, Newfoundland, 1977.

Papson, Stephen. "Tourism: World's Biggest Industry in the Twenty-First Century?". The Futurist, August, 1979.

Parks Canada. Author Listing for Documents on Regions 21 and 24 (held in the Documentation Centre). National Parks Branch, Ottawa, 1979.

Parks Canada. A Bibliography of the Mealy Mountains and Torngat Mountains, Labrador. Natural Resources Division, National Parks Branch, Ottawa, February, 1977.

Parks Canada. Example Routes Warranting Study NEWFOUNDLAND. Byways and Special Places Program, Ottawa, Document I0450R4, August, 1973.

Parks Canada. La Mauricie National Park Provisional Master Plan. Public Participation Program, Québec Region, August, 1977.

Parks Canada. A national park reconnaissance of the East Coast Boreal Region, Natural Region 21. Ottawa, 1974.

Parks Canada. National Park Options in Labrador, Newfoundland. Ottawa. August (?), 1974.

Parks Canada. National Park Options in Labrador, Newfoundland. Ottawa. November, 1974.

Parks Canada. National Parks Planning in Canada. 12th International Seminar on National Parks and Equivalent Reserves, Planning Service, Québec Region, Parks Canada, July, 1977.

Parks Canada. National Parks Policy. Ottawa, 1975.

Parks Canada. National Parks System Planning Manual. Ottawa, Second Edition, Second Printing, September, 1974.

Parks Canada. The National Parks Zoning System: An Outline. November, 1978.

Parks Canada. Natural Areas of Canadian Significance: A Preliminary Study. Parks System Planning Division, National Parks Branch, Ottawa, October, 1977.

Parks Canada. Parks Canada Policy. Ottawa, 1979.

Parks Canada. Planning Process for National Parks. Ottawa, October, 1978.

Parks Canada. Preliminary National Park Considerations for Labrador (A basis for discussion). National Parks Branch, Ottawa, November, 1976.

Parks Canada. Strategic Overview. Ottawa, 1980.

Parks Canada and Department of Tourism, Newfoundland and Labrador. A Summary Report and the Proceedings of Open Meetings held in Twelve Labrador Communities with Local Residents and Officials of Parks Canada and the Provincial Department of Tourism to discuss the possibility of National Parks in Labrador, August-September, 1977. Ottawa.

Parks Canada and Department of Tourism, Newfoundland and Labrador. "Will There Be National Parks in Labrador? Your Opinions will help decide". June, 1977.

Parks Canada and Department of Tourism, Newfoundland and Labrador. A Proposal to Plan for the Future of the Torngat Mountains and Mealy Mountains of Labrador. Ottawa, January, 1979.

Parks Division. A Provincial Canoe Route System: Proposal Development - A Discussion Paper. Department of Tourism. June 1980.

Patterson, Norman. Recreational Land Use Planning, text of an address to the Ontario Division's Spring Conference, in Niagara Falls, May 10, 1972. Community Planning Review. (date unknown).

Peach, J.A. The Tourism and Outdoor Recreation Climate of Newfoundland & Labrador. Department of Regional Economic Expansion, St. John's, 1975.

Petro-Canada. Getting Along in Labrador. Calgary, June 1980.

Pierce, T.W. Labrador Tourist and Recreation Overview Study The Terrain Quality Perspective. Department of Regional Economic Expansion, St. John's, (undated).

Powell, John A., Chairman. Report of the Tourism Sector Consultative Task Force to The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, Ottawa; Provincial Ministers Responsible for Tourism and to Commissioners of the Yukon and Northwest Territories. Ottawa, 12 July, 1978.

Priddle, G.B., Ed. Canadian Wildland Resources: The role and management of wildlands as a natural resource. Contact: Journal of Urban and Environmental Affairs. Vol. 10, No. 1, Spring 1978.

Offshore Labrador Biological Studies. Resource Management and Conservation Branch, Energy, Mines and Resources, Ottawa, May, 1979.

Conserving and Using Our Open Spaces. The Royal Bank of Canada Monthly Letter, Montreal, Vol. 57, No. 8, August, 1976.

Report of the Royal Commission on Labrador. Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, in 6 volumes, May, 1974.

Robinson, H. A Geography of Tourism. London: MacDonald & Evans Ltd., March, 1976.

Rosen, Peter S., (ed.). Workshop on coastal research and planning in Labrador, 1978. Environment & Fisheries Canada, Bedford Institute of Oceanography, Dartmouth, N.S., 1978.

Rowe, J.S. Forest Regions of Canada. Bulletin No. 1300, Canadian Forestry Service, Department of Environment, Ottawa, 1977.

Sadler, Barry, Editor. Involvement and Environment: Proceedings of the Canadian Conference on Public Participation, October 4-7, 1977. Environment Council of Alberta. Two volumes. Edmonton, 1978.

Sarsfield, Peter. Report to the Naskapi Montagnais Innu Association and the Labrador Inuit Association regarding the health care delivery system in northern Labrador. 1977.

Saskatchewan. Report of the Public Hearings Board on the Proposed Grasslands National Park to the Government of Saskatchewan. Regina, August 9, 1976.

Sewell, W.R. Derrick & Coppock, J.T., editors. Public Participation Planning. London: John Wiley & Sons, 1977.

Sharpe, Ivy. National park development in Labrador. Paper prepared for the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, Happy Valley, Labrador, 1976.

Wall, Geoffrey, ed., Recreational Land Use in Southern Ontario. Department of Geography, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Publication Series 14, 1979(?)

Wilkes, Brian. The Myth of the Non-Consumptive User. Park News. Vol. 15, No. 1, Spring 1979.

Williams, R.M. Labrador Demand and Market Analysis. Department of Regional Economic Expansion, St. John's, (undated).

Zimmerly, David. Cain's Land Revisited: Culture Change in Central Labrador, 1775-1972. Newfoundland Social and Economic Studies No. 16, Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, 1975.

SELECTED CORRESPONDENCE

Allmand, Hon. W. Letter to Hon. T. Alex Hickman,
Newfoundland minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Ottawa.
March 30, 1977.

Allmand, Hon. W. Letter to Mr. Penote Antuan, President,
N.M.I.A. Ottawa. June 16, 1976

Allmand, Hon. W. Letter to Mr. William Edmunds, President,
L.I.A. Ottawa. June 16, 1976.

Anderson, E.M. Re: Goose Bay Project Group. Indian and
Northern Affairs, Ottawa. March 19, 1973.

Bates, J. Meetings in the Labrador Communities. Parks
Canada, Ottawa. July 7, 1976.

Bill, R.E. Division Work Plan: Ongoing New Park Studies.
Parks Canada, Ottawa. February 2, 1978.

Bill, R.E. A review of Silas Bird's report. Parks Canada,
Ottawa. March 7, 1978.

Bill, R.E. Federal-provincial meeting to discuss possible
national parks in Labrador. Parks Canada, Ottawa.
April 13, 1978.

Bill, R.E. Federal-provincial meeting to discuss possible
national parks in Labrador. Parks Canada, Ottawa. May 18,
1978.

Bill, R.E. Cooperative Planning Project to assess
alternatives for the Mealy Mountains and the Torngat
Mountains, Labrador. Parks Canada, Ottawa. July 26, 1978.

Bill, R.E. Notes on a meeting to discuss Labrador parks..
Parks Canada, Ottawa. Nov. 2, 1978.

Buchanan, J. Letter to Hon. T.V. Hickey. Ottawa. Jan. 26,
1976.

Carruthers, J.A. Letter to J. Boulakia, Transport Canada.
Parks Canada, Ottawa. March 19, 1975.

Carruthers, J.A. Labrador New Park Proposals.- Meeting with
the local people. Parks Canada, Ottawa. Sept. 1, 1976.

Carruthers, J.A. Memorandum concerning Goose Bay Project
Group. Parks Canada, Ottawa. May 6, 1976.

Carruthers, J.A. Memo to File. Principles established for
new national parks in Labrador during public meetings,
September, 1977. Parks Canada, Ottawa. Oct. 3, 1977.

Chrétien, Hon. H. Letter to W. Rompkey, M.P. Ottawa.
May 17, 1973.

Chrétien, Hon. H. Letter to Jerry Wetzel, Native
Association of Newfoundland and Labrador. Ottawa. Sept.
1973.

Couture, G. Memorandum to T. Kovacs. Parks Canada, Ottawa.
June 2, 1975.

Faulkner, Hon. J. Hugh. Letter to P. Michel, President,
N.M.I.A. Ottawa. July 18, 1978.

Gillis, M.M. Suggestion for Involvement of Local People in
Labrador New Park Proposals. Parks Canada, Halifax.
Sept. 8, 1976.

Gillis, M.M. Format for 29-30 August 1977 meetings re possibility of National Parks in Labrador. Parks Canada, Halifax. Aug. 19, 1977.

Gillis, M.M. Report of a Visit to Labrador 27-29 Sept./78 and Considerations for Future Action. Parks Canada, Halifax. Oct. 3, 1978.

Hickey, T.V. Letter to Hon. J. Buchanan. Dept. of Tourism, St. John's, Nfld. Feb. 9, 1976.

Jamieson, Hon. D. Letter to Hon. J. Chrétien. Regional Economic Expansion, Ottawa. April 18, 1973.

Kovacs, T. Memorandum to File: Trip to Labrador, Newfoundland. Parks Canada, Ottawa. Nov. 25, 1974.

Luttich, S. Letter to W. Rompkey. Happy Valley-Goose Bay. Feb. 17, 1976.

Luttich, S. Letter to A.H. Faulkner. Happy Valley-Goose Bay. April 5, 1978.

Nicol, J.I. Letter to W. Rompkey. Parks Canada, Ottawa. Aug. 11, 1975.

Nicol, J.I. Native Land Claims-Labrador. Parks Canada, Ottawa. June 10, 1976.

Pope, R. Minutes of Meetings: Labrador Trip. July 12-16, 1976. Parks Canada, Ottawa. Aug. 8, 1976.

Roth, J. Proposed National Park, Mealey Mountains, Labrador, Provincial Dept. of Lands and Forests, Goose Bay. June 10, 1976.

Roth, J. Telex stating provincial position with respect to a draft strategy for national parks in Labrador. Provincial Dept. of Tourism, St. John's. May 5, 1978.

Tobin, D. Memo to file. Re: Minister's meeting with Indians of Northwest River. Ottawa. March 14, 1977.

Welland, A. Notes of the Ad Hoc Meeting between Parks Canada and L.R.A.C. Parks Canada, Ottawa. June 3, 1976.

Welland, A. Labrador Inuit Association - Parks System Planning Discussion about Labrador New Park Proposals. Parks Canada, Ottawa. Sept. 14, 1976.

LIBRARY

CARLETON UNIVERSITY

Manuscript Thesis

Unpublished theses submitted for degrees and deposited in the University Library are open for inspection, but are to be used only with due regard for the rights of the authors. Bibliographical references may be noted, but passages may be copied only with the permission of the authors, and proper credit must be given in subsequent written or published work. Extensive copying or publication of the thesis in whole or in part requires also the consent of the Chairman of the appropriate department.

Theses may be reproduced on microfilm for use in place of the manuscript itself provided the rules listed above are strictly adhered to and the rights of the author are in no way jeopardized.

This thesis by **BILL. R.E.** has been used by the following persons, whose signatures attest their acceptance of above restrictions.

A library which borrows this thesis for use by its patrons is expected to secure the signature of each user.

Name and address

Date

END

08-08-87

FIN