

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1978

May 3, 1978

Tape 1756

DW - 1

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am pleased to welcome to the galleries of the House of Assembly sixteen students from the Vera Perlin School of Gander accompanied by some of their teachers and volunteer workers. I know hon. members join me in welcoming these students and those who are with them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of privilege.

MR. S. NEARY: Yesterday in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier lashed out one of the most scurrilous personal attacks that has ever been made on a member in this House in my sixteen years in the House, and through innuendo tried to smear my character, and it was probably the worst example, Sir, of character assassination that we have ever seen. And now, Mr. Speaker, I have no choice but to do what I am going to do today. I am going - what I am - first of all I am going to do it providing that the hon. the Premier will also do the same thing that I am going to propose.

I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, in order to explode the arguments, in order to lay everything concerning my past on the table of the House - and if the hon. the Premier wants to know the number of times I go to the bathroom every day the hon. gentleman can have that, too - I am quite prepared, Sir, to lay my leadership expenses, revenue and expenditure in total, and I am not asking the Premier to list names because the hon. the Premier would not do it anymore than my hon. colleague the Leader of the Opposition or myself or anybody else who is involved in leaderships. -

AN HON. MEMBER: You would have to get permission to do it.

MR. S. NEARY: The laws of this Province do not compel us to do that, unfortunately. I wish we did have a law but because we never told these people when they donated to our various campaigns that we would make their names public therefore it would not be fair because these people may not want to make contributions if they knew they were going to made public. I am prepared to lay my Leadership expenses, revenue and expenditure, on the table of the House providing that the Premier will do the same for the two campaigns that the hon. gentleman was involved in, the two Leadership campaigns. And -

PREMIER MOORES: What two?

MR. S. NEARY: Well all right. The first one - and did they not have a second one?

MR. F. ROWE: President of the PC Party.

AN HON. MEMBER: I won you did not.

MR. S. NEARY: Well all right, Mr. Speaker, Providing the hon. the Premier will lay his expenses on the table of the House I am quite prepared to do it. I am also prepared -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am also prepared to lay certain other information in connection with my own personal life on the table of the House, namely, the mortgage on my home, I am prepared to lay that on the table of the House and the balance outstanding. I am also, Sir, prepared to lay on the table of the House, although I really do not have to do this because the information is available to hon. gentlemen, my conflict of interest statement which shows everything that I am the owner of. That can be put on the table of the House. I am also prepared, Mr. Speaker, to get a statement from the bank showing the balance due on my wife's car and I am also prepared, Mr. Speaker, to get a statement from the finance company showing the monthly payments and the balance due on my own car. I am prepared to do these -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY:

And I am prepared to do that too if I have to, Mr. Speaker, But I am prepared, Sir, to lay any information in connection with my own private and personal life, my Leadership Campaign, any elections that I have been involved in, I am quite prepared to lay the information on the table of the House provided, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the Premier will do likewise starting right back to the resignation of Mr. William Saunders and coming right on up to the present time. Let us say from January - no, from December 1971 right up to the present time. If the hon. the Premier is prepared to let it all hang out then so am I. I do not think it would be fair, Mr. Speaker, for me to lay the information on the table of the House, although I discussed it with my colleagues in Caucus this morning and my colleagues agreed, including those who were candidates in the Leadership and because it would not be fair for me to lay my expenses and revenue on the table of the House without consulting with them. The only one I have not consulted with is the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). So if the Premier will lay the matter of the Bill Saunders resignation, the information on that on the table of the House, if the hon. the Premier will lay on the table of the House his own

MR. NEARY: expenses for his campaigns since 1971 and lay on the table of the House his own statement of revenue and expenditure for his leadership campaign, then, Sir, I will do likewise, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to do it or cut out this smear campaign forever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: First of all, Sir, it is not a point of privilege; secondly, I am delighted to see that the hon. member has the support of all the backbenchers on the other side on this question..

My accusation - all I asked, was that the contribution by Mr. Doyle or any of his agents would be made -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I will insist that only one person at a time speak. The general mood and that of the House is such that this rule must be strictly enforced.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I do not think it is a point of privilege, but just to refer to a few of the comments made by the hon. the member for LaPoile, The fact is, Sir, that the question that was asked of him is only one specific question, of what Mr. Doyle or any of his agents had contributed because to me at least, and I think to others, it is fairly obvious that Mr. Doyle does have an influence over any or many people in this Province, or some at least. Also, Sir, all I would ask the hon. member is rather than table the documents, that he say outside this House all those things which he has said inside this House. Secondly, Sir, he talks about it all hanging out. I am sure, Sir, one way or the other, it

PREMIER MOORES: will all hang out before it is over. And thirdly, Sir, when he talks about Mr. Saunders, I would suggest he ask Mr. Doyle who paid off Mr. Burgess and Mr. Shea.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am in the process of giving a ruling. My ruling is that there is no case of privilege before the Chair. There is no matter on which the Chair can make a decision. There is no matter of privilege - a difference of opinion, a form of challenge on tabling different documents, but not a matter on which the Chair can make a ruling.

MR. NEARY: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman in his remarks, Sir, made another statement that I am going to challenge as is my right to do in this hon. House, Sir, and that is that I am quite prepared, Mr. Speaker, to lay on the table of the House any - if there is any - contribution from Mr. Doyle; I am quite prepared to put that on the table of the House, if there is, providing that the hon. the Premier will lay on the table of the House all the money that has been collected by Mr. George McLean for the hon. gentleman and his party in this Province.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: If I may, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, there is a serious question of privilege evolving here - it has been going on for several days - and that is by virtue of the abuse of the question of privilege, the abuse on a daily basis which is turning into debate, and turning into debate today, that all members of this Legislature are being robbed of their privilege, the privilege to enable them to enact on legislation, issues, resolutions, like this afternoon, Your Honour. And I think this has gone far enough.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And I am suggesting to Your Honour that some method or way has to be found to eliminate the abuse of the question of privilege going on in this House right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am in a position to judge the matter of privilege brought up by the hon. gentleman to my right. I do not see that it is a matter of privilege - again a difference of opinion, a form of challenge, a matter on which numerous hon. gentlemen could express their opinions if there is a suitable motion before the Chair on a debate, but I do not see it as a matter of privilege.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement on the illegal occupation of Crown land which I indicated I would be making.

Although the policy changes that I will have to announce here, Mr. Speaker, will probably not meet all the requirements that hon. members want, it is as far as we can go, or I can go at this time without a change in the legislation, and I am certainly not prepared to propose a change in the Crown Lands Act at this point in time.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture is charged with the responsibility of planning, managing and administering all Crown land in the Province for the continuing social and economic benefit of the people. The manner in which this role has been

May 3, 1978

Tape 1757

EC - 4

MR. MAYNARD: carried out during the past
several hundred years accounts for the present problems
which we have

MR. MAYNARD: which prevents the efficient administration of Crown land. Our action or lack of action at present will either help to resolve the problems for the future or will worsen the situation. And I think all hon. members will realize the problems we do have in the administration of Crown land in this Province. My department is thus responsible not only for meeting the needs of the present, but to try at least to respond to the needs of the future.

The department has three basic obligations to consider when carrying out our responsibilities. The first is a legal and moral obligation to existing land owners, many of whom we know very little about at the present time; second is our obligation to meet legitimate requirements for land both now and in the future; and third, but not least in importance, is our moral obligation to protect and conserve the physical and aesthetic values of land for future generations. When responding to these obligations we are continuously faced with conflicting situations.

One of the major conflicts results from the illegal occupancy of Crown land. This is a long standing, continuing and serious problem in this Province. It is a problem, which, if we do not resolve it, will continue to frustrate any serious attempts to efficiently administer Crown lands. I say it is a conflict because on one hand hon. members in this House and the public outside feel that they have unrestricted access to any land, but at the same time they want us to efficiently administer the land that we are in control of.

If allowed to continue, if illegal occupation is allowed to continue it will prevent forever any implementation of a proper system of land management. And furthermore, illegal occupation practises discriminates against those citizens of the Province who abide by the law and follow the complicated, time consuming but necessary procedures for obtaining legitimate title.

MR. MAYNARD: Contrary to popular belief, occupation of Crown land for whatever purpose, without the prior approval of government, has been unlawful since at least the introduction of the Crown Lands Act in 1844. Such occupation has been an offence liable to fines and summary conviction since 1930. Since the introduction of the act in 1944 several attempts have been made to stem the tide of unlawful occupation. The original act provided the opportunity for persons occupying Crown land prior to 1840 to apply for and receive a grant. The amendment of 1933 provided the opportunity for persons who had occupied Crown land for a period of five years or more prior to 1933 to apply for and receive a grant. The latter amendment also intended that no Crown titles would be issued for land unlawfully occupied after 1933. However, this restriction was removed twenty years later in 1953. The amendment passed by this House in 1976 (Crown Lands Amendment Act No. 20) and which was at that time applauded by the Opposition was the latest and most important effort in this regard. It is the most important effort in this regard. It can be seen, Mr. Speaker, that there has been many attempts made over the years to correct the situation. The latest amendment was important for the following reasons:

(1) Under Section 134 grants are now available to those individuals who can provide evidence of open, notorious and exclusive occupation of land for twenty years prior to January 1, 1977. There is no time limit placed on the submission of applications under that section. In other words, we say that people who occupied land for twenty years prior to January 1, 1977 are owners of their land. They cannot, however, get a mortgage on the land, even though they do own it by law, simply because it has not been surveyed and there is no legal description of the land. We will, if they want to get a survey

MR. MAYNARD: and apply and show that they have occupied it grant them, give them an outright grant. This never happened before. The only way that people could obtain land was to go through the Quieting of Titles Act through the courts which cost them, in many cases, thousands of dollars to prove their ownership.

We are now through this amendment which we passed in 1976, Mr. Speaker, allowing them a much simpler method of getting a title to their land. As I say there are no time limits,

MR. MAYNARD: they can apply ten years from now if they can show occupation. Approved applications require survey, of course, and there is a charge of \$100 for each grant issued regardless of the size of the land. And that amount only goes part way, a very minimal amount, towards recovering the administrative costs involved. We have received about 400 applications under that particular section to date and we are dealing with them as rapidly as we can.

Number two, under section 134, the same section, the concept of "squatters rights" has been abolished as of January 1, 1977, with the exception of the ones that I have just mentioned.

Number three, under section 134, anyone initiating illegal occupation of Crown land on or after January 1st., 1977 is liable, on summary conviction to a minimum fine of \$200 and/or a term of imprisonment. In addition, this section also provides for the removal of illegal structures and restoration of the land. The previous fine was \$50 per acre. In other words, anyone who has occupied Crown land illegally, since January 1st., 1977, can have action taken against them, and quite probably will because I have told the officials of the department to make every effort to enforce that particular section. That is in the act, Mr. Speaker, it was passed by this Legislature, it is not a personal policy of the minister.

The problem which has created the greatest amount of controversy and misunderstanding in recent months, is the policy which government has implemented regarding individuals who have been occupying Crown land for less than twenty years prior to January 1st., 1977, without benefit of title. These individuals are not subject to fine or imprisonment identified in section 134, but they are subject to possible eviction under section 116 of the Crown Lands Act, and that section has been in existence since 1930.

Simply stated, our policy regarding this latter group

MR. MAYNARD: who are at present illegally occupying Crown land under the laws of the Province, was to give every such individual — an opportunity to apply for a title according to existing policies governing the issue of leases or permits-to-occupy. We requested, through public notice, that such individuals identify themselves and submit a Crown land application, accompanied by a \$1 mandatory application fee, and we requested through public notice that they submit that application prior to March 31st., 1978. In exchange, even though they were illegally occupying the land, and in order to try to legalize their occupation during the time period necessary to process their applications, the applicant was to receive a permit-to-occupy for a fee of \$25 and no surveys are required prior to the application being processed. It should be noted that \$25 is the minimum annual rent presently charged to legal occupants of Crown land. Individuals within this group who failed to apply by the deadline would be subject to legal action.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that even though these people had illegally occupied Crown lands within the laws of this Province, this government was and is giving them every possible opportunity to legalize their occupancy. The \$25 which hon. members have referred to as being the cost of submitting an application is totally wrong and was totally wrong when they were saying it. It was \$25 for one year's rental on that piece of land.

Now, it is our intent that wherever possible, and where it is in the best interest of the public, the foregoing applications will be approved for long-term lease or temporary renewable permits-to-occupy. Unfortunately, there will be some applications that will have to be refused. In the case of refusal, the individual involved will be required to remove any structures erected on the land within a reasonable time period. And because of that notice that we put out,

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, 1700 people who were in a legal occupation of Crown land have come forward and asked for a lease or title to their land. We are processing their applications now.

The cries of changing the traditional life styles and burning the cabins are, of course, exaggerated and have not occurred. If any hon. member can give me one specific instance or name one person on my staff who has directly said, "I will burn your cabin," I want it brought to my attention immediately.

However, I recognize that the imposition of the -

MR. SIMMONS: Just one or more than one.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ten, a dozen.

MR. MAYNARD: I said, if any member can identify to me, any member of my staff who has said that, "I will burn your cabin," I want to know of them immediately. Is that clear enough? Names, places, dates, circumstances.

MR. MAYNARD: However before I recognize that the imposition of a \$25 annual fee, in some circumstances, is an unreasonable burden. And this hardship may have prevented certain individuals from applying by the March 31 deadline. And I am referring to those individuals who rely on temporary shelters as a means of earning their income or a part of their income. It is pretty hard, Mr. Speaker, to specify or put into classifications the people we are talking about, but they can be identified as commercial wood harvesting operators, commercial inshore fishermen, commercial trappers, including people who snare rabbits for some commercial resale, or as part of their livelihood, integral part of their livelihood. In many of these cases, more than one shelter is required, such as on the trap line. I am not referring to shelters constructed for recreational hunting or fishing.

In response to this problem I am hereby extending the March 31 deadline to July 31, 1978. I will also be requesting my colleagues in Cabinet to reduce the cost of the annual permit for these individuals to \$1.00. Such individuals will be required to submit a Crown land application, as before, for each site occupied and each application must be accompanied by a \$1.00 application fee. Individuals falling within the 'commercial' category that I have just mentioned, who have already received a permit at a cost of \$25.00 will get an appropriate refund. Each individual applying within the 'commercial' category will be required to provide proof, satisfactory to the department, that he or she falls within that category. All other occupation will be considered as recreational use and will be subject to the \$25.00 fee previously imposed. In other words, there is no point in someone coming in to the department and saying, I have a temporary shelter, I want to file an application with \$1.00, and when we inspect it we find that it is a three bedroom cabin. That just will not wash.

PREMIER MOORES: And a coloured T.V.

MR. MAYNARD: And a coloured T.V.

Mr. Maynard: I emphasize that the foregoing policy applies only to those individuals whose occupation is for a period less than twenty years prior to January 1, 1977. In other words, anyone who has built a shelter or cabin or structure of any kind after January 1, 1977 cannot be allowed unless they have a proper permit to occupy or a lease. All proposed new structures must be preceded by an approved Crown Land application plus a lease or a permit-to-occupy, as the case may be, before development can take place. Failure to comply with existing legislation regarding illegal occupation will result in legal action by the department.

In summary, I want to assure everyone that this policy is being implemented with the overall good of the majority of the people in mind. I hope that everyone concerned will take the opportunity to declare their illegal occupancy and avail of the opportunity that we are giving them to legalize their occupancy of Crown land. Otherwise, the illegal occupancy of Crown land is an offense against the Crown the same as illegal cutting of trees or the illegal harvesting of wildlife population, or whatever, and will be treated accordingly.

During the next three months, the department will be carrying out an intensive publicity campaign to ensure, wherever possible, that the public is fully advised on existing legislation and policy regarding the illegal occupancy.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this is going to be a very short response to that Ministerial Statement. I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, since I have been a member of the House that some ministers when they are going to present a major, long rambling statement, such as the one we just heard,

MR. FLIGHT: I have had the courtesy to deliver to the Opposition spokesman of that department a text of the statement, thereby enabling him to stand up and to comment on the statement. I would have wished, and I regret that the minister did not extend the same courtesy, Mr. Speaker. It is practically impossible to address oneself to that statement without having had a chance to have read the statement and to see what was contained therein. So I will not attempt, Mr. Speaker, to address myself to all the points obviously covered.

I just want to say for this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that we, too - all the Opposition - and everyone in Newfoundland, every responsible person knows and wishes and will work towards having a complete control of Crown lands and having a complete inventory, and knowing what the extent of the ownership of Crown lands is.

Our complaint, Sir, and our criticism of this government's approach is the high-handed way in which they decided to deal with people who, up to this point in time, had not received leases or grants under the law.

And, Mr. Speaker, I recall in the statement the minister indicated that the \$25 now being charged for right to apply is in effect, because the minister knows that if that application is rejected then the \$25 submitted with the application is not refundable; so in that sense the \$25 was paid for the right to apply, because 50 per cent, maybe, of those applications will be rejected.

Mr. Speaker, the minister made a statement in the House the other day, and this is very

MR. FLIGHT: germane to his statement now that it only takes six months to get a Crown land application.

MR. NOLAN: How long?

MR. FLIGHT: Six months.

AN HON. MEMBER: In what district?

MR. FLIGHT: In Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Speaker, I note the minister did not make any reference to that in his statement. I want to submit to the House and to the Minister and to the Speaker that it takes eighteen months to two years and I am still working on applications that were submitted before I became a member of this hon. House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. FLIGHT: The minister should have retracted that.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I think I will not bother - I reserve the right to address myself on behalf of this side of the House to that statement after I have had the opportunity to read the statement and determine just what the minister's statement is. With regard to any improvements however slight, we welcome any improvements in the position taken by this administration with regard to Crown lands.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

MR. HICKEY: I wish to table the report on the disposition of the Canada Summer Games facilities compiled by Chief Judge Geoffrey L. Steele. In doing so I would like to inform hon. members that government is addressing itself to this question and will make a decision at the earliest possible date. Copies are available for members and the media.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Convey Certain Trusts And Properties In The Province To The Royal Trust Corporation Of Canada".

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have to answer question number six in the name of the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) where he asks, number one, whether any doctors were prosecuted for making false and fraudulent claims under the Medical Care Programme for the years 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977? If the answer is yes, how many doctors were so prosecuted for each year? Three doctors have been prosecuted for submitting false claims to the Medical Care Commission - one doctor in 1974 and two in 1977. In all instances, convictions were registered under the Medicare Act and in addition to fines, monies in question were recovered. In several instances orders were issued by the Commission for collection of monies and penalties as provided in the act were imposed. Number two, the total amount for which fraudulent or false claims were made for the years referred to, 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977, the total amount of fraudulent, false or incorrect claims in 1974 was \$3,784.05; in 1975 it was \$9,976.75; in 1976, \$14,395.42; and in 1977, \$6,278.45 for a total of \$34,434.67.

MR. H. COLLINS: Number (3) "The amount recovered from doctors who submitted false returns to MCP for said year." I just referred to it, the total amount is \$34,434.67.

Number (4) "What legal action has been taken against doctors for false claims and/or overcharging under the Medicare programme?" The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is legal action was taken for false claims as reported in number one.

Question No. 39, Mr. Speaker, in the name of the same hon. member: "To ask the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What is the number of T.B. patients (a) in hospitals in Newfoundland and Labrador at the present time; and (b) the number of T.B. patients being treated in their own homes? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the latest inventory on T.B. patients was at December 31, 1977; (a) four patients were under treatment in hospital; and (b) 159 patients were under out-patient treatment or out-patient care.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: A question for the hon. the Premier of the Province, Mr. Speaker. In view of the affidavit tabled in the House here yesterday which makes some allegations concerning the government and the Premier, personally, I am wondering if the Premier has now had an opportunity to confer with his Cabinet colleagues in order to see whether they will agree to set up a public enquiry into all matters surrounding the Health Sciences Complex at Memorial University and the Carbonear Hospital? That is the building and design of those two structures, Sir, with particular reference to the

MR. W.N. ROWE: government's involvement and the Premier's personal involvement, as alleged, with Scrivener Engineering Limited, with Scrivener Projects (Nfld) Limited, who I understand were the project managers and designers for those two buildings. Has the Premier had an opportunity to deal with that question and decide whether a public enquiry should be set up to enquire into it, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: First of all that particular document that was tabled yesterday came to my attention some two years ago. At that time I thought it was written by a crackpot and I still do.

Having said that, the whole matter now is in the hands of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and whilst the Leader of the Opposition may or may not have confidence in that particular establishment, what we are looking at now, Sir, is a criminal investigation into any crime that was committed by anybody. If that was the case, obviously charges will be brought against that person. Equally, any wrongdoing on behalf of any person will be established. I look forward to that report very much, Sir, but I would suggest that the R.C.M.P. are in full charge of it right now and will do a good job on it.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: By way of preamble I would remind the Premier that there is a police investigation into one aspect of public spending, the alleged irregularities in spending by the Department of Public Works, and also a public enquiry on the broader question of general irregularities, Sir, the police enquiry being restricted

MR. W.N. ROWE: to one particular thing the hangar 3, as I understand it, and the general enquiry on other things, not only to determine criminality, Mr. Speaker, but to look at other areas of impropriety which may not be criminal but which may verge on improper conduct or, in fact, be evidence of negligence on the part of someone, or mismanagement or anything else, or gross overexpenditures of money. All these things, Sir, certainly will not be the subject matter of a criminal -

MR. NEARY: Construction components.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - all of those things, Sir, which will not be - which will have nothing to do with criminality perhaps and therefore the R.C.M.P. will not, in fact, investigate them or lay charges in respect of them. Therefore it is a little bit low for the Premier to try to insinuate that I do not have confidence in that body, the R.C.M.P. which, of course, I do.

The question is, Sir, why do we not have a public enquiry? And the Premier has said now, if I can read between the lines, that we will not have a public enquiry into these other equally important matters.

Well, let me ask the Premier this, Sir. Since the Premier has said -

PREMIER MOORES: Where is the question you had?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Sorry?

PREMIER MOORES: I was just wondering what question you were on.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Oh well, if the Premier will listen he will learn, Sir. I can understand his being very touchy on the subject. If this were the worst the Premier has ever done, Sir.

MR. NEARY: At least his hands are in
his own pockets.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W.N. ROWE: And not somebody else's.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: That is right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the
Opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, Sir, I must say.

Since the Premier has
admitted publicly on television yesterday, and in the
House I do believe and Hansard will indicate, that these
matters should be investigated by the police and that
the police department, the R.C.M.P. and the C.I.D. are
the best places for investigation of these matters, I
must ask the Premier point blank, Sir, why he did not
as Premier of this Province turn this matter over to the
police, over to his own Minister of Justice from whom
he apparently kept it secret, when he got a copy of this
very same affidavit, now tabled in the House, which he
says is now the subject of a police investigation, why
he did not turn it over to the police, Sir, when he got
a copy of it a year or more ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I can answer that very simply. I am delighted by the way, before I answer it, to see that the Leader of the Opposition has come down four square and totally behind the member for LaPoile's (Mr. Neary) position on this whole argument. I am delighted to see that the Liberal caucus and the Liberal side of the House, the Opposition side, are totally behind the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) on what he is trying to achieve here. And I know they will be proud of everything they stand for when it is over.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible).

PREMIER MOORES: I am just replying in kind if I may.

The reason, Sir, that that was not investigated by the police in 1975 or whenever it was that it came to my attention, as I said before, I think it was dictated by a man who is unstable, if not mentally deranged. I still have had no reason to change that opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: Does the Premier have some medical evidence not available to the rest of us, Mr. Speaker, about this? I do not know him from Adam.

MR. NEARY: Is he a psychiatrist or what?

MR. W. ROWE: Does the Premier have psychiatric evidence of this?

MR. NEARY: A man in charge of a \$40 million project.

MR. W. ROWE: A man who was Vice-President of Scrivener (Nfld) Limited, as I understand, and in charge of a project and kept in charge of the project until he resigned of his own volition a year or two after the government here got into power, Sir? Does he have medical evidence he would care to table as to the physical or mental instability of the gentleman whom he is referring to? Would he care to -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I do not have any evidence that the man has a mental problem that is certifiable.

MR. NEARY: Well why did you look around?

PREMIER MOORES: I find great difficulty in defining a man who has to hide away in Florida to give an interview instead of coming here to St. John's and doing it live on television. I have a great deal of difficulty with a man who has to be found in order to be interviewed. I have a great deal of difficulty with a man who does not have the courage to stand up in the society who he is condemning and say what he has to say and be gutless in putting forward a point of view, which in my opinion, is totally wrong. It is totally warped, and it is totally being used, as are other people, I have great difficulty, Sir, in believing the credibility of a man who acts in that fashion, yes I do.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, as I say I do not know this man from Adam, and I have no desire to defend him. But the Premier surely remembers that this very same gentleman was going around St. John's, Newfoundland here, giving out stuff to the press, and sending him affidavits, and wanting to get public attention brought to bear on this very important subject. I do not know what the Premier is talking about now, Sir, about a man who is frightened or scared to bring this case to the public. He tried his best and unfortunately failed because the Premier chose to ignore it.

MR. NEARY: Five years he was -

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, let me ask the Premier this more specific question. Did the Premier of the Province have any knowledge, personal or indirect knowledge of the negotiation of Scrivener's fee, the renegotiation or the negotiation of Scrivener's fee for the

MR. W. ROWE: Carbonear Hospital, up from \$63,000, which it apparently had been fixed at, to the sum of \$329,000 as alleged in this particular affidavit. Did the Premier know anything about that at the time or at any point, afterwards or at the time that it was done?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, yes I have a great deal of knowledge on that particular subject. As a matter of fact Mr. Harvey Self, who had been appointed by the previous administration, was given carte blanche, and not just the Carbonear Hospital, or the Health Sciences Complex, but the whole expansion of the North campus without any strings attached, and without any guidelines as to how he should operate.

The situation was that the previous administration had given out these broad terms of reference that -

AN HON. MEMBER: They did not?

PREMIER MOORES: Oh yes, and we will document this, absolutely.

MR. W. ROWE: The former administration.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes. It gave to Mr. Harvey Self in 1971, the full carte blanche on the development of the North campus. Finally that was taken back, Sir, into the dealing with the Health Sciences Complex. My colleagues in Cabinet, and I, are very aware of when the detailed documents came forward that a definitive contract had to be made with the consultants at that time, that information is totally available to this House as to why it was done, because we could not afford an open-ended contract like they had had before and that this was done with all the knowledge of everything that was happening in full Cabinet, and Sir, I suggest is also available to the full knowledge of this House which I am sure my colleague, the Minister of Public Works and Services, will gladly get in great detail and upon being asked a question on tomorrow

PREMIER MOORES: will give exactly what happened in that regard.

And by the way, Sir, going back to the hon. member's preamble, if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition does not know Mr. Davidson from Adam, I suggest he get the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to introduce him.

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

MR. NEARY: The Premier has entertained him up in Mount Scio house.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right.

PREMIER MOORES: Entertained him?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Entertained him.

PREMIER MOORES: Once.

MR. NEARY: A booze party.

PREMIER MOORES: I taped him.

MR. NEARY: And he taped the hon. gentleman.

PREMIER MOORES: Not that night.

MR. NEARY: Order, please! The hon. Leader of the Opposition recognized for a question.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know -

MR. NEARY: Tape the fat man too.

MR. W. ROWE: He does not like to hear about the fat man.

MR. NEARY: No, he does not like to hear about the fat man.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: His alter ego on the Mainland.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may -

PREMIER MOORES: That is Mr. Shaheen's friend, yes?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Shaheen's friend?

MR. W. ROWE: You can ask the Minister of Justice about the time he went down to Cape Kennedy, Sir, as a guest of Mr. Shaheen.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member has got to be joking!
He has got to be joking. When the fat man speaks outside of this Province he speaks for the Premier.

MR. W. ROWE: He does not like to hear about the fat man.

MR. NEARY: And I will prove that to him next week.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: No, you will not.

MR. NEARY: Yes, you will.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman to my left and right, on both sides, will co-operate with the Chair. And I will require that there be only one speaker at a time.

MR. W. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for that protection.

Now, Sir, I want to make sure that we are not confusing anything here. I am talking about the Carbonear Hospital, which I understand - I may be wrong, because I have no knowledge of it directly myself - there was a \$63,000 fixed fee which was granted to, or negotiated with the government, the present Administration, not the former Administration, Sir, that much maligned entity - we will change that. as I say, pretty soon - this Administration, \$63,000 which was subsequently, according to this

Mr. W. Rowe: gentleman here in his affidavit renegotiated upwards to \$329,778. Now I am asking the Premier if he had any personal knowledge of that? Had he had any involvement in that renegotiation of the fee to go to Scrivener on the Carbonear Hospital?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely not. And as I said, any detail of a negotiated contract on consultants which had been abused before, even though the hon. member may or may not be aware of it - obviously there are a lot of things in the Administration he was not aware of, there are a few things that he may have been aware of, there are a few things that he may have even been responsible for, I am not saying, Sir, anything about that, but what I am saying is regarding any specific thing with the Carbonear Hospital or the Health Sciences Complex certainly I was not personally involved, my Cabinet colleagues were not involved, and I will only too gladly, on behalf of government, make the detailed information available to the hon. House.

MR. W. ROWE: Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. ROWE: So in - what is it? - Clause (11), I suppose, of this famous document -

MR. S. NEARY: Article (11).

MR. W. ROWE: Article (11), Clause (11), Section (11), the words mention that the negotiation, drastic revision was negotiated directly with - he names the Premier of Newfoundland - in his office, along with Mr. Richard Greene, all resulting from negotiated political contributions. The Premier is denying as I understand that he had any negotiation with Scrivener in his office in the presence of Mr. Greene, or otherwise, concerning this matter, is that the correct situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely correct. And I would also say, by the way, for a gentleman who is quoting from something he has such confidence in, I would strongly recommend that he meet the author.

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the Premier is so touchy on this, Sir, I am giving him a chance to clear the air, and to

PREMIER MOORES: I am not. I just think the guy is a nut.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) outside the House.

MR. W. ROWE: Well I mean spare me from the responsibility, Sir, of having to decide whether hon. gentlemen opposite or anywhere in Newfoundland are all there or not. I mean that is a dreadful responsibility to impose on anybody.

Let me ask the hon. the Premier this again. I do not know why the Premier is gettin upset, Sir, because these allegarions are made, they are public knowledge and so on, and I am giving him an opportunity now to deny it or confirm it as the case may be. Also in the affidavit, Sir, it says that the Premier visited this Mr. Davidson in 1972 at the time of the letting of contracts for Carbonear Hospital, in company with Mr. Cyril Babb, if I remember, the affidavit correctly, and that they talked over the awarding of contracts to Babb Construction.

Now first let me ask the Premier does he know -

PREMIER MOORES: Finish the sentence now.

MR. W. ROWE: Let me see where is it? Sixteen. Instructed me to award two contracts to Babb Construction. And also to make sure that Babb Construction get the structural contract for this hospital.

PREMIER MOORES: Go on! Would you finish the sentence.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Cyril Babb and the hon. Frank Moores, Premier of Newfoundland are related, and Mr. Moores is the father-in-law of Mr. Cyril Babb's son.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, okay. Go ahead now.

MR. W. ROWE: The question is did Babb Construction get any contracts regarding the Carbonear Hospital to the Premier's knowledge?

MR. NEARY: Without calling public tender.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, at that particular time, it was three weeks after the 1972 election, I did meet with Mr. Davidson, I said if everything was -

MR. NEARY: Was he unstable at the time?

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

PREMIER MOORES: I did not know, but I have found out since.

Mr. Speaker, I said to Mr. Davidson at the time, after three weeks of being in office, that if everything being equal I thought that local contractors, and we have since applied it to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador by the way

May 3, 1978

Tape No. 1765

AH-1

PREMIER MOORES: - should be given first priority if everything being equal. Now, Sir, going to that full statement that the hon. member mentions, and which he puts great credence in, at that time the Babb family as I remember were fairly dedicated Liberals but having forgotten that particular subject the reference to Mr. Cyril Babb as the father-in-law of my daughter, they were married two years after the meeting. But that is typical, Sir, of the half truth, and the innuendo and the sickening, nauseous, personal vendettas that are going on here today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: I do not know why we are so touchy on the subject, Sir, it is just a matter of -

PREMIER MOORES: You brought it up.

MR. W. ROWE: - getting up and telling - of course I brought it up, and, Sir, unless there be any doubt I shall continue to bring it up and continue to question him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I will direct the hon. gentleman to my right, and the hon. gentleman to my left not to interfere. One hon. member ask a question at a time and one hon. gentleman answer at a time.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: I am not sure if the Premier answered my question or not. I do not think he did, Sir, I think he got to involved in his own personal matters. Did he say or not whether Babb Construction got these contracts?

AN HON. MEMBER: Without tender?

MR. W. ROWE: Well with or without tender. Does he happen to know whether there was a call for tenders, number one and; number two, did Babb Construction get one or more contracts in connection with this building?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the allegation in that statement is that I directed it to go to Babb and that is absolutely incorrect, that is absolutely untrue. I have said it before and I will say it again, the innuendo in that particular statement refers to a great many things and I resent, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition bringing this up. If he wants to ask a straight question, ask it, but when he starts bringing up the innuendo which he is obviously endorsing, he obviously feels that this is true. I suggest, Sir, that he stick to the facts and ask the questions and not refer to Mr. Davidson and the innuendos that he puts out because I am sure the Leader of the Opposition is above that sort of an attack.

MR. W. ROWE: Well I would hope so, Sir, since I was asked directly to read for the public record something which I did not particularly want to read. I am interested, Sir, lest there be any doubt, not in the Premier's or his families marriages or otherwise, I am not the least bit interested, I find it to be the most boring subject on the face of the earth and let me make this clear. I am wondering whether Mr. Babb of Babb Construction Company, with or without the Premier's instructions or inducements, got a contract or more from Scrivener or from the government without calling public tenders with respect to the Carbonear hospital? That was my question, Sir, as alleged in this affidavit as it happens, I merely refer to that as a starting point. The Premier asked me to go into the personal details of his life, I do not want to.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The hon. gentleman said that he is very bored with the marriages of my family and so on, I am sure he is, I am sure - no I will not say it. The fact is, Sir, that it is of importance to me when it is brought up in this House, it is of importance to me when it is brought up as a form and intended in a question in this

PREMIER MOORES: House and whilst I can get very upset -

AN HON MEMBER: You asked for it.

PREMIER MOORES: What do you mean,I asked for it? He was quoting a section of a document and if that is part of it, sure. Let us not get personal in here , let us get down to where the fact is..

MR. SIMMONS: Physicians heal thyself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: What are you saying? Let me get it straight.

MR. NEARY: You heard the hon. gentleman.

PREMIER MOORES: F White. Excuse me, I withdraw that, I apologize, Sir, and I withdraw anything that has been unparliamentary. But I will say this that Mr. Babb never got a contract on the instruction of me to anybody, to my knowledge he did not get it on the instruction of government to anybody, I suggest, Sir, that any contract he got was through the management consultants. I would assume it was in the normal sense and if it was not that is something that should be brought out, and I assume the same with anyone else in this Province, Sir. To my knowledge there was no wrongdoing and certainly not on my part.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR.W.ROWE: I want the Premier to either answer me yes or no now, if he can or if he cannot will he undertake to get the information. Did Babb Construction get contracts on the Carbonear hospital either through the mediation of Scrivener or otherwise from this government? And if so, Sir, how many? Were they awarded as a result of public tender call or were they merely negotiated or given to Babb or what? Will he get me that information? I am not interested in what is going on personally or behind the scenes or anything. I would like to have that information. Will he get it for me?

May 3, 1978

Tape No. 1765

AH-4

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, absolutely. I said in the very first question I believe that the Minister of Public Works would get all the background behind the Self-Scrivener detail on the awarding of the management consultants contract to them, what their responsibilities are, and what contracts they let. Gladly, Sir.

That is the responsibility of the government and we are only too glad to provide it.

May 3, 1978

Tape 1766

EC - 1

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir followed by the hon. gentleman from Conception Bay South.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I, like the Leader of the Opposition, am most interested in having a public inquiry into the Scrivener event, the whole Health Sciences Complex. And I would appreciate it if the Premier would do us the courtesy of confining discussion to that, because that is what concerns me, and his innuendo is not at all upsetting me except that I wish he would talk about the Scrivener projects, the Carbonear hospital and the Health Sciences Complex.

Can the Premier indicate to the House whether the party of which he is the leader ever received a political contribution from the Scrivener firms in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, it is well known, and I have said many times that yes, the political party I lead have received donations from people purported to be acting on behalf of Scrivener. I would suggest the Liberal Party in Newfoundland have received donations from exactly the same source.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

PREMIER MOORES: I am sure, but that is beside the point, Sir. The fact is that being - by the way, as long as the system is like it is in this Province, I would suggest that there are many people who give donations to political parties. I also suggest, Sir, that that system - I agree - should be changed and I think before the next election it will be. And I think that is the proper thing to do. I do not think there is any question about that.

PREMIER MOORES: But, in the meantime, to get back to the hon. member's question, it is before the police now where it is being totally investigated. It was looked at by the top officials in our government on the Civil Service level to see if there was any wrongdoing and there was not. Taking the new police investigation into consideration, if there is any wrongdoing, of course, Sir, it will be investigated - it will be prosecuted, but I would suggest by way of a red herring just to set up another public inquiry into something that is being totally studied now, I think, would be totally wrong.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, could the Premier indicate to the House where the Minister of Industrial development is at the present time? Is he out of the Province on government business?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industrial Development was one month late in having a very serious eye problem examined which was done yesterday and today in Toronto. He is coming home this evening and will be here as soon as he can. I would gladly say that it is unfortunate that he has had this health problem, unfortunate that he has had this problem for several years, but, Sir, on this side of the House we have sympathy with anyone who is ill and is trying to overcome that illness.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, we too, of course, have full sympathy for his health problems and have said so

MR. SIMMONS: to him on many occasions personally and in this House.

Mr. Speaker, is the Premier aware, or can the Premier indicate whether or not the Minister of Industrial Development will be meeting with his either present or former executive assistant, Mr. Terry White, while he is in the Montreal area?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I have no idea, Mr. Speaker. I would doubt it very much in that he could not contact him before he left here. Maybe he will have better luck in Montreal, but I do not think he is looking for him seeing he is in Toronto. That being beside the point, I understand the police, according to what was circulated yesterday - and I do not know if it is legitimate or not, I have no idea - but I understand that the police from that document have been in touch with him and are keeping an eye on him. I have no idea, Sir, if the Minister of Industrial Development is as well. It is something I just cannot answer.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary. I had indicated I would recognize the hon. the member for Conception Bay South. Of course, the hon. gentleman can always return to a subject.

MR. SIMMONS: A further supplementary to the Premier. Can he indicate now for the record, Mr. Speaker, whether indeed, Mr. White has resigned his position, and if so, whether there was an actual letter of resignation, and if so would the Premier be prepared to table that letter of resignation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, there is no letter of resignation. The fact is, Sir, that there has been no letter of resignation to my knowledge. I would suggest that the executive capacity that the gentleman was in has expired somewhat like his absence. The fact is, Sir, that, you know, if you cannot find a man you cannot pay him, but that being beside the point as well, I do not think it is necessary because he obviously is not doing the duty for which he was hired. He cannot speak for the Minister of Industrial Development, but if I could be acting minister for a minute I would say yes, Sir, his term has expired so to speak.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I agree with the hon. gentleman, Sir, we sympathize with the hon. minister's illness and I have told him so personally on a good many occasions.

Would the hon. the Premier indicate who accompanied the Minister of Industrial Development to Toronto?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

May 3, 1978

Tape 1767

EC - 1

PREMIER MOORES: No one at government expense,
Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. NEARY: That was not the question, Sir,
would the hon. gentleman tell us who accompanied the Minister
of Industrial Development to Toronto?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, that is a personal
question that I would suggest the Minister of Industrial
Development would answer. It is like me asking the hon.
member who accompanied him to Panama or who accompanied
him to Switzerland or Miami or wherever he went. I do not
know; I have no idea.

MR. NEARY: Or Granada or London or -

PREMIER MOORES: Wherever.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman indicate
to the House whether the hon. gentleman knows who accompanied
the Minister of Industrial Development to Toronto?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Captain
of Air Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman
aware of who accompanied the minister to Toronto from
Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I would imagine, Sir, however many
passengers were on the 'plane that were resident in this

May 3, 1978

Tape 1767

EC - 2

PREMIER MOORES:

Province at the time.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary question,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

Is the hon. gentleman aware that a big party worker - P.C. Party worker in the person of Mr. Ron Howard, a private detective -

AN HON. MEMBER:

A former policeman.

MR. NEARY:

- a former policeman - Can the hon. the Premier confirm whether that gentleman accompanied the Minister of Industrial Development to Toronto?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, yes, I will answer that gladly. Yes, Mr. Ron Howard accompanied the hon. minister at his expense to Toronto. The fact is - his or the hon. minister's expense, one or the other - the fact is, Sir, that Dr. Farrell, the Minister of Industrial Development, was going up for an eye examination, visiting a hospital, and someone volunteered to go along to give him a hand - no private eye, just a companion on the trip. There was no other reason to go other than as a friend. ~~that~~ has got to be insidious. This has got to be something that has a twist to it. This, Sir, is exactly the sort of warped question and opinion we are getting from the other side, Sir, and I am sorry, that is not good enough!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary question,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Now that we know who accompanied the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development - we have

MR. NEARY: finally dragged it out of the Premier - would the hon. the Premier indicate whether the Minister of Industrial Development told anybody who told the Premier that the Minister of Industrial Development may be going on to Panama?

PREMIER MOORES: What was that again?

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. the Premier indicate to the House if he has been told by either one of these gentlemen, the Minister of Industrial Development or Mr. Howard, that after the eye examination they would be proceeding to Panama?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, my source is the hon. minister whom I was talking to fifteen minutes before I came in the House, and who was catching the plane at 6:00 P.M. back to Newfoundland. If the hon. member has information from Panama to the contrary he should say so.

MR. NEARY: A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: For my own protection, Sir, I have to correct what the hon. the Premier just said, The information came from Craig Dobbin's brother in conversation with Dr. Farrell in the men's room in Halifax overheard by another gentleman who happened to be in the terminal at the time.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege, Sir -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

May 3, 1978

Tape 1767

EC - 4

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege, it is obvious which way the hon. member is facing, what happens to him and what hits him when he gets his information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The point of privilege is not a matter in which the Chair would have to make a decision.

Order, please!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day
the adjourned debate on Motion 7.

Is the House ready for the question
on the amendment?

The hon. the member for Burgeo -
Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I understood I had
adjourned the debate. That is correct, is it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, they are all very tender today, having lost another round.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. WHITE: Ten in a row!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible) men's room. (Inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: The minister would know all about the men's room.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, if I could have a few words without -

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: If I could have a few words, Mr. -

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: If the hon. member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doody) could restrain himself,

MR. DOODY: It is not easy but I will try.

MR. SIMMONS: - or go to the men's room, if that is what is bothering him right now.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Something is obviously bothering him. Perhaps it is -

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Perhaps it is his proximity -

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: I can understand, Mr. Speaker, after the performance by his Premier today that he would want to throw up. I wanted to throw up because he never did answer the question, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: - about whether -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Hon. gentlemen on both sides! I must again insist that hon. members speak one at a time. I do not wish interjections, certainly not those of an unparliamentary nature, but I think any interjections may well serve to, in my opinion, create further disorder. I have an obligation, not an exclusive one, we all share it-to maintain order in the people's House. I again ask for the co-operation of all hon. members in that.

The hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was interrupted in mid-flight as I was about to say that the Premier never did answer the question about -

MR. HICKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: He does not know what I am going to say, it may be about Labrador for that matter.

MR. HICKMAN: We are on an amendment to this resolution, and the amendment is that the first recital, I think it is, or the second recital, the second recital be stricken out. And that certainly has nothing to do with the hon. the Premier answering questions, because he has not been asked a question with respect to Labrador.

MR. SIMMONS: I agree! I agree!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman had not finished his sentence. What the hon. Minister of Justice said is correct. It may be that the hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir is referring to a question asked several weeks ago. I mean, he had not finished the sentence, but certainly the point made is that the matter under debate is a specific amendment to a specific resolution, and all hon. members should speak on that.

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I fully intend to do, and if I can be spared the harassment from the irresponsible Minister of Justice for a few minutes I will get on with the job at hand, namely, the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: There he goes again, Mr. Speaker. Name him!

Name him! If you can find a name for him!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, you know, just let the record show as to who is trying to drag this House down into the gutter. I rose on a point of order which was sustained by the Chair. I would suggest that it is quite out of order for the hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) to then get up and alleged that that my rising on that point of order is irresponsible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

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

MR. SIMMONS: As Mr. Speaker himself reminded the House, I had not finished my sentence, There was nothing in the part of the sentence I had been permitted to quote which indicated what the subject matter of the question was about. The minister assumed it was about some questions that were asked today. The Speaker did not rule me out of order. He just pointed out that I should be relevant and I attempted to be that. And in passing, I did not say that the minister was irresponsible in what he had done. I said he is an irresponsible minister which I believe to be the case.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Obviously, I think, one point is that every hon. member does have the right to raise a point of order. Obviously he has, I think, an obligation to the House to do it with validity, not that the point need always be sustained but with a material or substantial validity. The motion being debated I think is quite clear to all hon. members. It is the amendment to the resolution and all hon. members, when they speak, will obviously have to speak to that subject. I do not know that I can go further than that.

The hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Last day I just had, I believe, four or five minutes. Perhaps the table would be good enough to inform me how much time I have left. I am assuming it is around thirty-five or forty minutes or something close to that.

MR. SIMMONS: The resolution that we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, is the resolution moved by colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, a resolution concerning Labrador, and presently we are on an amendment which would have the effect of removing certain words. The amendment was moved by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and the words he would have removed are those which relate to the fact that the National Convention of the Liberal Party gave unanimous support to the concept the idea embodied in this resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot in recent days about how various members are alleged to be wasting the time of the House. I suppose if you were looking for an example of how members waste the time of the House, the classic example, the best example of all is this amendment itself, this amendment. This resolution moved by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, is a good resolution because it puts into the public records, assuming the House will pass it, it will put into the public records a very definitive and substantive policy on Labrador. And then at a time when we are deliberating on that very serious question, at a time in this debate when we were getting some consensus around the House, including some members from the opposite side who stood up and said they could support the spirit of the resolution including the member for Menihek, (Mr. Rousseau) the Minister of Labour and Manpower for example. At a time, when we are beginning to getting a consensus a non-partisan consensus on a very important issue about the development of a very strategic and important part of this Province, then we get introduced into some very childish low partisan politics, the very lowest form at a time when it is not particularly necessary or warranted. Now we all play the partisan game in this House from time to time. May I have a quorum, Mr. Speaker, a quorum call.

000

MR. SPEAKER: Will the clerk please count the House? There is a quorum.

May 3, 1978

Tape 1769

DW - 2

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

MR. R. SIMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Health tells me my problem, and he is right. I know my problem. His problem is he does not know his problem.

May 3, 1978

Tape 1770

DW-1

MR. R. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, this amendment-

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. R. SIMMONS:

Here we go again, Here we go again, Here we go again-all gone for the men's room. We hope your information is as reliable as ours when you come back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. R. SIMMONS:

We want to know who got all this money, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

The Jealously Brigade.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

If I were on the receiving end of it all I would be worried and I would have to go into the men's room more often too. I would be running, I would have the runs because I would be running back and forth to the men's room all the time if I were on the receiving end of all that money.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG):

Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member to be more relevant.

MR. MURPHY:

He knows the subject of the amendment.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

The amendment is a very vexatious, childish, lowdown, partisan blow to this House. It will remove all reference to the Liberal Party, the party which happens to form the Government of Canada - and may do again, may do again, God knows.

MR. DINN:

For a short time, a very short time.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

There he goes, Mr. Speaker, There is the "Dinnwit" back with us again. Mr. Speaker, this amendment was so unnecessary, and at the same time it is such an example of how we get into unnecessary, partisan debate in this House. Because it matters not, Mr. Speaker, who else happens to agree with this particular idea. The preamble to the resolution will not be forwarded to authorities in Ottawa if the time comes when the will of this House is stated to Ottawa. The essential ingredient is the policy which is contained in the resolution moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

And it is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, and silly and vexatious that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) would see fit, would see the need to move such a silly, partisan, warped motion, Mr. Speaker. The only reason for it can be that the facts in it just do not jibe with his view of reality, his warped, his jaundiced view of the way things are supposed to be according to him. That is one reason we have the amendment, because the member concerned is so caught in partisan labels that he cannot see past the label 'Liberal', and if it is 'Liberal' then he assumes immediately therefore it is no good. It has got to be struck out, he cannot stand the idea. Mr. Speaker, how sad it must be to live in a world like that where labels come out in front of you like red flags, where you get uptight, you almost get out of yourself, you almost have an epileptic fit every time you hear the word 'Liberal'. That is the sad case, Mr. Speaker, with the member for St. John's East and perhaps with some other members over there - I do not know - but certainly with him because he has demonstrated it by putting this resolution down, or this amendment.

There is another reason for this vexatious, silly, childish resolution and that is that the longer the crowd on the other side can tie this House up on Private Member's Day, and they do it in various ways on Wednesday - Wednesday afternoon is their day for petitions, you will notice, and their day for long ministerial statements. Today was bit of an exception because they are so preoccupied these days with the Scrivener scandal that they do not have time to write their speeches, let alone read them. They do not have to find the petitions in their files, let alone bring them in and present them to the House. They are just so preoccupied they are so scared, so panic-stricken, Mr. Speaker, with this whole Scrivener scandal - and so they should be. If I were sitting on the horns of that particular dilemma, I am sure I would be fairly scared, fairly mobile as well.

May 3, 1978

Tape 1770

DW - 3

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I will draw it to the hon. member's
attention the point of relevancy.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The point of what?

MR. P. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, you get harassed
from everywhere these days, do you not? Harassment everywhere.
Unbelievable.

Mr. Speaker, if I were - Oh,

there he is, there he is -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member, I will ask him to
be seated. I did hear that it was indicated to me from what I
heard that

MR. SPEAKER(Young): the hon. member said he was getting harassment from the Chair.

MR. SIMMONS: No, I did not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, he did not.

MR. SPEAKER (Young): Order, please!

I asked the hon. member if that was indicated to be from the Chair. If he did I would like for him to withdraw it, please.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He did not say it.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything about harassment from the Chair and I resent the Chair being coached from the other side.

MR. SPEAKER (Young): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Young): Order, please!

I definitely heard the hon. member say he was being harassed.

MR. SIMMONS: I did not say that, and I did not say from the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER(Young): Thank you very much.

MR. SIMMONS: If Mr. Speaker thinks that I said from the Chair, I would like Mr. Speaker to wipe that out of his thinking because I did not say from the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER(Young): I accept that. Thank you very much.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I rise on a point of personal privilege, Your Honour. He was speaking to me, the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). It was a private communication. It had nothing to do with Your Honour whatsoever, nothing to do with Your Honour. It had to do with members on the other side, Sir. As a member of this House it seems to me a little bit precipitate, a little bit prejudicial on Your Honour's

MR. W.N. ROWE: part to be leaping to your feet and to be assuming that my colleague is saying something which it to the detriment, or not respectful to the Chair. It is prejudicial, Sir, and I would, Sir, ask that in the future, with all due respect to Your Honour, that we be a little bit careful and a little bit more certain about what we accuse hon. -

MR. SPEAKER(Young): Order, please!

MR. W.N. ROWE: - of what we accuse hon. members of -

MR. SPEAKER (Young): Order, please! Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order!

MR. W.N. ROWE: - before we draw conclusions which may not be warranted.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege, whether it is a personal point of privilege or privilege of this House, that is not a breach of any privilege. The point that the hon. Leader of the Opposition brings up is foolish, vexatious and stupid and should be stricken from the record. There is no point of privilege here. As I understand it, and I heard and listened attentively to what was being said, the Speaker asked the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir whether, in fact, he had certain words that were directed at the Chair.

The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir said, No, I did not. The Speaker accepted the words from the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir and that ended the issue. There is no point of privilege before the Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Young): Order, please!

I feel I am ready to rule on that question. I think it is probably more a point of explanation. The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir

MR. SPEAKER(Young): indicated to the Chair that in no way were his remarks directed at the Chair. I accepted his word and I would ask the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir to please continue.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: A question of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: Who is abusing the House now?

MR. WHITE: That is right.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. There was a situation which developed here which has to be rectified. The member allegedly made a remark, Your Honour raised the issue, the hon. member said he had not made such a remark, Your Honour accepted and the Leader of the Opposition got up and did something I have not seen done since I have been in politics, that is to chastise Your Honour, indicate that Your Honour had made prejudicial rulings.

MR. J. CARTER: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That chastised Your Honour to be very careful in the future when interjecting. And, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that he got beat to a pulp today in the House, but he is not - get up and abuse me, get up and abuse the member for Green Bay, but the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition, has no right to get up here and chastise Your Honour and put him in a position of weakness.

MR. DINN: Hear, hear! The House -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I suggest that he get up, not because His Honour interjects, and withdraw what he just said to His Honour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Young): I recognize the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Sir, a point of privilege has

MR. W.N. ROWE: been raised which I should
treat with the contempt which it deserves and not say
anything, but one is forced, I suppose, to do so, to get
up.

As Your Honour well knows,
and as Your Honour fully accepted at the time, as Leader
of the Opposition, Sir, I rose to draw Your Honour's
attention to the fact that, and there was a presumption
on Your Honour's part that my hon. friend had said some -
thing prejudicial or disrespectful concerning the Chair.
I got up to say, Sir, that perhaps this may have given
the wrong impression, that to myself and to people
elsewhere it may appear to be prejudicial to my
hon. colleague and that in the future we should be
careful about making

MR. W. ROWE: assumptions, or presumptions, either Your Honour or members of the House, because Your Honour is a member of this House, making presumptions or assumptions concerning remarks made by hon. members without first ascertaining what in fact was said. Now, Sir, if there is anything wrong with that then it can only be found wrong by an incredibly small mind. It is my duty, Sir, to help protect the privileges of the House and the order of the House like any other member. I do not resent members getting up opposite on points of order or privilege, but Sir, I do insist on making sure that I, and my colleagues particularly, are fully protected and full respected in this hon. House by the Chair and by other members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. W. ROWE: Now, Sir, are we going to continue -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! Order, please!

I feel that we are getting into a debate on a point of privilege. I feel that it is not a point of privilege, it is more or less a point of explanation and so I will ask the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) to please continue.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

I was sitting here listening to the -

MR. SIMMONS: Additional ruling.

MR. MORGAN: - speech being made by the hon. gentleman from Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), There was absolutely no comment

MR. MORGAN: whatsoever from this side of the House of Assembly, none whatsoever, no harassment, none; there was no interjection, none whatsoever, Hansard will show that. The hon. the Speaker, Sir, you did indicate to the hon. gentleman from Bay d'Espoir that you would call him to order to be relevant to the debate. That was the only interjection, the only interjection in the debate on the speech being made by the hon. the member for Bay d'Espoir -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I feel the hon. minister is raising the same point of privilege and I would ask the hon. member for Bay d'Espoir to please continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker. -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor or do I not?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: - a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as a member of this House, I think it is intolerable for your decision and for your order at any time to be called in this House, should never be questioned.

MR. NEARY: Name him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: There is a method to be used in questioning the order from the Chair. - Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I heard, without any question, the question from the speaker who was then speaking, determining that it was harassment from the Chair when you called him to order.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that if we cannot be called to order by Your Honour in any debate, when we are irrelevant to debate, we are out of order in debate -

MR. F. WHITE: Throw him out.

MR. MORGAN: - it is your order, Mr. Speaker, who will then call us to order.

MR. NEARY: That is a -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would ask the hon. member to my right to be quiet during debate.

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Speaker, what happened this afternoon was that you had called a certain speaker, in this case the hon. gentleman from Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) who was then in debate, you called him to order and asked him to be relevant to debate; at that same time the hon. gentleman said he was being harassed from the Chair. Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that that is a question of privilege of this House. It is your authority, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS: You do not -

MR. MORGAN: - to call myself or any other hon. gentleman in this House to order if they are not relevant to debate or out of order.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is it is totally out of order for any member to say he has been harassed from the Chair when he is being called to order. That is the question of privilege of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I do not think it is a point of privilege.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am ready to rule.

I did ask the hon. member to explain his remarks. He explained them fully, in the opinion of the Chair, and I am quite satisfied with his explanation and I would ask the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) to please continue with his speech.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the -

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, finally.

MR. NEARY: Wasting the time of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, temptations arise on points

of privilege of my own but we have seen what can happen with points of privilege in the past few minutes. A word of explanation to the House, I did not say anything about the Chair at all.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. SIMMONS: I was harassed by the member for Mount Pearl arena and the beer baron from Bonavista South, but otherwise, Mr. Speaker, there was no harassment from the Chair and I confirm that for the record.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to the motion. The last few minutes have illustrated the venom that is behind this amendment. This amendment would strike out the word 'Liberal' because everybody over there just about, there are a few exceptions, there are a few souls over there, Mr. Speaker, who are not on the horns of the dilemma,

MR. SIMMONS: who are not losing sleep these nights, not losing sleep over other events and can still see clearly a few of them. The most of them, Mr. Speaker, see a red flag every time they hear the word 'Liberal.' They see it in a resolution. They see a red flag. That is the motivation behind the member for St. John's East because they have come to associate the word Liberal with exposing them for what they are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: They have come to associate the word Liberal with that racket that has gone on in Public Works, Mr. Speaker, with-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: with police investigations, with the Scrivener project.

MR. HICKMAN: Point of Order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has arisen.

MR. HICKMAN: To a point of order: Your Honour ruled the hon. gentleman out of order quite some time ago and ordered and directed when he was embarking upon the same lines to be totally relevant.

It is obvious that the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir is totally and absolutely and unpardonably disregarding Your Honour's ruling.

MR. W.N. ROWE: To that point of order, Sir. Here is another example of the harassment the hon. member was talking about earlier which caused specious points of privilege to be raised - completely useless and specious and time-wasting points of privilege which they were defeated on. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is being relevant. The member for St. John's East has brought in an amendment which has the effect of depriving my resolution of one of its preambles concerning Labrador and concerning the Liberal Party of Canada. Now my hon. friend here is indicating his reasons and his opinion why he thinks that particular amendment is being brought before the House and why we are debating it. Now, Sir, if that is not relevant to the reason for the debate on the amendment then nothing is relevant because what is certainly most relevant on an amendment is why the amendment is being debated,

MR. W.N. ROWE: what the hon. members are trying to accomplish. We are not trying to impute any base motives or anything but they are trying to accomplish, why they are doing it, the political reasons - partisan or otherwise. Surely, Sir, this is the right subject for debate on an amendment. And my friend from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir is being perfectly relevant, as relevant as you can be on this particular amendment to that resolution, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The gist of the amendment is to delete a certain recital which in general has a reference to the Liberal Party and resolutions that were passed at a meeting thereof. Argument as to why that reference to the Liberal Party should be deleted or allowed to stay would in my opinion be within the area of relevance.

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your ruling. I began speaking at about twenty-five after four and let the record show that for twenty minutes I have been interrupted on four occasions on points of order and privilege by the Minister of Justice who for some reason -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: For the record only; only on two occasions. And let the record also show that the hon. gentleman called a quorum call when his own members walked out on him. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point before the Chair to make a decision on. The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister because he does illustrate exactly what I was trying to state that he is bent on interrupting as much as he can. He obviously has a reason for doing that, and it is part of the reason I was discussing a moment ago that every time that - and particularly, there is nothing worse, Mr. Speaker, than a - the expression is nothing worse than a reformed

MR. SIMMONS: drunk, nothing worse than a reformed politician, nothing worse than a person who has changed horses in midstream. He becomes so -

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. This gutter language that is coming from -

MR. SIMMONS: Gutter language! Gutter language!

MR. HICKMAN: Gutter language that is coming from the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir in a deliberate, malicious attempt to destroy this House and invade the personal privileges of every hon. member of this House. It is totally in violation of the rules and I seek the protection of the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: On that point, Mr. Speaker, I was struggling for a term. There is another term other than nothing worse than a reformed drunk but there is something in the vernacular, a little expression which implies that a person who switched parties or changed his religious affiliation or changed his cultural and everyday habits becomes very evangelical in the opposite direction. And I was not implying at all the minister was drunk - insober in some of his judgements, but that is another issue. But, Mr. Speaker, the man has been known to be a Liberal. He ran for the leadership of the Liberal Party as I can attest. He is now a good Tory and I say there is nothing worse than a reformed drunk in that context.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I must draw to the attention of hon. members on all sides the essential rules of debate. May, page 429, states that "It is important to guard against all appearance of personality in debate," a rule which has not always been fulfilled, and also abusive and insulting language should be avoided by members on both sides. I am not referring here to the type of procedure where an hon. member might take exception to a specific word. There are a list of words unparliamentary. Those listed are not particularly helpful, and there was authority that whether the matter is on a list or not on a list is not the determining point. What I am speaking about is the more general area of what is generally considered courtesies that hon. members owe one another, including those whom they sit opposite. And I think the general regulation and statement of the rule in May, page 430 sums it up and that is, "Abusive and insulting language of a nature likely to create disorder," and I would ask all hon. members to bear that in my mind in participation in their debates.

The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay

d'Espoir.

MR. R. SIMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do want to get on because I have only got ten minutes or so left and there are some things I wanted to say. The minister had mentioned that I was deliberately trying to destroy the House. That itself is substance for a point of privilege, but I will not raise it because it is so vexatious and silly that it is not worth dealing with, I can only tell the House in good faith that I am not trying to destroy the House and I have asked them to judge for themselves of the minister's actions in the past few minutes on the same subject.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is really, Mr. Speaker, nothing so evangelical, so fervent about sobriety as a reformed drunk. There is nobody so evangelical and fervent about a political persuasion as he who has jumped the fence and got into the opposite political persuasion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: A turncoat.

MR. R. SIMMONS: And that is part of the reason here why we are getting such a bitterly partisan stance from the other side on this subject of whether we should remove the word Liberal from the resolution. Because it is a red flag, Mr. Speaker, it is a reminder of all you stood for before you went astray or got on the straight and narrow, as the case may be. It is a reminder of things you wanted to forget, that once you were part of all you are now condemning. It is a reminder that now, Mr. Speaker, you have down to a science, down to a fine science, a real fine art, all the tactics that you accused your predecessors of practicing.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. R. SIMMONS: It is a red flag, Mr. Speaker, it is a reminder of what you do not want to be reminded of. You wish you could put it behind you, you wish you did not exist. And then the Leader of the Opposition has the gall, the audacity to come into the House and put the word Liberal in print right before you so you got to see it every time you open your little Order Paper. What a complete insult!

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. Minister of Justice -

MR. R. SIMMONS: What insolence that the member for Twillingate would have the gall to do a thing like that to we people who want to forget, who want to forget that the whole thing exists, who do not want to be reminded that the word Liberal means you cannot lash out your money in Public Works to your buddies without contracts anymore. It reminds you of that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR WINDSOR: Did you bring in the Public Tender Act?

MR. R. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not bring in the Public Tender Act. And would to God the Public Tender Act applied to the Mount Pearl Arena, the member would not be in the mess he is in today.

May 3, 1978

Tape 1774

DW - 3

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!. Order, please!

I must require the hon. gentleman

to withdraw his last statement.

Order, please!

When the Chair interposes, hon.

members would assist in the business of the House if they did not interject and let the matter between the Chair and the hon. member vis - a - vis whom the interjection is taken place.

Hon. member.

MR. R. SIMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I

certainly withdraw the inference as directed by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: I withdrew the inference.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: I see. Well, Mr. Speaker, the word Liberal to that hon. crowd over there, Mr. Speaker, has all the characteristics of the traditional red flag.

MR. H. COLLINS: No doubt about it.

MR. SIMMONS: It has got to be a red one, eh? It definitely is a red flag. The choice of colours is good. The Minister of Health now knows the colour of the flag in front of the bull, and why should the bull not know the colour of the flag in front of the bull, Mr. Speaker, shooting all the bull he does?

MR. H. COLLINS: Do not turn me on.

MR. SIMMONS: The red flag for them, Mr. Speaker. It is a reminder that no longer can they look after their buddies with their slush fund in Public Works. No longer, Mr. Speaker, can they do the things up at the Health Sciences Complex that they got away with, or thought they got away with. Now the chickens are coming home to roost.

Mr. Speaker, I only have a minute or so left and there are so many things of substance beside the vexatious motivation behind this amendment, so many things of substance that need to be said about the main motion itself. But once we get rid of the amendment perhaps some of us will be back again, Mr. Speaker, because it is obvious now that the people on the government side of the House do not want the Nordsee resolution ever, ever, ever to see the light of day. They have not made their minds up on it, They cannot get their heads together on it, and the longer they can put off private resolution number two, the better for them and I predict when we dispense with this amendment they will come in with some other amendment, equally vexatious, aimed at something else in this resolution which has nothing to do with the substance of

MR. SIMMONS: resolution itself.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I moved a motion concerning the situation in Quebec and concerning the Freedom Road. As it was not considered urgent at the time, yesterday, this is the first opportunity in which I have had the time to speak on it. Whether there is an amendment, or whatever it is in front of the House, or whether the members opposite in the government consider I am wasting their time, or the time of the House, I intend to have my say on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment here that we are debating concerns the introduction of the words "Liberal Party" into this resolution. I think the amendment is totally facetious in many ways and I intend to show so, not by partisan talk back and forth at members but by discussing the situation as we see fit in Labrador, a situation which I think is very grave, and a situation in Labrador West which may very soon explode into proportions which we cannot contain.

Yesterday I indicated that the Quebec Government, the Provincial Government of Quebec are extremely interested and extremely keen on developing this road into Labrador West. I should also indicate that I believe that it is through the neglect of this government in the last two to three years that we are away behind, At least even if we managed to start the road now we would be at least two to three years behind.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STRACHAN: The minister can stand afterwards and defend. Two to three years behind because I have belief that what is occurring is that the Provincial Government of Quebec, the Quebec Government, have territorial aspirations and in any civilized country the way to obtain these territories is not by war but is by economic and physical

MR. STRACHAN: links. And what is occurring here is that the Quebec Government very carefully, very cunningly, and we cannot fault them for that, the Quebec Government are looking after their Province well. Levesque is doing very well in looking after the Province and their aspirations and be greedy as they may be, but we believe that what they are intending to do is to either neutralize the Labrador City - Wabush area as a service centre and remove that to Fermont, which will negate almost all the Bartlett Enquiry has produced, or they will make the economic and physical ties of Labrador be so strong with the Province of Quebec that whatever moves we make on our part we will be constantly struggling behind in order to try to make them believe that we are at last paying some attention to them.

The Labrador City - Fermont Highway is paved, of course. You can drive to Fermont.

May 3, 1978

Tape 1776

EC - 1

MR. STRACHAN: And I did have information yesterday that the striking workers of Quebec Cartier Mining operation with equipment from the company are pushing the road from Fermont to Gagnon, a distance of forty miles from both ends. The Gagnon to Fire Lake road - Fire Lake owned by Sidbek - is paved highway, and the sixty miles of road from Fire Lake to Manic 5, is now let yesterday, apparently, a contract to St. Lawrence Construction Company by the provincial government of Quebec, with what federal involvement in the funds I am not sure, but be that as it may, it is quite in order for Quebec to look for the same kind of cost sharing arrangements. That highway is now in the process of being constructed. And then from Manic Five one can go to Baie Comeau on the St. Lawrence on to the Trans-Canada Highway.

It is estimated that by July or August one can drive from Labrador West by a four by four straight through to Baie Comeau on the Trans-Canada Highway and on to Montreal. And the talk - I do not know the distances, I just know the distances of the roads which will need to be done - our basic argument is that Levesque has made his statement that it will be finished by Fall and paved by next year, so the Labrador City and Labrador West people will then have a physical and economic link. And the people in Labrador West are concerned and upset because they feel there has been tremendous neglect on the part of this Province. They feel isolated, and many people in Labrador do. Many times it goes beyond just pure isolation and frustration, but they feel that in many cases they have been neglected - in the last three or four years when the Freedom Road was talked about - because now the

MR. STRACHAN: Freedom Road has gone West, and the Freedom Road will be West, and whatever countervailing forces we bring in now we will always be behind to try to get the Freedom Road - which is no longer Freedom because the Freedom will now be West - the road to lead to the East to Goose Bay. And we are deeply concerned about this because we feel very strongly that it is all part of a development scheme, an economic colonization of Labrador by Quebec, which advertises the Torngat Mountains as the Quebec Alps, which show no borders separating Quebec and Labrador, which is prepared to discuss air freight subsidies with Quebec air companies to supply the Labrador Coast, which is interested in getting into other areas in Labrador West and making economic and physical ties with even changes of company names in the Wabush area and Labrador City area and to French titles. The whole thing is economic colonization.

MR. HICKMAN: Is the hon. gentleman suggesting that a company incorporated in Newfoundland has changed its name to a French company? - incorporated under the laws of Newfoundland?

MR. STRACHAN: No, what I am suggesting here and what we have evidence of is that companies are coming in from Quebec, operating in Labrador City-Wabush in French only, and their titles, their letterheads, their form letters and so on are all in French. There is no English and we talk about bilingualism. There is no English.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. STRACHAN: And what we are stating is that more and more of this is moving in and people see it as an insidious move into Labrador West, and I would say that this will continue - that with this road then, obviously, businesses would be foolish to consider expensive air freight operations

MR. STRACHAN: or any other operations in which the costs are higher when they can deal directly with Quebec.

MR. HICKMAN: There are companies doing business in Labrador City who will correspond only in French, is that correct?

MR. STRACHAN: We have companies who are dealing - yes, that is right - corresponding in French, whose letterheads are all in French, operating in Labrador West.

MR. HICKMAN: If I wanted to write this company in Labrador City, would they adopt the attitude that is adopted in the Province of Quebec, that if I write them in English they will not respond to me?

MR. STRACHAN: As I understand it, but I would suggest that I will certainly obtain a copy -

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. STRACHAN: - or I could yield -

MR. W. N. ROWE: I believe I have a copy on file, Mr. Speaker, that somebody sent to me, if I can pick it up, which has pure French in the letterhead and nothing else and the body of the letter is in French -

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, that is the part I do not understand.

MR. W. N. ROWE: - and the address is Labrador City or Wabush in Labrador - and that is probably legal and so on, but the point is being made that it is not in English - the letterhead is not in English. Psychologically, at least, it is a pure and simple assertion that French is the language here. And I think it had to do with the giving and taking of credit by one of the supermarkets or stores in the area - that was, I think, the subject matter

May 3, 1978

Tape 1776

EC - 4

MR. W. N. ROWE: of it. And the letterhead was French and the communication itself was in French with no English. I think that is the point, is it not?

MR. STRACHAN: That is it. The point I am making is that I am not interested in the legality of it. What I am stating is that this economic colonization, as I call it, is already underway and is proceeding fairly fast. And I argue very strongly when I see this all the time.

MR. STRACHAN:

when Nain becomes to Simpsons Sears, for instance, Nain, Quebec; when Goose Bay and Labrador City become Labrador City and Goose Bay, Quebec by national companies; when we do business with many companies and will receive all our mail as addressed to Quebec, then what I am suggesting is that the whole idea, slowly, over a period of time, to have your territorial aspirations satisfied through economic and physical lengths and economic colonization. What we are arguing basically is that we feel that, I certainly do feel, that in the last three or four years--and that is all the political life that I can talk about; before that we never even had radios so I never knew what was going on - in the last three or four years we feel that many of the commitments which have been made to the people in Labrador which we are going to make them part of this Province have not been lived up to. We are behind Quebec.

DR. J. COLLINS: Would the hon. member permit a question.

MR. STRACHAN: Sure.

DR. COLLINS: I understand the hon. member's particular concern at this time. He has many concerns which one can certainly understand. But I think his particular concern now is regarding the development of a road link from the Labrador City-Wabush area West. Now one can understand the implications of that, but I wonder if the hon. member would develop it further. What is his remedy? Is he against that road and, if so, how can we possibly prevent this, if that is the point, or does he have some alternative remedy for it? Because my understanding of the resolution that we are debating is that a road from Labrador, connecting Labrador with the rest of Canada, is thought to be a desirable thing.

MR. STRACHAN: I did not intend to be purely negative as an Opposition member and stand here. What I was intending doing was getting down to some solutions which I thought maybe could come into place. What I am stating here is the case, first of all, as we see it, and then later on possibly I would like to suggest--because there is more than just this road which is involved, there is also a major discussion now

MR. STRACHAN:

in Quebec of another railroad which will bypass totally Labrador City and Wabush to go around to Schefferville. There are also discussions of moving the whole Ungava area and developing the whole Ungava area where there are rich minerals as well or opening up that whole area. What I am suggesting here is that this is all part of an overall package, development package, by the Province of Quebec. Obviously we cannot object to it. Obviously what Quebec is doing is looking after their own legitimate concerns and we cannot obviously object.

What I am stating is that we are behind. I would like then to get into my discussion, certainly but if the minister wishes to ask me I am quite prepared to yield.

MR. HICKMAN: The other thing I want to ask the hon. gentleman is this. Several years ago in this - I have to confess this, something that has been sitting very lightly with me - several years ago in the 1960's there was a resolution passed in this House in compliance with a request from the then Prime Minister of Canada, the late Mr. Pearson, making this House bilingual. Now if this House accepts that position, you know, endorses the two language concept, how are we going to deal with this problem in Labrador City with respect to the use of the French language in correspondence, etc.?

MR. STRACHAN: I sympathize with the minister in his dilemma about the use of the language or what language we will use here. I am not interested in an objection to a language being used, French being used or any other language for that matter being used in Labrador West, as long as I do not see behind it this economic colonization which I think is behind it. Our message is not to object to the French people using the French language or the Inuit people using Inuktitut. My objection is that behind this there is an insidious plan. When we see our mail as Nain Quebec, when we see all this whole conglomeration of things occurring, when we see the Torngat Mountains being advertised all across North America for late Winter skiing as the Quebec Alps, it is these kind of things that I object to and I think that the whole thing comes together as a package. But what I am concerned about and have stated -

MR. HICKMAN: May I make one more suggestion?

MR. ROUSSEAU: (inaudible) because I would want to ask one question.

Does the hon. member, and I know he would agree with me 100 per cent and I would think he would want to say it because I do not want to read it, and I would not want anybody on the Island part of the Province to read it, that the people of Labrador are so weak that we would ever let that happen. And he is one of the people of Labrador and he knows what I am asking. And I know how he feels about it. I know he would want to say it.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, absolutely. In fact, the reason why I was talking previously, I think a month ago, about this question, I raised it then and the reason why I am talking now is, of course, I do not think there is any one person who I have ever met in Labrador who wants it to happen. In fact a petition-

AN HON. MEMBER: Or will let it.

MR. STRACHAN: That is right, or will let it happen. And the talk is all we are going to stand on the border with our rifles and so on and we are going to keep them out. But the point is that colonization is an insidious method nowadays.

MR. STRACHAN: It is done in civilized countries, not by war or by starting an uproar. If it is cheaper for me as a businessman to do my dealings with the province there, if for a holiday I no longer have to fly out at high expense and I can drive my car there, if I can get my goods brought in, my family, my furniture instead of paying \$5,000 or \$6,000 for my furniture and therefore the whole thing is that over a period of time if we can shift the mood West to Quebec and not I believe at a deliberate policy of Quebec, that is what I am stating. It is not just so happens that Quebec is looking forward to only developing its own province. It is a definite policy of the present Quebec government and I think of all Quebec governments before that, whatever their political affiliation, and I think that this is what they are attempting to do and it is a serious, serious question.

MR. HICKMAN: May I ask the hon. gentleman one more question more because I would like him to evolve his arguments. I do not disagree at all with this insidious - if insidious is the word - but the ambitions of the Province of Quebec. Another thing that annoys me and I find very offensive is that I have seen it, for instance, on maps and travel pamphlets prepared by particularly the nation of France showing all of Labrador as part of Quebec. And it seems to me that there should be, whenever that appears, a very violent protest on the part of the Government of Canada through their Ambassador in whatever the offending nation is. But let us not think that that scheme is restricted just to the Province of Quebec and that they are not being aided and abetted, because they are.

MR. STRACHAN: My argument with the minister is basically this on that point that he raised, that I have in this last two and a half years in this House, or three years in this House, brought up here questions of advertisements, questions that the government have, for instance, talking about an island province. But the reason why I brought these up is not because I enjoy asking the Minister

MR. STRACHAN: of Tourism a question that why do you advertise in Maclean's Magazine that we are an island province. My argument is not because I am objecting to the Minister of Tourism. What I am stating is that Labrador is not a Sinai Desert which we are going to argue over, that we are not Egypt and Israel and we are in between. My arguments in pointing out these things - My arguments with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador is that we must show concern that we are a province and that if we negate that, if we are careless in speech in which we talk about an island province or we talk about Newfoundland only, the argument of an inclusion awkward as it is and the hyphenated name for Labrador being included long as it is, the argument for it is that carelessness of speech people believe to be carelessness of mind and if it is carelessness of mind then people feel that they do not belong anywhere and if they do not belong anywhere well we might as well do business with Quebec.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. STRACHAN: And that is the basic argument that why we are caught here is that here we have a move and a definite, I would call it insidious - I see it in the Quebec Inuit Association. I could give an example last week, a very personal example but I do not wish to in this House because it involves personalities, involving Quebec Inuit people. They use the name Inuit.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Quebec Inuit people, do they speak English?

MR. STRACHAN: They want to talk English. They wish to talk English but there is an argument on just now about the use of Inuktitut and French in Quebec because they want to use Inuktitut and English because English is the general language of commerce and by adopting French, or being forced to have French as their second language, or first, whatever we want in commercial use, they are being forced in many ways to adopt French. I am not interested so much in that argument there. But what I am deeply concerned about and why I am raising this matter and why I think at this time that we should

May 3, 1978

Tape No. 1778

JM - 3

MR. STRACHAN: address ourselves with a major development plan to cherish the essence of the resolution that we have to in order to countervail the Quebec forces that we cannot think of bandaid approaches to a freedom road going to Labrador City or Wabush. We cannot think of just filling in a few potholes and a bridge across the rivers every spring when they are washed out or culverts being put in. We cannot think that way. We have to move urgently, quickly as I have said here for the last two and a half years because it is fundamentally important. Not one person that I know of, one Quebecker that is, in Labrador wants to have anything to do with any political affiliation with Quebec. Most of them are people from the Island part of the Province in the Labrador West area who have been living there fifteen or twenty years.

MR. STRACHAN: Their ties are still very strongly here and the reason why they got the petition up of 2,000 names in a few days, in a town which is virtually a ghost town at the moment, is because they feel so strongly about it, but they feel there has been neglect and they are being frustrated. This road here from Fermont to Gagnon is being carried out by Quebec striking workers, using Quebec Cartier mining equipment with the blessing of the government to underwrite any costs.

The Labrador West people offered to do the same and they feel, the minister can argue against it or not, but they feel, according to the information I have, that they had offered this before in this Province but it was not treated seriously. That is their argument as they placed it to me. They offered to do the road, for instance, from Labrador West -

MR. MORGAN: Whose government are you talking about, the Quebec Government or the Federal Government? There is a question there.

MR. STRACHAN: There is a real question here which I have asked. In fact, one person is trying to get it from me because this information I have was only found out because there were pickets at Fermont and pickets at Gagnon and nobody knew the road was being pushed through from both ends. And there was only a Quebec helicopter pilot who was flying there and now I have asked for him to take the CBC from Labrador West down to see the road because it has been going on there and nobody could get past the pickets to see what construction was underway.

My argument then basically is that is a move - it is a move also to negate the Bartlett Enquiry. It is a move to leave out Labrador City with an industrial park. It is a move to try and shift it over to Fermont, so that even if we do have the industrial park, Seven Islands will be dealing with Fermont.

MR. HICKMAN: Did the hon. gentleman say he is trying as well to get information as to whether there is Government of Canada money in construction of that road?

MR. STRACHAN: I am trying first of all to find out whether there is Quebec Provincial Government money into the striking workers being used to build a highway, I am trying to find that out, number one. Number two, what the cost sharing arrangement is between the Quebec Government and Ottawa for this road, if there is any, or what it is.

I have no arguments. I am not arguing. If Quebec manages to get a cost sharing agreement and it is ninety-nine - one per cent, that is well and good for them.

MR. HICKMAN: But it is very difficult for the Government of Canada to -

MR. STRACHAN: Absolutely. But what I am stating is that I feel that we have not been sitting pushing this as much as possible.

AN HON. MEMBER: I did not even know about it.

MR. STRACHAN: Our previous minister will probably stand and defend his position, that is fine. That is your right to defend it. But what I am basically arguing about -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the federal government -

MR. STRACHAN: - what I am basically arguing about is that we have only heard about the Port Labrador, about the Freedom Road as a major priority of this government in the last few months. We did not hear about it after the '75 election.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. STRACHAN: For two years it was a band-aid approach because the minister, willing as he wanted to be, did not have the money or the commitments to be able to do anything about the road, apart from band-aid approaches. The fact that he goes up and examines it we will welcome, examines the road to find out what he can do with available money, but there was no major

MR. STRACHAN: proposal, as I understand, He can defend the position, but there was no major proposals in order to try and get the same agreement that Quebec possibly is going after to open up. There were no major development programmes because we need economic development in that area and when I see, I see this as an insidious move by Quebec mining companies--and I absolve in this case here, just in case there is any mistake about it, I absolve IOC in this matter here. I am not talking about IOC workers. I am not talking about their company, IOC, or Wabush Mines.

MR. ROUSSEAU: That is what I thought you meant.

MR. STRACHAN: No. No. I am talking about Quebec Cartier Mines Sidbek and the Provincial Government of Quebec were all involved in this. I think they are deeply concerned about the Bartlett Enquiry. I think they are trying to find a way around the Bartlett Enquiry.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I had more phone calls from Seven Islands than I had -

MR. STRACHAN: That is right. So I think that the situation I believe is fundamentally important.

MR. STRACHAN:

I do not think that the government is getting down to grips with it. I think if we are going to get down to grips with it, it does require not a bandaid approach. It requires a major developmental programme for that area and for the whole Labrador right through. If you have it that is fine, if we are starting now to develop it. But I still say that we are a number of years behind and we have got to be as equally cunning, equally as crafty as the provincial government in Quebec if we are going to maintain our lead in having physical contact with the Labrador section. Because there is no other way around it. If it does happen nobody there wants to deal with it. They have no affiliations to Quebec but it is a serious situation and with isolation and frustration of towns which are on strike and frustration, the people feel very strongly about it. They feel it is a destruction of the last link with this Province.

I sometimes think that when I state this often and often, and I am sure other Labrador members will feel the same on some of it, sometimes when I state this because it is not right on our doorstep in front of Confederation Building in St. John's, we do not want to recognize that there is a problem there. There is a major problem with the richest part of this Province, the future of this Province, a major problem and we should make sure that we are not going to lose it by default and not going to lose it by neglect. And we do not need to lose it by changing boundaries or borders. We can lose it because in effect the riches of Labrador are going to flow into Quebec anyway and Quebec are going to make sure they flow into Quebec. We must therefore move quickly, with courage, guts, determination in order to negate this insidious move. And that is not the only one. If it was the only move they were making, I would not see this as being fundamentally that important. But there are many other moves which they are making in order to economically colonize part of this Province.

I am not one who, at the moment I think anyway, who wants to use scare tactics in order to wake people up. But I do

MR. STRACHAN:

tell you that it is a very serious situation. I have stood and said it time and time and time again here. I have said it in a number of places and nobody seems to recognize the seriousness of it. Maybe that is the frustration of being so far away. But it is, and I am sure that the member for the district of Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) feels that sometimes too with his colleagues, I sometimes find it with my colleagues, I find it outside the House, I find it dealing with the press, for instance, that we can have something very, very serious happen in Labrador but if you do not really understand the geography of the place or the feelings of the place then it is not really important because you cannot get a grasp of it.

So I think that what we have to do is that we must encourage very strongly and this is what I believe that the government has not done, where it has fell down on the job. The Minister of Health has stated that he wishes I would get together with him now that I am back this week. Why was I out of the House? Why was I not in my place in the House last week? Because I went to my home in this Province, Nain, which cost me more than to cross the Atlantic, for a two day meeting with the CRTC and to visit my family, because of sickness and got stuck for eight days - not eight hours, not eight minutes, eight days! I particularly enjoyed it but that is not the point. For eight days we could not move in this Province. Meanwhile the CRTC was moving around opposite us on the Chimo - George River - Ungava Bay area freely.

MR. STRACHAN:

quite freely. And we, 100 miles further East, could not get out for eight days.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why? What was the implication of them being able and you not being able?

MR. STRACHAN: They were able to do it because they have airstrips. They were travelling in twin engine planes with IFR instruments to fly because they have beacons, because they are not relying on visual VFR rules and they can move. I mean it is, although it is stopped now, it is a commentary to me. You know, to me it always was a sad commentary when the goods, the vegetables and food stuffs which we ate on the Labrador Coast and which we can get cheaper on the Labrador Coast come from Quebec, and it is recognized. Who can fault the Labrador West businessmen for dealing with Quebec when it is recognized, or was recognized by the Department of Rural Development of this government that it was cheaper to deal with Quebec than it was to deal with this Province. And a department of this government was buying its goods in Quebec, food stuffs for the Labrador Coast, moving it up to Schefferville and chartering a French-Quebec company, this government, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, chartering a French company to supply vegetables and food stuffs to the Coast of Labrador. It is stopped and it does not happen any more this year, but for four and a half years that is what happened. And to me it is an admission of failure of this Province and the government of this Province, when we have to through its Public Tendering Act here or whatever system they have downstairs in Public Works for food stuffs for the Labrador Coast through government stores in the Labrador Coast, that this must be purchased in Quebec, railroaded up Quebec, flown by Quebec companies into Labrador to supply towns and communities in this Province with vegetables and food stuffs during the Winter.

So, who can fault with this man in Labrador for starting to looking to Quebec when we find even the government of

MR. STRACHAN:

this Province deals with Quebec because it is cheaper? I think there has been neglect and some frustrations obviously of the people. But what I am stating is that we often feel that there is no government of this Province. But if there is a government let us get down to the serious business of a developmental plan of pushing it, having somebody resident on the doorstep in Ottawa instead of bickering and fighting, resident there, lobbying, pushing because we are in a serious situation as I have said before, a very serious situation. I think that we are at the crossroads and there is no use complaining five or ten years from now because everybody from Labrador goes to Quebec for holidays and vacations and business dealings and meetings because it is cheaper to go there than it is to come back to the Island part or to deal with the rest of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the amendment is such is striking out 'the Liberal Party', the amendment in this part here, it is facetious, it is foolish. Just because it mentions 'Liberal', because I have not seen in the two and a half years that I have been here that there have been many development plans for Labrador of the government across the House. There are many cases when we have brought up some arguments about the word 'Newfoundland' only or the Island Province or various other small bits, letter heads and so on, that has been kind of laughed at, you know this kind of foolishness where it is a serious, serious question to the people in Labrador. It is an emotional question obviously, a very emotional question. But I suggest that the amendment here is facetious, it is not necessary, that what is needed since the preamble to it is not important to me, what is important is the developmental parts of this resolution. And if the government as the minister indicates has a plan well and good but let us get moving with it because for the last three years we have seen nothing or very little or bandaid approaches. Let us get moving because the people there feel that they are being neglected, that there is no government, there is no concern and I suggest therefore that we should move fast and quickly

MR. STRACHAN: for the sake of the future of this Province, not because it may change its boundaries - that I am not afraid of - but because slowly it will be much easier to deal with another province than it will be to remain within this Province and deal with people here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: A good speech. You can teach your colleagues a lesson over there.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I must say that I appreciated yesterday that the hon. member gave me this press release. Unfortunately I have been involved in other problems in Labrador City and Baie Verte in the past few days and there are only so many things that a man can do at one time, but I appreciate the fact that he did make that available yesterday. I was not aware of it, as the hon. member knows.

I think that I would like to say that the question I posed to the hon. member when I stood up is a very important one and I would think that, not that I deserve it; I deserve it less, I think, than the hon. member. I do not know how long the hon. member was in Labrador, but certainly the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), we will be the first three men on the board I would hope. But there might be a lot more people who deserve that right much more than we do.

MR. STRACHAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes. I think one thing that we should not do on this, and I would hope that the hon. members of the House would agree, that we should not panic. I mean Labrador is part of this Province. When the hon. member talks about the name of the Province, I fully support that and I said publicly in the House of Assembly, as long as I am here, that the name of the Province will be Newfoundland and Labrador. It may not be appreciated

MR. ROUSSEAU: by people on the Island part of the Province, but it is a very emotional and important subject for the people of Labrador. I would hope some day that the people of Labrador might want to call the Province Newfoundland, only because, and I was misquoted on that and we have had some correspondence, only because the people would feel part of the official name of the Province, which is legally the Province of Newfoundland, but by tradition it has become the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, it is the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and I fully support that concept.

I must mention one thing, talking about airstrips; I remember when my hon. colleague, who is now the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, and myself, and the hon. member who is now the Minister of Tourism, and I am sure that his successor, the hon. the present Minister of Transportation and Communications, have fought long and hard for the question of airstrips on the Labrador Coast. I remember at one point in time - 1975-1976 I believe - the question of airstrips at Nain, Makkovik and Mary's Harbour and Cartwright arose. The hon. member who is now the Minister of Tourism did a lot of the work, the ground work was laid and we fought, I only say that because we fought a long while for this concept.

I would hope - and I know the hon. member would like a cup of coffee - but if the hon. member from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) is in the confines, then I would like to say something and I wish he could be present for it. For some time now we have been talking about the Trans-Labrador Highway. We have been shuffled back and forth between the Department of Transport federally, and the Department of Regional and Economic Development regionally - nationally, I should say. We have had a lot of problems because the cost of the road three or four years ago - 1974-75 I believe, was the last dollar cost we have - between Labrador City - Wabush, to Goose Bay -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Happy Valley, then South down to the Straits to cross some way over to the St. Barbe area, the great Northern Peninsula, it was then in the area of \$500 million to \$600 million in '74-'75 dollars. I would think now that it would be a lot more.

I have a document here that I cannot table only because it is a lengthy document but with the leave of the House I would like to refer to it, but copies will be given to the Opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is it a state document or -

MR. ROUSSEAU: There just is not. It is a big document.

I can get copies for the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and a couple of copies that we can work from. And it is not the first such copy of this document. We have been working on it for a number of years in various ways. But it is a document from this Province to the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion in Ottawa, with our blueprint for development in Labrador.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The final document although it was worked on long before and there were other documents preceding it is dated October 1977 and my colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications who is also the minister responsible for intergovernmental affairs who deals with Ottawa, has indicated that he will make a couple of copies available to the Opposition so that they would be able to see what this government's blueprint for Labrador is. It covers amongst other items, Mr. Speaker, land management, water management, wildlife management, tourist and recreational facilities, fisheries, forestry, agriculture, trapping, resource development, community planning, community health programmes, education development, community legal services, transportation and communications and the administration evaluation and implementation of this programme. Within that programme is something that this government has been, for a number of years, working on and that is the question of the Trans-Labrador Highway.

I share the hon. member's concern about the social and economic impact of the Quebec Government calling tenders to connect Fermont to Baie Comeau but I do not fear it. I do not fear it. I do not fear if the Quebec Government put a fence around the boundary where they think it might be because I know the people of this Province are not prepared to accept government by Quebec.

That is not to say that eventually Labrador may not decide to go on its own as a territory or a province but my reading of Labrador is that it will not be governed by the Province of Quebec. We will not stand for it. It is not in the making and the separatism or the feelings that you hear from the people of Labrador are not those of let us go with Quebec, it is a feeling of let us be part of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have never, I do not think, referred to past administrations but I am prepared to stand here and take my blame as a member for Labrador and as a Labrador member in the government for what has not been done in Labrador for six years. I am

MR. ROUSSEAU: most prepared to do that. But let us say that we have forgotten Labrador for a lot longer than that, since 1949. The hon. member refers to the industrial park - when I became elected in 1972 I had to start from scratch on the concept of an industrial park because the goods were flowing from Quebec, Mr. Speaker. I sweated, I cried, I ranted, I roared to the point that I think one of the proudest moments of my life was when the DREE agreement was signed with my colleague, the hon. Minister of Justice, when he was Intergovernmental Affairs Minister, in Goose Bay and Mr. Marcel Lessard, the hon. Marcel Lessard, the Minister of Regional and Economic Expansion, referred to that particular item in the agreement as 'Rousseau's dream', 'Rousseau's fancy' and it was because it was an effort to try and waylay the service center from Seven Islands to Labrador City-Wabush.

We are progressing well with that concept. I would not like to think that because of that and because of other things that have happened in six years in Labrador West we are not where we want to go but we have been a long way since 1972. We have houses built, 270 building lots in Wabush that people could not get before, 170 houses in Labrador City with the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, an industrial park. We hope to draw some of the business away from Seven Islands and maybe this is the ambition on the part of another province to attempt to lure away any businesses from Labrador-City-Wabush to Fermont.

But again, Mr. Speaker, and a very important point, it is not only the people in this House who have to guard against that thing it is the people in Labrador as well; to demand that products are Newfoundland products, to give Newfoundland companies an equal opportunity. As a result, as I mentioned before in the House of Assembly and because of the strike situation the situation has not developed but as soon as the strike is over at Labrador City undoubtedly it will - the two main mining companies up there have appointed purchasing agents in Labrador City and Wabush and they are prepared to give every company in this Province an equal opportunity

MR. ROUSSEAU: to submit proposals or bids on goods and services that they require. I think the Bartlett Inquiry indicated only one company that we really had a problem with, the company of Real Ste Marie. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that in 1972 I had more than one company that I was worried about. It is only six or eight months ago that Dominion Stores, both companies, told my colleague the Minister of Justice, when he was in the Maritimes, to inform me that now management in Labrador City and Wabush, the two stores, will be Newfoundlanders. Before the stores were connected with the Quebec operation. Now to hon. members in this House and the people on the island part of the Province that may not seem to be a big effort on the part of Dominion Stores. To me it is. H. G. O'Connell was a company working in Labrador City/Wabush when I went there and it was a company that gave me a lot of problems, personally, with non-Newfoundland labour content. I have to say here and now, Mr. Speaker, I do not have the same problem with them. As a matter of fact, for the companies who are there continuously there is only one company I have problems with. I do have problems with companies who come in on occasion to do sub-contract work in the area, but we will work at those.

I think that all members of this House, and I think all the people on the island part of the Province feel the strength of Labrador and feel the pride of it and they are not prepared to allow Quebec to exert any jurisdiction in that area. Certainly, I am not; I am certain my colleague and friend, the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) is not; and I am certain my hon. friend and colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) is not; and I am certain that all other

MR. ROUSSEAU: members of this House and all people on the island part of the Province are not. As I say, in my opinion, if anything happens to Labrador it will not be with Quebec. It may be alone, it may be a territory, it may be its own province - its wishes are its wishes - but my reading of the part of this Province that we define as Labrador, the mainland portion of the Province, is not inclined to join Quebec.

Now as the hon. member and I have said, this is our developmental plan, that we have submitted to DREE. We have talked about this road for a long while because we think it is important.

MR. PECKFORD: By the way, a lot of the things incorporated into that proposal have (inaudible) been dealt with at length in the Snowden Report and other recommendations from all the associations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Right, and this is presently being studied by the Labrador Resources Advisory Council. As I said, I do not know whether the hon. member heard or not that my colleague, the minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs, will have a couple of copies tomorrow because they are not something you can table, they are quite extensive - for the member for Eagle River and other people who would want to read it on the other side of the House.

We stand by this, and if I may, part of the programme in transportation is and I am not going to quote from the document because I think I have leave that I will give it to the hon. member - that there is a road from Goose Bay to Gull Island. There is a survey and design of a 275 mile section of Trans-Labrador Highway from Gull Island to Labrador City.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Because apparently, the existing road is not one that they want to use. They want to go South of it and connect the Gull Island/Lower Churchill/Upper Churchill area into Labrador City - Wabush by a new route. The minimum we could hope for would be the Goose Bay - Happy Valley area that would at least give the people of the Western section, as it does now to the Eastern section, the ability to get their vehicles and their transportation directly to the island part of the Province, to the area generally of Lewisporte. And I would think that the hon. the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) is quite happy with the amount of business being done through Lewisporte by the island part of the Province. And I cannot understand what the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) mentions about Quebec. I hope he was not referring to the government stores on the Coast, what used to be the Labrador Services Division. I hope that is not what he was referring to because as I say to the hon. member now, we have in the past transported by airplane - you cannot do it by boat, obviously. In emergency situations, as when the fire occurred at Main, we did that. But I would hope that my colleague, the Minister of Rural Development, would not allow goods and services to be provided from the Province of Quebec for the government stores on the Coast of Labrador. And I say that not knowing if it is being done or not. If it is, then I say here and now

MR. ROUSSEAU:

and we should not be doing it.

MR. STRACHAN: Two years, more or less two years, two and-a-half years goods purchased under the services division of the Department of Rural Development were purchased in Seven Islands, were transported to Schefferville, put Laurentian Airways DC3 on skis, because it was the only one available Laurentian Airways DC3 on skis, and flown into the communities of Nain, Davis Inlet, Hopedale, Postville and Mikkovik to be sold through the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador stores for two and-a-half years. That is now not the case this last year and it ceased when I brought up the question a year and-a-half ago. But for two and-a-half years the government of this Province was purchasing vegetables and fruit for its government stores in Quebec and transporting it through Quebec.

MP. ROUSSEAU: Well I can only say one thing here, Mr. Speaker, the government of this Province should not have been doing it and I am part of the government and I should not have been party to it. By the way I would like to table something which came to our attention yesterday, I guess, it was, finally picked up. This is a driver's license for - I will not mention the name - well it does not matter, it is permis de conduire, Quebec Driver's Permit, issued to one Gervaise Gagnon 218 Barlett, Labrador City, Nouveau Quebec. I do not know how we found it. I guess the motor vehicle inspectors and so on, Nouveau Quebec. And that happens.

You know, Rousseau. Everything I get from Quebec to my address, 12 Reeve Street in Quebec is in French, you know, because they assume that Rousseau is a Frenchman which I am not. I am by nature, birth and inclination a Newfoundlander born and raised, on the West Coast. But because my name is Rousseau they would, you know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes. But you know these are the small things. And I agree with the hon. member, these are the small things that agitate people. You know, the funny thing about it in speaking about Labrador,

MR. ROUSSEAU:

the road we would love to have, and we know it is not going to happen overnight, but I think the members who represent Labrador in this House including, I should have mentioned the hon. member for the Straits (Mr. Roberts) as well, that a lot of the little things that we brought up might seem insignificant but to the people of Labrador they are very significant. It is very significant to a person in Labrador, Mr. Speaker, when they send down a twenty-seven dollar cheque for a twenty-six dollar driver's license or a license plate and it is sent back up and they have to send it all back down again, not that it is sent up with a refund of one dollar. These are frustrating little things.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the road but I am not fearful of it because I believe that, as I say, the people of this Province will support the people of Labrador, that the ambitions of the people of Labrador are not towards Quebec. I would hope that the hon. members here representing Labrador would be the first on the border. We might get killed in the rush but we would certainly be the first there. I am not declaring war but I am saying this, that as long as Labrador is part of this Province it is part of this Province. If Labrador should decide otherwise, then Labrador will decide on its own and my reading is that it will not be towards Quebec but as an independent authority or as another province of this Nation.

Now as I say further, this will be made available tomorrow or on tomorrow. I will say on tomorrow because tomorrow may be a little later than we think depending on how many are available, to show what we have been doing. And I want to make very clear this is not something that developed only in October, 1977. It was compiled then, but this has been going on for years and years in different ways with different departments. The Trans-Labrador Highway has gone back from the Ministry of Transport to DREE, to the Ministry of Transport from DPEE. We have had studies done on it. There are studies done on it. We even tried to have an agreement with the Province of Quebec to

MR. ROUSSEAU:

build it right from Seven Islands up around and down through thinking that two provinces would have a greater impact on Ottawa than one province. That obviously did not work out because there were some few problems there from a federal standpoint with the federal members. We support a road. We want a road. We would hope that any Northern development initiative on the part of the federal government would include that. The people of Labrador West feel that they deserve that. I do not think that anybody on the Island part of the Province would be envious of them getting that little bit of psychological uplift.

MR. ROUSSEAU: And I would hope the people of Labrador would stand firm in this suggestion, that they would not fear any initiative on the part of the Province of Quebec, that there would be a good interplay because we have other areas, Schefferville is the same way. I visited there and I have said before, that the people in Schefferville, the French people in Schefferville and the English people get along very well. Their fight is not amongst each other. I think people being reasonable in 1927 indicated what this Province consisted of, an Island portion, and a Mainland portion. I am sure, and I can say for the record, that this government supports that concept. That this government will push forth the development of Labrador. This government would love no more, and I would love no more as the member, and I am sure my colleague, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) would, and I know every member of this House would, than to sit down tomorrow with the Federal government and sign an agreement based on this document. That would be, we think, a good development plan for Labrador which has been in the works for a number of years.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. J. COLLINS: Before the minister sits would he permit a question? As a Labradorian, do you think it is a little peculiar that you have to stand and debate in this House the fear that the integrity of our Province is at risk because of the intentions or the perceived intentions of another Province? Do you think that this is a peculiar situation in the Canadian Confederation? I would be interested in your response to that point as a Labradorian?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well I would like to thank the hon. member very much for calling me a Labradorian. That is the best compliment I have had in a long while. Thank you very much.

Yes, it is unfortunate but I speak out of the ambitions of Quebec, not out of the fear of me as a member for what Quebec is going to do, because in my considered opinion, the people of Labrador are not tending towards Quebec. Their tendencies would be by themselves or as a Province, if indeed they separated within this

MR. ROUSSEAU: Province.

It is unfortunate, if what the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) says - it is an insidious thing. I used ambitions before but I will use insidious now -if this plan of building a road is meant to some how water down or combat the findings of the Bartlett Commission Enquiry. And I have had a lot of calls from the Quebec news media who asked me to parler Francais, and I je ne pas Francais, but they have asked me about it. I know they are concerned on the North Shore about it because the business community, obviously, do not want to see businesses move to Labrador City - Wabush, and that is where the bulk of the purchasing is done. If that is the case then it is an insidious plot. I would hope it is not the case.

I believe in the people of Labrador and I say that in a situation of this nature, not the member, not all the members of Labrador, or not the government can do everything, it is the people who have to ensure that if they see something and it has one label on it to go back and say we should have two labels on it, because that is important to the people up there, that we buy Newfoundland, that Newfoundland become part of Labrador, as much as Labrador has become part of Newfoundland, so that people will feel together. And it is unfortunate that a Province such as Quebec would attempt, if they are attempting by an insidious plot, if it is insidious, to attempt to sway the feelings of the people of Labrador. I can assure hon. members of this House they have not, they are not, and they will not, because the people of Labrador are sure-minded people, the new people who are in my area, and the older people who are in the hon. member for Naskaupi's (Mr. Goudie) area, and the hon. member for Eagle River's (Mr. Strachan) and I say older in the sense they have been there longer. They are not going to fall for that sort of insidious plot. They have very strong feelings on what they want to do and I can say to the hon. member in reply to his question, there is nobody going to tell the people of Labrador what they are going to do. They are going to

MR. ROUSSEAU: decide it themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to stand on a point of information or order or something. My hon. friend can have the floor, I do not intend to speak on this. Before we reach six o'clock I would like to ask the permission of the Government House Leader to take off a resolution that I have on the Order Paper, it is only cluttering up the Order Paper. It has to do with unemployment, we can deal with it during the Throne Speech or the Budget Debate and in order to get it off I have to have the unanimous consent of the House.

MR. HICKMAN: What number?

MR. NEARY: It is number nine. So if the hon. gentleman will agree, I would just as soon take it off the Order Paper today and get rid of it and go on to the next resolution.

Well, we can debate it during the Budget Debate.

We will never get to it anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is, does the hon. member have leave for motion nine to be withdrawn?

MR. HICKMAN: We will debate motion 8 and then we can see what the situation is.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, in the two or three minutes remaining today for discussion on the resolution dealing with Labrador rather than relate directly now to some of the comments which were put forth by the hon. member for Eagle River and the hon. member for Menihek, the Minister of Labour and Manpower I should perhaps bring to the attention of hon. members a problem which relates to Labrador and to the resolution when we think in terms of development in Labrador and particularly the North Coast. A fisherman's conference was held in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area some three weekend's ago and obviously the topic for discussion was the fisheries in all parts of Coastal Labrador and something was brought to my attention which I had not been fully aware of prior to that conference and that was the rather extensive and heavy storm which occurred on the North Coast of Labrador on the 11th of December of 1977. As a result of that heavy storm there was extensive damage to stages, to fishing gear, to boats, and to motors. I received a preliminary report which was co-ordinated, by the way, by the Department of Rural Development officials at Goose Bay last week, a preliminary report indicating the damages would be in the vicinity of \$31,000 or \$32,000. But that is only a part of the whole survey and when the final report is in there would probably be double that amount or perhaps even more.

The problem we have is that there is no existing gear replacement programme in the Provincial Department of Fisheries at this point in time. When you have a fisherman on the North Coast of Labrador or, I suppose, in any other part of the Province who suffers damages in the amount of \$6,000 or \$7,000, in some cases, what is going to happen to that fisherman when he tries to get back into the business and the activity of fishing the spring, June or July perhaps on the North Coast? When his stage is gone, when his boat and motor

MR. GOUDIE: are gone, when most of his gear is gone I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is a special case particularly when nature is so heavily involved, where damages were incurred to the fisherman not through his own fault. The boats were hauled up, the gear was put away and because of the waves washing in on the shore with such force and at such height everything was destroyed. So the report has been passed on to the Minister of Fisheries, the Provincial Minister of Fisheries for some preliminary investigation by his staff, hopefully. And I want to inform the hon. minister that there will be more information coming in within the next week or so in relation to that storm damage. I would appeal to him now to deal with that problem as expeditiously as possible and certainly with a sympathetic view towards the - I do not know the exact number but in the preliminary report there were something like twenty or twenty-five fishermen involved with varying amounts of damage and I would suggest there will be much more than that when the final reports are in.

Mr. Speaker, if it is in order I will adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now in order to move the adjournment of the debate.

It being six o'clock the House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday at 2:00 P.M.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 4, 1978 at 2:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MAY 3, 1978

May 3/78

QUESTION #6

Mr. Neary (LaPelle) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) Whether any doctors were prosecuted for making false and fraudulent claims under the Medical Care Program for the years 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977? If answer yes, how many doctors were so prosecuted for each year?
- (b) Total amount for which fraudulent or false claims were made for the years 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977?
- (c) Amount recovered from doctors who submitted false returns to M.C.P. for said years?
- (d) What legal action has been taken against doctors for false claims and/or overcharging under the M.C.P. program.

ANSWER

- (a) Three doctors have been prosecuted for submitting false claims to the Medical Care Commission - one doctor in 1974 and two in 1977. In all instances convictions were registered under the Medical Care Act and, in addition to fines, monies in question were recovered.

In several instances orders were issued by the Commission for collection of monies, and penalties as provided in the Act were imposed.

(b) Total amount of fraudulent false or incorrect claims

1974	\$3,784.05
1975	9,976.75
1976	14,395.42
1977	<u>6,278.45</u>
	\$34,434.67

(c) Recovery of fraudulent false or incorrect claims

\$34,434.67

(d) Legal action was taken for false claims as reported in (a).

March 30, 1978

May 3/78

QUESTION #39

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What is the number of T.B. patients (a) in hospitals in Newfoundland and Labrador at the present time; and (b) number of T.B. patients being treated in their own homes?

ANSWER

Latest inventory on T.B. patients was December 31, 1977.

On that date

- (a) 4 patients were under treatment in hospital
- (b) 159 patients were under out-patient treatment.

April 4, 1978