

PROPERTY OF N.S.A.
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
PLEASE RETURN



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 35

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

5 May 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers, I would like to welcome to the galleries twelve students from Conception Bay South district with their teacher, Sam Martin, along with eleven exchange students from Drumheller, Alberta, with their teachers, Jean Cammart and Robert Moggey.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I would also like to welcome this afternoon twenty-six Level II students and their two teachers, Heather Conran and Magella Aylward, from St. Mark's High School, King's Cove, in the Bonavista South district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I would also like to welcome fifty Grade V and VI students and their chaperones from Miquelon and St. Joseph's School, St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
I am pleased to inform hon. members of the House that the

government today is announcing a small-scale hydro electric generating plant in Mary's Harbour, Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
This is consistent with government's policy to attempt to identify and to bring into production small-scale hydro and, where suitable, other forms of electricity generation. The Government is awarding a \$60,000 grant for the project. The plant will be built and operated by a privately owned Newfoundland company, Mary's Harbour Hydro of Clarendville. Construction will begin in August of this year with a target start up date in October.

With recent Cabinet approval, the Public Utilities Board has waived its jurisdiction over electrical generating facilities with less than one megawatt capacity. This will eliminate the need for costly hearings for small projects and speed the approval process.

The total cost of the project is estimated at \$625,000. The federal government, through the Department of Energy Mines and Resources, has authorized a \$270,000 grant. Mary's Harbour will invest \$80,000 and the remainder of the development costs will be made up by a \$215,000 loan obtained from Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, as well as a \$60,000 grant from the provincial government.

The Mary's Harbour Hydro plant will have a generating capacity of 800,000 kilowatt hours annually. This will satisfy approximately half of the community's present electricity requirements.

This will be the first private, small scale power development in Newfoundland and Labrador to sell electricity to the Province's established utilities, and as such, has been used as a pilot project to review policies concerning power generation by private companies.

Once in place, the Mary's Harbour Hydro plant will sell its energy to the PDD, the Branch of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation which operates the diesel generating station. In turn, PDD will supply power to the community's residents.

The company will sell its power at a price determined through the formula contained in Hydro's new "share-the-savings" policy for the purchase of power from private electrical generating facilities.

The Department of Energy's contribution to this innovative project is part of its larger commitment to provide Newfoundlanders with secure supply of affordable power based on sound energy principles.

The project is being undertaken when low diesel fuel prices still make it uneconomic for a private hydro venture to proceed without government assistance. However, should prices again approach those of the recent past, the Mary's Harbour development will provide the business community, Hydro, regulatory bodies, government and consumers, the opportunity to learn from the development and operation of the project.

I am confident that, in due course, other private sector developers will also see the potential for the small-scale hydro option in other Newfoundland

communities that are presently dependent on diesel generated electricity.

As I said at the beginning, this is the implementation of a policy in attempting to identify and to bring to development small-scale electricity generating projects, whether it be hydro power or other forms of energy, and, as I mentioned in the Estimates Committee yesterday, there is also some work being done now with respect to energy derived from waves, and I hope, in the not too distant future, to have further news on that. But this is, I think, an important initiative and one which should be followed, hopefully, with the identification of other small projects of this kind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, we agree with the minister that it is an important initiative and we congratulate him and the administration for this particular initiative. I believe, as he says, it is a first, and we regard it as an important first.

I could not help but reflect, as I watched the minister make his speech, on two matters, one that since he became the minister the department has certainly taken on some substantive direction and we commend him for that, and I could not help but reflect on a quasi personal note, that he was once a Leader of the Opposition, and I

could not help but think what a marvelous government we would have had if he had gone on to be the leader of a government, of whatever political stripe.

MR. REID:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
The member for Trinity - Bay de Verde assures himself he is there. Yes, he is there.

Mr. Speaker, there are two or three points we would like to make on this. First of all, the combination of private and public capital here again is a good initiative and we commend that. I want to draw the minister's attention to the first paragraph of his statement in which he mentions Mary's Harbour Hydro of Clarendville. I ask him, and perhaps he could give me a nod, does he mean Mary's Harbour Incorporated or Limited by any chance? I would certainly hope that would be the case, because otherwise my point would be that I would find it passing strange that public funding is being put into an incorporated entity under a trade name. Either it is an incorporated entity, in which case we can go to the registry and find out who the owners are, or it is not and we should be told who the owners are, as the case may be. We are dealing here with public funding and that is the one question I would raise about the statement, that we are certain here that the taxpayer's money being dispensed is being dispensed to a corporate entity or, in the absence of that, then I would hope we will get the minister's undertaking to tell the House, at the appropriate time, who the unincorporated owners are.

Mr. Speaker, not much else needs to be said except to hope that this will be part of a trend to make small-scale hydro developments available to areas such as Mary's Harbour and other areas that, for reasons of geography and small population, are not able to hook onto the provincial power grid. We commend the minister for this initiative and we wish the owners of the project, the promoters of the project well in its successful development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

I must commend the minister for being so prompt in making the announcement, since he only mentioned it to us yesterday, in the Estimates Committee, that it was coming forward. Of course in line with the recommendations that we have been making to the minister we would like to see more and more small scale projects coming on stream. This certainly is a nice start. I have a number of questions that I am going to raise in the response to the Ministerial Statement, because the information given is incomplete in my opinion.

The first question that rises to mind is that it seems from this that Mary's Harbour will receive about one half, I believe the statement says, of its electricity from this small-scale hydro plant. What classification will it be? Will it be a PDD plant under the same rates as for a diesel powered one, with the very

high rates that we are all aware of, or will it be the same rates as the Island rates, the lower rates of six cents a kilowatt hour and so on? The minister has not been very clear on exactly what the situation is here.

The next point that seems to be asking for an answer here is what kind of rate is this company going to be paid in order to sell the electricity to the PDD district in Mary's Harbour? There is nothing in there that indicates that. I think it is subject to some negotiations. But that, of course, is a very important question, because that will start establishing the rate at which Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and Newfoundland Light and Power, if they get into the buying of electricity from small scale producers, will buy power. I think it is a very important question, one that has to be answered before we can expand it when the amendments to the Public Utilities Board, that the minister has promised in Committee, are coming forward.

The final point that is raised from it in terms of information is that the minister refers to a formula contained in Hydro's new 'share-the-savings' policy for the purchase of power for private electrical generating facilities, which sounds like a policy in place now for the company to purchase it, and I would ask the minister if he does have additional information on it, would he please table it at some future time, because I am not quite clear on what exactly that policy is.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That was announced a long time ago.

MR. FENWICK:

Was it? Well, in that case I would very much appreciate it if the minister could provide the information.

So the three points to be raised are: First of all, what is the price at which the power will be purchased from the company, a very important point, I think, for future development; and even more important, I think, to the people of Mary's Harbour, what are their new electricity rates going to be like as a result of this? And does all this mean that the PDD saves money, or does it mean that the people of Mary's Harbour will save money?

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

We have seen the statement that the Parliamentary Assistant or Secretary, or whatever he is called, is about to deliver on behalf of the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward). While we thank him for that privilege, we do want to raise a certain point. That is, as I said, while we are in favour - I think there is good news in the statement - with the good news that is in the statement, Your Honour will recall that at certain times in this Legislature we have raised the question as to whether Parliamentary Assistants should be allowed to give Statements by Ministers but not answer questions in the Legislature.

Now, let me say to the hon. gentleman that last year I think

there was a case in point, where it was passed to the Government House Leader to make the statement rather than the Parliamentary Assistant. Let me say to the Government House Leader and the government that we recognize that it is a privilege to make a Ministerial Statement, it is a privilege for the minister to get out information that is of vital concern to the public, but it is also a privilege of this Legislature that the Opposition has the right to ask certain questions. And if we are going to give leave, or if Your Honour is going to rule that the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development has the right to make a statement on behalf of the minister, then we certainly want to claim our right and our privilege as an Opposition to have not only this parliamentary assistant but every parliamentary assistant in this legislature answer questions on behalf of the minister when the minister is not in his place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would go on to point out, and I suspect the Government House Leader will do the same thing, that in the Parliament of Canada the parliamentary assistant is responsible, when the minister is absent from the House of Commons, to both make all kinds of statements on behalf of the minister and to answer questions in the same way that the minister is required to answer questions. Of course, he can refuse to answer as the minister can refuse to answer. But he occupies in the House of Commons the same position as the minister, when the minister is absent.

If the Government House Leader agrees and if Your Honour agrees

that parliamentary assistants should have to answer questions for the minister when he is absent, and if we chose to direct them to him, we will, of course, give leave or agreement or whatever is required to have the parliamentary assistant today make a statement on behalf of the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. Otherwise, we would have to stand on our privilege and our rights in this Legislature.

Thank you.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding, I think it is generally the same as the hon. Opposition House Leader's (Mr. Tulk), and that is in the absence of the minister from the Chamber the parliamentary secretary may, number one, make Ministerial Statements on his behalf and, number two, that questions which would ordinarily be addressed to that minister may be addressed to the parliamentary secretary, and the parliamentary secretary's position in answering the questions is the same as that of the minister.

AN HON. MEMBER:
He does not have to answer.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
No, but he obviously is required to answer. But there is an equal right to ask a question to the parliamentary secretary. In other words, he fulfils the same function in the House with respect

to answering questions or giving Ministerial Statements, when the minister is not in the House, as the minister would. I think that is generally the practice, certainly federally, and, I would think, probably generally the practice in most areas. If that is agreed, then it would require that no longer when these incidents come up that we need reaffirm them. In other words, if there is general agreement, then our practice should conform to what appears to be the general practice, and that is that in the absence of a minister a parliamentary secretary may make a statement on his behalf, and that concomitant with that questions may be addressed to that parliamentary secretary as if he were the minister and he may reply as if he were the minister.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, just one more point.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

We think that the point the Government House Leader just made is long overdue. You will recall, of course, that last year, I think, there was an incident in this House where that was refused. But if that agreement is in place that we, on this side, feel is long overdue, that agreement that parliamentary secretaries can both make statements on behalf of ministers and answer questions, certainly we would concur 100 per cent with that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, that point is well taken. That matter was

dealt with here, that parliamentary secretaries do not have the right to speak on behalf of ministers. There was a ruling made November 21, 1985 to that effect, and there was also a ruling made on November 25, 1983, page 1427, to that effect. So the hon. member can make the statement by leave of the House.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

With the indulgence of the Chair, I recognize that such a ruling was made. For all practical purposes, if we go now by leave we go by leave, the effect is the same, but it would sort of obliterate the need for leave and going through this format if there were unanimous agreement. Then the Chair could regard it as the practice of the House and it would no longer be leave to make a statement or leave to ask a question to, it would be the accepted practice and it would just mean that when the matter came up again there would be no need to go over these arguments all over again.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader is absolutely right. I think it would be to our detriment to do this by leave today. I think what we have to have is unanimous agreement - of course, that includes the other party in

the House as well - that indeed in future this will be the case. In effect, what basically happens is that we do away with the precedent and this, then, becomes practically the same as a Standing Order of the Legislature. I think that unanimous agreement should be given immediately, by everybody in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

As I understand it, the hon. member is speaking by leave today?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

By unanimous agreement?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Let this be regarded as a standard practice.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

It is my understanding from what the Government House Leader has said and what the Liberal Opposition House Leader has said that they wish to establish a new rule whereby parliamentary secretaries will be able to respond to questions in Question Period and make Ministerial Statements, and that this will be the new rule of the House. From our perspective we see nothing wrong with having the parliamentary secretaries make Ministerial Statements and answer questions. It would be much to our enjoyment, quite frankly.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to announce, on behalf of the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, that Central Dairies will be establishing a fluid milk processing facility in Deer Lake. The company currently only processes milk in St. John's. This move will require considerable capital investment by the company, thus ensuring their commitment to the future of the dairy industry in our Province.

The primary industry has shown significant growth throughout the Province over the past number of years. This is especially true for the West Coast where the number of dairy farmers has tripled from six in 1983 to eighteen today. This expansion has led to an analysis by Central Dairies of their West Coast needs.

Central Dairies will be establishing their operation in the former Humber Valley Vegetable Processing facility. The building is owned by the government and has been unoccupied since 1982, when Vegetable Marketing Associates Limited closed their operations. I am pleased that Central Dairies and the government and my department were able to reach an agreement on leasehold conditions for utilization of this facility.

The location of this building is ideal as it places the company close to the heart of the dairy industry on the West Coast. It will reduce their need to transport raw milk to their St. John's plant, thus reducing the time lag between pick-up at farm and processing. The result will

be a fresher product available to consumers on the West Coast. It is anticipated that the offset in costs associated with this current transportation will make the Deer Lake facility a viable operation.

The establishment of this operation by Central Dairies will result in eight to twelve permanent positions in the Deer Lake area once the facility is fully operational. It will also generate a spin-off effect for the service sector, thus providing a good boost to the economy of the region.

The preparation of the site is currently ongoing and will be operational depending on the arrival and the set-up of the required equipment.

Mr. Speaker, as part of the increasing production for the dairy section, I am also pleased to announce that the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development has been able to sign a five year contract with Havelock Lime Works to produce local agricultural limestone for Newfoundland farmers. In the past, much of the agricultural limestone used in Newfoundland came from mainland sources, even though there are vast reserves of quality limestone on the West Coast of the Province.

Havelock Lime Works plans to establish a grinding mill at the Cormack Quarry to produce agricultural limestone for the next five years. The quarrying of the limestone and the operation of the mill will create additional employment in the Cormack region. In addition, distribution of this limestone will be done by local trucking firms providing in-province benefits and better

service to farmers. The establishment of this industry will mean a considerable amount of money will now stay in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

The limestone provided from this local source will be subsidized under the same system as before, with a farmer charge of \$19.00 per tonne. However, with the new system in place, the cost of government for the limestone will drop from last year's cost of \$77.00 a tonne to about \$55.00 per tonne this year. This will save the government of Newfoundland nearly \$200,000.

The soils of this Province are very acidic and require large amounts of limestone to produce satisfactory crop yields. My department subsidizes limestone purchased by farmers to promote its utilization for improving the soil resource and crop yields. The farmer demand for limestone is increasing yearly due mainly to the recognized need for limestone on acidic soils. The government limestone subsidy programme, in conjunction with the Soil and Plant Laboratory, have played a major role in correcting acidity on farm fields by giving farmers limestone recommendations, and offsetting limestone costs. This results in increased and improved crop production.

It is planned to have limestone available for the Summer from this source. Farmers requiring limestone should submit applications to my department.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude, these two announcements today confirm government's long term commitment to the development of a healthy, viable agriculture industry in the

Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure it would be in order for me, on behalf of the Liberals, to congratulate the hon. member for doing such an outstanding job. I only wish that some of the ministers would notice the way it was done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, we welcome the announcement that there will be a milk processing facility in Deer Lake. I saw some time ago a picture of a dairy cow, I believe it was a Jersey - I am not sure if it was a Jersey or a Guernsey - which was the largest milk producer in the world for three or four years. Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not see that picture in Western Canada nor did I see it in the British Isles, I saw that picture on the West Coast of Newfoundland.

The cow was owned by a Newfoundland farmer on the West Coast, the largest milk producer. Maybe all hon. members are not aware of this, but for three or four years a Jersey cow owned by the Lundrigan group, who ran Hammond's Farm on the West Coast of Newfoundland, was the largest milk producer in the world. This proves, Mr. Speaker, that we in this Province do have the ability to produce agricultural products in this Province. I only wish

that some efforts could be put into the production of beef cattle, because I believe we have an ideal climate on the West Coast and the Northern part of this region to produce beef cattle. There are modern methods of producing beef where you no longer need large stretches of land on which to produce beef cattle. I wish the department would put more emphasis on that so that the next time the hon. gentleman gets up he can say that we are pretty well self-sufficient in the production of beef.

Has anyone tried to get a meal of local Newfoundland lamb, Mr. Speaker? You almost have to go to the black market to get it, yet at one time this Province, before we became a part of the Dominion of Canada, was one of the top sheep producing areas in the world. Today, Mr. Speaker, to get lamb you have to buy it from New Zealand. I only wish, now that the parliamentary secretary is taking an interest in this department, that we would see more emphasis on the production of lamb in this Province.

A recent dairy producer in this Province was located in Bear Cove, on the Northern Peninsula. It is ironic that when that gentleman attempted to put his dairy in place there was not a single grant available from government because it was outside the boundary of where government assistance is given. But that gentleman was so bent on producing milk that he went ahead and did it without government help. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the hon. member today that he make sure that grants for farmers be made available to all Newfoundland, whether it be on the Northern Peninsula or whether it be in

Labrador. The second part of this announcement, Mr. Speaker, is about limestone.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, just three points and I will start with the last one first.

It is unfortunate that we look at the parsimoniousness, I guess that is the proper term to use, of the government in terms of the limestone programme. Here we have an excellent announcement that we are our producing the limestone in our own Province again, thank God, and that the price is dropped by \$22 by ton overall for the use of it. But we have noticed in the Budget, of course, that the government has increased the cost by \$2 per ton to the farmers themselves. I think it would have been a symbol of magnanimity on the part of the government opposite if perhaps they shared a bit of this saving with the farmers themselves rather than actually adding to their costs. That is one comment, Mr. Speaker.

The other one is on milk production. I am quite pleased to see Central Dairies opening up a West Coast operation again. They have had one before, I believe, in the town of Stephenville not too many years ago, and it is unfortunate that they closed that one down, but it is nice to see them re-established there, and it is nice to see, Mr. Speaker, they plan, I would assume, to buy more

local milk on the West Coast since Central Dairies, it is my understanding, still is a very large consumer of milk brought in from Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and other Maritime Provinces, since we are not yet self-sufficient in it. Hopefully the location of that processing plan in Deer Lake will add to the local amount.

Finally, the third comment while we are talking about milk, I think, most members will probably see in the paper today that the Supreme Court, on appeal, has overturned the tribunal that gave the power to the Milk Marketing Board or said to the Milk Marketing Board had the power to fix the retail cost of milk. I again challenge the government opposite to look at their legislation and see if we can get rid of any indication at all that the Milk Marketing Board should be able to fix the retail cost of milk, since it seems totally too much power for a Board like that to have.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, may I raise a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I had wanted to do it after the gentleman for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development had spoken, but I regard the process of the response of the Opposition and of the third parliamentary group as part of the ministerial

statement. I regard it as a unit and I did not want to interrupt that. I want to make what I believe, Mr. Speaker, is an important point of order.

I want to draw the attention of the House to an important precedent and seek the indulgence of the Government House Leader and, perhaps, it will not take long because I am sure, given the comments that he made in a previous point of order, he will probably want to concur with my suggestion anyway.

We have seen the Debutante Ball, if you like, for the gentleman for Torngat Mountains, his coming out. He now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you, ceases to be a private member. This was implicit in the unanimous decision that was made a few moments ago in the earlier point of order. He has now ceased to be a private member. I congratulate him on that. He now is going to earn his \$15,000.

Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this: Having ceased to be a private member, he must, and so must the other three gentlemen in this House who are parliamentary secretaries, be governed by the restrictions on non-private members; governed by the restrictions, insofar as participation in the House is concerned, on members of the administration. Because, in speaking for a minister in his absence, in answering questions for a minister in his absence, he is clearly now part of the administration.

My second point is, Mr. Speaker, if you are looking for precedent, I spent two years as a parliamentary secretary in Ottawa

and what I am about to suggest applied to me, both insofar as being able to make statements and answer questions and insofar as the restrictions that I am now going to draw the House's attention to.

The implication of the gentleman from Torngat Mountains ceasing to be a private member this day on the basis of a unanimous decision of this House is the following: One, Mr. Speaker, he cannot rise in his place as a private member and ask questions of the administration because he is no longer a private member. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, he cannot sit on, and by implication, chair, in some cases, committees as a private member because he is not a private member. You cannot have a member of the administration chairing a committee which is enquiring into the government's spending practices. You cannot do that. That is the ultimate conflict of interest in this Chamber. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, since he is no longer a private member, thanks to a decision that we have made in this Chamber today, he cannot put down private members' resolutions. That is reserved for private members. Wednesday afternoon is sacred for the private member. We have just found, Mr. Speaker, in our earlier ruling that he is not a private member.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the able gentleman, and others of the House, realizes full well the implication of the decision they were entering into in the previous point of order. So I am just looking for the concurrence of the House. I know I will have no difficulty in getting it, because, Mr. Speaker, you are either a private member or you are not a

private member. We must reserve for private members rights such as asking questions, sitting on committees, chairing committees, and putting down private members' resolutions.

So, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that I would hope you would see fit, Sir, to rule, as I have suggested, namely that the fact that the gentleman from Torngat Mountains and three of his colleagues, the member for Carbonear, the member for Burin - Placentia West, and the member for Port au Port, by virtue of the previous ruling on the point of order, and more to the point, the unanimous decision of this House, that that will become part of our rules, in effect. By virtue of that, you would find that the four gentlemen concerned, no longer being private members, cannot participate in those four practices that erstwhile they have done, they being: To ask questions; to sit on committees; to chair committees; and to put down private members' resolutions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, in speaking to that point, I would agree with one of the points made by the hon. gentleman but not the other two.

In general, the parliamentary secretary, the hon. member said, is no longer a private member. I suppose to a certain extent he is hybrid. A parliamentary secretary

is not the same as a private member but, obviously, he is not a Cabinet Minister. He represents one particular Cabinet Minister in making Ministerial Statements when that Cabinet Minister is not there and in answering questions for that one particular minister when the minister is not there, but he is not a minister and indeed is not an acting minister. For example, when a minister out of the Province, in this administration, I would assume in all administrations, there is a roster of acting ministers. There are usually two alternates and that never, obviously, includes a parliamentary secretary who is never sworn in as member of the Executive Council. That is just a comment. I suppose what it comes down to is that a parliamentary secretary is different than other private members, something of a hybrid, but not a Cabinet Minister.

So, with respect to the three matters - because I have put them in three by rolling the committee stuff together and here I suggest we look to our practice - with respect to asking questions, members on this side are agreed that parliamentary secretaries should not be recognized to ask questions of the ministry and indeed that is the practice. There have been rulings by the Chair. Pardon?

MR. SIMMS:
Cannot ask questions.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
May not ask questions of the ministry. There are already rulings in this House. It is already our practice that parliamentary secretaries may not ask questions in the Legislature of the ministry.

With respect to the other two matters, I would disagree with the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I say our practice there is quite consistent. With respect to membership of committees of the Legislature or with respect to giving resolutions for debate on Wednesday, I think that this side would argue our customs are firm and we would wish them to continue.

On the three matters, with respect to questions, we are agreed. I think it is a practice of the House and there are rulings to the effect that parliamentary secretaries may not ask questions of the ministry, however, we feel that our practice with respect to parliamentary secretaries on committees and giving notice of resolution should continue as now is.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Briefly in response. I thank him for agreeing to the particular matter insofar as asking questions is concerned. He, in so doing, follows the Ottawa precedent and our precedent. Mr. Speaker, I say to the minister that not only does he follow our own precedent and the Ottawa precedent, but I say to him, with respect, he puts both feet really in it because, Mr. Speaker, let me translate, let me interpret what he said.

A member who is a parliamentary secretary cannot ask questions. I ask you, Sir, what is the point of a member being on an estimates committee if he cannot ask

questions?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
In the Legislature.

MR. SIMMONS:
Now, let us stop splitting hairs, Mr. Speaker. Either the member can ask questions of a minister or he cannot. The Committee is an extension of this House of Assembly and, if he is going to be restricted from asking questions in the House by virtue of his position as part of the administration, surely, Mr. Speaker, that restriction ought to extend to an extension of the House, the Estimates Committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that what the minister was talking about when he mentioned membership on committees were committees other than estimates. Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that we have other committees. We have the Privileges and Election Committee, which is there for the benefit of members of the House, irrespective whether they belong to the ministry or not. There are also Select Committees. We are talking about a very particular kind of committee, a committee which holds the government to account. What government? The government that the gentleman from Torngat (Mr. Warren) is a part of and stands in this House today and speaks for. How can he, Mr. Speaker, be fish and fowl? How can he be both?

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that this matter has arisen today because of the circumstances of the gentleman rising and giving a statement. I would submit to you, Sir, it is an important question and you might want to take it under advisement. We are in no rush for the ruling. We think that the ruling, when you make it,

will be an important one. It will be a precedent setting ruling and will, by implication, affect the rights of all private members to ask questions on the estimates committees and to put down private members resolutions. I would suggest to you you take under advisement the suggestion that it be dealt with after due research.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

If I might just very briefly reply to that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I certainly agree it will be an important decision and I would assume Your Honour will take it under advisement. Just to clarify three points I made, one was that we are in agreement and our practice shows that parliamentary secretaries may not ask questions during the Question Period as outlined on the Order Paper. But we also submit that our practice is consistent and clear with respect to membership on committees, all committees, including estimates committees and the debate there is quite different than it is in the Question Period of thirty minutes in the House every day and our practice is quite clear there. Also with respect to resolutions, that our practice is quite clear with respect to parliamentary secretaries.

With two submissions on both sides, I assume Your Honour will take it under advisement. I do not wish to say anything further.

MR. TULK:

To the point of order, I will not take up much time of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I would point out to Your Honour the whole point of a person in the administration, and who is part of the administration, as the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) said, you cannot be either fish or fowl. Either you are or you are not. In this particular case what we have done today, and I think it is a good agreement, is that we have agreed that the parliamentary assistants in this Legislature are part of the administration and should be allowed to carry out certain things.

Now, in doing that we are saying that those people who occupy the positions of parliamentary assistants, have available to them and are privy to, privileged information in the Legislature and discussions that go on perhaps in other government circles. That is precisely the point that the Government House Leader must remember when he makes the point that that is the reason we do not allow them to ask questions in Question Period. That is precisely the point of why they are not allowed. They already have privileged information.

Now, if I could go one step further. The rules of this Legislature apply to committees, Estimates Committees in particular, unless by formal agreement of the committee, we engage in some other informality. But that is leave, the same as in this Legislature. The member, who is the parliamentary assistant at that point, has the same privileged information as he has during Question Period. That is the reason why the rules are

extended from the House of Assembly to committee, so that a person who is privy to privileged information and certain kinds of discussions that are private in government does not have the right to ask those questions in Question Period and, therefore, he should not have the right to ask questions in Estimates Committees, because they are basically the same type of questions, and that is about the financial and economic administration of the Province.

So, on that basis, Your Honour, I would ask Your Honour to consider this and, indeed, bring us back a ruling, in view of our agreement on parliamentary assistants. As I said, I think that is perfect. It is a great agreement. It is one that is long overdue, but in the process, we have to make the whole process meaningful as well and say that parliamentary assistants are parliamentary assistants, they are not hybrids. There is no such thing. You are either a parliamentary assistant or you are not and you occupy full or part of the role.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

There were three speakers on that side, I think it is only fair there be a final one on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a couple of remarks on the issue now. First of all, it has been argued by the member for Fortune -

Hermitage, throughout his presentation, or at least implicit in his remarks is the fact that this would be a precedent setting ruling, whatever Your Honour decides to do with respect to this issue. I want to point out that that is not necessarily the case, because there is a reference in Beauchesne that clearly says, a ruling made one day is not necessarily a precedent setting ruling for another day. So what will be decided today or whenever Your Honour rules will be the opinion of His Honour in the way he sees the arguments put forth. So that is one point that I want to make.

The second point is really to re-emphasize what the Government House Leader has said, Your Honour. That is, what we are arguing here or the basis of arguments, at least from that side, is on the practices of the House and the practices of this Legislature. The practices, Mr. Speaker, for the last eight years in this Legislature are clear and consistent. In the House, a parliamentary secretary may reply on behalf of a minister, or he may present a statement on behalf of a minister. The practices with respect to being on an Estimates Committee are also clear. The practices with respect to who may present resolutions on Private Members' Day are also clear. In all of those practices over the last seven or eight years, parliamentary secretaries have indeed been entitled to do just that. I would suggest that that will help Your Honour in making the ruling.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I think I have heard enough.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Are we are going to keep going on? The hon. member has spoken twice on this matter. If the hon. member can be very brief, I will certainly hear him.

MR. SIMMONS:
It will not be in rebuttal as such. It is just a quick point that I meant to mention earlier.

If you refer to the various estimates you will find that the stipend that I receive as a member of this House or as Leader of the Opposition or some other position relating to the House comes out of the Legislature budget. You will find that the gentleman from Torngat Mountains gets two stipends. He gets one in respect to being a member and that comes out of a legislative amount, he gets another in respect to his attachment to the Department of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development. He is a part of the administration and he receives a stipend for being a part of the administration.

MR. SPEAKER:
Thank you very much.

I would certainly like to take some time, take this matter under advisement and come back with a ruling later on.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I table a publication

from my department entitled Current Research, which has just been released by the Mineral Development Division of the Department. It presents the preliminary results of geoscientific research carried out in 1986. These reports are published annually, as soon as possible after the end of the calendar year, in order to put the results of our work into the hands of mineral industry and others who may make use of the information. Final reports and maps from each of these projects will be published individually, as the projects are completed.

Some 53 individual reports are contained in this year's Current Research. Thirty-eight of these projects, Mr Speaker, were carried out by my department, many with the financial assistance of the federal government under the Canada-Newfoundland Subsidiary Agreement on Mineral Development. Fifteen others were planned cooperatively and carried out by the Geological Survey of Canada under that agreement. Several reports have Memorial University personnel as joint authors, reflecting the close liaison and cooperation which exists between the Department of Earth Sciences and the staff of my department.

These reports cover all parts of the Province, from the Southern Shore to the Labrador Plateau West of Nain; from Wabush to Harbour Grace. They also span the range of geologic time, from the two billion-year-old rocks in Northern Labrador, to sand and gravel deposits left on the Avalon Peninsula after the retreat of the glaciers a mere 10,000 years ago.

Some of this scientific research may appear to be rather esoteric

to the uninitiated. It is, however, part of a carefully planned endeavour to provide an understanding of the geological framework of our Province, a framework that will guide us to the discovery of new mineral deposits and the opening of new mines. This research has already played a major role in the discovery of Hope Brook, Strange Lake and other deposits now in advanced stages of exploration. The geological database we are providing is a very important factor in the rapid increase in exploration expenditure in this Province, which we expect will top the \$20 million mark this year. It is also essential information for general land use and economic planning in the Province.

The carrying out of this work also provides significant employment and training benefits. Each year large numbers of seasonal personnel, most of whom are students of Earth Science, are hired to assist with the work. This not only provides needed employment but also gives students necessary field experience. This year, 55 seasonal personnel will be hired of whom 47 will be students.

This volume represents another step in my department's long-term plans to provide a modern geoscientific database for the Province, to promote mineral exploration and development. These reports, which are published annually, have come to be recognized in the scientific community as significant contributions to our understanding of the geological history of Newfoundland and Labrador. They are quoted nationally and internationally, and our held in high esteem by mineral exploration

companies, academic institutions, and other government geological surveys across Canada.

I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that it is with great pride that I table this report.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take much time of the House. I am sure the minister knows there is a place on the Order Paper for tabling such reports and I am quite surprised that he would take the time of the House to table a report via Ministerial Statements, something which is done every single year, year in and year out by his department. This is nothing new, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing extraordinary in here. The minister could have come here and tabled this report under the Standing Orders where the place was for tabling such reports.

Mr. Speaker, one very quick point. It is called Current Research. We hope the minister does not come in next week with another report called "current research updated" if his research is anything like the research we have seen in recent days with respect to the Domtar crisis on the West Coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) who, I see, is trying on the backbench. I do not know if that is ominous or not.

Mr. Speaker, the minister in the House yesterday indicated and, I think, since on the airwaves, that government had withdrawn from Challenge '87, the Summer Student Employment programme, much as it had done in respect to the Canadian Job Strategy programme last year. Indeed, I think the minister made that point in his submission to the House yesterday, that they were being quite consistent in now having withdrawn from both the employment programmes, the Canadian Job Strategy programme and the Challenge '87 programme. The minister gave his reasons and we respect those. We do not necessarily agree with them, but we hear what he said.

The question we have and I have for the minister, though, is in relation to the very excellent precedent he set last year. I understand that there is \$12 million in the kitty here for Summer youth employment being spent by the Province this year. Last year he did not have enough money to play with but he set a good precedent, and the precedent was that he took the money that flowed from the withdrawal from the Federal/Provincial Job Strategy programme and he dived it by fifty-two districts and he

farmed it out to the M.H.As. and he said, to his credit, that M.H.As. will have the say as to which projects are approved or not.

MR. TULK:
And equal amounts.

MR. SIMMONS:
We have done the arithmetic, and \$12 million divided by 52 equals, roughly, \$234,000. May I ask him when I will be notified that I can begin making recommendations in respect of the \$234,000 for my district, and so for the other districts of the fifty-two involved?

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) for his question and for his credit for how we spent our money last year. Last year we withdrew at a fairly late date from the Canadian Job Strategy programme for make work projects, and we did have a kitty, I guess, of \$2.1 million which we then did divide up between the fifty-two districts in the Province, and the money basically was \$50,000 or \$50,000-odd each, which was well spent in the Province, and the M.H.As. certainly had a very large degree of input as to which of the large number of applications were actually approved.

Last year, I announced when we withdrew from the Canadian Job Strategy programme, that that was a temporary measure. It was done for us to try and facilitate some long-term job creation in this

Province, and many of the projects were started in the resource sector.

This year we have decided to not only withdraw from the Canadian Job Strategy and the Summer Employment Programme, Challenge '87, for students, but to implement our own separate programmes. We have done that in two separate categories. One is that we have a kitty of \$7.5 million which is basically going to be spent by government departments and it is meant to facilitate long-term employment. Even though persons who work on these make-work, job creation projects may only work for a very short amount of time, a large amount of the money is going to be spent in the development of aquaculture, as an example, in the Department of Fisheries; it is going to be spent in clearing pasture land and such things in the farming industry, so we can have long-term jobs created in the farming industry. Long-term jobs in the forest industry will be created by forestry thinning and a whole bunch of forestry silviculture projects that we have done. Those projects, in that \$7.5 million, are designed to be departmental applications to be approved by Cabinet and meant to facilitate long-term jobs, primarily in the resource sector of the Province.

The other sector, Mr. Speaker, which I will be making a Ministerial Statement on tomorrow, is the \$5 million that we have left is going to be for the 50/50 private sector employment programme where we intend, as a government, to subsidize each incremental job that is created in this Province, applied for by business, so that we will have a

large amount of jobs so government, and the people of Newfoundland who are unemployed, get full value for that money. Because by government spending \$5 million it means that private sector industries, as well, have to spend \$5 million.

We already have, Mr. Speaker, a large number of applications sent out to industries that are willing to take part in this programme. We have designated one target group specifically under this programme, and that is the youth under age twenty-five. We will have 40 per cent of the jobs designated for the under age twenty-five group, and that will take into account students as well.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, in answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question, the members of the House of Assembly will not have \$234,000 to decide on, we will, and we will be able to prove quite conclusively that the money is spread quite equally and fairly throughout most districts in the Province. As we begin to spend this \$5 million, with first approvals coming next week, we hope to create a large number of long-term jobs in this Province, because not only is our \$5 million going to be spent but \$5 million from private industry as well.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

So there is not 234,000. Now, can you tell us how much there is, or are you telling us there is none? Are you telling us that you made an error last Spring in trusting

the fifty-two MHAs to make recommendations? Are you saying that you are dissatisfied with the kinds of recommendations that flowed from the considerable effort put into that undertaking at the invitation of the minister, Mr. Speaker?

Will the minister inform the House why it is he is not being consistent on this and not looking again to the elected representatives of the people to make recommendations on job creation projects that affect the youth in our respective districts?

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, the answer may be longer than the question, but I am sure the hon. member opposite wants to understand the process completely. There is, first of all, nothing to prevent an MHA, an elected member of the Legislature of Newfoundland making a recommendation to any departmental minister who is submitting departmental projects for the \$7.5 million for his or her riding. There is absolutely nothing to prevent an MHA supporting and recommending an application by a private business in his or her riding so that we can have those projects there. We are not being inconsistent. As I announced in the Legislature last Winter, we did have \$2.1 million, we did decide to withdraw from the Canadian Job Strategy. And we had reasons for that. One of the reasons was the nature of some of the Canadian Job Strategy projects were not really geared to long

term employment in this Province, the ten week syndrome, getting on a project, qualifying for UIC. We want, as a government in Newfoundland, to get away from that syndrome in any way we possibly can, so this year we are going to have a separate provincial job creation programme, divided into the two components that I mentioned earlier.

The federal government will still have its make work projects, and I have signed a whole lot of recommendations, going to the federal government on behalf of provincial Legislative members, recommending projects under the federal make work projects, as well, both for Summer employment and for the longer term Canadian Job Strategy Programme.

So MHAs in this Province have a full say in how the money is spent, realizing that we do not have direct input into the components of the make work project that the federal government has, but we can recommend our own projects, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Our own projects that are out now in parks, fisheries and forestry, there are just as many in Liberal districts as there are in PC districts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
They can recommend people who are going to work on those jobs.

MR. POWER:
There are, if anything, Mr. Speaker, a larger number, because in some cases some of the rural ridings have high unemployment

rates and, in effect, there is probably a higher number of jobs in Liberal ridings than there are in Conservative or government ridings. And, Mr. Speaker, we do not apologize for that, because the nature of the projects is such that we are trying to target areas of high unemployment, we are not trying to play party politics in any given way, shape or form. The only targeted group that we really have identified is youth under age twenty-five. Forty per cent of that \$12.5 million is designated for youth and student employment and that is the one group we have targeted, Mr. Speaker. As I say, I will be making a further announcement tomorrow and another announcement hopefully next week, to show the first list of approvals that we have.

MR. SIMMONS:

One final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

I thought the most significant part of that exchange was that I saw the Premier helping the minister.

Now, then, the very fair Minister of Career Development has given us his usual fair response. My only regret is that some of the fairness does not rub off on the gentleman who sits directly behind him.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I want the minister - and this is my supplementary question - to relate his fairness in looking to all members last year to give

recommendations and, to his credit, he pursued those recommendations and so each district got a fair amount of money, now relate that very fair policy of his - perhaps this is why he is looking for the federal nomination - to the political boondoggle being perpetrated by the gentleman who sits behind him, insofar as municipal grants are concerned.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Would the minister indicate to the House, Mr. Speaker - this is my supplementary - would he assure the House, that the political boondoggle that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is engaged in on municipal grants will not spill over into his department and he will pursue the same kind of fairness this year as he did so well last year?

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, that really is not a legitimate question for any minister to answer. Basically, I will say about the reference to the Premier helping a minister, the Premier helps all his ministers and that is why we do not change our leader every eight or nine or ten months like other parties in the Province do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Besides the Premier helping his

ministers, as he does every day and which we are all very grateful for and which we enjoy, he leads an extremely fair government. As the Minister of Municipal Affairs convinced everyone of in this Province last week, things are done very fairly and the make-work money that we have, the \$12.5 million, will be to benefit the unemployed in Newfoundland irrespective of which political party they may or may not support.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. the Premier. It concerns the recent upheaval in the Fishermens' Union in recent weeks, where the union is changing its affiliation.

Can the Premier tell the House where his government stands on the issue of the Canadianization of the Fishermens' Union in the Province.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, it is outside our jurisdiction. We have no particular comment to make upon how the fishermen or the fish plant workers or the trawlermen want to conduct themselves as it relates to the whole issue of who is to represent them as a union. That is entirely in their hands, and hopefully they will work it out to the benefit of the

fishermen and their membership.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
I have a supplementary and maybe this time I should direct it to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries. I understand he was invited to speak to the convention that is now ongoing. I wonder can the minister tell the House what position he took at that meeting. Did he, in fact, support the efforts of the present leadership in their attempt to break away from the American union, or did he, as the Premier indicated, just appear to be non-committal?

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to advise the hon. gentleman that I did not take any position of support for one particular sector of the union against the other. I was invited in my capacity as the Minister of Fisheries to speak to their founding convention and, if I get invited in my capacity as Fisheries Minister to speak to a founding convention of some other fishermen's union, or fish plant workers' union, or an inshore fishermen's union, or a trawlermen's union, then I will at the time, assuming I am available to do it, be quite pleased to accept any of those invitations, and it was in that context that I addressed the founding convention

today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, how the minister can be so non-committal and detached from an issue that so severely affects at least 25,000 Newfoundlanders is rather strange. I wonder would the minister, Mr. Speaker, and maybe the Premier, undertake to follow the example set by our leader today who sent a letter to the president of the union giving them full support in their efforts to break the shackles of the foreign union and to now affiliate with a Canadian union? Would he follow suit, Mr. Speaker?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have had an excellent working relationship with leadership of the people who led the UFCW up until a few days ago and who are now attempting to form themselves into a Canadian led union. I have worked well with them over the last couple of years, my door has been open to them at all times over the last couple of years, I have sought their advice on every major policy direction that I have attempted to take as Minister of Fisheries, and I have no problem whatsoever in working with any of those people. I am not going to say that the fishermen or the fish plant workers of Newfoundland ought not

follow their own conscience and join with some other group if they want to. I can tell you this, my reading and my feeling from the pulse of the fishermen and the plant workers of the Province is that this founding convention that is winding up down here this evening will be a great success.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. On April 2, 1985 in the community of St. Barbe, in the district of St. Barbe, the Premier announced a project for \$900,000 to pave the roads to New Ferolle, Shoal Cove West, Reefs Harbour, Bartletts Harbour, Castor River, and he announced that those roads would be paved this Summer, meaning the Summer of 1985. They were not paved in the Summer of 1985, they were not paved in the Summer of 1986, they will not be paved in the Summer of 1987. I want to ask the Premier what happened to that \$900,000 he committed to those people April 2, 1985?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know off the top of my head, Mr. Speaker. I will have to check it out for the hon. member, and get back to him, and see what happened as it relates to that and see whether the people of the area wanted the money used some other way or whatever. I will take the question under advisement and get back to the hon. gentleman.

MR. FUREY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1985 the Premier promised in the town of Port au Choix, in the district of St. Barbe, to alleviate once and for all the water problem in that town. Can the Premier tell us when he will live up to that commitment?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we just approved \$100,000, I think, to do exactly that.

MR. FUREY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, that \$100,000 is to drill a well where there are now four wells that have been drilled and are not working. Can the Premier tell us, and give a commitment to the people of St. Barbe -

MR. DOYLE:

(Inaudible) false information. Ask me that question if you want some information.

MR. TULK:

Why ask you?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier if he can give me a commitment to get

back to me soon on the \$900,000 he promised for roads to be paved in the Summer of 1985, for the alleviation of the water crisis in Port au Choix, for the pavement of the Loop Road through the community of St. Barbe, and for the recreation center that he promised to have a look at for Port au Choix? Will he get back to me with all those election promises, specific promises, made by himself specifically to the people of St. Barbe?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier and it concerns the fate of seafarers and seamen in the Province. As the Premier knows, we have one of the best marine training institutes in the world. The federal government some time ago spent \$43 million to build the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

(Inaudible) no way.

MR. TULK:

Well, there was \$43 million spent. If the Premier wants to get his share in, fine! This is the important thing, could the Premier indicate if there are large numbers of people graduating in marine courses specifically from that Institute who are not finding work? Is the Marine Institute cutting back on some of its courses -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

Could we have it quite here, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

- because there are large numbers of its graduates who are not finding work in the Province or outside?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology was a proposal which I, personally, and this administration was very close to and very instrumental in getting going. I can remember a meeting that I had with the Prime Minister of Canada of the day, and with others of his ministers, who told me the day would never come when the federal government would cost-share the new Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology. While Mr. Trudeau was still Prime Minister, I was able to convince his ministers to go and convince the Prime Minister to change his mind on that. Because he thought that the Province would get all the credit and the federal government would not get any. They did not want to go along with the flume tank either, which we later got since the new administration came into power, and it was shared 75/25. So in the capital costs we contributed 25 per cent, and in the operating cost we are contributing 100 per

cent. And the hon member is right, it is one of the best, if not the best, Institutes of its nature in the world.

It is a matter of record, Mr. Speaker, that graduates from the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology have a higher success rate of job placement than students from almost any other institution in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It goes anywhere from 70 per cent to 100 per cent, depending on the course. But it is a very, very high placement rate. As a matter of fact, some of the best mechanics and machinists who have come out of that institute are now working in the Shipyard in St. John, New Brunswick, involved in the defence programme for the building of a number of ships for the Department of Defence in Ottawa. So it has been a very high placement rate.

What we are trying to do now, and the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies could elaborate on this a lot better than I could, is we are trying to respond to what is the market out there and introduce new programmes which have, on the one hand, a very high placement rate and, on the other hand, are far more technical than we had in the past, where we are getting into two and three and four year programmes as opposed to six month and twelve month programmes.

So I really thank the hon. member for his question. I am glad he thinks that the institute is a world-class institution, as part of our centre of excellence

policy. And I am pleased that I am able to respond to him by saying that the introduction of new and longer courses is to ensure that our young people can respond to the market place as it changes and becomes more technological.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, is the Premier aware, and I believe that he is, because I believe he has the same information that I have, that there are approximately 1,500 seafarers and seamen in this Province who are unemployed at the present time? I would ask the Premier a question related to Come By Chance and that is has he consulted with Newfoundland Energy Limited and has he gained any assurances from them that the 1500 unemployed Newfoundland seamen and seafarers will have first call for jobs on the tankers and the tugs that will be responsible for bringing crude to the Province and taking the refined product out of the Province?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say we have tankers coming into the Province every day from Gulf and Texaco and Imperial and so on, and Irving, from all over the world. They are foreign flag ships that come into Newfoundland with oil and gas and other

lubricants for sale in the Province. We do not have any say over who works on those tankers. In the same way, we would have very little say over the tankers that might be leased by Newfoundland Energy to bring oil in from Norway or Indonesia, Nigeria or the Middle East, from whence the oil is going to come for the Come By Chance refinery, that great success story which last Wednesday had 340 Newfoundlanders working there, Mr. Speaker, by the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

\$800,000 a week payroll in the Come By Chance area right now, \$800,000 a week, which was not there this time last year, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So the tankers themselves, to come to the question, they are foreign flag ships and will act, no doubt, in the same way as the other tankers that are now coming to the Province to feed the tanks for Texaco and Imperial and Gulf and all the rest of them. As far as the tugboats go, though, the tugboats will be located in the Come By Chance Harbour or in Placentia Bay, and we are encouraged in our talks with Newfoundland Energy that they are going to try to hire as many Newfoundlanders as possible, from the Newfoundland area, to man those tugboats.

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Premier that while he may be correct that there are 300 jobs, there are 200 more that would have been available on the tankers and the tugs in coming into this Province. And while we know that they are foreign boats, and while we know that the crews on those boats will probably be foreign nationals, he could have, if he had thought about it in his negotiating process with Newfoundland Energy Limited, that Bermuda based company of which he refuses to tell us the shareholders, he could have perhaps got -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier if he will now, in view of the fact that he obviously has not done it in regard to the tankers and he is only encouraged about the tugs, seek an ironclad guarantee from that Bermuda based company, called Newfoundland Energy Limited, that the tugs, specifically, will employ Newfoundlanders and that, insofar as possible, the tankers bringing in that crude and taking out the refined product will also employ Newfoundlanders? Or is he just going to allow them to reap the profits of Come By Chance and skip off with the money to the United States and Bermuda?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely ridiculous. I never heard anything like this in all my life. We are going to tell some foreign flag ship, which has a union, that they can no longer hire union people who are lined up looking for the jobs, that they have to hire somebody who has never been in a union. They are from unions all over the world. You cannot do that. You cannot tell Irving or Ultramar tomorrow that their ships that are bringing crude oil into Newfoundland have to employ Newfoundlanders.

As it relates to tug boats, yes, the Local Preference clause under the Newfoundland Energy agreement which has been tabled and made public will apply and Newfoundlanders will be employed on those tug boats. There is no question we will be able to do that. But as it relates to foreign going ships, they will rent a ship for a week or two weeks, however long it takes to get from the Brent field in Norway, and that ship might not be back here anymore because many of these ships are rented on the spot market. And you will have a ship from Indonesia that will come in once and might not be back here again, and this kind of a thing.

What a ridiculous kind of thing. By the way, as of today there are 415 people working at Come By Chance. It has gone up since last week, 415!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A Liberal disaster becomes a Tory, Tory, Tory success, Mr. Speaker. Let me make the government's position clear. I have no

intention whatsoever of trying to dictate to foreign owned companies who own oil tankers that they have to have Newfoundlanders on them. That is a ridiculous request to make and we would be the laughing stock of the world. But I will insist, as it relates to the tugboats that are here in Newfoundland and are helping to bring the tankers in, that the local preference which does apply will apply, and that we will get the maximum number of Newfoundlanders on the tugs in the same way as we got 415 Newfoundlanders working to date.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. CALLAN:

How many people do you have working at the hospital in Come By Chance?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance.

The minister, in his recent so-called budget, states that the government has put in place a clear-eyed plan for the development of our economy, designed once and for all to kick-start our Province out of its deep disparity, the success of which, however, is contingent upon the federal government's participation.

In view of this, I wonder whether the minister can indicate whether

before designing this kick-start plan, or after its presentation to the House of Assembly, the minister has received any commitment from Ottawa as to its willingness to participate in this kick-start plan?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think our approach in that regard has been explained a number of times. We made approaches to the federal government, we presented a brief, we had meetings with them face to face, we had communications by letter, and so on, indicating our requirements here and our suggestions as to how the federal government might adjust its policies to help us. We received a very sympathetic hearing in Ottawa. They did study our proposals. I think there has already been some suggestion that they are responding to us, because one of the things we have pushed forward very strongly was that there should be increased attention given to the fishery in terms of helping out this Province, and, as the Premier has stated, at the recent talks on the Constitution the federal government was quite amenable to having the fishery jurisdiction question dealt with on the highest level of this land, at the absolute top council of this Nation.

Of course, the fishery jurisdiction is extremely important to this Province, especially in terms of the inshore fishery.

So I think that is an index of the seriousness with which the federal government is looking at our case here.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I take it, Mr. Speaker, in the words given by the minister, that the federal government have simply given a sympathetic hearing, hardly the kind of response, I would expect, that is going to get this kick-start plan into place.

I ask the minister again, is that the level of commitment that he has received from the federal government to this point in time, just a sympathetic hearing? Has he not received from the federal government anything more tangible, anything more concrete than that? Has he received, for example, from the federal government any kind of suggestion that they will employ a certain formula for the funding of this kick-start plan?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we received other indications. For instance, the hon. member may remember that the federal government and the provincial government have entered into an agreement in regard to the building of trawlers at Marystown. That was an extremely helpful employment strategy in that part of the Province.

In addition to that, there is an inshore fishery agreement put in place between the federal government and the provincial government. And there are other matters. The Atlantic Provinces' Opportunities programme: We have put in a brief there, we have made suggestions in that regard, both as to its funding and as to how it will impact on this Province. We know that is being studied in Ottawa. So there are quite a number of things being looked at and already there are some results.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no one expects that the federal government will turn around and in a few days change what has been a difficulty for us for thirty-eight years. We have had problems, economic-wise in this Province, for thirty-eight years that Confederation has not cured. No one expects the federal government in a few days to turn that around and make everything in this Province the same as in any other province. But things are starting, and I think our strategy and the response from the federal government is useful in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before moving on to the next item I would like to welcome to the gallery officers and cadets from the Salvation Army College for Officers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Petitions

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have here a petition from 615 people of the communities of Grey River and Ramea. The prayer of the petition is this:

"To the honourable House of Assembly in the Legislature assembled:

"The petition of the undersigned residents of Ramea and Grey River, in the District of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, humbly sheweth."

The prayer is: "That the Ramea, Burgeo, Grey River ferry service will soon be back to the days of the ferry motor vessel Senator Penney when no vehicles could be accommodated. However, today it is felt that the opposite is true; the service being in place to accommodate vehicles, but too expensive for the everyday person to avail of as often as he or she would like.

"That this service has the highest rates for the whole Provincial ferry service. For example, a family of four just to get to Burgeo and back costs approximately \$46, a distance of eighteen miles. What will it cost the same family to drive eighteen miles on a provincial highway or any highway or road for that matter? In addition, there is still the cost of reaching the provincial Trans-Canada Highway, ninety-two miles, for a weekend of shopping or pleasure, etc.

"That salt water and bad road conditions make the cost of vehicle maintenance higher than normal, even though the insurance and licence costs the same as the rest of the Province.

"That all travelling on this service is at the owner's risk while on the ferry or while embarking or disembarking. Why pay such a high cost to travel at one's own risk? If there is to be a cost for this service, it is the opinion of the undersigned that this service is part of the provincial highway system, why not a token amount or at least a uniform rate for all provincial ferry services.

"Your petitioners, as in duty bound, will every pray."

That is signed by 615 residents from the communities of Ramea and Grey River.

Mr. Speaker, this seems to me to be a very serious petition. I know when I was in the district last week it was one of the very serious concerns of the people who live in Ramea and Grey River. They point out that over the last five years the ferry rates have increased by 400 per cent. They also point out that they are living in Ramea and Grey River and they are contributing to the economy of Newfoundland and they feel that they must travel back and forth. They do contribute to the economy so they cannot see why they have to pay this exorbitant rate.

The example that was given me when I was there in talking to some of the people last week was the fact that a man, his wife, and three children, to go just to Burgeo for a day if he wanted to take his

car, if he wanted to do some shopping in Burgeo, it costs him approximately \$60 just to go back. In the prayer of the petition, they use a man, his wife and two children for \$46. This seems to be an exorbitant rate, particularly in view of the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment which was set up by the members opposite before the last election to solve the problem of unemployment in Newfoundland. One of the main recommendations of the House Commission was that the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the ferry that runs between Sidney and Port aux Basques be considered part of the Trans-Canada Highway and that people be allowed to travel at a minimal cost or at no cost at all, essentially the same as it would cost to travel that equal distance on the Trans-Canada Highway.

It is for this reason that the people who live in Ramea and Grey River feel that the Province should consider providing a ferry service to those people under the same arrangement as was recommended in the House Commission, and that is that it be at a nominal cost or at no cost at all. The reason for this is, of course, the fact that they are living in Newfoundland. They choose to live in Ramea, and they choose to live in Grey River for the simple reason that they make their living there. They did not want to be resettled at the time of resettlement, they wanted to stay where they were.

I think that if the members opposite would check and if the minister would check he would see that the contribution to the economy by the citizens of Ramea and Grey River would be a lot higher than it is in many places in Newfoundland. So for this

reason they are there. They are viable communities. It is with this in mind that they feel that they are discriminated against when they have to pay this exorbitant rate to travel nine miles from Ramea to Burgeo to hook into the main highway.

Now, the other point is -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. GILBERT:
And I was making a great speech too.

MR. TULK:
A very brief point of order just to bring it to Your Honour's attention.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
There seems to be an awful lot of noise in the corridors around this place and it is very difficult to hear people in here. I just bring it to Your Honour's attention in case it continues.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, it is well taken. There should not be noise and I will see what I can do about it.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in support of the petition presented so ably by my friend and colleague

from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert). I do so for a couple of reasons, one because the petition deserves support and I shall return to that point. The second, of course, is I take particular pride in doing it in that for a number of years from 1975 until 1984 I had the privilege of representing the people of Ramea and Grey River first provincially, and then federally. I know with some intimacy the problem that he speaks of here today.

The people in those two communities, as members of this House will realize, depend on a ferry to take them from Grey River through Ramea and into Burgeo and then they are hooked up to the provincial road system, thanks to a road that was constructed there under the auspices of the federal government and the good graces of my good friend the late hon. Don Jamieson. Subsequently I had the great privilege of finding a few shekels for that project as well.

Mr. Speaker, my only regret is that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is not in the House to respond to this petition because it is under his jurisdiction that the matter of rates lies.

Mr. Speaker, the cost here is certainly exorbitant, there is no question about that. The amount of money involved effectively delimits the number of trips that a family can take. Now, picture Grey River. It is in a very pretty setting. It is a place where people with pride raised their families for many generations, but it is also a place you would like to get out of once in a while. I have had people who love and live in Grey River say that to me, and so it is

with Ramea. It is a very picturesque set of islands off the coast, but it is a place you would like to get away from sometimes. You would like to take your family out and, likes aside, there is a need to get out, to get to medical facilities, to educational facilities, access to better shopping than might be available in those small communities.

I do not think we have to make the case in this day and age that residents of Newfoundland and Labrador ought to have reasonable access to the Province's services. That generally is the case if you live in Corner Brook or St. John's or Labrador City or many places. If you live in Grey River, instead of the cost of a gallon of gas to get down the road to the nearest facility, the next town, you have to fork over a substantial sum of money. If you live in Ramea and you want to put your car on the ferry, you have to fork over an even larger sum of money, and the amount is \$46 in one particular example. The amounts are mentioned in the petition. So I will not dwell on the substance of the concern except to say that, Mr. Speaker, it is a very legitimate concern.

Let me make the essential point here that I think needs to be made. It is this: If you are going to address these issues of access to transportation on the basis of cost recovery, well then, of course, you have to look at such entities as the St. John's Transportation Commission which is daily carrying people at a subsidy provided by the taxpayers of this Province. There are all kinds of precedents where we as taxpayers subsidize where we do not think it is fair in terms of electricity costs in rural Newfoundland, in

terms of transportation, in terms of boat transportation, the coast boat service, the Marine Atlantic we subsidize. Every time a person steps on a coastal boat on the South Coast of Newfoundland, it costs the taxpayers of Canada \$582, and we collect from that person not \$582, but usually of the order of \$2, \$10, \$15 or \$20. The case can be made well, perhaps, those rates are too low. But I put it to you that the other case has to be made here. A family in Grey River or Ramea which has to move between those communities sometimes several times a week for work or educational purposes should not have to pay the full brunt of this on a cost recovery basis.

I think the operative principle here, the underlining principle here has to be that person's right to have some access to reasonable services despite the fact he lives in a very difficult part of the country geographically.

So I would make a strong appeal to the minister, in his absence unfortunately, that he give ear to this petition with a view to acceding to the very legitimate request of the petitioners. I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the petition.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Briefly to the matter, as the hon. gentleman said, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is unfortunately not here, but I shall certainly undertake to draw to his attention the petition presented and the arguments put

forward by hon. gentlemen opposite.

MR. SPEAKER:
Are there any further petitions?

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a petition.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
I would like to present a petition on behalf of approximately 1,400 residents. Mr. Speaker, I have in mind the recent concern of the Chair as to whether petitions are properly worded. My constitutions, the petitioners have taken due care, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, you will be absolutely impressed by this one.

It reads: "To the Hon. Speaker and Members of the hon. House of Assembly of Newfoundland" It then states the prayer of the petition to which I shall return. Then it says at the bottom something that will touch everyone of us "and as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray, dated at English Harbour West this 30 day of March, 1987."

MR. TULK:
There you go.

MR. SIMMONS:
Now, Mr. Speaker, anybody having trouble over there advising their constituents on the proper wording, I sent you to English Harbour.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of this petition is simple and to the point. It was promoted, engineered, if you like, undertaken by students and teachers at Fitzgerald High

School. Mr. Speaker, -

MR. PEACH:

Did 'Leo' sign it?

MR. SIMMONS:

No, but it reminds me that I have not signed it, and, of course, I should do that, should I not?

MR. PEACH:

I thought I would do you a favour 'Roger'.

MR. SIMMONS:

My friend for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) is always doing me favours, most of which I do not need, but that one I do.

Mr. Speaker, the students and teachers at Fitzgerald High School and St. Thomas Elementary School in English Harbour West, St. Lawrence Elementary School in Bellorem, and Florence Williams School in Pool's Cove, and parents of these students, have put together this petition. Rather than make a protracted speech on the issue, I believe the best speech is contained in the few words of the petition. I shall read them to you.

The above mentioned people, "in the district of Fortune - Hermitage, hereby petition you, the Government of this Province and of Canada, to take immediate action to alleviate the problem of the deplorable road conditions of Routes 362 and 363, namely the road from Bellorem to Wreck Cove and Coomb's Cove, and the road from Bellorem to Pool's Cove Junction.

"We face the same problems year after year with lost school days due to the accumulation of snow on parts of our road due to the way it is built. Then, with the

Spring thaw, our roads break up and create such a condition that it is impassible at times to bus transportation.

"When we get to school" - I believe this is the crux of the case that is being made by those students, I say to my good friend from Terra Nova, this is the crux of the issue - "we arrive sick from the rough ride. Our education is inferior to that of other parts of the Province due to loss of school time, and our inability to function properly when we do arrive at school.

"The local Department of Highways is ill-equipped to handle the snow clearing and upkeep of our road. That, coupled with the restrictions placed upon them by government, make it almost impossible to properly keep the roads in good condition.

"The only solution is a major upgrading of all our roads and paving of the same.

"We urge you to consider our needs since we have, by far, the worst road conditions in the Province. Consider our petition seriously since we are the present and future voters of this area, your support or your opposition."

Mr. Speaker, there are two points I want to emphasize. There is so much can be said about those roads, but the kernel of this petition is the emphasis on the way it is having that debilitating affect on the education and the health and safety and general comfort and well-being of students. It is a matter that we have raised in this House before. It is a matter that cannot be emphasized too much or too often.

The second and essential point, of course, is that there is only one way to alleviate this problem, and that is to do for those people what has been promised so often and for which there is a great need, a complete upgrading and paving of the roads.

Mr. Speaker, I have much delight in signing and supporting the petition, and I would ask, in accordance with the rules, that it be referred to the appropriate department.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

I am pleased to stand and lend my support to this petition which was presented by my colleague. I can understand, I am empathize, with those students who are forced to travel over what is loosely called roads. I can understand the way they feel when they finally arrive at their school after being shaken and beat over roads which are not fit for traffic to go over in the first place. The only way to solve the problem on this particular road is, as the students point out, that there be a major upgrading.

If the hon. the Minister of Transportation were in this House today I can suggest what he would say. He would say, 'The Province cannot afford to upgrade and pave all the roads in this Province.' Like a broken record, this is what he says every time anyone in this Province asks for roads. He would to on to say, 'We have not yet managed to enter into a secondary road's agreement with Ottawa' and

he would insinuate that we are on the verge of getting a secondary road's agreement. But, Mr. Speaker, this is absolute nonsense.

I have had a couple of pieces of correspondence from the Minister of Transport, from Mr Crosbie in Ottawa, and Mr. Crosbie is suggesting that there is a primary road's agreement in place between the Province and Ottawa, the \$180 million which we are going to receive over a seven year period. In Mr. Crosbie's mind that is the only road's agreement that we are going to get until that one runs out. It is insinuated in that letter, Mr. Speaker, and it is time for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to stop the silliness he is getting on with and to face the fact that it is his responsibility and his responsibility alone.

There is no Mr. Ottawa, there is no Uncle Ottawa going to bail us out. The roads that my friend is referring to are the responsibility of the Minister of Transportation and this administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, they have to stop blaming Ottawa, they have to stop blaming some outsider and they have to begin to govern this Province. It is time to stop grandstanding and putting on displays. The time is here to start governing. This is what the mandate is for, to govern, and to provide the roads which have to be provided for the people, for the students who are sick when they arrive at school and who are getting an inferior education because of the time they are missing. It is time now, Mr. Speaker, for this government to stop putting the blame on someone else and remember and admit that the buck stops right there in the

lap of the Minister of Transportation.

I support that petition and I challenge the minister, if he is within the hearing of my voice, to come in here, get up and face it man-fashion, that it is his responsibility to see that the roads in this Province are upgraded and paved.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words to the petition that was presented by the Leader of the Opposition. I am sure that particularly all of us who represent districts in rural Newfoundland are indeed very conscious of the road conditions that exists in this Province. There are certainly not unique to the Fortune - Hermitage district. They are in my district, and I am sure, in the district of the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), in the district of the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), Terra Nova (Mr. Greening) and Bay of Islands (Mr. Blanchard). I am sure we all experience, Mr. Speaker, significant difficulties as it relates to the road conditions in this Province.

Now, the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, cannot have it both ways. We just heard the member for the Strait of Bell Isle (Mr. Decker) that time talk about how the buck stops here, how government should do more, and that money should be put

in place to do it. It was only a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, in the budget debate that the Opposition was screaming about government spending too much money and the deficit is too high. Which way do they want it? They cannot have it both ways all the time.

The fact of the matter is that we need, and it has been said, this Province needs \$1 billion to do what needs to be done on the roads in this district. One billion dollars, Mr. Speaker, is what is requested for road work in this province and that has been said, I believe, by the construction association. I know in my own district, Mr. Speaker, the figure is somewhere in the area of \$25 or \$30 million to do the roads that need to be done in the district. So, we are all experiencing the same kind of problem. Government is doing everything they can with the resources that are available to try and solve the problems with the roads in this Province, but we do not have the \$1 billion that is needed and we cannot do it all overnight. We are, with the resources we have available, making the best efforts possible.

Mr. Speaker, I am as familiar with the South Coast as the Leader of the Opposition. In terms of snow clearing I believe last year we probably spent more money on snow clearing in this Province than we have ever spent before. I know on the Burin Peninsula Highway this Winter there were times when we had twenty-one pieces of equipment working and most of that was hired so, Mr. Speaker, that is the type of commitment that the government has to the roads in this Province. It was a very severe Winter, as we all know, and we tried to do the best possible job.

I want to say that I sympathize with the people who are experiencing problems with roads in this Province, as we all do. As members in rural Newfoundland, I think we all share, Mr. Speaker, the same type of concerns for the roads that exist in the district. I am sure that government will continue to do the same type of job they have been doing, that is the best possible job with the resources that are available.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

DR. COLLINS:

Order 7, a continuation of Bill 4, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 7. Second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Development And Tourism Act."

The hon. the member for Fogo has fifteen minutes left.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening I believe I adjourned the debate on this bill. I wonder if the Clerk could tell me how much time I have left.

MR. SPEAKER:

Fifteen minutes.

MR. TULK:

Fifteen minutes, lots of time.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I started off my few words on this bill by pointing out that indeed I wanted to say a few words on it because it is one of the most important departments in the government. If

we are going to deal as legislators, and if the government is to deal with the tremendous problem of unemployment and the tremendous problem of suffering that is in this Province, then obviously that department has to become a far more important department than perhaps it is.

I also pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that even those people who are employed in the Province, or working, some of them are working for very substandard wages and it amazes me, and I am sure it amazes a number of other people, how some of the people who work for \$5.00 an hour or for \$4.75 an hour - if you look at \$5.00 an hour for a forty-hour week, as I was saying yesterday, that is \$200 a week and that is basically \$800 a month.

It is very, very difficult in Newfoundland today, as everybody knows, to survive on \$800 a month. We are talking here about gross pay and not net pay. Sometimes that is down to \$650 a month. I was saying that that too, as well as the number of people who are unemployed, the number of people who are getting what I would consider to be a substandard wage, is a very important thing for the government to consider.

I also made the point, I think, when the Minister of Development was out of the Legislature, that while his department is regarded by government to be somewhat important, regarded to be the glamorous department of government, there is another one that if we are to implement should have a close liaison with the Department of Development. There is another department of government that I believe is perhaps more important than the

Department of Development. I speak of the Department of Rural Development.

It is my belief that what the House Commission did in the Province was bring together a number of recommendations that people in this Province already knew, that the ordinary person in this Province already knew, and that is if we are going to develop our economy on a sound footing, then it becomes very obvious that the answer to that development lies in rural Newfoundland.

It is shameful to see the role that the Department of Rural Development is given by this government, in that it is given, I believe, insufficient funds. I believe that it has insufficient authority to deal with other line departments of government such as Fisheries, Forestry, Tourism and so on. I believe that that department has to occupy a much more important role than it has at present.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the other thing that I dwelt somewhat on was the other part of the Department of Development which is the Department of Tourism. In that, I pointed out that the Liberal Party, I think, since 1983 has had a policy which says that the Gulf should be an extension of the Trans-Canada and should be treated as same. If you are going to make us equal as Canadians, the Premier talks about our equality as Canadians, then I would suggest to him that one of the platforms and one of the policies that the government should develop and one of the - how should I put it? - one of the policies that they should have the federal government implement and bring into force in this country is that the Gulf

ferry service, not only from Newfoundland but to Prince Edward Island as well, become part, an extension, of the Trans-Canada Highway. I pointed out the importance of that to tourism in the Province, particularly I suspect to the West Coast and to the Argentea area and indeed all of the Province.

It does us very little good to start spending money on Tourist attractions in the Province and on tourist facilities in the Province so that they can be comfortable while they are here and enjoy Newfoundland if, first of all, it costs them a great deal to get here and that deters them from coming.

Mr. Speaker, I then went on to point out, recognizing the importance of his department, that if the Minister of Development had come into this Legislature and said that we need to appoint four more deputy ministers, then we would have very little quarrel with the bill. If he came in and said we need an assistant deputy minister for this section of Development, we need another assistant deputy minister of this section of Development and we need another assistant deputy minister here, we would have very little quarrel with the bill. But that is not what the minister has done.

What the minister has done is asked us to approve a piece of legislation, and I will read from it: "This amendment would repeal the reference to three assistant deputy ministers in the Department of Development and replace it with a reference to 'such assistant deputy ministers as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council,' which is the Cabinet, "may by

order approve.'" In other words, if the Minister of Development or the Cabinet, the government, choses to have one, two, three, four, five, ten, twenty and to be ludicrous, 100 deputy ministers, then all they have to do is to put an order through Cabinet and they are all approved. I said, Mr. Speaker, that you would think that we would trust this government or any government to carry out its duties in the proper manner.

Without being down in the muck, without being dirty, I think if you look at the record of this government and what it does with jobs in the civil service and the number of contracts that it puts out for its Tory friends - and I have no problem with the government appointing their Tory friends if they are appointed on the basis of competence - but that has not been the case in the past. I listed off, Mr. Speaker, a number of instances where the government has used taxpayers dollars to pay off its defeated candidates. I listed the member for Windsor - Buchans, which I understand has \$40,000 a year job.

MR. REID:

They should all vote Tory then according to that.

MR. TULK:

No. Because then you would break the treasury.

The truth of the matter is that this government has appointed, as I said, the former member for Windsor - Buchans, who was defeated in the general election, to a job which I wonder - and I have to question the government - as to whether indeed he is doing the job. The former member for St. Barbe was appointed, made some of job contracted out, some sort

of thing concocted up for him so that he would have a job, another \$40,000 or \$50,000. The former member for Gander, Mr. Collins, at one time was the official handshaker in the Province and paid a sum of \$50,000. The former member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir is now or was at least receiving - I suppose he still is - some \$40,000 or \$50,000 for some sort of work. The former minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development is in Labrador. While I have no doubt about the competence of that gentleman, he is getting a salary of probably \$50,000 to \$60,000 a year. We have seen this government carte blanche, without calling tenders for legal work, which is a question that we will have to raise later, spend close to a million dollars, it will be a million by the end of this year on a couple of their Tory friends, Mr. Lougheed from Alberta and Mr. Cabot Martin. While again I have no doubt about the competence of those gentlemen, I wonder if the price could not have been cheaper. Mr. Speaker, we could on. Perhaps, Your Honour, one of those days will enjoy the privilege of some of the patronage that belongs to the government, maybe not because then, when he is defeated, there will be a Liberal government, which will be in the next election, and we will hire him on the basis of his competence rather than on the basis of the party to which he belongs.

Mr. Speaker, there are another few questions that you ought to ask him about this department, whether indeed the minister is trying to carry on development in this Province in a competent and fashionable manner in which it should be carried out or whether indeed, as my friend from St.

Barbe said yesterday evening, he has become part of the jet set. Maybe he wants to appoint assistant deputy ministers to be a larger part of his entourage. If you look at the minister's budget of last year, his estimates for last year, and if you traced them through, very quickly you will find that the part of his budget that rose tremendously and had to be upgraded and revamped is his travel and communications budget.

For example, one section, the MINISTER'S OFFICE, rose from \$60,000 to \$135,000 in one year, his budget for Transportation and Communications. Another section, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION, it went from \$72,900 up to \$89,000 and so on it goes through the budget. INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT, Physical Planning Support went from \$31,000 to \$33,000. OFFSHORE BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT, it went from \$78,000 up to \$104,000. You look at TRADE AND INVESTMENT, PROSPECT DEVELOPMENT, the Travel and Communications bill increased \$30,000 from \$70,000 up to \$100,000. ECONOMIC RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS, Transportation and Communications increased \$9,000 to \$15,000. And so on you can go through his budget. PROMOTION SERVICES, again his Transportation and Communications budget is up from \$108,000 up to \$150,000. Go on again, FINANCIAL SERVICES in INDUSTRIAL AND SMALL BUSINESS OPERATIONS, up from \$12,000 up to \$43,000, an increase of 350 per cent in the Transportation and Communications sector of his department. Look at another one. Here is an interesting one. INDUSTRIAL AND SMALL BUSINESS OPERATIONS went from \$1,500 up to \$4,500. There is no trouble to know where the emphasis is being placed in that department. LOCAL INDUSTRY SUPPORT, Transportation

and Communications went from \$8,000 up to \$14,000 and you can go on through the minister's transportation budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as my friend from St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) said yesterday, if the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) can come into this Legislature and tell us the number of jobs that his travels, and the travels of the people that he is taking with him around this world justifies what appears to be, just a preliminary look at the figures, appears to be around a 300 per cent increase in his overall Transportation and Communications budget, then we have no problem with supporting him doing that. The truth of the matter is that we have seen very few jobs. We heard the minister down in Port aux Basques last year arousing all kinds of expectations about the offshore. They take a splurge every now and then across the Province to try to build up their political fortunes.

MR. BARRETT:

I am going to Fogo.

MR. TULK:

That is where you will meet your Waterloo. Come on any time. You will find out that you are not as safe as you are in St. John's West, I will tell you that. Any time you want to come down to Fogo come along, and that is where we will end the hon. gentleman's political career, right there. If he wants to resign his seat now and run in Fogo Island I will resign mine right now for him and we will have a go at it. Otherwise do not threaten me with rape if he is not going to carry it out.

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that the hon. gentleman

has a department which is being used by the government for pork-barrelling and the truth of the matter is we can hardly be sure that when he comes in here and asks us for any number, whatever the Cabinet wishes to approve in terms of assistant deputy ministers, we can hardly be sure that the minister and the government and the Cabinet are not going to use that to shore up the next group of Tory candidates that are going to be defeated in the next election. I see my friend from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) over there smiling. He knows what I am saying is correct.

MR. PARSONS:

I heard that before.

MR. TULK:

I think, to be quite frank with him, that the member for St. John's East Extern will survive another election. Now I would not say the same thing for the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young). The member for Harbour Grace squeaked in last year just under the wire, squeaked in by something like 200 votes -

MR. YOUNG:

Two hundred and fifty votes.

MR. TULK:

- in spite of trying to hire every person that he could hire from his district. They tell me that the Minister of Public Works has his own private hiring firm in the Department of Public Works. Your biggest criteria is that you have to be from the district of Harbour Grace and a Tory. If that is the case, you will be hired in the Department of Public Works. In spite of the fact that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) last year in this Legislature gave us incorrect

information as to what he did to two civil servants, he is still only one by a measly 200 votes. So he is in danger. And I say to my friend from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons), I do not believe he is in such danger because I believe that he is going to do a fairly good job as a member from that district. I think his heart is in the right place, I think his mind is in the right place, and I think he is a pretty fair fellow, unfortunately, I cannot say the same for the Minister of Public Works.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said that, I want to say to the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) that I think his department is a very important department. I think there is only one perhaps that is as important if not more important and that is the Department of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development. I say to him that he should adopt the policy and should try to get his federal counterparts to put in place a policy that makes the Gulf an extension of the Trans-Canada Highway, in other words, making it no more expensive for me as a citizen of this country or some other citizen of this country to travel this Province than it would to drive the same stretch from the Trans-Canada Highway. I say to him that he is not the person in the ministry, in the Cabinet that I would give a blank cheque to when it comes to hiring as many assistant deputy ministers as he choses to hire.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burgeo -

Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this bill in itself when you look at it, I suppose, is not earth shattering. The government and the minister want to have the right to appoint as many deputy ministers as they deem necessary to operate the department, and they want to do it without going through the regular channels of hiring those people, to do it by Order-in-Council.

The Department of Development and Tourism is, as my friend and colleague from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) just said, one of the most important departments in the government. But in the length of time that I have been in this Assembly, it has been one of the most silent department's here and it should be one of the most vocal and vibrant departments here.

I have heard all kinds of horror stories as to people applying to this department to obtain funding to start up operations in Newfoundland. I have even heard it is not the job that you are doing, or the development you want to start, but it is who you know. I have heard it is even the place where the political patronage is being used to a very large extent and to a very silent one. I have heard some horror stories about the tourist loans that have been made in this Province. That is something I think we should be very careful about.

We have a potential for a tourist industry in this Province which has never been developed. We have heard posturing on developing the tourist industry, but when the people of Newfoundland want to get

involved in the tourist industry, there is very little money unless you are a friend of the government and then there is all kinds of money spent indiscriminately.

For instance, I heard of one case last year where a gentleman applied for - maybe the Speaker has heard about it too - a grant to provide boats, this is one of these water slides or boats or something. When he was given the money the department discovered five miles away or ten miles away someone else had the same sort of a grant. So they said, 'Look, take the money, do what you like with it, but do not say anything about it.' Now I have heard that, I do not have proof of it, but I have heard that and I am sure that maybe the Speaker could check into that. It is close to home for him.

This is the sort of stuff I have heard has happened in the Department of Tourism. This is the indiscriminate way that I have heard that grants have been given out in the Department of Tourism. So, as I say, it seems to me that there is very great potential for tourism in Newfoundland. As this department has joined development and tourism, it seems to me that it is the most important department that we have in government right now, but it is also the most silent and the most ineffective. We have not seen any great development in business in Newfoundland and certainly not in tourism. I can think of many places in Newfoundland that could be developed and we would be attracting people who live on the mainland if the thrust of this government was put really into developing tourism instead of posturing about it.

It is a situation that is sad. We

see the Development Associations, when they made their report to government, or their annual brief to government in December of last year, they claimed that one of the major problems that they found in getting development going in Newfoundland was bureaucratic red tape and the indifference of government. Now these are the two major points that the Development Associations in Newfoundland pointed out last year in their brief to government.

The reason that they were not working to the level that they felt they could was they met with bureaucratic red tape and then they met with this government indifference. Now, this to me would seem to be the problem with the Department of Development and Tourism. The Development Associations that are trying to develop Newfoundland have to come to the government and tell them this is why they cannot work to their full potential.

This, to me, seems to sum it up a lot better than anything else that anyone could say about it. They are the people, they are the front line. The infantry, shall we say, of development in Newfoundland is handled through the Development Associations. When they have to come in and make this as a salient point in their presentation, bureaucratic red tape and government indifferent, I think it is time that the minister really have a look at overhauling his department.

I do not know if the right to hire more assistant deputy ministers is what that department needs. I have a feeling the minister should possibly look at that department, go through it and have a serious look at the people that he has

there at present. Because obviously, if the people are doing a good job, the minister cannot be doing a good job. If the minister is not doing a good job, then he should do the honourable thing and resign. But if it is his people who are not doing the good job, maybe he should look at them and instead of hiring extra people and finding places to put friends of the government, when they can hire their assistant deputy ministers by an Order in Council, maybe he should look at what he has there, utilize the people that he has there and place the ones that are not performing into the proper jobs.

Some things come to mind when I think about development in Newfoundland. We have talked about the incubator malls. My colleague from Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) talked about that yesterday, and Development Associations. I think there are a lot of things that could be done in Newfoundland. I have talked to those people as I go around the Province.

One of the ideas that always seems to come up is that a lot of those people, as I say, in the infantry of development in Newfoundland, the people who are in Development Associations and things like that, say to me all the time, 'Listen, we know that we cannot get involved in the secondary process manufacturing the same as they can in Ontario.' They cannot do it. They cannot compete in that market, but wonder why they can not get involved in secondary manufacturing to serve the needs of Newfoundland. One gentleman I was talking to last year pointed this out to me. I had known it before.

The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is proud about the fact that the offshore fishery is now in fine shape but none of the equipment that is used to feed the fishing industry, the machinery in the plants, the nets and the equipment that is used in fishing are manufactured in Newfoundland. You know, 99 per cent of this has to come in somewhere else.

I would say to the minister, in his capacity as the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett), his department should set to work to see what could be developed along those lines. In other words, develop industries that we would feed ourselves, industries that we would produce in Newfoundland, create jobs in Newfoundland and then sell to the primary producers in Newfoundland. This is one of the things that I think his department has forgotten about.

The fishing industry in Newfoundland, as everybody realizes right now, is in an upswing. There is every indication that it is going to continue that way because of the changes in eating patterns of our great neighbour to the South, the United States. The fishing industry is going to grow in Newfoundland and with that there must of necessity be a need for the equipment that is used in the fishing industry. This should be manufactured in Newfoundland, the belts, the cutters and the things like that which are used in the plants, and, of course, the nets.

I had an example this year of when they are starting a new industry in Newfoundland, aquaculture. We find that it an industry that has been developed by this government over a period of five or six years. It is not a new industry.

Aquaculture is 1000 years old but yet we have reached the stage where we are going to grow the fish and put them into salt water, but the equipment that is going to be necessary to keep them in the salt water, the nets, the pounds, and the other stuff, is being made somewhere in New Brunswick and shipped in. This to me is an example of the short-sightedness of the Department of Development in not having their people working on an industry like this. It is new to Newfoundland so let us go through and and let us get all the benefits out of it and not just, again, to be the person who puts the salt in the water and take them out and sell them to be processed again down in the States. So, in this thing right there, if we are going into an aquaculture project like we are, we have, first of all, the equipment that is going to be used.

The feed right now that is being used to feed smelts that are in the aquamarine centre in Bay d'Espoir is now being brought in, as I understand, from somewhere in the United States or somewhere in Central Canada. Those fish are still going to have to be fed. We are farming them now. They do not go and get their own food like they do when the salmon go back and forth the river. They are going to have to be fed on a daily basis so, for this reason, it should have been the duty of the Department of Development to develop this industry to the full extent and not just be there in name as a department and say, 'We are the Department of Development.' What have we contributed to the economy of Newfoundland?

They have had control of the

aquaculture programme in Newfoundland right from day one. It has been a programme that they have had in their control and yet all we are going to do is feed the fish with fish meal that comes in from the Mainland somewhere. They are going to be in cages that were made on the Mainland somewhere and the minister sits there and signs these papers and says he is the Minister of Development. To me this was a chance his department had to get in to do a job that could have benefited Newfoundlanders for years to come. We think the aquaculture is going to go in Newfoundland. We have seen it. The salmon right now in Bay d'Espoir are supposed to be going on stream very shortly. But to feed into that industry is something that the minister should have looked at, and maybe it is not too late now. Maybe he should look at development in Bay d'Espoir of the industries that are needed to support that industry.

One of the points that the Minister of Finance made in his statement was that he needed to get the Department of Defence involved in Newfoundland more than it is now. Everybody agrees with that. We, in the Opposition, made a recommendation, as my colleague from Stephenville said yesterday. I happened to be in the position where I had found out about this before anyone else, I guess, because I was on the executive of the Newfoundland Division of the Navy League. I found out about the fact that there was going to be a new sea cadet training establishment put in Nova Scotia. Nobody in the Newfoundland Government knew anything about it. It was going to be put there. Even though we cited the figures here in this House, the

fact that we own 60 per cent of the Sea Cadets from the Atlantic provinces here in Newfoundland, yet the government, members opposite, did not know that there was going to be a Sea Cadet establishment put in Nova Scotia. It was the Opposition who pointed it out and wrote to the Newfoundland minister.

Then I heard the Premier stand up in this House, as he does, and take the credit for it the other day. The member for Port au Port in the background was supposed to be involved. I do not know if the Premier was trying to mislead the House, but the actual fact of this was that this was introduced by the Opposition. We found out about it. We wrote the federal minister and we sent copies to the Premier. Now, all of the sudden, it is the situation that it is a positive thing that was established by the Opposition. This was a chance to have an operation come to Newfoundland, a partial Department of Defence operation, introduced by the Opposition. It was not found out by members opposite or the Department of Development.

If the Department of Development is all embracing, as we are led to believe, you would also think that the minister or someone in his department would have known that they were going to spend millions of dollars to establish a Sea Cadet camp in Nova Scotia and to go out through Intergovernmental Affairs, or whoever it was, to contact his counterparts in Ottawa and say, 'Listen, we need this development. We have not got a full military presence in Newfoundland, and we need this development here. It will do something for the unemployment problem that is ever with us in

Newfoundland.'

The main function of the Department of Development should be to realize that they should be working to reduce the terrible, crushing unemployment problem we have in Newfoundland. The figures that never seem to get better. They even increase. We see figures coming down all across Canada and yet the unemployment figures in Newfoundland continue to climb.

They continue to climb, I submit, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that this government opposite has lost the will to govern. They have lost the will. They do not want to put the effort into doing the job that they were elected to do. The job that they were elected to do was to govern Newfoundland.

So when we find that in the last two years the economy has gotten worse, unemployment has risen, we hear nothing but empty posturing from members opposite. We hear the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) get up and say he is taking a new approach to the government of Canada, he is going to kick start the Newfoundland economy. I do not know what he means by kick starting it. We have not seen any examples of it yet. We see again that he is going to go to Ottawa and do something but kick start, as one my colleagues said, something you do with a motorcycle. It certainly is not something you do with an economy.

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) kick start the hon. member.

MR. GILBERT:

The hon. member, the Minister of

Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) there, he knows all about kick starting. I will not go into that with him today.

MR. DECKER:

Come on, why not?

MR. GILBERT:

Anyway, I have to make a speech. Sir, I am talking about something for Newfoundland. If you want to joke, you go outside.

MR. DECKER:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

This is serious. The Department of Development and Tourism in Newfoundland is serious business. It might not be for the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, the member for Grand Fall, because really I suppose he has never been too much concerned in it. He has been elected, he has been appointed, or he did something, he has never really worked too hard in the economy of Newfoundland, so he would not be too concerned about it.

MR. SIMMS:

Tell us about when you were elected.

MR. GILBERT:

I can tell you many times. Anyway, I can tell you right now I am here, am I not?

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible).

MR. GILBERT:

I am not going to get into this with the minister because he has never done anything in his life only he did manage to get himself elected and lived by being elected to one thing or the other all his life. Anyway, I am not going to

get involved with the gentleman. I just tell him that this is a very serious matter that we have in Newfoundland where we have an employment figure that, as I said, is higher than anywhere else in Canada, much higher, and the government does not seem to be doing anything about it. Now, that to me is the sad part about it.

We have listened for the last seven or eight years to this government telling us how tough times were. We had the Minister of Finance tell us in the budget that this is a hold the line budget or a retrenchment budget or all those good adjectives that they come up with over there from time to time when they want to cover up for their ability to do nothing.

This bill asks us to give them the right to appoint more assistant deputy ministers to a department that, as far as I am concerned, is under worked already. We have not seen any of the examples that you would expect to see from the Department of Development. We have not seen this development that we have been led to believe is there.

With the unemployment, I can take you to the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir which again is one that is very close and dear to me. We have an unemployment rate that is 90 per cent in that district. I heard the Minister of Finance say in the estimates committee last night that he has been down there and it is a beautiful place and no doubt there was possibly going to be development there. He thought it was a great spot for development of tourism or some of the things like that. They have great deep

indraft and a great harbour.

I told him all this was thought about and there was even suggestions that it could be made into a shipping port for Central Newfoundland. This happened some years ago, I will tell him, but nobody has done anything about it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Ice free.

MR. GILBERT:

Yes, it is ice free. I just wanted to tell the minister all those things are there. The infrastructure is there to build around. You have the natural infrastructure, now we need the rest of it to put there. It is there. I am glad that the minister recognized the fact Bay d'Espoir looks like a place that has a lot of potential. I have been saying that for the last two years. I hope you will tell your colleague in the Department of Development, yes, you think it has an excellent chance for development. It has all the natural attributes that should be there but the only thing that it does not have is it does not have any work. People are unemployed there. Ninety per cent of them are unemployed. The average salary down there is about \$7,000 a year.

So when we think that here I am speaking on a bill to appoint more assistant deputy ministers, it is certainly not going to do much to the unemployment problems in Bay d'Espoir. When I think that the over the last three years the MINISTER'S OFFICE increased its expenses by 115 per cent, it would seem to me that this is not the sort of development that we are looking for in this bill. We are looking for development that is

going to put Newfoundlanders to work, ordinary Newfoundlanders, the 1,700 who are unemployed in Bay d'Espoir.

I look with some amusement when I see in all the media across the Province they are announcing that they created 283 jobs spending maybe \$1 million to announce this thing. A great announcement, every print media in the Province they created 283 jobs - or 2,083 jobs I am sorry. I look and I say here, down in Bay d'Espoir, we have 1,600 unemployed in Bay d'Espoir that are living on unemployment or welfare or they move back and forth between unemployment and welfare. This great system that in those jobs that the government is so proudly advertising right now, this 2,083 jobs or whatever it is, costing the taxpayers in Newfoundland \$1 million, if members opposite would tell the truth about those jobs, they would find that most of them were made with the idea to put people to work for ten weeks, to take them off one form of welfare and put them back on another type of welfare.

This, Mr. Speaker, is certainly not development. It is the thing that I find as I stand here to speak on this bill impossible to imagine how people who were elected to govern could stand and waste the taxpayers money pointing out that they had created 2,083 jobs when we know that those 2,083 jobs, most of them were made to put people to work for ten weeks.

We heard the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) stand here today, so it is still tied into development, and talk about how his government were not going to get involved in Challenge '87 this year. So now

we find that they have developed a new way to use political patronage, a new way now by bringing it down to the level of the youth of this Province, people who have the highest number of them unemployed, the people twenty-five and under who are the highest number unemployed in this Province. Now we find that the government have found a new way. They have found a new way now, they are going to give out political patronage for children during the Summer, people who are out of school trying to get money to get back to school.

This to me seems to have reached a new low in the political patronage in Newfoundland. It seems to me that it is the sort of a thing that we would not expect to see any government stoop when we have this very serious youth unemployment problem in this Province. The minister last year when he withdrew from his Job Strategy programme, at least he had the decency to divide the money that he had left over among the fifty-two districts. Today we heard him stand in this House, and again posture and skate and slide around it, 'slide' maybe is a better word, around what he had done with the Challenge '87 money as he has withdrawn from the Challenge '87 programme. He did not give any answers to the facts. He did not say that it was going to be divided among the districts on an equal basis because I can assure you that the unemployment rate is equally high in every district in Newfoundland. I would say it is verging on 90 per cent in any district in Newfoundland.

You know, it is a sad, sad thing when we see a society where we have people in Newfoundland who

are twenty-five years old and has never had a full-time job. Some of them who never had a job. Yet we have a government that takes advertisements out in local papers announcing that they created 2,083 jobs, and spent \$1 million to do it. Then we find that those jobs are not full-time jobs, they are not part-time jobs, they are jobs that takes people for ten weeks and takes them off unemployment.

MR. MORGAN:

It is better than what Clyde Wells will get them.

MR. GILBERT:

It is not the same price that you get for cotton either, no, it is not. Some people are making money on cotton those days.

MR. TULK:

Stuff your ears in a cotton.

MR. GILBERT:

This to me would seem to be a pretty good deal. That is about the only development that we have seen out of anyone going to Hong Kong. The member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) may have reaped some benefit from his world trotting and his globe trotting. But I have not seen many Newfoundlanders that have made any

MR. BARRETT:

(Inaudible) when we were over there, did you?

MR. GILBERT:

I have not seen many more -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. GILBERT:

I hope they have. I said, maybe, the member is the only one that has anything out of it. I have

not seen any great turn down in the unemployment rates since you came back. So when the unemployment figures come out next week, we will see it better. I can assure you right now that the fishery is the only thing you have going for you, and you had nothing to do with that. The Department of Development had nothing to do with that. The fact is the market in the United States picked up.

MR. BARRETT:

Is that right?

MR. GILBERT:

That is right. I am telling you now. The fact that you got a market down in the United States, you know, you are fortunate that there was a market. Three years ago FPI was closing down. The fish industry was closing down a few years ago. Now all of a sudden it is turned around. I tell you right now that -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave!

MR. GILBERT:

I was making a good speech, anyhow.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Do not go talking about cotton now 'Jim'.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, the affect of this bill whereby the number of

assistant deputy ministers is no longer limited to three could well bring in, in theory at least, a situation where we could have literally dozens and dozens and dozens and dozens of ADMs until they are practically leaning out through the windows, blocking the elevators.

MR. TULK:

You know what they will do?

MR. DECKER:

What will they do?

MR. TULK:

We will defeat ten or twelve or fifteen or twenty more in the next election and then they will hope that we will hire them.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, as is so eloquently pointed out, the affect of this bill could create a roost, a nesting ground, for more defeated candidates of the Tory Party. We have seen all too much of that over the past years, where nests have been inched out, where roosts have been made, comfortable places with cozy salaries, with cozy pension plans, for defeated Tories. This is what could happen, Mr. Speaker, if this particular piece of legislation is pushed to its ultimate extreme.

That is to say nothing about the other departments in the government, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what the situation is today in the Department of Health, for example. Is this just the leading edge? Is this just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak? Are we seeing a trend beginning here today, beginning to bud, or has the Department -

MR. SIMMS:

No.

MR. DECKER:

The Minister of Forestry says, 'No.' Does he mean that the Department of Forestry already has gone through the motions and is already able to appoint more than three ADMS or more than ten ADMS or more than fifty ADMS? Has the Department of Forestry already reached this stage, Mr. Speaker? Or is he waiting until the precedent is set with the Department of Development and Tourism first? Shall we see tomorrow or the day after or at some future session of this House an act to amend the Department of Forestry act, Mr. Speaker, whereby some more defeated Tory candidates can be appointed as ADMS in the Department of Forestry?

MR. SIMMS:

We do not act like the Liberals acted.

MR. DECKER:

Is this what we are going to find, Mr. Speaker? Is this going to happen or not?

MR. SIMMS:

No.

MR. DECKER:

Whatever the reason, Mr. Speaker, the ultimate affect of this bill passing through the House will only tend to make the Department of Development and Tourism a little more top heavy than it is today.

If I were to levy one criticism at the Department of Tourism, at the Department of Health, at the Department of Forestry, at the Department of Finance, or any department in this government today, if I were to level one criticism right from the top of my head, the criticism would be, Mr. Speaker, that all the departments

are top heavy. There are too many chiefs in government today. There are too many chiefs and not enough Indians, too many leaders and not enough followers, too many big salaries and not enough for the little people. That is the whole problem, Mr. Speaker. That is the whole problem with the administration which is presently in power in this Province today, too much top weight, Mr. Speaker, too many leaders, none of which have the ability to lead. Too many leaders getting paid for being leaders. Too many leaders goes in parenthesis. Leaders should have a question mark after it, Mr. Speaker.

The whole problem is what they need is a good dose of the Liberal caucus to straighten out some of those leaders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:

That is what they need, Mr. Speaker, to put some of those fellows in their place. Mr. Speaker, I have good news for the people of Newfoundland. We are right now on the verge of when the grim reapers of the Liberal Party are going to take over and believe you me we have shown our ability in chopping people down to size.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. DECKER:

And, we are going to start with the Department of Development and Tourism.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder if the hon. member would enlighten me as to how much leaders are trading for on the Toronto stock exchange?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

I understand that the two experts in that are within the gentleman's own department and, I think, one of them has the last name of Ryan. What is the name of the other one?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Steele.

MR. TULK:

Dobbin, that is it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, Your Honour could have taken the point of order under advisement because I am sure if we look a little closer there must be a point of order there.

I am going to announce today, good news, good news for Newfoundland. In the very near future, when this administration is thrown where it belongs, out off office, so far that generations of Newfoundlanders yet unborn will only be able to read about it in history books, not knowing whether they are reading fiction or fact and hoping that they are reading fiction, we are going to throw them totally out and we, the grim reapers, we are going to come in and we are starting with the Department of Development and Tourism. That is where we are starting and we are going to trim that department down to size because if there is one problem with the Department of Development and Tourism today, as with the Department of Health, as with the Department of Finance, the department is too top heavy.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Not so.

MR. DECKER:
And the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth is, I believe, the very worst offender of all.

MR. SIMMS:
Could I ask a question?

MR. DECKER:
Yes, go ahead and give me a question.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Could the hon. member tell us, since he is so knowledgeable about the departments being so top heavy and all the rest of it, could he perhaps run down for us, in recent months even, how frequently he has

been in to see the Executive of the Department of Development and Tourism, for example, and the Department of Forestry, as another example, how frequently he has been in to see these senior executive people and also whether or not he has had an opportunity to say to each of these senior executives in the department, professional people, that he did not think they should be there? How often has he done that?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Thank you very much for the question. Mr. Speaker, the whole problem with answering that question is this, there is so much bureaucracy in the departments of government today that I, like every other Newfoundlander, is unable to wade through the bureaucracy. The hon. minister has put his finger right on the point, he has nailed the problem which I was leading up to and I commend him for nailing the problem, there is so much bureaucracy. Let us run a test case, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:
I have another question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
I can understand what the hon. member is saying if indeed he was consistent in his comments but he is not. What he said was that the departments were to top heavy and now he is saying there are too many there so he has not been in to see any of them because he does not

know how to get through them. In my own department, for example, there are only three, plus the Deputy Minister, four senior executives. Is that too many for the hon gentleman to get in and see? That is the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am coming to the Department of Forest Resources and Lands, Mr. Speaker, and I will be the most surprised member of this hon. House if I am to find that I am able to wade through the bureaucracy and after maybe a couple of years, of course, it will be too late, Mr. Speaker, because it is the last dying days of the corrupt administration. So the question is hypothetical anyway. I could never wade through the bureaucracy. We are going to do away with the bureaucracy. The worst department of all, I believe, next to the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth is the Department of Consumer Affairs. I wrote the minister, I believe it must have been a month ago now, about a little problem I had up in my district and that letter is lost somewhere in the bureaucracy. Somewhere, Mr. Speaker, it is lost, it is probably being walked over.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is not true.

MR. DECKER:

How come the hon. minister has not answered me if it is not true?

Mr. Speaker, I would chastise the hon. minister. He does not have

much time left in which to reply, and this is what he does not seem to realize. Time is running out, Mr. Speaker. That letter is bogged down somewhere in the bureaucracy. This particular piece of legislation which we are putting through is setting the precedent whereby the Department of Consumer Affairs will be able to appoint an infinite number - this is what the legislation says, there is no cap on it - an infinite number of assistant deputy ministers.

Mr. Speaker, what those hon. lady and gentlemen over there must realize is this, that even though they are preparing the roost, they are preparing the nest for their defeated candidates in the next election, the fact of the matter is there is going to be a different administration over there. Do you think for a single minute that we are going to appoint the defeated candidates to those ADM positions? The only one we are going to appoint is the hon. the Minister of Health, because he is the only one over there that we believe has the ability to be appointed. That is why we are going to appoint him, but all the rest of them can cry all they like, they can shout all they like, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, they will not be appointed because there is already too much top weight in the Department of Development and Tourism. Now, there is also too much top weight in the Department of Consumer Affairs.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Beginning with the minister.

MR. DECKER:

This is probably going to add weight to my next argument, Mr. Speaker.

I was about to say I am not sure that we even need a Department of Consumer Affairs. Now, the reason I am saying this, Mr. Speaker, is that since I have been elected to this House I have seen the hon. minister deliver maybe a dozen Ministerial Statements. Would that be a correct number? If he presented a dozen, eleven of them were corporate. They should have been for the Department of Corporate Affairs, because he spends most of his time trying to justify why Imperial Oil is charging seventeen cents more on a gallon of fuel oil in Newfoundland than they charge in Nova Scotia. He spends most of his time, Mr. Speaker, trying to justify price gouging. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there are only two people in the total department, I am suggesting that the department is top-heavy because it is not doing that which the Liberal party designed it to do, it has let down its reasons for existence, its raison d'etre, it has backed away from it and it has become a resting place for the corporate citizens of this world, it is a haven for Imperial Oil, it is a haven for Gulf Oil, it is a haven for Irving Oil, it is a place, Mr. Speaker, that the price gougers of this world can run to get their price gouging justified.

Mr. Speaker, I am doubtful that the department should be allowed to exist anymore, therefore, if there are only one or two or three people in the bureaucracy making up that department, then it is certainly top-heavy.

Mr. Speaker, before I leave this bill I want to make some suggestions to the minister: I believe that instead of trying to make a roosting place, or resting place, for more defeated candidates, it might be a lot more

beneficial to the people of this Province if the hon. minister were to look into some of the regulations which his already excessive bureaucracy is imposing upon Newfoundlanders today.

MR. MORGAN:

How about tabling Clyde Wells' salary?

MR. DECKER:

The problem we have with Clyde Wells' salary, Mr. Speaker, is a serious problem that the Liberal Party has today. We have a money problem. We might just as well get used to it. We might just as well get used to Clyde Wells, Mr. Speaker, because he is bringing in a new era. When the hon. the Premier was given his salary, he kept it covered up for years and years until finally the news media dug it out. He kept it covered up, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

The Premier's trust fund was covered up and kept secret until the press dug it out. What we are seeing with Clyde Wells is a breath of fresh air being thrust upon this Province, because we are seeing absolute honesty. It is totally aboveboard.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes! Who is paying his salary? Who is paying his salary?

MR. DECKER:

I could imagine, Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Wells had listened to some of the Tory advisors who said to him, 'Now, Clyde, boy, do not let anyone know about it. Keep this a

secret.' I can hear the advice that Mr. Dobbin would give, that Mr. Ryan would give, and all the Tory hacks and bagmen, 'Keep it quiet.' But Mr. Wells is bringing into this Province a breath of fresh air. There will be no more under-the-table salaries, they will be right up front, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Newfoundland might just as well get used to it. Because that is what is coming. A new age is opening up, Mr. Speaker, no more under the table.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. SIMMS:

I was just going to call the hon. member's attention to the rule of relevancy, because obviously he is straying somewhat. But since he now wants to adjourn the debate, I will not even bother to raise it.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

If the hon. gentleman would carry out his job as assistant to the assistant to the House Leader on the other side and keep the likes of the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) half quiet -

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:

Just half quiet, that is all, Jimmy, just half quiet. We do not expect a mouth like that to be completely closed, just half quiet.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, look at him. Are you finished now? If you could just keep him half quiet, Mr. Speaker, then we could carry on this debate in a sensible fashion.

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:

That is it, Jimmy, act up again. Tell us a story. Come on.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

The hon. gentleman from Fogo may try every possible tactic he can to keep this member quiet on the topic of Mr. Clyde Wells, but I can assure the hon. gentleman it will not be a quiet topic in the next six months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, I would ask the hon. member to confine his comments to the particular bill that we are debating.

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

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Seeing it is now almost six o'clock I will adjourn the debate, but I shall return.

MR. SPEAKER:

The debate is adjourned by the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, before the adjournment motion, motion 8. It is a first reading, that is all. I should have done it earlier.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting the Return Of The Business Of Fishery Products International Limited To Private Investors." (Bill No. 34)

On motion, Bill No. 34 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I would just remind hon. members, although they are rather scarce, that, as hon. members are already aware, at seven-thirty this evening the estimates of the Department of the Environment, tomorrow, Wednesday, at 9:30 a.m. Forestry Resources and Lands, and at 11:00 a.m. Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. These are the departments which have

been once and are going back tomorrow. Then at seven-thirty tomorrow evening the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow at three o'clock.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m.