



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 17

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

UNEDITED

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Thursday

23 May 1985

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to inform the House that approval has been granted to the United Church Regional Council to operate a hostel in the city for people who are homeless. The hostel will accommodate ten to twelve individuals. It will have a full-time social worker so that not only will accommodations be provided, but also, counselling services, with a view to assisting the individuals to live more independently in the community and avail of the services provided by my department. I wish to express our appreciation to the United Church for their co-operation and effort in developing such a worthwhile service in partnership with the department.

In addition, my colleague responsible for Housing and his officials, are actively involved in the process of securing a facility that will serve as an emergency hostel for people who are homeless and experiencing difficulty in securing adequate accommodations. The facility will be operated by the Salvation Army and would accommodate forty to fifty individuals. We are very appreciative of the co-operation

and support we have received from the Salvation Army in the development of this facility. The Salvation Army has considerable expertise in the operation of such facilities, as a result of their experience throughout Canada. I anticipate that my colleague, the Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn) and I, will be in a position to make a joint announcement concerning this facility in the near future.

It has been decided that in view of the development of these two hostels, the department will defer participation in the residential rehabilitation of boarding homes in the city. The two hostels referred to earlier should be adequate to respond to the ongoing problem for individuals who are homeless in the city, for the reasonably near future.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, in the context of that Ministerial Statement I do not think there is much that can be said in a negative sense. We on this side welcome what the minister has announced today, and what he was supposed to announce yesterday but could not because of the furor. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the United Church and the Salvation Army are both interested in and plan to operate these homes is excellent, we believe. However, I am not sure that it is necessary for the minister to defer the plans that apparently his department already had for the residential rehabilitation of homes around the city.

The minister says that what the United Church and the Salvation Army plan to do will be good for the interim, for the short-term. We hope that the deferral that the minister is talking about will, of course, only be for a short time, and that adequate accommodations will continue to be provided, in addition to what the United Church and the Salvation Army plan to do.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today that approval has been granted for funding of various tourism-related projects valued in excess of \$525,000 under the new \$21 million Canada/Newfoundland Tourism Development Subsidiary Agreement. These projects will be covered under the two program elements of Marketing and Incentives as set out in the agreement and represent a considerable effort on behalf of both the federal and provincial government and the private sector to promote and further develop the lucrative tourism industry in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Under the Marketing Program of the agreement a total of \$377,000 will be provided for 12 projects. The overall objective of the Marketing Program is to co-ordinate marketing activities in the areas of research, promotion, communications and tour development. Marketing activities are directed to those areas with a high potential for Newfoundland and Labrador and will enable the Province to compete effectively by responding to changing market requirements.

These marketing initiatives represent a three-fold increase in

the amount of money spent on tourism advertising and promotion. Some of the major projects will include a co-operative effort between Eastern Provincial Airways and Conquest Tours to promote non-stop flights from Toronto to St. John's every Saturday until September which will call for \$150,000 to be funded equally by the provincial and federal government and EPA/Conquest at \$50,000 each. A co-operative effort in Atlantic Canada between CN Marine and Budget Rent-A-Car to provide low cost auto packages including ferry passage and accommodations valued at \$225,000 in total. And a further \$150,000 will be used to promote bus tours and charter services from the Northeast United States market to Newfoundland. Funds have also been set aside to develop package tours as well as newspaper and radio advertising campaigns in Newfoundland.

Under the Incentives Program of the agreement in excess of \$148,000 has been allocated for 13 projects. This funding is being provided in recognition of the need to improve the quality and range of the tourism product being offered by the private sector tourism operators in Newfoundland and Labrador, and the need to upgrade the services associated with that product. Some of the projects approved included a \$21,000 grant to Goose Bay Outfitters to assist in the upgrading of fishing camps in Labrador. In excess of \$10,000 to the Plum Point Motel for upgrading and some \$15,000 for upgrading at Mackinsons Lodge in Clarke's Beach, among many others. The majority of projects covered under this program will be geared towards the upgrading of existing tourism facilities including

motels, hospitality homes, fishing and hunting camps, and the upgrading of specific attractions.

I should also mention that these projects represent only the initial thrust of the Tourism Agreement. The projects also represent additional jobs created both in the construction phase and in the service sector. We fully expect an increased level of tourism activity and development based on the availability of funds under the agreement. And I will undoubtedly have further announcements of funding for tourism-related projects in the near future.

They still managed to do real damage to the economy. However, Mr. Speaker, let us see, as my friends on the other side have been suggesting, let us see the positive side in this, here are some good Liberal federal dollars to give a little shot in the arm to an economy that needs an awfully big shot in the arm.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, this is part of an ongoing policy that we have to keep the House informed of highroad construction and improvement projects. As you will recall on February 26 of this year, I announced early tendering of approximately \$11 million in highway improvement and construction projects. Early tendering has been a philosophy of my department for some years. The Province was near the end of its cost shared agreement with Ottawa and funds remaining were designated to complete ongoing projects with no funding in place

for new ones. Consequently, the provincial government allocated \$11 million to carry out the announced projects, and in the process, help stimulate the vulnerable construction industry. As in other years, Mr. Speaker, this early tendering process has worked very well.

In mid March, government announced that an extra \$13.7 million, under the Road and Bridge Rehabilitation Programme, would be tendered. Under this special programme started last year, government is ensuring that all existing paved roads and bridges in the Province are returned to standard condition. Over the next seven to eight years, we hope to have completed this process for all roads and bridges in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to further inform this hon. House today that my department is calling tenders for three major road construction projects in this Province totalling approximately \$7.6 million. Other tenders will follow in the days ahead. These three major projects, along with other road work to be tendered under the federal-provincial agreement this Summer, will result in capital expenditures of approximately \$15 million.

This construction work falls under the recently announced seven year, \$180 million agreement between the Province and the Government of Canada, which, as all hon. members realize, is the largest roads agreement ever between the two governments. This agreement confirms a major long term commitment on the part of both governments for improvements to the Trans-Canada Highway and continuation of construction of

the Trans-Labrador Highway between Wabush and Goose Bay. Although this agreement will not formally be signed for a number of days, our governments have agreed to proceed with tendering these projects to take full advantage of our relatively short construction season and to create employment opportunities in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to very briefly outline the three projects which will be tendered in the next few hours. There will be the recapping of the Trans-Canada Highway from Riverside Drive Intersection to the Corner Brook Stream for an approximate distance of 9.5 kilometers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:
Upgrading and paving of the Trans-Canada Highway from Bishop's Falls West Access to Grand Falls of a distance of approximately 9 kilometers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:
And the upgrading of the Trans-Canada Highway near Port Blandford from the junction of route 233 to the National Park boundary for a distance of approximately 6.4 kilometers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, thank you.

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, at last at last. This is what the people of Newfoundland have been waiting for because I believe, Sir, there was some question as to whether or not the Department of Transportation still existed in this Province anymore or not. We have been waiting for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to at least make some announcement. He is talking about the repaving. We all have to agree that a lot of our roads in this Province need to be repaved. But there are a lot of people in this Province today, Mr. Speaker, who have not yet had any paving, or any upgrading. I think of Great Harbour Deep, I think of Burgeo, I think of many places in this Province which now will probably never ever be paved.

The minister's statement is extremely presumptuous, Mr. Speaker. They are making plans for the next seven to eight years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, I am not going to ask for silence. I have the microphone. When other members are speaking I do not shout across. There was a time, Mr. Speaker, when I might have done that, but when I was a child I spake as a child and I thought as a child, but when -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:
- I became a man, I put away childish things.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see that the hide and seek days of the Department of Transportation are passed. The peek-a-boo campaign is over, and now we are beginning to see released, albeit, one measly little step at a time, the department is gradually beginning to release some of the things that they will do. And I am extremely pleased to do that.

I wonder though about the third announcement of this big roads agreement. First, it was a press announcement. When the minister was down from Ottawa-

AN HON. MEMBER:
A press conference.

MR. DECKER:
A press conference. Thank you.

Then it was announced by the Premier in this hon. House that this agreement was about to be signed. Now I learn that it still has not been formally signed, but no doubt in a matter of a few days, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be signed. I am longing -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:
- to hear the ministerial statement which says, it has now been signed. A fait accompli. It is done. When, Mr. Speaker? When will this agreement be signed? Someone is soon going to have to sign this thing, because all those contracts are being called, Mr. Speaker, and the agreement is still not signed. Well how much longer?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:

And again, Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of fair play, which was so gallantly expressed a few days ago, we have three projects announced, two I am told are in Tory districts and one is in a Liberal district, I believe. Am I right?

AN HON. MEMBER:
No, no.

MR. DECKER:
All three Tories.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Never, never!

MR. DECKER:
Guys, how can I be positive, if you do not give me a chance, if you are going to do all Tory districts.

A few days ago it was said in this House that the worst section of the Trans-Canada Highway is between Gander and Glenwood.

AN HON. MEMBER:
The Minister of Transportation, that is right.

MR. DECKER:
Is it being done on need, Mr. Speaker, or is it not? Of course, you have to say something positive and if someone can find something positive in this statement, then you can put me down as supporting it, Mr. Speaker. I will support everything that is positive. I find it extremely difficult to find something positive in this statement, Sir.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I would like to welcome a delegation from the town of Victoria, Carbonear with their Deputy Mayor, Fred Baldwin and councillors Harold Priddle and Ross Cole.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier why did they call a Royal Commission on Unemployment and nobody came? I would like to ask the Premier whether he feels that the credibility of his administration and of the royal commission has been enhanced by the meetings on the South Coast where nobody showed up for some of the meetings, others had to be terminated early, and rarely has been the instance where any of the 60,000 unemployed in this Province have come out?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a bit early to judge the effectiveness of the royal commission that has been established to look at employment and unemployment and various educational programmes presently in existence in the Province. I think it is a way too

early. I think the question will be more appropriately asked after the royal commission has had an opportunity to have public hearings all over the Province, then we will have a good assessment as to whether in fact the royal commission was an effective instrument to get people involved and how we could create more jobs or whether it is not. So I think it is a bit early, a bit premature to condemn the commission at this point in time.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

I would like to ask the Premier, since the Chairman of the Commission has stated publicly that many people are intimidated by the name Royal Commission, has he thought of calling it something else, like a waste of time and money?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not think that really deserves a substantive answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Well, then, Mr. Speaker, would the Premier indicate whether he feels that it is justified to spend the \$500 to \$750 a day to the five Commission members to have them tour the shipyard at Marystown because nobody showed up for their scheduled hearing the previous day?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is worthwhile for a Royal Commission charged with the responsibilities that this Royal Commission is, to survey and visit various employment opportunity developments around the Province like the Marystown Shipyard. I do not see anything wrong with that at all.

As it relates to the amount they are getting paid, I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) would know from his experience of getting paid on various things over the last couple of years, from the Labour Relations Board to other work that he has done, that the amount that is being paid to these various Commissioners, which varies, by the way, depending upon whether you are chairman or vice-chairman or a member of the Commission, that they are in line with the payment that is being paid to other inquiries and Royal Commissions, very much in line. And I am sure the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, as a member of the legal profession, will readily admit that from time to time when lawyers get work around this Province, that there is a certain fee charged by all of them for various work they do, which becomes a standard for everybody and, you know, they are getting paid in the same way.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, this is another question rather than a supplementary. The Premier is absolutely right, the \$750 a day would not come close to covering the legal fees that would be involved in a day's work, that is a function of either supply and demand or the quality of the service that is provided, I am not sure which. But, Mr. Speaker, what we have in the case of the Commission on Unemployment, of course, is a boycott by the unemployed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:
By those in demand.

MR. BARRY:
Yes, it is a boycott by the individuals who are supposed to be helped by this Royal Commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to co-operate with the Royal Commission on Unemployment -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Is there a question here, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BARRY:
I would think that a reasonable preamble is necessary. Mr. Speaker, I suspect it is because the unemployed in this Province see that the Premier is not approaching the creation of permanent jobs in any realistic fashion and that is why they are boycotting the Royal Commission on Unemployment.

I would like, with respect to the

creation of permanent jobs, to ask the Premier whether he has had an opportunity to consider the bids that have been put in by various companies to Petro Canada and whether the provincial government is going to take a position in favour of those bids that will see a reactivation of the Come By Chance refinery, the bids that will see permanent long-term jobs in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I note with a great deal of interest the way the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) gets up to ask another question. First of all, he says it is not a supplementary, so therefore, it has nothing to do with the previous subject matter, which was the Royal Commission, and then he goes ahead and comments at length on the Royal Commission again, and then he asks a question about bids in Come By Chance. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether the rules of the House are - in any case, just let me say, I also note with a great deal of interest the way he tried to respond to the comments that I made as it related to how much lawyers were getting paid in the Province. It is now all a question of supply and demand, it is all a question of quality. Is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) saying that Dr. Douglas House is not a very qualified Chairman of a Royal Commission in Newfoundland, that Dr. Linda Inkpen is not a qualified - I mean, the implication is there that the Leader of the Opposition is saying that in things that he has been involved in has been supply and demand and quality, and by implication that the people on

the Royal Commission are somehow not as well qualified as he is. Well, the people of Newfoundland knew how qualified the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was, because that is where they placed him after the last provincial election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The people of Newfoundland did not think that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was qualified to be Premier of this Province, Mr. Speaker. Talk about people coming out to the Royal Commission, quite a few people came out in the last election, Mr. Speaker, and spoke very loudly and clearly about the Leader of the Opposition and his party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, talking about employment it is really appropriate that the Leader of the Opposition should bring up the whole question about the Come By Chance refinery, the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment and this whole issue today because today two ministers stood in their place, in Ministerial Statements, one, the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) concerning incentives for the tourist industry to create permanent jobs in the Province and the other one by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) when he got in his place and announced three tenders being called as part of the \$181 million roads programme for the next seven years. Now, Mr. Speaker, to me, just in the last five or ten minutes, that is performance on what we are trying to do to create jobs in this Province.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, the Premier totally ignored my question with respect to the Come By Chance refinery and whether the Premier intends to support the three out of the five bids, the best bidder there that is likely to see the reactivation of the refinery as opposed to the two bidders that are proposing to dismantle the refinery. Would the Premier indicate is the government of this Province going to come down on the side of reactivation as opposed to dismantling? The Premier took the opportunity to refer to Dr. Douglas House, the Chairman of the Royal Commission on Unemployment. He is a great Newfoundlander, an excellent academic, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure he is a very good reviewer of books, I am not sure he is a very good reviewer of Newfoundland literature. I notice that he was high in his praise of the Premier's recent literary effort and I wonder if that had anything to do with his appointment, the fact that Dr. House was prepared to go on the back of the Premier's book and testify that it was great reading. Now, I have to confess that I have great respect for Dr. House in his particular field but literary criticism is not his forte, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
I wonder would the hon. the Leader

of the Opposition like to ask his supplementary?

The hon. the Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that invitation, Mr. Speaker.

My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is, is the Premier going to answer my first question, and, secondly, will the Premier take and accept responsibility for influencing Petro Canada in its approach to these bids with respect to the Come By Chance refinery? Will the Premier together with his good friends in Ottawa tell Petro Canada which of these bids are of most interest and of most benefit to this Province and will he come down on the side of reactivation of the Come By Chance refinery?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, like many, many other Newfoundlanders and Canadians, had to read my book he would know the answer to that question.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have recognized the hon. the member for Menihek but if he does not mind just waiting for a final supplementary, fine.

MR. FENWICK:

No, I am sorry I am not going to yield. He had five supplementaries already.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I know how easy it is, Mr. Speaker, for all involved in the House of Assembly to become wrapped up whenever the Opposition starts coming too close to the nerve of members opposite and starts getting into areas that are too sensitive, but, Mr. Speaker, there is, I think, an accepted procedure in the course of Question Period. I think it is normally accepted that a member does get a couple of supplementaries, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to have the opportunity and the benefit of completing my series of questions with respect to the Come By Chance refinery which is a matter of some significance to many Newfoundlanders.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has had an opportunity in this House in the last ten minutes or so to ask a number of questions and supplementaries, and then he started on a new series of questions. And, Mr. Speaker, we have the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) there who has been trying to get the eye of Your Honour for some time and who, no doubt, wishes to ask a few questions of the ministry, as well as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). The Leader of the Opposition cannot carry this House on his back. There are rules that have to be followed and I would refer the Leader of the Opposition to page 11 in the Standing Orders. Standing Order 31(b), "In the discretion of Mr. Speaker, a reasonable number of supplementary questions arising out of a minister's reply to an Oral Question may be asked by any members," so it is up to the discretion of the Speaker. The Speaker has by acknowledging the presence of the member for Menihek for a question, when he stood in his place, has therefore, in his discretion, indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that he has had enough supplementaries and that he wishes to hear from another member for a question.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. I have recognized the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). I have not intention, whatever, of trying to restrict any member. I asked the hon. member for Menihek, when I had recognized him, if he would yield. So the best I can do now is when the hon. member for Menihek has asked his question I would be more than pleased to recognize the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry).

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett). Over the last week or so we have heard the announcement of two new officers being appointed to his department, two industrial development officers, namely Joe Goudie and John McLennon. My question to the Minister of Development is, would he assure us that these are not just pork barrel appointments on the part of his government and that indeed there is work there for them and positions that they will be fulfilling and doing a useful job for the government?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the member was given the opportunity to ask such an important question. I think that it is very appropriate that this government has recognized the particular need to provide people of quality and of great understanding and sensitivity in areas of this Province which requires a great deal of special attention. This government has gone on record for quite some time that it has desired to put in place in Buchans and in the Labrador area people who have specific responsibilities and specific talents to advise government with respect to some of the concerns and problems that exist in those areas.

So I would like to acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of pleasure, that we have been able to enlist the services of such fine people to perform this task for us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Menihek

MR. FENWICK:

Quite frankly I have no doubt whatsoever that those two areas do need a considerable amount of attention but that is not really the direction that I would like to enquire on. I have just recently checked with the Public Service Commission and they assure me, at this point, there are no positions in those particular locations. So what I was trying to ask the minister was, was this an appointment as a port barrel appointment, which it certainly seems like, since there has been no clearly defined need for these people in either of those areas in accordance with the requirements that are usually put forward in order to do it? And the other part of the question I would like to ask, because I have not been able to get an answer from his department today, is that I understand it they are both classified as Industrial Development Officers and since there is a lot of variety in those particular positions, going from Industrial Development Officer 1 at \$19,000 to \$22,000 a year up to Industrial Development Officer 5 from \$40,000 to \$51,000 a year, I would like the minister to tell me, first of all, why nothing was put through the Public Service Commission in terms of a public advertisement for the job and a competition for it? And, secondly, would he give me some indication of how much the government is now forking over for what may or may not be necessary positions?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

*

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, it has never been the role or responsibility and I think we would be very concerned if this government allowed itself to be dictated by the Public Service Commission as to which jobs and which positions it should have to carry out its responsibilities.

It was not felt that these two specific positions should be filled in that particular perspective. What was felt was that these were two special needs that had a possible limited time frame in which the work necessary to perform these responsibilities could carry out. If one goes to the Public Service Commission it becomes a permanent position which must be carried on even though there might or might not be a necessity to carry on with the position in that particular region.

We had the sensitivity of two specific regions of the Province which we have a great deal of interest in, and a great deal of interest in trying to help and preserve and I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it was in that issue and that concerns that we had that we addressed this particular position and that we in fact created these positions on a contractual basis and therefore government had the options to either create permanent positions but it would be done at its discretion, not at the discretion of the Public Service Commission, and certainly not at the discretion of the member for Menihek.

With respect to the salary or the remuneration package responsible to these positions I will confirm

that it is between one and four but it is not either.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, now that the minister has confirmed that the Department of Development is now serving the same function in our system as the Senate is for the federal government, I would like to ask him if he has any plans now to set up additional positions in - well say the district of St. Barbe, perhaps a couple on the South Coast, in Fortune-Hermitage, and Burgeo, how about in Twillingate or Bonavista North, or in Gander or in Stephenville? In other words, Sir, can you assure us at this time that you are not continuing to pad the Civil Service with all kinds of defeated Tory candidates in the next little while?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I think it will be the decision of this department and this government as to what position it intends to fill in any sector of this Province in the future and if my department so wishes then the member will receive the information as he did on this particular appointment.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is for the Premier. It is on the same subject. Specifically and simply put, do these appointees have to do anything to receive their salaries? And I ask that having in mind, the Premier will know the case I am talking about, that there is another incident, another instance I ought to say, of a former Tory MHA who for an extended period of time, going into a number of years, received a stipend and did absolutely nothing for it. And that is not a matter of my opinion, that was the terms of reference of his appointment, that he was to do nothing. Now I ask the Premier, in all seriousness, -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who was it?

MR. SIMMONS:

No, the Premier know who I am talking about and I do not think, Mr. Speaker, it is needful - I can give the Premier the name privately, but I do not think it is needful to bring that person's name into play here now. The person is no longer on the payroll of the government to my understanding so I do not think it is fair to raise his name, but I am prepared to give it to the Premier privately. But I say to him since these two names are on the public record, and since the minister put them on the public record, do they in all seriousness, do they have to do anything to receive this stipend, do they have to do anything, and if so what is it they have to do and what are their credentials which entitle them to perform these functions?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in both cases that the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) brought up we had a request at a number of meetings over the last six months or so with the Buchans Action Committee, and a number of things arose out of that Buchans Action Committee. One was a request to ensure that either the hospital remained open or it got converted to a nursing home care institution. And we have implemented that recommendation from the Buchans Action Committee. They also indicated that they would like to move in the way of a development corporation and they had meetings with the Resource Policy Committee of Cabinet, and meetings with me, and they amended that recommendation because we had indicated to them that very often a development corporation does not seem to be the way to go, that we were in the process of regionalizing the Department of Development, and that we would be more inclined to approach the situation by giving the Buchans Action Committee for a period of time a development officer who could assist them in meeting with the various governments and so on.

In the case of Mr. McLennon, he has been appointed by the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) to be the Development Officer from the Department of Development to co-ordinate the activities of the Action Committee, the town council, and the other people in Buchans as they pursue, through the provincial government and through the federal government, the various programmes to assist Buchans in sustaining its life, and enhancing its life. I think Mr. McLennon, being a former businessman in the area, being a former member in the area who

helped that Action Committee a fair amount over the last three or four years, and who is familiar with government, is in an excellent position to assist the Action Committee. That is the position there.

As it relates to the Happy Valley - Goose Bay situation, when we started to regionalize the Department of Development we, first of all, after we established the new department, established an office in Corner Brook and in Gander, because the Gander Development Corporation was phased out from provincial involvement, anyway, and we also established an office in Labrador West.

Now, if you look at what is going to happen in Happy Valley - Goose Bay over the next while, and they had been upset that they did not get a regional office at that point in time, if you look at Mr. Goudie's credentials and his familiarity with Happy Valley - Goose Bay - North West River, the whole Lake Melville area, then I think one would have to conclude that he would provide a very valuable service there.

So they are development officers, one, community specific to Buchans, the other one area specific to Labrador East. That development officer is going to be reporting to a director, to an assistant deputy minister, who reports to the minister, to carry out and to assist all the local groups in the Lake Melville - Labrador East area, in bringing forward programmes and activities to create jobs and to do what all development officers do for the Department of Development. So both of them will have specific job classifications and reporting procedures to follow in the same

way as the existing development officers do, who are already employed by the department.

MR. SIMMONS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I thank the Premier for confirming that these two guys are supposed to do something. I construed from the sobriety of his answer that he knew all too well of the other case to which I alluded.

I want to go back to the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett), because, in fairness perhaps, the question is better put to him than the Premier, he perhaps having a more direct knowledge of the cases we are discussing.

Could the minister indicate to the House what particular credentials Mr. McLennon has for this particular job - a fair question - and whether, in particular, in light of what the Premier has said about the Buchans Action Committee's desires to have some assistance on this matter, is it not true that the Buchans group were not consulted on this appointment at all, it was dropped on them, they were informed that this was the man they were going to work with whether they liked it or lumped it, that in no way did they have an opportunity to have any say or give any input to the minister on the issue?

To the first part of my question, since I raised some heckles, the credentials question here, Mr. Speaker, is very important. I do not argue the fact that these guys

are Tories, that is a credential, given that the Tory government is in power. We are all used to patronage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

You can say that again.

MR. CALLAN:

Especially you with the student Summer jobs.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, a patronage system requires, in addition to having the right party label, that you have some other credentials of competence to do the job. And in view of Mr. McLennon's well-known business success, or lack thereof, we seriously ask the minister what in the name of goodness can he bring to this particular job other than fill a patronage appointment? Why does not the minister and the Premier come clean with the House and say they have just taken a page out of Governor Mulroney's book.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

He is giving a patronage appointment every three hours -

MR. W. CARTER:

Now you are hitting the dirt.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Every three hours he has given out a patronage appointment in Ottawa, since they have been appointed.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Premier, on a point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of questions on this subject. As I understand the Standing Orders, supplementaries have to be very brief, and have very little preamble, and the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) is going on on a supplementary. I recognize that he does know a lot about patronage, because his former leader in Ottawa, just before he got out, did a fair job on that, did he not?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I can understand, Mr. Speaker, the Premier said 'sensitivity'. Apparently, we are seeing a few dark stains on the underbelly of Mr. Clean. Now, what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not we have now a new era of patronage on which we are embarking, consistent with the approach taken by the Prime Minister? Or, Mr. Speaker, is there some special qualification that these gentlemen, who have recently been rejected by the electorate, have to bring to their positions? That was the member's question, and it is a question that the Premier should answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, there should be no need in a supplementary question to have a long preamble, and I was just about to draw the hon. member's attention to that fact. I would ask him if he could put his supplementary directly now.

MR. SIMMONS:

I would be glad to, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

My question to the Minister of Development is whether the overriding consideration here in making these appointments, where the credentials of the individuals involved are credentials in terms of the jobs at hand, or whether or not it is just not part of an unfolding patronage scheme, practiced at will in Ottawa - they have made a patronage appointment every three hours since they took office last September. Is this what we are seeing here, or can I invite the minister to get up and assure us that these appointments were made on their merits and, in particular, in lightness as to what their merits are insofar as Mr. McConnell is concerned?

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to acknowledge that the reason the appoints were made was to fulfil a specific need in the areas which we have addressed. I have already answered that question, I think, quite adequately.

With respect to the qualifications of the individuals concerned, I have absolutely no problem with them, and they are my responsibility, so I guess I will make them if I so choose. They are both contractual arrangements, as I have also

indicated to this House. They are not permanent positions. We feel it is a specific job to be done and, to the best of my ability, I have selected two individuals who I think can perform those jobs adequately.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I want to address my supplementary to the Premier because he is aware of the situation in Buchans as it unfolded over the years. Would the Premier confirm to this House of Assembly that the first request from the town of Buchans for an industrial relations officer came in 1976 through the Buchans Task Force report and that every year since 1976, the Buchans Action Committee have been requesting an industrial relations officer? Would the Premier confirm that that is a fact? And then, in confirming that, would he indicate why it is taking so long? Is it a fact that there was nobody around with the kinds of qualifications required until Mr. McLennon got defeated on April 2, 1985 in Buchans? Why, after ten years, did we have to wait for a defeated Tory to take that position?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, the recommendations from the Action Committee in the Council has changed over the years. It was an industrial relations officer, it was a development corporation. In the last year or two, the Action Committee was

moving towards - and put it in writing to me and to the various ministers - establishing a development corporation. That has been their most current request. We had long meetings with them over that and we had indicated to them, because of the new Department of Development, because we were trying to regionalize and because there are a lot of programmes now under the Department of Development, they would be better served by having a development officer attached to the Department of Development available to them on a day to day basis in Buchans over the next year or so to see what they can put together. So, to answer the hon. member's question, there have been various recommendations coming from Buchans and the Buchans Action Committee, some for an industrial relations officer, some recommendations for a development corporation, some for a development officer. They have not been consistent in the sense that it has always been the same thing. But they did, in the last several months, indicate their desire to have a development officer. I indicated to them in writing that we were prepared to provide a development officer to them and now we have kept our commitment to the Action Committee and the people of Buchans in providing them with a development officer whom they know, who has been in the area over the last three years and who has co-operated with them on many, many occasions.

MR. FLIGHT:

What was their reaction to the appointment?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Go ask them. The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans should know

that better than I. All I know is that we promised the people of Buchans and the Action Committee and the Town Council that we would provide them with a development officer to assist them in preparing briefs in seeing what could be done for the future of Buchans. That we have done. That we are very proud of, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

At this stage I would like to welcome to the galleries a group of students from the schools at South Brook and Little Bay/Green Bay, accompanied by their teachers and chaperons, principals Edward Pitts and Jim Starkes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Answers to Questions for which
Notice has been Given

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I have an answer to a question asked by the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W.

Carter), the question was; the number of vacant houses owned by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation in the St. John's area? And the St. John's Metropolitan area? The answer is; ten. The dates on which these houses have become vacant? They are listed in the answer, most of them September 1984, on six of them; seven -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:
The appraised value of these houses, the total appraised value of these houses \$173,900. The outstanding liabilities on each house? The answer is, none. And, Mr. Speaker, these houses which were bought by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation six of those houses will be used for infill, they have already been assessed and will be going to contract or tender on them. Two houses are not suitable for infilling, so they will be sold or torn down or whatever. There is one under consideration for refurbishing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table these answers for the benefit of the hon. members.

Petitions

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present essentially two petitions but I

think I will concentrate on one because I think it is the one that is more appropriate.

The prayer of the petition is, "We, the undersigned, fully support the endeavours of parents to have their children enrolled in French Immersion programmes. We urge you to take whatever action possible to ensure that this programme is available to all people who wish to avail of it and that arbitrary criteria for acceptance be eliminated through the process of accepting all children." I am not sure of the exact names or number of signatures but I am sure that they can be counted.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition I think I am in probably a unique position in the sense that of my six children, five of them have been enrolled in French Immersion programmes, the oldest for the last ten years now. And I am in an immediate position to be able to verify or testify - it sounds like a revival meeting - or, at least, to witness - that sounds even worse - to, at least, say something about how valuable I think those programmes are and why I feel that whatever kind of action can possibly be taken on behalf of these parents be taken right now.

One of the problems that I had was that two years prior to the French Immersion programme starting my oldest daughter started school and unfortunately has not been able to take advantage of the immersion programme. For those of you who are historically orientated, the first French Immersion programme in the Province, I believe, was established in Cape St. George at Notre Dame de Cape Central High School in the Port au Port

district in which I lived at the time. It was, in my opinion, a very fortunate occurrence primarily because we did have one of the largest concentrations of francophones in the Province at the time. Both my wife and I felt that it was probably one of the most fortunate things that could happen that we were able to get our children educated in French so that they would become functionally bilingual.

I would like to tell the House now that that has occurred, that they are functionally bilingual. They are at a point now where they have a considerable edge in seeking employment in something like 500,000 present federal positions within the civil service. I think that most parents, when they see the kind of advantages this programmes would bring, are very much concerned that they can give this kind of an advantage to their children.

I can also say to you that the experience that we have had with our children is that they have not suffered at all in terms of their English education. They have been able to keep their marks up in the English language courses that were introduced after the third or fourth year to the point that they have been able to function extremely well in both languages both written and spoken.

I am fortunate now to represent a district that probably has the second largest concentration of francophones and I am not entirely sure why this continues to occur to me. In Labrador West we have, I think, something in the neighbourhood of 800 francophones. These are essentially the pioneers of Labrador West, people who

originally came from Quebec and who still speak the French language to a large extent, and quite frankly, are every bit as much now loyal Newfoundlanders and Labradorians as anyone else in the Province. They themselves actually have a French high school up in Labrador West and I am looking forward, this Fall, to bringing one of my children up to Labrador West to enroll in the French high school because I feel that that would be a nice rounding off to his education prior to going to post-secondary education.

I would like to say that I endorse the petition which I think is an important one. I would like to urge the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), who I know has taken a lot of time dealing with this particular issue and I hope he responds to it, to -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. FENWICK:

I have three real signatures on the front. Do not worry.

I would hope that the Minister of Education could respond to the petition, and let us know what is being done now that we know that discrimination did occur there, in terms of meeting the real problem. There are a large number of children in the St. John's area, as I understand, whose parents are quite eager to have go into this programme. I think it is an important programme and I think we should be doing everything we possibly can in order to make it go.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

I would like to thank the hon. member for bringing the petition to the House of Assembly. I have discussed the problem with the parents concerned and with other representatives of the parent's group.

The issues mentioned in the prayer of the petition, the concerns mentioned, they are certainly well in hand. Since coming into the department we have met with all the various agencies involved. We realize the interest that is there in French Immersion, in fact, the programme has drawn significantly. We now have in St. John's a number of schools who are French Immersion classes, in fact, in St. John's alone in the RC Board, we have 436 students in French Immersion; in the Intergrated Board we have 376. That is a total of 812. We have twenty-seven classes in French Immersion and twenty-nine French Immersion teachers. So since the advent of the programme just a few short years ago it has grown in leaps and bounds, perhaps it has grown so fast that it is relatively hard for the boards to keep up with the demand in relation to space and teacher allocation, etc. especially when they have to apply for funding separately to start up new class.

Right now in St. John's we have twenty-three students who, at present, are not yet placed for September in the French Immersion classes. That problem is presently being addressed. We are receiving very, very positive feedback from the various agencies involved. And now that we have gotten all the groups together to

work on the problem instead of working in different directions, I think, perhaps, that positive solutions can be found.

So once again, as I said, I would like to thank the hon. member for bringing it to the House. I assure him and the people who signed the petition that we appreciate the concerns. We agree that French Immersion is very, very important as-- if French, generally, in our schools. I would like to add to that perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that not only are we looking at the French Immersion problem as it presently exists in relation to some people not being able to get in but we are addressing French in our schools generally by setting up a committee that will investigate the whole French input in the whole educational system so that we will end up, undoubtedly, with a beefed up core that will help other students, not only those in French Immersion.

So the situation, as I mentioned, is well in hand and all agencies involved are now working together to come up with, what we hope will be, a very positive and practical solution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of this petition. I am not satisfied with the position that we are hearing from the minister. I heard him on the

radio this morning and it would seem that from the minister's perspective all is well. Now I have to tell the minister all is not well. I have a petition that I will present in a minute which, I believe, is on a similar line to the one just presented.. I wonder if I could have a copy of that one that was just presented so I could see it, please.

AN HON. MEMBER:
It was a copy.

MR. BARRY:
It was a copy, I have a copy as well which I will deal with in a moment after this one. We have some original signatures on it to comply technically because people, when they prepare petitions, are not familiar with the technicalities of the House. I see some of the names are similar, I have some additional names.

Mr. Speaker, what the minister is going to have to tell this Province is he satisfied with the fact that apparently members of the public, parents of students, were given reasons by school boards that were not accurate as to why their children could not be admitted in the French Immersion courses. Perhaps he can do it on my petition seeing that he has slip slided that question on the petition of the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). Is the minister satisfied or is it not a fact that there should be an investigation of what has gone on where parents are saying they were given reasons of overcrowding, they were given reasons of being in the wrong area, they were given every reason. But what has apparently been now established as the correct or actual reason namely that the child was either not of a recognized or professed

denomination, had not taken a position with respect to what denomination it was adopting or, Mr. Speaker, because it was of a different denomination. Now I do not think it took any great legal knowledge, Mr. Speaker, to establish that for a school board to say that it was going to discriminate against pupils on the denomination of the pupil when it came to whether or not there was going to be room for that pupil who was going to be in the classes of that school board system that they were going to decide on the basis of religion as to whether or not that pupil was going to have the advantage of a French Immersion course. There is something rotten, Mr. Speaker, there is something smelling in that type of situation to develop. And the minister is going to have to stand up in this House and tell members of this House what he intends to do about that. Is that sort of thing happening in other areas of our school system today? We now have an example of one privilege which is being denied, children, in our schools, on the basis of denomination. Is that same sort of thing happening in other areas?

Now, also, Mr. Speaker, the minister is going to have to inform this House whether he is prepared to support the provision of additional classrooms, additional teaching facilities for the apparent excess numbers of students who want to go into French Emersion classes. Also, Mr. Speaker, the minister should indicate whether in fact he sees any problem with respect to what appears to be a shift from the English classroom to the French Emersion classroom and what is the impact of this on the teachers that we have in the Province

because I understand there are school systems - and the member for Menihok, I think, has probably the most obvious situation in Labrador City and Wabush but it is occurring in other parts of the Province as well - that because we have so many people seeking to get into French Emersion classes we are having teachers who are Anglophone, English speaking teachers, becoming redundant. They are becoming redundant, Mr. Speaker, because they do not have the qualifications and the training to teach in the French Emersion course. So we have a problem right now in terms of the qualification of teachers which the minister is going to have to deal with. All of this stems from the same issue and I have never heard such a wishy-washy response in all my life to a petition of such an ignoring of these basic issues and the minister is going to have to do better than that before his estimates are passed in this House.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition signed by twenty-eight residents of Durrell. The prayer of the petition is as follows: 'We, the undersigned, petition the provincial government for the installation of water and sewer on Farmers Arm Road. In addition to already committed funding for 1985 we request that additional funding be allocated so as such services can be installed to the end of that road.'

Mr. Speaker, this problem is common in the district of Twillingate. A great many communities in the district do not have water and sewer services and of course, Durrell, which is one of the largest communities in the district, or at least a community that is making a very substantial contribution to the economy of the area and indeed to Newfoundland, is without adequate water and sewer facilities. In fact, Mr. Speaker, Durrell accounts for the landing of approximately 4 million pounds of fish a year and that fish is sold to the Twillingate fish plant. Four million pounds of fish would account for a half a million dollars a year being paid to people in direct wages not to mention the benefits that accrue to the fishermen that serve on that boat. Mr. Speaker, I make that point because I think it is important that a community like Durrell, like other places in the Twillingate district, and, in fact, I suppose all over Newfoundland, that are making a very worthwhile contribution to the social and economic life of the Province it is rather sad that these communities should be without what is looked upon by most people in this century, this day and age, as being an essential service.

I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the government give some very serious consideration.

There is an added feature, Mr. Speaker, to this petition in that the road in question is one that leads to and passes the Marine Service Center in Durrell. It is rather strange that a facility built by the federal government with some provincial funding would be built there at a cost, I

suppose, of \$3 million or \$4 million without putting in water and sewer facilities. I am told that the only source of water now in the Marine Service Center is salt water. That is not adequate as we all know. So what the people are asking, Mr. Speaker, is that if and when an agreement is made between the federal and provincial governments to install water and sewer facilities to the Marine Service Center, as indeed it will, I hope, as indeed it should be, then they are asking that the houses on that road where the water and sewer will go be connected up. They are not asking too much, Mr. Speaker, in light of the situation and inconvenience, indeed the hazards, to the health and safety of those people.

I request that this petition, Mr. Speaker, be tabled and passed on to the department to which it relates.

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, I rise to have a word or two about this petition that was presented by the hon. member. I guess we can all, Mr. Speaker, easily identify with the request that is being made by the twenty-eight residents of Farmers Arm with respect to water and sewer services because as the hon. gentleman is probably already aware each year we have quite a number of requests that come in from various communities all around the Province looking for water and sewer services. I do not imagine anybody, Mr. Speaker, would disagree that there is quite

an amount of money needed to address all the requests that we get on an annual basis in my department for water and sewer services and also for road paving projects.

Now to give the hon. member some indication of the number of requests that we do get on an annual basis for this type of service, this year alone and last year my department received requests in the neighbourhood of \$160 million for water and sewer services and road improvements as well. As the hon. member is also probably aware last year we had a capital programme of \$25 million to \$30 million to try to address these requests. So that should give them some indication of the problems that we do have in trying to address every single request that we get from municipalities around the Province for water and sewer services. However, Mr. Speaker, we will take this petition and I will have a look at it, pass it on to my officials to see if anything can be done in this regard. I do not know if these people have an application in this year for water and sewer services but in any event we have not dealt with our capital programme for this year, Mr. Speaker, and I will certainly have a look at the request and see what can be done.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of the petition so ably presented by my colleague for the district of Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter). Mr. Speaker, as I have

said in the past in this House of Assembly when anybody presents a petition in this House pertaining to roads, road improvements, pavement and also in connection with the need for water and sewer projects I am tempted on each occasion, Mr. Speaker, to stand and support the petitioners because, Mr. Speaker - now I do not always do it, I am always tempted, sometimes I get a chance to stand and support it - Mr. Speaker, I find it very easy to be able to stand in support of these types of petitions because, Mr. Speaker, over the years, it is over the last ten years now, eight when I had the opportunity to stand in this Legislature personally, the hon. Don Jamieson, brother of Bas, represented the district of Bellevue for a year and a half, then, of course, there was six months before a by-election was called.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, the former Minister of Justice, I am not sure what his portfolio is now, but he is also attempting to interrupt me.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:
But what I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition that I know, I am surprised actually after the district of Twillingate has been represented by the former member, the lady, it was started.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:
It is rocky.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are towns and communities in the district of

Bellevue which do not have that problem. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) knows full well that the town where I live, the town in which I live, where I was born and raised.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Whitbourne.

MR. CALLAN:
No, the Premier was born in Whitbourne, and raised in a beer tavern out there, and that accounts for his actions on certain days. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I was born in the town of Long Cove, I now live in Norman's Cove, and there is a municipal government there which is called The Town Council of Norman's Cove/Long Cove. These two towns together make up one municipality is second only to Clarendville, in Trinity Bay, in size. In size, I am talking about the population figures, 1,300. Mr. Speaker, there has not been one cent spent in that town for -

AN HON. MEMBER:
There is money being spent for water.

MR. CALLAN:
There is money being spent for water, yes, because they have been able to get Canada Works programmes to drill several artesian wells.

But, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) is listening. He is talking to one of his colleagues, but I am sure he is listening. It was only a week or two ago that the town council from that municipality came in and met with the minister.

MR. DOYLE:
(Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:

The minister does not have to question whether or not there is an application in from that municipality. He knows that there is one in this year, it was sent in last Fall, it should be, and it was sent in the Fall before that and the Fall before that. Actually, Mr. Speaker, water and sewer, phase one, was approved for the municipality of Norman's Cove/Long Cove back in 1975. It was approved in the Spring of 1975 before I became a member. And some members likes the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) will remember that we had an election on September 16, 1975, and following that election then we had a mini-budget, it was then that the mayor and the councillors, the municipality of Norman's Cove/Long Cove were told, we are sorry, but the water and sewer that was approved in the Spring -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:

That is right. It is now being cancelled.

Ten years ago, Mr. Speaker, it was approved-

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:

No, the member in 1975 was the hon. member who now represents the district of Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid).

MR. SIMMONS:

Hear. hear!

MR. CALLAN:

It was before redistribution, you see.

MR. SIMMONS:

A good man.

MR. CALLAN:

The first election that was held after redistribution was September 16, 1975.

MR. SIMMONS:

Now I hope you are going to come (inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:

Now the member who now represents Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid) was the member then.

A lot of strange things happened during that year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Tell us about (inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:

I am not going to talk about Joe Smallwood or the savoury patch or landslide Simms in Grand Falls, I want to talk about water and sewer, and I know, and the minister will concur, Mr. Speaker, that in a place like Durrell, a place like Twillingate where phase one has been started, then it should be automatic that they get phase two and three in subsequent years. And I want to say to the minister that I hope that this year that the minister will not be like the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) who is blatant in his pork-barrelling and the way he distributes taxpayers money -

MR. SIMMONS:

The way he admitted today.

MR. CALLAN:

- out of his Department of Transportation. I hope that the

Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) who should drop in and see Mrs. Legrow more often, but I hope whether he does that or not, he will make some funds available this year for phase one of the water and sewer in Norman's Cove and, of course, whatever phase it happens to be in Twillingate, if it is phase two or three. I hope that comes -

MR. DOYLE:
(Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:
The minister is on record, the minister knows that there are no more than three towns, municipalities in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, there are no more than three larger than Norman's Cove who do not have at least phase one or some phase of water and sewer. Norman's Cove has not any at all.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Which one do you want?

MR. CALLAN:
I want out of the minister's chunk of money this year-

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:
- I hope that he makes some funds available to the good people in Twillingate, very intelligent, they voted for this gentleman, and, of course, also -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:
- the good people in the municipality of Norman's Cove/Long

Cove. I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I support the petition.

Orders of the Day

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Oh, I beg your pardon.

The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage, on a point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS:
I refer to the proceeding of the Privileges and Elections Committee of this Chamber. I was slated to have been a member of that Committee but because of a domestic circumstance I was not here, so my very able colleague for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is the member in my place. I was somewhat relieved in the knowledge that I would still have full access to the Committee except in terms of voting. And I have attended, I dropped in to the Colonial Building the last couple of nights, and, Mr. Speaker, in case you have not been there, it is really worth your while to go, if you like charades, circuses, and insults to the people who sent us here. It is an absolute galling charade what is going on there, to see a member of this Chamber elected by the people of Bonavista South, in this particular case, to come here and represent their best interest, have to write his notes on paper and have another member ask them for him, and have them corrected and being sent back to him and told the spelling is not right, or could he rewrite and could he be more eligible and that kind of nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, we are told in related matters that were raised in the last day or so in this Chamber, we are told that somehow all that is happening down there is technically correct. The history books are chocked full of autocrats who were technically correct in their pursuit of muzzling people's rights, of shutting people up.

So I am not concerned, Mr. Speaker, one iota of whether what is happening down there is technically correct. In realistic terms it is absolute abominable, and we are less than men and women, if we allow it to go on one more second down there. It has to stop. Not only my rights, but the rights of the people who sent you here, Mr. Speaker, and who sent me here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Now I do not particularly blame the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), I pity him a little bit. But let us understand, Mr. Speaker, he is just the water boy, the carrier pigeon in all of this. He is just carrying a message. He is carrying an instruction to that Committee. The government set out-

MR. J. CARTER:
Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes, I will in a moment, I am on a point of privilege.

The government set out to frustrate the efforts of this investigation from the beginning, and they are having a lot of success because we are sitting on

our rights over here and over there. We are sitting on our rights. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan issue. This is an issue that affects the rights of every person in this Chamber and the rights of every person who voted in the last Provincial election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Now, Mr. Speaker, let us call off that charade down at the Colonial Building, let us instruct the Committee that we intended is not happening, what we intended in the House is not happening, but the government intended it is happening down there. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us call off the charade, call it off. I hope in the process in saying this I do not in any way obstruct the opportunity of the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) to have his case properly aired, that is not my intention, I say to him, that it is not my intention. But we have to find another vehicle or we have to see that this vehicle is on course. It is not on course now, because she is being frustrated by what is justified under the term 'technically correct'. Mr. Speaker, it would be technically correct for us to say to everybody in those galleries now, 'Get out!' Because Standing Order 12 says that all I have to do is say, 'Mr. Speaker, I recognize some strangers,' and, according to the rules, you are supposed to order them to withdraw. But surely, Mr. Speaker, that is put there for some extraordinary purpose. And I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the provision that a Committee may prevent members other than Committee members from

participating in the Committee, that Standing Order is put there for use in extraordinary times. So, my question to the Acting Government House Leader is this: What is particularly extraordinary about this? The Committee, itself, Mr. Speaker, is provided for in House rules, not as a Select Committee that just came out of nowhere because of the allegation or the submission of the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). It is a Standing Committee, and for very good reason. Because we recognize that from time to time, we will require such a Committee to adjudicate various grievances that come before this House. So there is nothing extraordinary about the Committee. There may be something extraordinary in that a member's or a former minister's files are being shredded under particular circumstances, but I do not want to get into the merits of the case. What I want to put to you, Mr. Speaker, is that my privileges, as a member of this House, and therefore, and more importantly, the privileges of every person who sent me here and every voter who sent you here, Sir, and every voter who sent the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) and every other member of this House, our privileges are being breached, breached absolutely and without question. And the only way to undo that - there are one or two options, call off that Committee, because it is an absolute charade, it is making us all look an absolute laughingstock, call off the Committee altogether, or get it back on track and allow it to conduct itself as every other Committee of this House has conducted itself. There is no precedent anywhere, Mr. Speaker, not in Ottawa, not here in St.

John's, not in Westminster. There is no precedent whatsoever for what the government majority foisted on that Committee in terms of procedure, no precedent for it whatsoever, and the only explanation I can find for it is that the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) has been, in this case, a very able carrier pigeon. He has carried the message well to that Committee, he has done his job. It is a despicable job he has done, a despicable job, and we are party to it if we allow it to go on, Mr. Speaker. So I appeal to you, Sir, to allow us - I am prepared to put down the motion - to instruct the Committee to get back on track and to conduct itself as every other Committee in this House conducts itself, i.e., allowing members to participate, except in terms of voting, and as every other Committee in the British parliamentary system, whether in Australia or New Zealand or Westminster or Ottawa or Edmonton or anywhere else is operating. This is an absolute travesty and it should not be allowed to go on another second.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of privilege, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of points here to be considered. First of all is that I trust that the hon. member is able to read. And if he is able to read, he should re-read Section 86 (b). Your Honour, I believe this was

handled adequately yesterday in Your Honour's decision, to allow Section 86 (b) to stand. There is no requirement for this Committee, I would add, to hold its hearings in public, yet, because of the public nature of the point of privilege and the amount of publicity that it received, the Committee felt that the interests of the House and of the people named and of the member claiming privilege would be better served if the hearings were to be held in public.

It was further decided by this Committee to restrict it to members only, largely in order that the deliberations could be concluded in this present century, and I say that with full knowledge of what I am saying, that this could become an endless procedural wrangle that I do not think anybody wants. There are civil servants who have been named in this point of privilege and I think that their interests should be looked at, and I think that the matter of privilege should be handled as expeditiously as possible. I think that the stand that we took was a reasonable one, a considered one. The proper procedure was followed, it was voted on in Committee and it was minuted, and I believe, Your Honour, the appropriate sources have been quoted. Also, Your Honour, having been decided by Your Honour, I do not feel that it should be able to be raised again. However, that is a matter for someone else to decide.

MR. SIMMONS:

Would the member say what he quoted, Standing Order 86 (b)?

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of personal privilege, I would like to add a few comments to it and I agree, of course, with the remarks of my colleague from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons).

I had occasion last night to visit the old Colonial Building and to take in the session that was taking place there. I must say, Mr. Speaker, it was almost embarrassing, Sir, to see the way that that hearing was conducted. And I am not casting any reflections on the Chairman of the Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the whole scenario, Sir, was wrong, notes being carried back and forth between the former minister and the Chairman, notes being sent back to be clarified, to be rewritten, and it it was not so serious, Mr. Speaker, it would be laughable.

MR. SIMMONS:

It was laughable.

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, it was laughable.

I agree, Mr. Speaker, that that is a Standing Committee, and while the Committee might have been right in deciding that members would not be allowed to question witnesses, certainly, there are no special circumstances that would warrant that kind of action. I have had the privilege of serving on a number of Standing Committees as a member of Parliament in Ottawa in the Opposition, where we travelled to almost every major city in Canada conducting meetings and hearings on certain issues.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you now that never in my experience was that kind of a situation allowed to prevail. At all of the Standing Committee meetings, naturally there are just so many members appointed, made up from government members and from Opposition members, but certainly, other members were entitled to attend and, in turn, ask questions. Now, they were not allowed to vote, they could not form part of a quorum. They had to stand in line, as it were, and wait to get their questions on, they could not just jump in ahead of a properly appointed member of that Committee, but certainly, they were allowed to question the various witnesses that came before these Committees.

It is a very serious matter, Mr. Speaker, that is being considered by that Committee. Certain allegations have been made, allegations that, in some cases, reflect on certain people, and I believe it would be in the best interests of all concerned if members who care to attend those sessions would be permitted to question the witnesses. As a former minister of that department, knowing something about the structure of the department and the way files are handled and stored, I believe I could have made a worthwhile contribution last night to that meeting. But I was muzzled. I could not, in fact, I dare not ask a question. That is why I would support the comments of my colleague and request that the House Leader - or whatever has to be done to broaden the hearings and to enable others other than the appointed members to question witnesses as they appear.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I would like to rule on that matter now.

We had a full discussion on this matter yesterday and I ruled that there was no prima facie case, because we are going strictly according to our Standing Orders, and they are there in the one that was quoted by the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). I will quote again, which I did yesterday: "Procedural difficulties which arise in committees ought to be settled in the committee and not in the House". That is from Beauchesne, Paragraph 608, Page 196. As far as I am concerned, my hands, as I said yesterday, are tied. These are the Standing Orders of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Committee is master of its own rules and there is no prima facie case.

MR. MORGAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with your ruling and having interpreted clearly yesterday as well on your ruling, but my point of order is this that the rules of the Committee are changing and I think my colleague, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) will understand what I am saying, the rules changed

from yesterday in the House when we agreed I could not as a member ask questions of any witness. In the middle of last evening's proceedings I received a note from the Chairman saying I could then, or now, ask questions but I had to write them out, deliver the questions to the Chairman, and he would ask the questions for me. Now that is a different ruling from what we understood in the House yesterday afternoon. Yesterday afternoon the decision was, I understood Mr. Speaker, that the Committee had made a ruling, I disagreed with the ruling so did other members of the House, that no member could ask questions but now last evening that rule is changed. Mr. Speaker, the point of order I am making, if I can ask questions by writing them out and giving them to somebody else to ask why can I not ask them directly myself by sitting in on that Committee as a member of the House?

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, while it is true that as the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) says that yesterday evening you did rule on this point of privilege, the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) is perfectly correct in that he feels that his privileges have been breached and it is up to the government to stop that kind of nonsense that went on down there last night. I concur, Mr. Speaker, with the member for Bonavista South, that it was nonsense. As a matter of fact as a member of the Committee at one point I had to ask if I could be

recognized to get ahead of him. It is confusing to see a page running back and forth between a member of this House, a member accused, a member making accusations or whatever the case might be, running back and forth with questions to be put through another party. That is absolutely wrong. If there has to be some method worked out in this House with the Government House Leader, with the government side, whereby there has to be certain controls put on the Committee well let us do it in this House so that members of this House feel that their privileges are not being breached, so that they feel they have the freedom to ask questions because they have been elected by a certain number of people.

So while the member for Fortune-Hermitage is probably right when he stands and says, "technically everything is above board," you have to ask yourself the question, why is that charade going on down there? Why is it that we have to see members, and I suppose the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) if he had so chose to lower himself to that extent, could have put a question on paper to the Chairman and then perhaps would have been told that he could not read his writing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is just not good enough. And I call upon the government side of this House, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) or whoever happens to be acting for the Government House Leader, or the Premier, to come in here and straighten this matter out, let us get it straight so that members of this House can ask appropriate questions.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the point of order that the member for Bonavista South has just raised, the substance of it puts the lie to what the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) said less than five minutes ago. Remember that he rested his whole case for his decision to exclude members of this House, others than members, he rested the entire case on two items, one, that he could get away with it under the rules; and two, that it was expeditious. That was his term.

Now I ask him, Mr. Speaker, through you, how can you construe that it is more expeditious to have the member for Bonavista South sit down and craft his question and have it come through the mouth and the lips of the member for St. John's North, or have the member for Bonavista South ask it himself. Does he talk faster than the member for Bonavista South, is that what he is saying?

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, that is what I meant in using the term charade. It is an absolute charade. There is nothing expeditious about this. Expeditiousness had nothing to do with this. Muzzling is what was behind the whole thing. Refusing members of this House the opportunity to get to the root of the matter, that is what is behind it. They have a carefully managed Committee, they get a government majority that rams it through, that is what it is all about. Let

us call spades spades. That is what is going on let us get rid of this Committee, it does not deserve to be called a committee of this House.

The member for Bonavista South in his point of order makes a valid point because it has nothing to do with expeditiousness, if that is a term, expeditiousness.

MR. CALLAN:

Expediency.

MR. SIMMONS:

Expediency, my teacher friend from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) helps me, because it takes the same time whether he reads the question or the gentleman from St. John's North reads the question. So let us call off the charade and if he uses that term again we will have to get up on another point of order, if he uses that excuse again, and accuse him of misleading the House. Because it has nothing to do with expediency. That is not why he is doing what he is doing at all. He is doing it because he is under orders to do it, because he is a carrier pigeon for the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a perversion of the rules of this House. It is a perversion of that Committee process, that Standing Committee was put there for a good purpose, not to be frustrated by a government majority, but to allow members on whatever side of the House they sit, as an independent, a budding independent, Tory, aspiring Liberal, a Liberal, whatever. Every member of this House has got to be assured, and the people who sent us here have to be assured that there is an impartial court of last resort, the Privileges and Election Committee, that we can put our

grievances before.

DR. COLLINS:
(Inaudible) rules.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to know the rules so skillfully as those who pervert the rules. I do not claim to know them that skillfully, but I see a perversion of the rules here, Mr. Speaker. I see my rights being breached. And I understand this matter was dealt with yesterday but one of the rights we still have in this House, until the government moves in on us with their majority, one of the rights we still have is that each single one of us in turn can get up on exactly the same point of privilege. Because I did not get up on the matter of whether the Bonavista South member's privileges were breached, I got up on my rights being breached. And when the Speaker has ruled on that, my friend from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) can get up and make the same point. Mr. Speaker may well have the same ruling, of course, but Mr. Speaker, if we have to stay here until Doomsday, if we have to stay here this thing is going to be cleared up one way or the other. We are not going to continue to be a party to that circus down there, that charade, that insult, that absolute insult that is going on down there now. The structure of the Committee is a good thing. It has been perverted by government clout, by a majority that went there with instruction to frustrate the will of that Committee to see they do not get to the bottom of things, "Do not let too much air in boys. Do not let too much light in boys. Do not let too many members in asking questions because the truth might come out, the truth could just

come out."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you cannot - and when I say cannot I do not mean lack of ability but lack of authority in terms of the rules which you are constrained by, and I appreciate that, if you cannot, Sir, because the Committee is the master of its own rules, if your hands are tied as you said in some other words a moment ago, perhaps we could just get for thirty seconds a little informal, let me appeal to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs who I assume at the moment is the Acting Government House Leader, is that correct? Yes. Let me appeal to the Acting Government House Leader, and say, "Look, in view of the dialogue, the concerns that he has heard in the last twenty-four hours in this Chamber, in view of the perception that is being conveyed out there, and you heard my very esteemed colleague for Twillingate (W. Carter) who draws a lot of experience in Ottawa and here on committees in opposition and governmental experience. In view of the concerns that have been expressed, in view of the perceptions that are going out over the public airways about this process, I am sure the government, whatever its motives, however honourable its motives, I am sure it never intended that it would be portrayed as this kind of a circus. And I submit it has become a frivolous set of events down there. And so let us find the mechanism to instruct the committee, a motion, it does not matter what the mechanism I am sure we can find it in the book. I guess the appropriate one would be a motion.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS:

Or the leave of the House itself. All I am saying to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) is listen to what the concerns have been, have a second thought in terms of the perceptions that we are conveying to the public. The old cliché about justice not only being done but seeming to be done is pertinent here. And at the moment this Committee is not serving the purpose that is intended under the Standing Orders. And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, it is not serving that purpose because of the action of the government majority in excluding people who are not members of that Committee. Now, that is the crux of the issue. We can stand on technicality, we can brazen it through, or we can do the sensible thing and say, 'Fellows let us get this back on track.' And it seems to me that would be the appropriate course.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, briefly on this. The first point I want to make is obviously not central to the issue but I do want to make it. The hon. members refer to majority, the government has a majority on the Committee and therefore things can be perverted or just not done because of the majority, and, of course, the government has a majority. No matter who forms the government they have a majority in the House. I mean things work by majority. Every hon. member opposite got in because he either got a majority or if he did not get a majority he got the largest plurality in a three-way fight, so there is nothing so wrong about

majorities. Hon gentlemen opposite all wanted their majority, so this word majority is as if it were something unparliamentary in itself. However, on the substantive matters, Mr. Speaker, this matter, whether it comes up as a point of privilege or a point of order, whether it comes up from whatever member it comes, is the same point which has been ruled on more than once. And it is not accurate to say that when a ruling has been made with respect to one member you can then go through all the other fifty-one members and make the same ruling fifty-two times. That is not accurate at all. Once a matter is decided then it is decided. It is what is called (inaudible). This matter has been decided, has been decided as a point of privilege, has been decided as a point of order, and when the Speaker rules on it again that does not mean that everybody who has not gotten up to originate that point can then do so. That would be totally ridiculous. So the matter has been ruled on.

There is only one other point I wish to make and that is, I think, hon. gentlemen probably view this Committee totally out of context. You would not know but it were the last judgement or the trails of Nuremberg. I mean with all due respect to the Chairman and the people involved, the members who are on it, those who are testifying before it, those who are going down there and those who are subpoenaed. I understand the Chairman even offered to subpoena the CBC if they wanted to come. In due respect to everybody what does this Committee do? It enquires into and reports upon. And what does it do? It reports to the House and it reports to the House by way of a motion. That is

a debatable motion and every hon. member can get up and agree or disagree or make whatever points he wants to germane to it. So it comes back to this House when it is completed in the form of a report which is made available to the House by a debatable motion. And if hon. members then feel that the Committee did it improperly, its findings are wrong, its methodology was wrong, or whatever, that is the time that the House deals with it, when it comes back into the Legislature by means of a motion which is a debatable motion.

So all I say is that this matter has been ruled upon, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that it would be appropriate, parliamentary practice not to allow the same matter to keep coming up time, after time, again, under a different guise or just because the same matter comes up by a different member.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, one further point should be made. I have no objection to a procedural wrangle. It perhaps can be upsetting but it does not bother me at all. It is where the procedural wrangle takes place. If the procedural wrangle takes place in this House of Assembly that is one thing but it is cruel and unusual to have a procedural wrangle take place at the meeting of a Committee where there are civil servants, people who do not have the same right of reply and of recourse as the rest of us members in this House. And, as Chairman, I think it would be utterly irresponsible for me to

allow the kind of procedural wrangle that I am sure would take place if I had not insisted upon 86 of Section (b). And the more members jump up and down and talk about their rights being trampled the more I am glad that I spotted this particular rule and was able to have it passed. I think that as a Committee we are doing the right thing and every time the members opposite jump up and down it is just a shadow of the kind of things they would like to do down in Committee, and I am very glad they cannot do them.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in discussing the point of order I indicated that I really resent whether or not we should permit people to cross-examine. When you think of cross-examine you think of frightening people, who cannot protect themselves, literally to death. I am not talking about that, Mr. Speaker, that can be worked out.. What I resented was the right of members of the House of Assembly being denied their right to question a Standing Committee, to take part in a Standing Committee. The Chairman of that Committee, if he wishes to restrict any member of this House to one or two questions, he can do that as the Chairman. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. acting House Leader contradicted his own argument in a sense when he said, well who is this Committee, they are not the last word. Well they must be awfully important because they are important enough, Mr. Speaker, for this House and the government to refuse to allow members to appear before them, the first time, ever, in a Standing

Committee it happened since this Legislature was established. So, Mr. Speaker, if the Committee is so insignificant and so unimportant, in a sense, why is it that we take this drastic measure of denying the rights of members of this House of Assembly? And I want, also, Mr. Speaker, to set the record straight in as far as this member is concerned, and I am sure I also speak for my colleague for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), Mr. Speaker. The Committee made this decision. Well, let me tell this House of Assembly and the media and the general public that this member was not part of that decision. He was a part of the decision but he voted against denying members of this House the right to appear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

And that also applies also to the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), Mr. Speaker. It is a charade. We are making fools of ourselves. The hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) piped across the House that this House is the last resort. Well, of course it is and this is the second day we have come back to the last resort. We have come to this House of Assembly, through you, Mr. Speaker, we have come to this House of Assembly and asked to stop this charade, to stop this foolishness. The House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, has been held up to ridicule in this Province. Not necessarily individual members but the whole House of Assembly is being held up to ridicule and members opposite will have to answer to their constituents.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

I allowed the hon. the member for

Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) and the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) to speak at length, but this whole matter was discussed at length yesterday and I ruled at that time that there was no prima facie case.

Now, my job is to see that the Standing Orders are carried out. I have read the Standing Orders and the Standing Orders are perfectly clear. This Committee was formed by this House and the procedure in that Committee is determined by that Committee itself. So there is no point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of privilege, and it relates but it is not near the one I raised a moment ago, it arises out of the comments that were just made by the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). When he says, Mr. Speaker, that part of the fount of wisdom he drew on in allowing that motion to go through the Committee was that he foresaw that it would be cruel and unusual punishment, or something, he is misleading the House. Because all of us know - he is not misleading because we know better, but he is trying to mislead - that the rules of committee can and were established, I presume, in camera, certainly before the witnesses were called. So this nonsense about there being a procedural wrangle, had there been a procedural wrangle, it would have been put to bed before the witnesses were called. That is

point number one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my real point of privilege is this: He has just insulted every member of this House. Because what he said, in effect, is that he could not trust us to go down there and ask questions. The people of this Province trust us to come here and ask questions and make speeches and make representations on their behalf, but he, in his wisdom, could not let us loose down there, Mr. Speaker. Afraid we would ask the wrong questions. What an insult! I believe, Mr. Speaker, you should ask that member to withdraw that insult to every single member of this House, the suggestion, the gall, that somehow if we were let loose in the Committee we would not ask the right questions. Is that the real reason, I say to the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) he is making you write your questions out, so he can screen them?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Censor them.

MR. J. CARTER:
Good point.

MR. SIMMONS:
Shame! Withdraw! Withdraw!
Apologize to the House.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

There is no prima facie case of privilege.

This is a matter which has been discussed at length if the matter is going to be changed, it is up to the House, by leave, or change the Standing Orders. But the Chair has not authority to say that there is a prima facie case. The rules of the House are being

obeyed, and strictly obeyed.

MR. SIMMONS:
With leave of the House I would move that we instruct the Committee -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No leave. No leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
No leave.

MR. SIMMONS:
Muzzled again.

Who said the government was not behind this?

Before going to the budget debate I wish to move, just to remind hon. members what this is. As hon. members will recall, the composition of the committees which examine the estimates have been identified, and this is the motion which establishes which departments go to which committee. I would there move that the following Heads of Expenditure be referred to the Resource Committee: Mines and Energy, Fisheries, Development, Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, Forest Resources and Lands, and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

Furthermore, that the following Heads of Expenditure be referred to the Social Services Committee: Justice, Health, Education, Environment, Social Services, Culture, Recreation and Youth, Career Development and Advanced Studies.

And, finally, that the following Heads of Expenditure be referred to the Government Services Committee: Municipal Affairs, Public Works and Services, Labour, Finance, Transportation, and

Consumer Affairs and
Communications. I think that is
it. I so move.

DR. COLLINS:
Well done! An excellent job.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
I wonder if the Acting Government
House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer)
would indicate whether members are
going to be allowed to ask
questions at the Estimates
Committees?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of
Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
To the best of my knowledge, this
government is one which encourages
full participation, as our record
over the past number of years has
shown, and no doubt these will be
very stimulating, and there will
be questions on top of questions.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Would the Acting Government House
Leader explain to this House,
then, what the difference is
between this Standing Committee,
that there has been so much talk
about, and the other Standing
Committees that he is now
proclaiming in this House? What
is the difference?

He will not answer the question.

MR. FLIGHT:
He will not answer it.

MR. BARRY:
He cannot answer it.

Motion, that Heads of Expenditure
be referred to the various
Estimates Committees, carried.

MR. SPEAKER:
Motion 1, the hon. the Leader of
the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get
too many of my -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Could I just interrupt the hon.
leader before he gets started?
There are three questions to take
up the adjournment. One is by the
hon. member for St. John's East
Extern (Mr. Hickey), a question
asked on Thursday in reference to
the Minister of Social Services
(Mr. Brett). He is not satisfied
with the answer about boarding
houses.

MR. BARRY:
I do not blame him.

MR. SPEAKER:
And there are two questions asked
by the hon. the member for
Menihek. One, he is not satisfied
with the answer given about the
appointment of the two development
officers, one for Buchans and one
for Goose Bay, and the second one
is by the hon. member for Menihek
who is not satisfied with the
Premier's answer to his question
about the percentage of
Newfoundland workers in the
offshore oil industry.

The hon. the Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I started off in the budget debate pointing out that we have a government that is failing to set any objectives with respect to the reduction of unemployment, or the creation of jobs. We have a government that is seeing the deficit increase, but the deficit is increasing in an uncontrolled, unplanned fashion because of bad management, bad planning by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Premier and Cabinet, rather than being increased as a result of a determined effort and a specific decision to stimulate the economy in order to create employment.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we have a business-as-usual budget at a time when we do have a serious crisis of unemployment. The Minister of Finance says we do that, i.e., we stimulate the economy by our capital budget and that tells you something about the mentality of this government. The mentality of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is that it is enough to create short-term construction jobs. That is the minister's answer to dealing with unemployment in this Province when every month we see more and more of our neighbours, our friends, our relatives, unemployed, we see more and more young people walking the streets desperately looking for work and the answer of the Minister of Finance is, 'Well, we deal with that by increasing our capital budget.' That is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. That indicates a government and a Minister of Finance that is bankrupt of ideas, bankrupt of new policies. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid it indicates some bad times for this Province over the next several years if this attitude continues.

Mr. Speaker, not only is it wrong in the short-term, we are seeing the groundwork laid, we are seeing the foundation laid in this Province for serious social problems. I do not know if anybody saw the television show, *The Journal*, on last night on unemployment in Britain and it -

DR. COLLINS:

There was one view reported in that document. They only showed one aspect of their society. (Inaudible). There is much more to it than that narrow image that that programme showed.

MR. BARRY:

Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, again that is very revealing. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will have us put on the blinkers and look elsewhere than at the 1 million youths unemployed, double the population of Newfoundland. One million tales of heartbreak and hardship and the Minister of Finance would say, 'Put on the blinkers and let us look instead at these rustic country lanes. Let us look at the bear and bull, the cock and dove. Let us look at these quaint British pubs and let us look at the changing of the guard at Buckingham Palace. Let us look at the Bentleys that are drawn up on Fleet Street. Let us look at the few big business individuals that are still there still able to earn a living and have their chauffeur standing by their Bentleys and their Jaguars and quite a large number of Rolls Royces and an occasional little Mercedes thrown in there as well.' That, Mr. Speaker, is what the Minister of Finance would have us focus on. Ignore the 1 million unemployed youth because if we looked at what was happening in Britain with respect to the social problems being generated by the

Thatcher Tory policies we might learn from those mistakes. We might understand what goes on in the heart and soul of that young fellow who spends his time lying in bed because he has been totally crushed by the burden of unemployment and gets up as the sun is going down to open up his tin of homemade cigarettes getting his two pounds a day - what is that worth around \$4 a day - living in the YMCA. Now he is really going to be making a contribution to Britain. Mr. Speaker, the same thing is happening up here. We have to refer to television in Britain because I know the Minister of Finance has no concept of what is going on beyond the overpass. He has no concept of the many communities in this Province. We had the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) come back from his last visit to his district and list communities. One community, where out of 118 people under 25, 116 are unemployed. Would the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) have us look elsewhere on that? If it has not been on television yet believe me it will be. Mr. Speaker, we have other communities in this Province not just the district of St. Barbe, go out to the Port au Port Peninsula, go down to the Bay d'Espoir region of this Province.

MR. SIMMS:

Where is the member today?

MR. BARRY:

The member for St. Barbe had some illness in his family and has informed the Speaker to that effect and will be back in the House today.

The member for St. Barbe, Mr. Speaker, has been doing a magnificent job and is very much

on top of the social problems that are being created in his district and the same is true of many other districts.

Just imagine what we are going to have to deal with in another ten or fifteen years when these same people, these young men and women, who are now seventeen to twenty-five in ten years time are from twenty-seven to thirty-five and still have not been working. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker? They are not even going to know how to work. They will have lost the discipline that is one of the real reasons that we have a school system, to get people used to meeting deadlines, used to disciplining themselves, used to disciplining their way of thinking, and, Mr. Speaker, in ten years time we are going to have lost an entire generation.

DR. COLLINS:

(Inaudible) resourceful
Newfoundlander. Have you lost
faith? Doom and gloom.

MR. BARRY:

The minister goes by the old Biblical, 'Consider the lilies of the field, they toil not neither do they sting that even Solomon in all his glory.' That is the philosophy. Now there are a few lines in the Bible that I have had some difficulty understanding and I will be interested in hearing the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) get up and give us a little explanation of some of this.

Another one, Mr. Speaker, that I am sure the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) understands full well is the parable of three talents, he would go along with that too, where the guy who hoarded his talents, buried it to

keep it safe because he did not want to abuse the money that had been placed in his trust and lose it, was the guy who got the worst of the deal and the ones that went out and took a little high risk speculation were the ones that the Lord favoured. I always had a lot of difficulty in understanding that particular parable and I want to have the member for the Strait of Belle Isle explain that to me. I am sure the Minister of Finance with his warped and distorted perspective, Mr. Speaker, on economic matters -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Let them eat cake.

MR. BARRY:
Yes, I am surprised he has not jumped up and said, 'Let them eat cake.'

Mr. Speaker, we have a Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), who, regrettably, is becoming tired. Still a young man but tired. Tired in thought as well as deed, Mr. Speaker. The budget is a product of Tim Horton.

MR. SIMMONS:
They should retire him and make him a development officer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would not inflict the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) on any industrial development district, or industrial development association.

MS VERGE:
I thought you were going to keep debate on a higher plane, this time.

MR. BARRY:

I thought we were making a very effective point, were we not?

MR. PATTERSON:
You will have to get a new speech writer.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, this gives me the opportunity. The Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) is concerned because she feels that my comments are personal. And, I must say, the press tends to slip into and to buy that old adage. I must say, I slipped once when I referred to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) as Newfoundland's answer to the Care Bear, but that was an affectionate reference, Mr. Speaker. That was the only personal comment I made about the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Finance knows that was done with affection. Even the Minister of Justice smiled about that one. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference in pointing out that the minister is a failure as minister in the responsibilities given him in trust by the people of this Province, by the Premier. There is a difference in pointing out that the minister is an abject failure in his portfolio and in talking about his family, or his personal lifestyle, or his automobile.

MR. TULK:
The Minister of Finance is just as big a failure in his job as the Minister of Justice was in hers as Minister of Education.

MR. BARRY:
Maybe that is why the Minister of Justice is a little touch. Because she is going to want to get up and protest that we are being personal when we start to look at her tenure as Minister of Education, as we will during the

course of the estimates. There is a real difference, I can tell the Minister of Justice, between calling ministers of the Crown to account for the way in which they have conducted their affairs as minister, and their personal lifestyle.

MR. TULK:

Another one gone. Another one left.

MR. BARRY:

We will have them all driven out in a minute, and we will have to call a quorum.

MR. TULK:

They cannot take it.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue to point out the failures of the administration with respect to the responsibilities entrusted in them in their official capacity. We are going to try, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure sometimes in the heat of debate we will make a mistake. We will try and not do it too often, but I am sure we will slip into some personal reference. But it is not a personal reference, Mr. Speaker, to question whether the Minister of Finance is doing the job that the people of this Province want him to do when he says, Do not look at the million unemployed youth in Great Britain, do not examine the social problem that is being created in Great Britain by that great Tory policy of increasing the number of unemployed in order to deal with inflation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House said we must look at that million unemployed, because from their torture, from their hardship, from their torment

we will learn what is going to happen to the unemployed young people of this Province. And we do not want to see those social problems ingrained in our social fabric that Britain is now experiencing. I know we are getting the occasional skinhead around here, and the occasional punk, but, Mr. Speaker, we do not have a high violent crime rate, we do not have a society of young people who are alienated, we do not have streets that are unsafe to walk because of class tension, because you have a whole segment of society that is left out of sharing in the benefits of society. That is the sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, that we do not want to see happen to this Province.

We do not want to see those thousands of young people under twenty-five say, To hell with it, what is the point of supporting a system that has nothing for us? Mr. Speaker, that is what is being created out there by members opposite, that is what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is going to have to answer to and answer for. He is going to have to explain how he feels when he looks out and sees those - how many unemployed young people do we now have in this Province under the age of forty-five?

MR. TULK:

Forty-four per cent.

MR. BARRY:

We have over 40 per cent of them unemployed. In numbers we have close to 60,000 unemployed, we are probably talking 20,000 to 25,000 young people under twenty-five. Now, it is not a million, Mr. Speaker, it is not a million, but when it comes down to dealing with the hardship and the suffering of

one individual who is being placed in a position of despair and desperation by the failure of the government opposite to bring in policies which will stimulate the economy, policies such as we have set forth to reduce taxes, stimulate the economy, create a few jobs. That is what should be done.

MR. CALLAN:

Do not be so scared of overheating the economy.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, do not be too terrified to inflict prosperity on this Province. You are burning up the economy. Are you ever!

MR. SIMMONS:

Do not forget the prosperity crusade.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, we had a prosperity crusade in this Province. It started in Port aux Basques.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It worked.

MR. BARRY:

It worked for the member for LaPoile. I suppose we have to concede that.

MR. TULK:

At that time it did not. He did not get the Tory nomination.

MR. BARRY:

What?

MR. TULK:

He did not get the Tory nomination at that time. That was a federal election, remember?

MR. BARRY:

Oh, he tried for that, did he?

MR. TULK:

He got rained out.

MR. BARRY:

That is right. He missed the nomination for that election.

Well, I guess our loss is the Government of Canada's gain, is it?

MR. TULK:

No, No, our gain is their loss, they got him.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we had a cavalcade of truth, fortunately, following behind the prosperity crusade, and the prosperity crusade consisted of the Premier, in a vehicle, moving across the Province, with a bullhorn, trying to avoid the tomatoes and the eggs that he met in Corner Brook, and it was even then that people were beginning to see the truth.

MR. TULK:

And those were young people, were they not?

MR. BARRY:

And a lot of those were young people.

MR. BAKER:

Nobody listened to him in Gander.

MR. BARRY:

He came into Gander and nobody listened.

MR. TULK:

In St. George's he had twenty-six.

MR. BARRY:

What do they call a prosperity crusade when nobody came?

Mr. Speaker, I guess what we are seeing now in this budget is the end result of that prosperity crusade. This is the culmination

of that crusade, what is being laid on the people of this Province in that budget.

MR. SIMMONS:

One, two. This is number one, and tonight's is number two.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, we will get the old one, two. Tonight we have a budget coming out. In another forty-five minutes we will all go home and listen to it, and I hope that the Prime Minister of Canada shows more concern for the young people of this Province than have members opposite.

The sad part is not that they have no ideas. Whether it is because of false pride or just pigheaded stubbornness, refusal to take a good Liberal concept, they have totally ignored our proposal for an apprenticeship and training programme which young people all over this Province have responded to very positively.

MR. SIMMS:

Do you have the details of that?

MR. BARRY:

Yes, we have the details we can supply the minister with, and we can refer him to the programmes in West Germany, in Japan, and in Austria, in the United Kingdom, Mr. Speaker, where there were reductions. They have 1 million now in the United Kingdom. It would have been 1.5 million, it would have been 2 million if they had not implemented some of these training programmes that they did. Mr. Speaker, the cost would be much less than the cost that we are going to incur in this Province in dealing with the social problems that will result from the alienation of our young people. The cost will be a lot

less than the cost of providing welfare to people who have become totally unable to work, totally unable to move into fruitful employment.

MR. TULK:

They cannot get it with your government.

DR. COLLINS:

What would be the estimate (inaudible) cost.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, let us do a quick calculation, let us talk in terms of paying a young person \$10,000 a year. For \$20 million you can have 2,000 -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

\$20 million a year for two years and have 2,000 young people put to work. You can double that 4,000 - \$40 million, 8,000 - \$80 million.

AN HON. MEMBER:

One thousand - \$10 million.

MR. BARRY:

One thousand - \$10 million. How many, Mr. Speaker, will we have to deal with. What we say, Mr. Speaker, we saw the Premier come in with figures saying there were 6,000, I think it was, young people a year graduating.

MR. SIMMS:

Under that SEED programme (inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

The Premier included in those graduating figures -

MR. TULK:

Do not be so foolish. Make no wonder you only won by forty-one

votes, you make a fool of yourself all the time. Come on, boy, behave yourself.

MR. SIMMS:

What are you talking about?

MR. TULK:

Act like a former Speaker of this House.

MR. BARRY:

Could I be protected from the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier said that there were 6,000 young people every year for whom we would have to provide. Now in using his calculations he brought in graduation figures from every part-time course at the College of Trades and the College of Fisheries. Whether it was a one month course or a two month course, he treated that as somebody included in graduation. We have to start somewhere. What we are talking are the students who have gone through a full-time course at the university, at the trade school and the Fisheries College for two years, three years, four years. Forty per cent of them are not finding employment now; 60 per cent are, through no help of any members opposite, not able to find employment. Even if we took the full 6,000, which is an exaggerated, we are talking about 40 per cent of 6,000 which is 2,400. So you are talking in the area of \$24 million a year, Mr. Speaker. So the most it would be in one year would be, where

there is a doubling over effect, \$48 million - \$48 million in the second year when you have the second half of the first year's programme and the first part of the second year's programme coming into place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for \$48 million to mop up that 40 per cent level of unemployment amongst our young people, I do not think it is a bad investment when you consider how little black (inaudible) you get on a road out there for \$48 million.

MR. TULK:

That is nothing.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to invest \$48 million a year into our future leaders, into our young people in this Province, into our future as a Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister wants to get me off the topic of young people because he knows that we are making a very valid point there. But the minister is absolutely correct, that is only one step, that is only dealing with, as is my topic today, Mr. Speaker, I will move on to my other fourteen or fifteen in days to come. But, Mr. Speaker, we are dealing today with the problem of youth unemployment. We have to start somewhere and it would not be a bad start to deal with the young people just coming out of school. But the minister is absolutely right, there are non-students, there are people middle aged, there are people five or six years from retirement, who are being thrown out of work

because of the negative policies of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Premier and members opposite. Some of them are as old as the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.!

MR. SIMMS:

I am must younger than the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), by the way.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) has pointed out a valid fact that it is not just young people who are unemployed. Mr. Speaker, we have to start somewhere and we have to have a specific programme for our unemployed youth or we are going to cause a greater problem a few years down the road.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

Well, I will just mentioned now in terms of dealing with youth unemployment in the first year it would be about \$20 million to \$25 million.

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I am misleading the House. It is not even that much because all we are talking about is subsidizing the salary. So if it were on a 50 per cent basis we are talking half that. So the first year would only be \$12 million, say \$15 million at the most; the second year would be up to \$24 million to subsidize.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How did you get confused there?

MR. BARRY:

Well because I was giving the worst case scenario.

Now if we just subsidize on a 50 per cent basis, we can have every young person in this Province working, Mr. Speaker, for \$12 million this year with an apprenticeship and training programme as we are recommending. For \$12 million we could have every young person in this Province graduating from a full-time course this year working-

MR. SIMMS:

For a full year.

MR. BARRY:

- for a full year and it would cost us \$12 million and have them working the second year and to have the programme continue it would cost \$24 million or \$25 million next year.

MR. SIMMS:

I am looking forward to seeing the detailed (inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, those are the hard, cold realities. That is what we are talking about. If we provided 100 per cent subsidy to the employer, it would be \$24 million in the first year and \$48 million in the second. But our programme has envisaged a co-operative effort and that is not even taking into consideration what we might get from the Government of Canada in terms of a contribution to any such programme.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) half a percentage point a year.

MR. BARRY:

Cost what - \$2 billion?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

In Newfoundland?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) Canada.

MR. BARRY:

What has the minister been smoking?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) the Economic Council of Canada.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, \$2 billion, not what percentage is the population of Newfoundland and the population of Canada, let us have a quick calculation - one-fortieth roughly, we will say one-fiftieth. Now if we divide fifty into \$2 billion, that is \$2,000 million, fifty into 2,000 goes forty times, so the member is saying forty - do you know something, we are not that far out except we are talking about reducing it a lot more than 1 per cent, one employment percentage.

AN HON. MEMBER:

We are talking about half a percentage point.

MR. BARRY:

Half a percentage point. No, the member is going to have to go back to the drawing board or go back to the Economic Council of Canada and is going to have to query those figures because we are putting forth a proposal that would see 2,500 young people in this Province employed at \$10,000 -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

Well multiply, the member can multiply. The member should not get in the habit of believing everything he reads and only half of what he says and almost none of what he hears.

Mr. Speaker, we are now talking about simple multiplication to supply \$10,000 a year to 2,500 young people and that is \$25 million.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I would adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It is now five-thirty and the first question to be debated is by the hon. member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. MORGAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Sir, it is a matter of the transcripts from last evening's proceedings not being available as of right now, and I understand at least for one hour from now so I cannot see how a Committee of the House can properly function this evening with regard to the matter before the Committee unless we have the transcripts from last evening's proceedings, to be able to peruse them and go through them in detail to enable to ask

questions, including this member to ask questions as well as other members, whether written questions or otherwise. In this case written questions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if we can get the transcripts earlier than six-thirty or seven o'clock, but I understand proceedings will start at seven-thirty and I feel it is important we had the transcript as soon as possible or to arrange a different meeting for the scheduling of witnesses as it pertains to this evening.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, what I would suggest is, I do not think it is a matter on which the House can do anything, and I do not think it is a point of order, but obviously it is a matter of some concern to the hon. member, what I would suggest is that if he were to confer with the Chairman of the Committee I am sure the Chairman would act in a reasonable manner.

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

To clarify matters, Mr. Speaker, the transcripts will be ready at six o'clock and any member of the Committee who wants to start reading a little earlier can get a part of the transcript I would think in a few minutes. So it is not a question of their rights being trampled on, or a member affected by the Committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, the question I ask my colleague, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) regarding boarding houses in the city of St. John's, and I asked for an opportunity to debate it further because the information provided the minister by his officials did not stress the issue that I raised, and the concern that I expressed, namely it was not a concern of mine so much that any particular person occupying a position was given a termination notice but rather that the services provided by a registered nurse in policing, monitoring the issue of quality care in boarding houses in the city was now going to be terminated. And the minister indicated to me in his reply, and I appreciate his answer, that those services would be provided by social workers. I want to say to the minister, Mr. Speaker, that I have no question that he believes that this can be done and I am sure he was sincere in his answer.

I raised the question in the first instance, Mr. Speaker, out of concern that an issue which raised its ugly head last year became a controversy like nothing else. There are numerous press clippings, all kinds of statements from voluntary organizations, individuals, etc., decrying the conditions which existed in boarding houses in the city.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit to my colleague that social workers cannot monitor quality care in boarding houses unless they have a health background or it is a registered nurse, or a

person of those qualifications.

The indication in the minister's answer, the information provided him by his staff, seem to indicate that the reason this person was hired was to keep people out of hotels and obviously save some money which of course we all wanted to do and still want to do at this time. And I do not doubt the minister's word for a moment because indeed I am inclined to agree that when I left the department, it was only a few months ago, precious little improvement had been achieved in terms of numbers in moving people out of hotels.

The initiatives I took while I was minister are ongoing. I am sure the minister can confirm and will confirm, two hostels will be provided and developed in the city. However, Mr. Speaker, that does not answer the issue or respond to the issue raised. The fact that there will be two hostels would even make it more important that the monitoring of diet, of meals, of good hygiene, of general health conditions in those hostels, and in the numerous other boarding houses around this city, be maintained. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the crux of the issue.

Social workers in the city of St. John's, as in all other parts of the Province, and I am sure the minister will appreciate and maybe confirm, I do not know, are overworked, Mr. Speaker. They have caseloads which are unbelievable, the highest in Canada bar any other province. When I left the department, Mr. Speaker, the average caseload for a social worker in the city of St. John's in Social Assistance was 200, in Child Welfare it was over

80, Rehabilitation it was over 130, not to mention the numerous other categories, services to seniors, people suffering from alcohol problems, etc., etc. The minister, Mr. Speaker, as I was, still is, and he inherits the very difficult task of sitting on the proverbial powder keg with regards to child abuse, child neglect, and a whole range of other issues. This is a poor Province, Mr. Speaker, I do not fault it from the point of view of our being able to do more. I realize the restraints that we are faced with. We cannot supply the numbers of staff which are required. Consequently, the onus is on us, Mr. Speaker, to minimize the degree and the diversity of the job so as to give them as much time as possible to do those very important tasks.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. HICKEY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Before calling on the hon. Minister of Social Services, I would like to inform the House that I have a note here that the record of the Committee proceedings will be ready by 6:15 at the latest, and the first half will be ready by 6:00.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I do not really know what this debate is all about, because, Mr. Speaker, I almost could get up and say ditto to what the hon. member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) has said.

A very brief history of the problem is that just over a year ago, of course, some agency in the city brought to light the fact that some boarding houses in the City of St. John's who catered to people who are in receipt of social assistance were not up to standards, standards laid down by the Department of Health and the city, that there was overcrowding and probably they were not even being fed properly. I think it should be noted here that that condition probably existed for a long, long time. And one of the actions taken as a result of this being brought to light, Mr. Speaker, was that a person was hired, a registered nurse, as the hon. member says to monitor conditions in these boarding homes. I understood when I answered the question a couple of days ago that the person had, in addition to that would also people to find boarding homes.

But anyway that person was hired on a temporary basis. It was a temporary assignment, twelve month temporary assignment, and it was extended for a two month period actually, but now it has expired and the position is not being done away with, Mr. Speaker, we are advertising for the position on a full-time basis. So, you know, I could not agree with the hon. member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) any more. Of whether or not it will be a registered nurse I do not know, but I have enough faith in the people who are running the office to assume that they will advise the Public Service Commission the type of person that they will need for this job and that the person hired will be able to continue on with the duties of the person who was there on a part-time basis.

But it should be obvious, although the hon. member said, he was not concerned about the person or the temporary status, but I think I should point out that we cannot keep people on temporary assignments forever, I mean, this one was on a fourteen months temporary assignment, and obviously we had to advertise it on a permanent basis sooner or later.

MR. HICKEY:
(Inaudible).

MR. BRETT:
The hon. member feels that my answer to his question was inadequate because I did not address the specific duties that afternoon, but I already mentioned that and I clarified the matter.

MR. HICKEY:
(Inaudible).

MR. BRETT:
The hon. member suggests that we still need somebody to monitor conditions in the home. While this person being hired on a permanent basis will have to do part of that. I still contend that this is not really the responsibility of the Department of Social Services. I think that should be carried out by somebody in the Department of Health or the city, the city to monitor the physical conditions and somebody from the Department of Health, if necessary, to make sure that they are getting properly fed.

Mr. Speaker, everybody is aware of the statement that I made in the House this afternoon. We are very cognizant as a department of this situation that that exist and that will get worse, by the way, as Hibernia comes onstream and we get more people pouring into the

city. It is a problem that we will always have to deal with as long as we are around here. We are cognizant of it and we are doing all that we can do, as is obvious today when I announced that we are opening two hospitals.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The next question is from the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), who is not satisfied with the answer regarding the appointment of two industrial development officers for Buchans and Goose Bay.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, that question is directed to the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) since it is his department that is responsible for those appointments.

I have a second question. May I switch to that one first and then, if the Minister of Development is back by that time, I can ask him that question afterwards? The other one is to the Premier, and he is in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:
The second question is dealing with the percentage of Newfoundland workers in the offshore oil industry.

MR. FENWICK:
It is not entirely accurate, it is really the percentage of St. John's area residents versus those outside the St. John's area.

Mr. Speaker, if it is acceptable, I would like to read a letter that I have sent that outlines my

argument on the particular issue and it is easier for me to read the letter than it is to go through the arguments again. Is that permissible as long as I table it?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Yes.

MR. FENWICK:
"Many people in our Province know the frustration of trying to get work and a large number of them have tried to get jobs in offshore oil. For some, a couple of thousand, it has been a successful hunt, landing jobs that pay extremely well with good fringe benefits and every other month off. For others, it has been frustration after spending thousands to take the emergency disaster courses, then they are turned down and told they are thousands of others on the waiting list.

If you live outside the St. John's area, it is even more frustrating. No one ever calls you for an interview and you spend fortunes on long-distance calls, trying to get your foot in the door. When you come to St. John's to see what is happening, you meet people working in the offshore who tell you flat out, if you are not in St. John's where the openings occur, then you are totally out of luck.

Many people have had this experience and, as an MHA, I have had a number of my constituents from Labrador West complain that they could not get a look in.

Now that Mobil has produced its Environmental Impact Study, we have proof that it is not necessary to live in St. John's to work on an oil rig, but it sure

helps. The statistics show that St. John's residents have a six times better chance of working on an oil rig than non-St. John's residents, yet the unemployment rate in the rest of the Province is twice as high as it is in the St. John's area.

Well, what should be done about this? It seems to me that there are two courses of action. The first is to do nothing and leave the situation as it is, and the other is to try to tilt the balance back so that more non-St. John's residents have a chance of being hired on. Those who say do nothing, and to this point, that includes the provincial government, are then effectively cutting off the rest of the Province from the one growing industry in our Province. They are badly unbalancing the population distribution in our Province, as well. Today, one-quarter of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians live in the St. John's area. In twenty years, that will increase to one-third of the population. Indeed, the study suggests that all the growth in the population in the next twenty years will take place in St. John's, while the rest of the Province stays the same. The population of the Province is projected - these, by the way, are figures from the Environmental Impact Study, Volume IV, Pages 236 and 237 - "The population of the Province is projected to increase by 56,400 by the year 2006, but the St. John's area will increase by 56,505, indeed, 105 people more than the total increase in the population.

Now, what this means, of course, is that while most of the Province remains stagnant in terms of population for the next twenty

years, according to the study, St. John's grows like 'Topsy', and land values, and therefore, home costs in St. John's, will continue to escalate, while the real estate in the rest of the Province will plummet. Communities will find themselves with a dwindling population and the inability to support their own services. All the rest of the Province then becomes a backwater to the only vibrant community of St. John's.

At the same time, St. John's undergoes rapid, uncontrolled growth that prices the ordinary working man into housing ghettos, and, fuelled by oil fever, becomes an expensive showcase that the people of the rest of the Province can only look on and envy.

Offshore oil is an ideal industry to help supply employment in the rest of the Province. Most of the on-the-water jobs are a month on, a month off, and it is of little consequence if the individual returns to St. John's or Corner Brook or Buchans, but imagine the impact on a community like Buchans if thirty to fifty of the highly trained miners were employed in the offshore. It would be the equivalent of a small industry. Indeed, it would employ as many as the proposed barite mine in (inaudible)."

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, I started two minutes late because of the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FENWICK:

But, Mr. Speaker, I started two minutes late.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FENWICK:

Okay. May I just finish then?

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. FENWICK:

But it was not elapsed, I started a bit late.

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes.

MR. FENWICK:

Okay, I will table the document, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think we have the gist of what the hon. member was trying to say in reading the letter that he has written and, from the questions that he asked here in the House the other day, I think it is quite clear where the hon. member is coming from, and he is expressing a concern that, I guess, all of us in this hon. House and most of the people of the Province are expressing, How best can we distribute the job opportunities that are going to come from offshore development? I find it a little bit odd, a little bit strange, a little bit ironic, I have been accused by most of the people opposite and others around

the Province of having oil on the brain and am not interested in anything else. I find now the same kind of thing coming from the very people who have been accusing me of that over the last three or four years. Perhaps it is starting to hit home to some of the hon. members opposite that it does provide - it is not the panacea to our unemployment problem or to our economic problem, necessarily, but it does provide another component, among many other components, for job creation in the Province, and that is all I have ever said since I have been involved in this whole question of oil and gas since 1975 - 1976, almost ten years now. But it does, and I am glad to see that the hon. member is finally coming around to our way of thinking on it. It is a very difficult problem. It is like talking about the Marystown area over the last ten or fifteen years. I lived in Marystown back in the 1950s when Marystown was nothing, it was Burin, Grand Bank, and St. Lawrence were great places. The people from Marystown could not get jobs in these other communities, and finally Mortier Bay got underway with a shipyard and then the fish plant and some new subdivisions were built and there were people from all over Newfoundland who went to Marystown to try to get work.

Labrador City is another good example, if you are not right on site in Labrador City for a job, if the company start to expand then obviously the people of Labrador City are going to have a six times better chance of getting the job there than the people from the rest of the Province.

So it goes, if in Happy Valley - Goose Bay now we suddenly see an

explosion of growth due to a NATO base being established there over the next couple of years, the same will be true. So it is around the Province. And what we are trying to do and whilst the Opposition keeps condemning the royal commission that is established that is one of the mandates that they have, also as to see how we can distribute and better co-ordinate our efforts to ensure that the job opportunities that are available are provided to everybody in the Province. But it is not an easy matter to solve so that you are fair to all areas of the Province. We did have the emergency programme that is in place where a lot of students or a lot of people have to get that first. That causes a bit of a problem. There is a big line-up there.

The other thing that we have to do and the royal commission hopefully will address this as well, that as we get into, not only, we are talking now about the exploration stage, where the big kicker is going to come is in the development stage where we try to target various areas of the Province to build different components related to the production of the oil and gas. There is only a limited number of jobs as we now know 2,000 to 3,000 over the next couple of years in the exploration stage, but it is in the production stage. That is why the Argentinia Accord was so important yesterday, so that we can open up land there. Hopefully on the West Coast there will be a number of businesses, perhaps with government incentives who are going to be able to build certain other things that are going to be a part of the production system.

But in the exploration stage there

are only a few jobs to go around. They are good jobs. They are important jobs, as the hon. member said, and there is a couple of thousand Newfoundlanders now out there. But it is not an easy problem to solve from a provincial perspective to ensure that every single person from around the Province are given a fair opportunity to get those jobs. And as the government interferes in that, you are going to have a friction between one region of the Province and another.

Right now the only, I checked on it, over the last couple of days since the hon. member's question. The only statistics that are kept because of our local preference policy is Newfoundlanders versus non-Newfoundlanders, because what we are trying to do is to emphasize as many Newfoundlanders getting jobs offshore as possible, it is somewhere around 62 per cent to 64 per cent right now. It is not bad. And without that local preference it would only be around 30 per cent to 35 per cent.

So our main thrust over the last couple of years has been not to separate one Newfoundlander against another, but rather to ensure that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians be the first to get jobs if they are qualified. But it is a difficult problem. I do not want to try to minimize it. But it is difficult to work out given that, especially, in the exploration stage, you have those limited number. What we have to try and do through negotiations with the Mobil group and with the federal government through the development plan process, hopefully which will be finished by the end of this year, is to put in place ways and means and with the private sector to ensure that

the production aspect of it, which will cover, somebody was asking me yesterday, okay, so somebody goes and establishes in Argentinia for the cables, for example, that have to be associated with production. Well sure that is only good while the platform is being built. But, you know, that is not true. The cables will be needed for the whole production of that one oilfield which will be twenty to thirty years. And obviously there are going to be two or three or four or five or six more fields come on in that length of time as well. So you are looking at a more permanent kind of situation in the production mode or production phase of development than you are in exploration. It is an extremely difficult problem, one that we are aware of, but it is not an easy one to solve.

Hopefully, as I say, in the development plan process, on the production side of things we can dedicate through the development plan various areas of the Province getting involved in permanent jobs dealing with industries that are spunoff from the development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek on his first question.

MR. FENWICK:

The first question is to the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) who does not seem to be in his seat so I guess we will have to ask it to the Premier.

Is the Minister of Development and Tourism here?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. FENWICK:

The question really comes down to one of credibility. I think we are talking about credibility in terms of what the Province has been trying to forward in its budget, what it is trying to say in the Throne Speech, what it has been trying to say consistently for the last couple of years and it seems to me the appointment of two former members of this House, who failed to win re-election, into government paid positions with no advertising done whatsoever, with no competition for the jobs, has done a lot to destroy the credibility of this government in terms of the kinds of restraint it is trying to impose on the rest of the Province. We have heard this Province brag that in the last four or five years there are six less employees of the government than there were four or five years ago. This is put forward as a laudable objective. They claim that there are 800 vacant positions that have not been filled and yet. They turned around and appointed two former members of this House, who did not get elected, into positions that did not even exist prior to the time that they were appointed there, did not exist in the sense that the Public Service Commission had no knowledge whatsoever that they existed there, no concept that those were necessary whatsoever. What I think is happening now is we are starting - I do not want to use the words that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) tends to - but it is starting down the slippery slope, if we want to use that expression, that the Mulroney government has, we have seen over the last number of months, started to slide down.

It is really a case of how much patronage and what kind of patronage you are going to put in here. I have no arguments with the individuals concerned. I am sure that they are both credible people and I think that if they had applied for the jobs there was a possibility that they might have gotten them but I think it is despicable that in a time of restraint, in a time with 800 vacant positions, in a time with a wage freeze on public employees, that we are sitting at a time here when they are willing to put in two members in sinecures. What is even worse is, the last question that I asked the minister was, What are you planning to do with the other six or eight former members of your party that have also been defeated and there was no definitive answer that they were not planning to create nice little secure positions for them as well. So I find this a very, very important time to say, 'No, this is not the kind of patronage we want, we just do not have enough pork left in the bottom of our barrel to start wheeling out.' I think it is important for us not to start that kind of thing. I think it is important that we realize that if these two members are paid on the scale that we think they are we are talking maybe \$80,000 to \$100,000 a year being paid to these two people. I think what we should realize is that if that money was put into the SEED programme, for example, and increased by \$80,000 with the multiplier that would occur with the federal government we could perhaps create 175 Summer jobs for students and that was the kind of thing that could have been done with that \$80,000 instead of providing patronage appointments for these members. So, I think that it is important that we

realize that we only have choices, that we have choices of where to put our money, if we are putting it into patronage like that then we do not have it for student employment and other things.

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) 175 students
(inaudible).

MR. FENWICK:

What I am saying is if it is 15 per cent leverage we are talking about, then we are talking not about \$80,000 or \$100,000 we are talking perhaps about \$600,000 or \$700,000 as matched by the federal government.

The point is that we have used this money now as a patronage thing instead of using it in a way that could have been creative in terms of youth unemployment.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) seems to have a very strange perception of the Public Service Commission. The Public Service Commission does not create positions. The positions are created by the government and then the positions, after they are created and classified with Treasury Board, are passed over to the Public Service Commission to advertise, interview and recommend. So let us get the facts straight. Therefore, it is up to the Cabinet and government to decide whether they want to create certain positions or not and from time to time, if you look at the history of Newfoundland, government may decide in its wisdom to create additional positions for particular circumstances.

Now, the hon. the member for Menihek said up until a couple of days ago nobody knew anything about these positions. Well one of the positions was already committed by the government to the Action Committee in Buchans. We do not then go through the Public Service Commission. We had indicated and passed through Cabinet, by a Minute in Council of Cabinet, after discussion and debate, that we were going to approve, there a couple of months ago, a development officer for the Action Committee in Buchans and that was announced. So this whole question of going to the Public Service Commission to find out whether they knew anything about it is completely irrelevant. We had, as a government, announced that we were going to provide a development officer for the town of Buchans. Therefore, we are delivering upon a commitment that we made to the Action Committee in writing. So that ends that.

As far as the person who is filling the position, Mr. Speaker, as far as the government and I are concerned, he is most qualified to take on that job because he has been with the Action Committee and the council for the last three years helping them along and therefore who better than he to be there. That is that first position.

Now, on the other position we have, since the Department of Development has been created we have been expanding that department. We established a department first, then the minister, now President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), came to Cabinet and wanted to expand in Labrador West in this past year and now there is a person in place. It is still money that

could go to the youth employment programme. Let us eliminate the office, if we take the hon. member's argument to its logical conclusion, and use that money for the youth employment programme. Let us close down the regional offices we have around the Province. I mean it is absurd what the hon. member is saying. We understand, because of the problems in Labrador West, it is difficult, we need more than one person in Labrador to handle the problems that are there. Labrador West has its own problems so we need to beef up that office or that region and one way to do it is to also have an office in Labrador West so that these people can coordinate their efforts in Labrador. The situation in Labrador, especially in the Lake Melville area now with the whole question of low level flying, with the whole question of a NATO base and that kind of development, is you need somebody there, perhaps for a year, especially, to be project orientated as opposed to just a development officer into the future. Therefore, we cannot think of a better person to put there than somebody who has been representing Labrador in this House for quite a few years. Whether it becomes a permanent position or not will be determined on the experience that this hon. gentleman brings to it and whether after a year or not there is a demand and a need to continue it. So let us not cut off our nose in spite of our face. We are doing something project specific in Buchans that was committed and we have delivered upon that commitment. We are doing something which is project specific in Lake Melville that we want to do and we will review that after a year to see whether in fact it should be continued. We

are proud that we are doing these things, Mr. Speaker. The Opposition have been complaining, 'You are not doing anything for Buchans, you are not doing anything for Labrador, you are ignoring Labrador.' When we do something for Buchans then they criticize us. When we do something for Labrador then they criticize us. Well, Mr. Speaker, they can criticize all they like. We are going ahead to help Buchans, we are going ahead to help Lake Melville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 24, 1985, at 9:00 a.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

May 23, 1985

Reply to Question

23 May, 1985

UNITS VACANT UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR INFILL PUBLIC HOUSING AS OF MAY 16, 1985

OWNED BY NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR HOUSING CORPORATION

LOCATION	DATE VACATED	APPRAISED VALUE	OUTSTANDING LIABILITIES MAR. 31/85	REMARKS
56 Colonial Street (HY 624)	September 1984	\$20,000	Nil	To be utilized for infill this year.
109 Gower Street (HY 629)	September 4, 1984	13,000	Nil	To be utilized for infill this year.
17 Freshwater Road (HY 627)	August 1, 1984	14,000	Nil	Not suitable for infilling. Being sold through Public Tender - Closing May 27, 1985.
38 Cookstown Road (HY 702)	August 28, 1984	18,000	Nil	Not suitable for infilling. Being sold through Public Tender - Closing June 7, 1985.
6 Allen Square (HY 704)	February 15, 1984	16,000	Nil	Tenders awarded for infill.
41 Prescott Street (HY 619)	February 16, 1984	19,500	Nil	Tenders awarded for infill
388 Empire Avenue (HY 663)	October 27, 1983	20,000	Nil	Tender awarded for infilling. Delay in utilization was due to allocation of funds from CMHC.
61 Quidi Vidi (HY 713)	January 1, 1984	10,400	Nil	Tender awarded for infilling. Delay in utilization was due to allocation of funds from CMHC.
9 Gower Street (HY 646)	December 1982	22,000	Nil	Tenders awarded for refurbishing. Was held for non-profit group for approximately 2 years. They could not obtain funding.
197 Gower Street	February 21, 1985	21,000	Nil	Under consideration for refurbishing or infilling.