



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 34

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

4 May 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Before calling other items, at this stage I would like to welcome to the Speaker's Gallery the hon. Pierre McDonald, Minister for External Trade and Technology from the Province of Quebec, and he is accompanied by Mr. Lawrence Cannon, his Parliamentary Secretary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before calling for Statements By Ministers there is one matter that I would like to clear up. It was in connection with the petition presented by the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) on Friday. He raised a point of order which I ruled was not a point of order, but I said I would look into the petition itself. I must rule that the petition is out of order for two reasons: Number one, the petition according to our Standing Order No. 90 has to be signed in the hand of the member and I could not find his signature. Number two, I would refer hon. members to page 210, Section 673 of Beauchesne, 'Petitions may be written, or printed; they must be free from erasures or interlineations. Appendices may not be attached thereto, etc.'

Now it does not appear to the Chair that this was a petition for presentation to the House of Assembly.

MR. FENWICK:

It was not, either.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is a printed matter here that I am not going to read - it should not have been read in the first place - and a whole lot of signatures, and there are two or three different additions written in here which, quite frankly, I think is an abuse of our privileges.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make this statement today not only in its own right and in our own Legislature but particularly, given that there is a representative of the Government of Quebec in the galleries, that makes it all the more appropriate.

As hon. members are aware, last Thursday evening at a meeting in Meech Lake, Quebec, the Prime Minister of Canada and the ten provincial premiers reached an agreement in principle that when translated into a Constitutional text will bring Quebec back into the Constitutional fold and enable that province to again be a full member and active partner in our great country - Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

This agreement, Mr. Speaker, is an historic one, and one that is good for the whole country - and for

all Canadians no matter where they live. Contrary to some news that this agreement will lead to a weakening of the nation and the federal government, I believe this agreement will strengthen and unify the country.

A fundamental principle of my government's position on the Constitution has always been that there must be balanced federalism - that is a strong central government and strong provinces. This agreement well reflects this principle and the federal nature of this country.

Equally important, this agreement also reflects and endorses the fundamental principle upon which, I believe, the Canadian federation is founded - the juridical equality of all provinces. This principle has always been and will continue to be the cornerstone of this government's constitutional position. I am extremely pleased that the Prime Minister and the other nine premiers have in this agreement reaffirmed their belief and commitment to this view. This reaffirmation and strengthening of the principle of juridical equality is good for Newfoundland and good for Canada.

The honourable, the Government House Leader has already advised hon. members of the components of the agreement. Attached to my statement is a copy of that agreement so all hon. members will have the opportunity to view it in writing. I want to address one particular element of the agreement that is of special interest and importance to all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

For the past ten years, The Government of Newfoundland and

Labrador has strongly advocated that the Province must have some legislative jurisdiction over its most vital economic sector - the fishery. This historic agreement signed at Meech Lake, will see entrenched in the Constitution, a requirement for a First Ministers' Conference on the Constitution to be held not less than once per year, and to be included in the agenda for these conferences, 'Fisheries Roles and Responsibilities.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Fisheries jurisdiction will have the same status on the constitutional agenda as will senate reform. And when hon. members reflect upon what has happened in Western Canada over the last three or four months, not to say the last number of years, the importance that this agenda item of fisheries gets to be discussed equally with senate reform given that you had Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia all fighting for senate reform to be a requirement in any future round of constitutional talks, and to think that Newfoundland and Labrador has achieved the recognition among the other First Ministers, including the Prime Minister, that fisheries must take an equal status with senate reform, I think in itself, Mr. Speaker, is a major accomplishment for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

By this agreement, all First Ministers have recognized the importance of the fisheries of the

Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and the need for this Province to have some legislative competence in the management of this resource. This is a major achievement for this Province and a significant step towards the attainment of this government's objective for shared jurisdiction in the fisheries. While a constitutional requirement for fisheries jurisdiction to be on the constitutional agenda does not guarantee success, it does provide the appropriate forum for a comprehensive, national and public discussion by all First Ministers of this country on this most important issue to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

This agreement could not have been achieved without the spirit of co-operation, goodwill and national vision exercised by First Ministers. In particular, the efforts of the Prime Minister must be commended. His leadership, perseverance, and drive were instrumental in bringing about this great achievement.

This agreement, which was reached in the truly Canadian way of free and open discussion and compromise, will strengthen and unify the bonds of Confederation. With this act of nation building completed, we can now go forward to face new challenges and to build a stronger and better Canada, from Bonavista to Vancouver Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, we in the official opposition want to be identified with the events of last week and, first of all, on behalf of my colleagues I want to congratulate the Premier, Prime Minister Mulroney and the other First Ministers for the historic initiative that was taken at Meech Lake last week. It is one, Mr. Speaker, which we feel will have immense and positive benefits for Canada, particularly insofar as the main objective of that meeting was concerned, that is to say, the bringing into the Constitutional Accord the Province of Quebec. The initiatives of 1981, as important as they were, were never rounded out, could never be completed until the act of last week had been done, as well.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago I had the privilege of meeting with the Quebec Premier, Mr. Bourassa, and raised with him a matter that my colleague for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry) had earlier raised in correspondence - I believe in person as well - the matter of fisheries jurisdiction and the need to have that addressed in a constitutional forum. I am delighted to hear from press reports and have confirmed by the Premier in his statement a moment ago that that matter will be addressed.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, we should be aware of what was agreed to in Meech Lake last week: It was an agreement to talk about fisheries jurisdiction, that and that alone. That itself is important, but we should not get carried away into thinking it was more than that. The real fight is yet to come, I say to the Premier, and I think he is aware of that. I spoke also that same week with

Mr. Peterson, the Premier of Ontario, and raised this issue with him and I was delighted though not surprised to find in both sessions, the one with Mr. Bourassa and the one with Mr. Peterson, that they were amenable to having this item discussed and, of course, that was confirmed in last week's agreement.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other point I want to make before sitting down in relation to this agreement of last week. First, let me say again that the objective of bringing Quebec into the Constitution is absolutely admirable, that objective was attained, and for that we are delighted, absolutely delighted! Mr. Speaker, this is in no way to subtract from the near perfection of the objective itself, but I submit, Sir, that in obtaining that objective some very serious missteps were taken, missteps that we shall pay for for a long time, particularly in terms of a weakened federation.

Now, that may serve the goals of the stronger provinces very much, but I submit to you that a strong central government is the best guarantee that the smaller provinces have, and it is that strong central government that we have been able to look to in this Province every since our Confederation in 1949.

Some of the measures that were taken last week have frightening implications. If you listened last night to the CBC show with Mr. Roy Romanow you will know what I am talking about, and if you listened to Jean Chretien earlier on some commentary you will know what I am talking about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, there you go again.

The objective is an admirable one, Mr. Speaker, and one with which we want to identify. Some of the measures that were taken were serious missteps and are again testimony, more than anything else, to the naive approach of the Prime Minister to short-term headlines at great cost to the country. We will live to rue the day, Mr. Speaker, because of some of the serious missteps that were taken along the route last week.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, we salute the overall objective. We salute the fact that a mechanism has been found to bring Quebec into the Constitutional Accord. In the process, Mr. Speaker, before the several aspects of the agreement are set to paper, carved in stone if you like, we hope they rethink some of those matters which would have the effect of weakening the federation at great expense to provinces such as Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Just to repeat the comments I made on Friday in response to the House Leader's notes and his comments on it, I would certainly like to commend all the Premiers, all eleven of them, including the Prime Minister, for making

Confederation whole and for at least being able to say it is one country from one end to the other and there are not any gaps in it at all. Speaking as a former resident of the Province of Quebec I certainly appreciate the effort made in order to accomplish that.

Just two other comments on it, Mr. Speaker: One is with regard to the fisheries jurisdiction. I think I can agree with the Premier that lack of extended jurisdiction in fisheries has cost us in the past and has put us in a position where we have not been able to create the number of jobs we wish within this Province out of the fishery. I am not entirely sure that this amendment will improve it, but at least it gets away from the status quo and there is a chance to get better. The problem we may have is four or five Atlantic Provinces sitting down and tugging in various different ways on the fisheries resource. So I hope the Premier is in fine fettle when he goes back to negotiate in these upcoming conferences because I think the task has just begun.

My final comment is about the Senate: I am pleased to see anything on the Senate because, quite frankly, myself, the Provincial Party, the Federal Party and every New Democrat in the Province are not satisfied with the Senate as it exists and we would prefer, quite frankly, that it be abolished completely. If, however, a second Chamber can be established in which the concerns of the peripheries, such as us, are met through this Chamber, then we certainly, from my perspective and the party's perspective, would very much like to look at the kind of proposals they are talking about here.

Personally, I believe that it has to be representative, it has to be elected, and there are a number of other things, I think, we would have to do. We have to be very careful, though, I think, at that time to define its powers. Because I think this House, itself, would feel somewhat constrained if we had a second Chamber sitting off somewhere that somehow was putting a check on everything we did. It may be extremely frustrating for members of the House of Commons to find finally that the Senate, when it is reconstituted into whatever it is going to be, may be a frustrating organ. So I think we will have to look at that very carefully and see what powers we do wish it to have. I think that is the key, how we want the people selected and where they will come from.

But I look forward to movement on that because, quite frankly, what is there now is not working. It is an expensive boondoggle and it is better to be gotten rid of than to do anything else with it, if it were to continue on in the same way.

So, I again would like to congratulate the Premier and say that I think the Premiers and the Prime Minister have done a laudable job here. I will look closely at the actual wording over the next little while to see if it sits with what we think it is supposed to do. And it would be very interesting to see the actual wording if we go through the Constitution itself.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I

will take my seat.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
I am pleased today to be able to call the attention of hon. members to National Forest Week which began yesterday and is being observed in this Province as well as in other parts of Canada. The week is sponsored by the Canadian Forestry Association and is supported by many individual organizations as well as the federal and provincial governments.

Each year the week has a special theme and the theme this year is "Forests -- A Shared Resource." This theme is especially applicable in this Province where we are constantly striving to ensure that our forest resource is managed in a way that is of benefit to everybody. The economic value of our forest can easily be illustrated by the fact that almost 14,000 people depend directly or indirectly on the industry for a livelihood, which means, in effect, with spinoffs and other economic factors that these jobs have an impact on the lives of some 25,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, all jobs created since I became Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

This same forest, Mr. Speaker, provides endless opportunities for recreation throughout the year.

One of our main tasks, Mr. Speaker, is to protect the forest from devastation by fire, insects or disease, as recommended in the

Report of the Poole Royal Commission on Forest Protection and Management. Hon. members will recall that on Thursday last I announced in this House that forest fire regulations would come into effect on May 8 this year, 11 days earlier than in 1986 and all our equipment, including the six canso water bombers - with two new CL-215s to be available soon - are ready for instant use and firefighting personnel are ready for any eventuality. In addition, we are well ahead with our plans and preparations to combat the destructive insect pest hemlock looper which threatens the health of thousands of acres of forest. We believe that the majority of people in this Province support our efforts to protect the forest from this insect, which has the potential to very rapidly cause enormous damage.

Mr. Speaker, National Forest Week offers us many opportunities to show people the value of the forest and the way in which it is managed. For instance, our forestry offices throughout the Province will be holding open houses at various times throughout this week.

The Newfoundland Forest Protection Association, of which my department is a member, co-ordinates many of the activities carried out during National Forest Week. The Association will be holding a display at the Village Shopping Centre from Thursday afternoon through Friday and Saturday and I invite all hon. members to drop by.

MR. TULK:
Are they going to stuff the minister?

MR. SIMMS:

They might stuff the hon. the member for Fogo.

Technicians from the Canadian Forestry Service, Mr. Speaker, will be on hand at the display to answer questions from the public about any insect or any pest, such as the member for Fogo, or any disease problems with their own trees and our own people will be on hand to provide forestry information.

Just as an example, Mr. Speaker, the NFPA is also asking students in schools throughout the Province to submit suggestions for a provincial tree. The hon. the member for Fogo will find this very interesting. We are one of the provinces that does not have one.

There is a massive essay contest ongoing over on the West Coast, in the Corner Brook area, and they will be awarding prizes this Friday, by the way, in the Corner Brook area.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to advise hon. members of this House that the town of Grand Falls has been nominated forestry capital of Canada for 1988.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

That nomination did not come from the member, it came from a number of associations.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we are hopeful that the Canadian Forestry Association will be making their decision on that nomination very, very soon.

Mr. Speaker, just to conclude, I want to invite hon. members, as

well as everybody in the Province, to take a moment or two to reflect upon the value and the importance of the forest to our economy as well as to our way of life in this Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

My, oh my! I wonder could we have tea now after all that?

MR. MORGAN:

And crumpets.

MR. TULK:

He has those with the federal Minister of Forestry.

MR. MORGAN:

Clyde Wells is going to need more than tea and crumpets, I guess.

MR. TULK:

He is going to serve you more.

MR. SIMMONS:

Restrain yourself. I know you have a particular affection for the hon. member for Bonavista South, but if you could restrain yourself for a minute while I get a word in here edgewise.

MR. TULK:

I love him. I love the stories he tells.

MR. SIMMONS:

Just let me say first of all, Mr. Speaker, that National Forest Week is an important event that we want

to salute as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

When they are all ready, Mr. Speaker, we will continue.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

National Forest Week is an event that we want to salute. I spent some time at the federal level involved as the parliamentary secretary for Forestry and we used to love to tell people then that one of every ten Canadians is employed in the forest industry. That statistic alone focuses on the importance of the forest industry. Here, in this Province, it is something like one out of twenty, but nationally one out of ten people are employed in the forest industry, not to mention the spinoff and the secondary jobs that flow therefrom. So it is an industry, Mr. Speaker, that we want to salute and join the minister in so doing.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, this has to be another prime example of the nothing statements we get from this administration that chew up the time of the House. Let me be more charitable. Perhaps they have reformed their ways. Perhaps this is notice, Mr. Speaker, that they are now going to get away from those fifteen or seventeen ads which show up in the paper every time there is a national green frog with blue spots week. Whatever the case may be that week, you get twelve, fourteen, fifteen, seventeen ads every time with a pretty picture.

I have to say for my cousin from Grand Falls, my darling cousin from Grand Falls, that his picture I find not particularly offensive. As a matter of fact, I wish they had the good grace to run his picture more often than some of the others over there.

But the point is made, Mr. Speaker. I hope that this is notice of a new time, that they are going to come to the people's House and deal with those issues and trust the press to report them instead of doing what they have been doing all along, obviously not trusting the press and going and buying ads to advertise items that are of public interest and concern anyway.

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) good stuff.

MR. SIMMONS:

Oh, that is not the reason? So it has to do with getting your picture in the paper.

I hope, in this National Forest Week in particular, and I have in mind the minister's reference to recreation on the top of page two, he will now, in concert with his colleague, the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett), go back and resurrect that green paper on commercial hunting and fishing camps which they have almost hidden away -

MR. TULK:

Almost? They have.

MR. SIMMONS:

- and give notice in one of the ads - put it beside your pretty picture if you want to - to the people that they have only another three weeks or so, until the end of May, to have some input on that issue which is going to affect the

lives and the whole lifestyle of many thousands of rural Newfoundlanders if the government goes for some of the more Draconian options in that particular paper. It is a document that not enough people are aware of I say to the minister, and he could do, in addition to going to the Avalon Mall and having tea and crumpets -

AN HON. MEMBER:

You only have until the end of May, four more weeks.

MR. SIMMS:

I will do some more ads.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. YOUNG:

This time next month you will have a new leader, boy. Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

You could do with a new leader yourself, but that is another issue.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the minister, in addition to his tea and crumpets and in addition to his Avalon Mall visits, to get some information out to the people about this particular statement.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Are you looking for me, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We, in this Party, would also like to make a note of appreciation and respect for National Forest Week but I would like to take up a statement in the Minister's Statement in which he says 'we believe the majority of people in this Province support our efforts to protect the forests from the hemlock looper' and say that the minister comes in here today with absolutely no shame. There is a controversy raging in this Province. The weekend newspaper carried articles by no less than three prominent citizens in our community, all of whom are raising very serious questions about the proposed spraying with fenitrothion this Summer, and they are raising those questions simply because they are not getting any answers.

Notice has been given by the Rod and Gun Club as one organization concerned about protecting our forests, that they may be forced to take the government to court. This spraying with fenitrothion this Summer may be in contravention of the Migratory Bird Convention Act, and it may indeed bring shame on this Province and other provinces across the country and the federal government may have to deal with the fact that Canada, as a signatory to this international convention, may, through one of its provincial governments, be in contravention of it.

The minister has not acknowledged

MR. PEACH:

(Inaudible) a turr.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Why do you not ask me a question about it?

MR. LONG:

The minister has not acknowledged - and some of the remarks that we are witnessing in the Chamber here today are further evidence - that the government as a whole has absolute contempt for the concerns that are being brought forward on this issue. What this government must understand is that the forests as a resource do not equal simply dollars, the forests have to do with culture and recreation and we -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These questions will continue to be put to the government.

MR. SIMMS:

You have not put one yet.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, you may recall that during the last Session of the Legislature an amendment to the Real Estate Trading Act was passed

which provides for the establishment of a Real Estate Foundation. This amendment requires real estate agents to maintain interest bearing trust accounts with the interest earned on these accounts to be used for educational purposes within the real estate industry.

The foundation is to be administered by a Board of Governors and in this regard I am pleased to announce the following appointments:

Mr. Kenneth G. George of Century 21 Suburban Real Estate, St. John's, is appointed as Chairman for a three year term. Mr. George is currently the President of the Newfoundland Real Estate Association.

Mr. Owen Grimes of Homelife/Pat King Real Estate, Grand Falls, is appointed as a member for a two year term.

Ms Goldie Melendy of Central Trust Real Estate, Corner Brook, is appointed as a member for a two year term.

These first three appointments will represent the real estate industry, pursuant to Section 51(2) of the legislation.

Mr. Tony Dearness, President, Newfoundland Branch, Consumers Association of Canada, is appointed as a member for a three year term representing the public at large.

Mr. Robert LeGrow, Superintendent of Real Estate, is appointed as a member for a three year term and will represent the Department of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

It is hoped that with the appointment of the Board of Governors, the interest earned on these trust accounts can be readily directed towards educational purposes within the real estate industry and will result in real estate professionals whose increased qualifications will benefit the consumer in the form of advice and guidance in all matters pertaining to real estate transactions.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

We, on this side of the House, supported that particular piece of legislation when it appeared here. We welcome the appointments and wish these people well in the exercise of their duties.

We will be watching very carefully to see what actual benefits will accrue to consumers and we would have wished, Mr. Speaker, and I think this was brought out by the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) during debate at the time, we would have liked to have seen some this particular money from the interest rates bearing accounts be directed to consumer groups for research with respect to real estate matters.

However, we welcome the general thrust of this statement. We wish these Board of Governors in their appointments by government today well in the exercise of their duties.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, we see who the rip-off crew is for the rip-off legislation, do we not, as they are now being appointed. Just to repeat a few comments made last year since, I think, we have hashed this out quite well. I am glad to see my friend Ken George there, by the way, since we did debate on CBC about the foundation itself.

To repeat the same points I made last year, the money does not belong to the real estate companies; it does not belong to the real estate agents, it belongs to the people who are buying and selling houses and have they money in escrow. There is no reason in the world that the interest on that money should be used to train these professionals when every other professional group pays for its own training. The money at the very least should go back to the consumer or should be used in a much more charitable way.

Mr. Speaker, we made the remarks last year. All we now have is the gang of people in this foundation who will be administering what is, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, a rip-off. It continues to be a rip-off and it will always continue to be a rip-off until we can get to change the legislation.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. It concerns the hiring of the former Premier of Alberta, Mr. Lougheed, and the Premier's commitment, I think it was a couple of months ago, to table certain information concerning the advice that Mr. Lougheed was giving to the Newfoundland Government. I understand, for example, the retainer for Mr. Lougheed has perhaps now risen from \$40,000 to \$60,000, and I understand that the \$440,000 that we paid him last year may very well just be the tip of the iceberg, so to speak, and that we may pay him another \$400,000 to \$500,000 this year. I wonder is the Premier now prepared to table the information that was given to us by Mr. Lougheed for this amount of money that we paid him last year?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer) addressed this issue this morning. Since Mr. Lougheed and the firm that he represents have been working for the government, all of the reports and information that has been forthcoming from the firm and from Mr. Lougheed have been centered almost exclusively around the whole negotiations on Hibernia. Obviously, any information that we would normally provide in a normal energy update on the situation in Canada or North American and the world would be appropriate information to table in this House. The information and the focus of attention, since Mr.

Lougheed and his firm have been hired, have been almost exclusively on the Hibernia negotiations and the various discussions that are going on there.

So it would not be appropriate at this point in time to release that information because obviously it has to do with the ongoing negotiations between ourselves and our negotiations with the federal government, as a government versus the province, as well as the negotiations that we are having, together with the federal government, with the Mobil group of companies which wish to develop the Hibernia oilfield. So at this point in time it would not be appropriate to release the information because obviously it has to do with the negotiations, which are still ongoing, and are confidential.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier committed himself, I think it was on March 5 - I have now got the date nailed down - to getting the information, especially the quarterly reports that Mr. Lougheed was supposed to give us for his \$40,000. I would like for the Premier to again tell us why has he changed his mind particularly in relation to the quarterly reports?

I would also like for the Premier to tell us what it was Mr. Lougheed has to give us over and above Mr. Cabot Martin, whom I understand we paid \$102,000 to last year to get certain information and to advise the

Premier on the offshore; in other words, seventeen weeks work at \$105 an hour, which I think comes out to somewhere around eighty-five days, or 600 hours at \$150 an hour. Is it \$150 an hour that we paid Mr. Martin? I would like for the Premier to tell us just what it is that Mr. Lougheed has got that is so special that by the end of this year is going to cost us around \$800,000 to \$900,000, in addition to Mr. Cabot Martin costing us \$105,000 this year gone?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Fogo obviously is confusing the whole issue. It is not just Mr. Lougheed, important and valueable as he is in our ongoing negotiations with the federal and with the companies, it is his firm. His firm has been involved in various legal and economic analyses as we exchange various proposals. Even within the proposals themselves there are a myriad of components which have to be analyzed, so a lot of follow-up analysis has to be done on the legal and economic implications of various components in a given proposal, either from the federal government to us or from us to the federal government or both governments to the company, or from the company to us. It is a pretty intricate business.

Mr. Martin's first role is as an ongoing member of the negotiating team for the government, and he provides us with information which is primarily provincial and an analysis of it from a provincial

prospective.

Mr. Lougheed and his firm are into the more global aspects of the agreement and its impact upon the federal government, and upon the companies - especially the companies. Where Mr. Lougheed and his firm can do and are doing the most good is in analyzing the various positions of the companies and giving us some valuable information upon the whole group of companies that are involved and the various proposals that they put forward, their likely motivations and this kind of thing. So it is a different role that the two people play.

As I want to just reiterate, it is not only Mr. Lougheed but his firm, many people in his firm, who do a lot of this additional legal and economic analysis. Mr. Martin's main role is to advise the Province of Newfoundland, from a provincial prospective, and Mr. Lougheed and his company to do it on a national and international basis in his ongoing involvement around the world in the oil business.

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, is the Premier then agreeing with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) who, I think at one point, called the lawyers in this Province 'garden type' lawyers? I think he said to a certain newspaper this week that perhaps in twenty years time we could develop some expertise in this Province to deal with the kinds of matters that Mr. Lougheed

is dealing with.

Will the Premier now admit that he too -

MR. TOBIN:

You want Clyde Wells to do it, I suppose.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have the gofer at the back there quiet.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Would the Premier now admit that by the end of this year we will have spent close to \$1 million on his political friends for information which the law firms in this Province could very well have contracted for? Will he now admit that this \$1 million is just another example, the latest one that we have revealed - the \$440,000 paid last year, the \$440,000 paid this year, and the \$102,000 to Cabot Martin at the rate of \$150 an hour - is just another example of his political patronage to fill the pockets of his Tory buddies?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how the hon. member for Fogo can get up and keep making these kinds of statements. I will let the character and integrity of the hon. Mr. Peter Loughheed speak for itself. He does not need any money from the Government of Newfoundland to put bread on his table, neither does Mr. Martin. The competence and the character of these individuals, and whom they represent, speak for

themselves. I mean the same hon. gentleman is -

MR. TULK:

Did he agree with the Finance Minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- getting up and talking about that when his own party is in deep, deep trouble for obviously providing to one of their leadership candidates a whole range of money, and nobody knows how much it is, nobody knows where it is coming from, so how can he stand up and accuse this party and this government of doing something?

MR. TULK:

How about Mac Peak, 'Brian'?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Were you a part of that?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We are proud to have Mr. Loughheed serve for the Government of Newfoundland to provide us with information and analyses of the various oil companies. We are proud to have Mr. Cabot Martin involved with us, who has been involved with the Government of Newfoundland in one capacity or another for the last ten or fifteen years. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to defend it, I intend to take the offensive and say that we are proud of Mr. Loughheed, proud of Mr. Martin, and every dollar we pay them we get it back in spades.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

MR. TULK:
You are offensive to everybody.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
That is why I am still over here
and you are over there.

MR. TULK:
It is going to change, 'Brian',
and very quickly.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
You have been promising me that
for ten years.

MR. TULK:
I promise it again.

MR. CALLAN:
It is only eight, by the way, but
it seems like ten.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
My, they have had a good weekend,
Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
You are darn well right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, we have just
illustrated how the Premier can
misunderstand most things. I was
referring to my hon. colleagues
having a good weekend.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

To the same subject, Mr. Speaker,
I say to the Premier I understand
his pride in Mr. Lougheed; that we
do not argue. I understand that
he wants to take the offensive;
that we do not argue. But I ask
him to just leave the red herrings
outside the door, as it were, and
answer the key question that my
friend from Fogo has put to him.
It is not whether anybody wants to
smear the reputation of Mr.
Lougheed, who served this country
well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member is making a speech
instead of asking a question.

MR. SIMMONS:
I thought so, Sir.

To the question: It is not a
question of Mr. Lougheed's
reputation. The real issue is
this: Is the Premier convinced
that he had to go outside the
Province to get the kind of advice
he is getting from the Lougheed
firm? To say it differently, is
that kind of legal expertise not
available in the Province? Is
that what the Premier is saying to
the House and to the people of
Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:
Okay, we have him on the run!

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn). Can the minister tell the House how we went from such a positive statement of eight weeks ago, made by himself in this Chamber, stating that a large part of Domtar's gypsum requirements would be produced at Flat Bay for US and local markets, to the negative statement of Friday past, that this new company, Domtar, would close the operation because the gypsum produced there was not satisfactory? Now, how did we go from such a positive statement, made by the minister himself in this Chamber, to such a negative statement, made by the minister Friday past, in such a short period of time?

MR. TULK:

He did not know what he was talking about.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

Mr. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, that is relatively simple. The statements that were made here about a month ago, and the statement that was made here last Friday were ones that were co-ordinated with the company. The company, Domtar, bought Genstar, which is the gypsum operation of Imasco, and Flintkote was a wholly owned subsidiary of Genstar. When they did that they had slow machine operations down in the Eastern United States. They made a corporate decision that they would speed up the machines down in the Eastern United States and, because of some small impurities in the gypsum at Flat Bay, they decided that they could not produce a good quality wallboard with the impurities that

they had in the gypsum produced at Flat Bay. The impurities consist of sodium and gravel. Now, the gypsum at Flat Bay is perfectly good for slow machines, such as the one that we operate ourselves in Corner Brook, at Atlantic Gypsum. It produces perfectly good wallboard and we have every indication that we will find a buyer and an operator for the Flat Bay operation before the end of this year. Mr. Speaker, this government has a pretty good success ratio with respect to operations such as Corner Brook -

MR. SIMMONS:

Answer the question.

MR. DINN:

- unlike the hon. member whose record is not that good. The hon. member should stop interrupting and go out and see if he can do up his income tax for this year.

MR. SIMMONS:

Boy, answer the question.

MR. DINN:

Maybe the hon. member should pay his taxes. Has he got them done yet this year?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

I am attempting to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, and I keep being interrupted by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, whose name appears not in the news columns of the paper but in the court column.

So the gypsum produced at Flintkote, because of the high speed machines used in Eastern United States, will not produce a good quality wallboard in that operation, but it does, as I say,

in the operation in Corner Brook. There are plenty of machines around that operate much like the one does in Corner Brook, so we are very confident. So both statements, the one that was made a month and a half ago and the one made last Friday, are positive statements, because we still have the operation operating. We hope, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. member's information, to get Daniel's Harbour back operating before the end of this year as well.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, the minister tell us today that his statement of eight weeks ago, which was a positive statement, was co-ordinated with Domtar. I would like to know how he squares that with the President of Domtar, Pierre Dupuis, saying that Domtar always knew that Flat Bay did not fit in with the needs of the company. 'We did not buy it' - the mine at Flat Bay - 'but it was part of the deal, we had to buy it. It did not fit in with our total picture.' If you knew that eight weeks ago, why did you not tell this House?

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

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, Domtar did not make any decision on Flat Bay until about one week ago. That is when the Board of Directors made the decision on Flat Bay. Mr. Speaker, we were informed - we understood that there was

something going on - about that decision, we had a meeting with the company, the company is interested in being part of the divestiture package, and is, as a matter of fact working with us to make sure that we find a buyer for the operation out at Flat Bay.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, we see that the President of North Star Cement Limited knew of the closure some time ago, the President of Atlantic Gypsum knew of the closure some time ago and now we have the President of Domtar stating that this particular mine did not even fit in with company plans. Why did the minister not know some time ago that this particular mine would not be operational?

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

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, the mine is operating and we believe that the mine will continue to operate, albeit maybe not with Domtar. We believe that the gypsum operation in Flat Bay will operate for a long, long time to come, not only in the gypsum operation in the pit that it is in now, which is pit B, but there also is a lot of gypsum out there in that area some of which we believe should have no contamination at all. It just so happens that in rationalizing all of the operations of Genstar, which were bought by Domtar, the one that they had in Flat Bay just

did not fit in with their plans, and that was only decided recently. It was always our opinion that the gypsum in Flat Bay was of good quality and still is. The pit that they are in now, even though it has some contamination in it, Mr. Speaker, we believe that it is still good and it works perfectly well for the gypsum operation in Corner Brook.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
A question for the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Finance would inform this House of the total cost of the advertising of the government's claim to have created 2,000 jobs during the past year, more than half of which were part-time? Can the minister indicate the total cost of advertising these 2,000 jobs?

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, just to make sure that the hon. member understands, last year 5,000 jobs were created in the Province. So far this year, and this is by no means the total that will be ultimately created, we have documented somewhat over 2,000 jobs created.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

I do not think it cost us anything to have the word about the 5,000 last year go out because I think that was done by many reputable authorities throughout Canada. But this year there might have been some minimal cost in regard to getting that meaningful information out to our people in regard to the continuing creation of new jobs. And I do not have that detail at hand, but I am sure it can be easily gotten and I will undertake to do so.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
I remind the minister that there was a full-page ad appearing in all the dailies advertising 2,088 jobs. Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House Commission pointed out that unless the provincial government generated 10,000 jobs each year that unemployment would remain at critical levels in this Province, and in view of the paltry number of jobs created by this government, would this money have not been spent more wisely if it were spent on job creation rather than trying to advertise the creation of a paltry 2,000 jobs?

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, there are many things go into the creation of jobs. Some of them do involve some government expenditure, but that is by no means the main factor.

So I do not think that that very small amount of money - I do not know what it is, but I am sure it is, relatively speaking, quite a very small amount of money that government paid in getting that very meaningful and very much required information out to our people - would have had much impact on job creation in this Province.

I would like to again, Mr. Speaker, point out that this government has in place a whole range of plans that in time, some of them quite soon, but some of them over a longer period of time, will undoubtedly result in job generation and employment in this Province. We are taking the House Commission very much to heart. We have acted on many of its recommendations already. It is part of our ongoing plan, and we will pursue that with vigor in the months ahead, despite the fact that the Opposition do not want us to do that. They want us, apparently, to put the House Commission up on the shelf, forget about it, do nothing about it, inform the people not one iota about it, but that is not our intention. Our intention is to push ahead, create jobs, using the House Commission as one of the basis for our thrust in that regard, but also employing many other initiatives.

MR. LUSH:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUSH:

I can inform the minister that if this government had any kind of a job creation they would not need to advertise it because the people

in this Province would know about it.

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). I wonder if the minister can indicate how he can support the waste and extravagance of this government in its total advertising and propaganda programme when communities in Bonavista North, like Gambo, Greenspond, and Wesleyville, have raw sewage coming up from the ground and running in the ditches?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

How can he support a government that is wasting this money on advertising?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I do not think that question is quite in order. It was a final supplementary on the particular topic that the hon. member was addressing to the Minister of Finance. If the hon. member wishes to address a final supplementary, that is fine, but not on a different topic.

MR. LUSH:

It is on the waste and extravagance of this advertising programme.

I will put the question to the Minister of Finance. How can he justify, how can he rationalize this extravagant waste of money on advertising a nothing job creation programme when we have communities right throughout Newfoundland - particularly I named communities in Bonavista North like Gambo, Greenspond and Wesleyville - with raw sewage coming up through the

ground and running in open ditches, a threat to the health of residents living in these communities?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is using adjectives about the amount of cost to bring out that meaningful information to the people of the Province - information that they are very anxious to hear - like extravagant and exorbitant and all that sort of thing, but that does not mean that that is a fact just because he applies those adjectives to them.

In regard to municipal funding and funding for municipal services, the hon. member may not be aware, but there has been an enormous increase in the amount of funding going into these services year after year after year. I think if you compare this past year with 1979 you will find well over a 150 per cent increase in the amount of funding that went for those particular needful services.

So the hon. member is comparing one thing that is quite minimal in cost with something else which is a very large cost and which the government is already taking care of. I mean, it is just a rather foolish play on words.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

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

and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power). It has to do with Summer job creation for students in the St. John's area. I would like to ask the minister if he could tell us what plans his department has for Summer student employment in St. John's, especially in view of the fact that this government has withdrawn from the federal programme which it participated in in Summers past?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I would be more than delighted to explain our position on Summer employment this year for students and for other persons in this Province. Basically we have withdrawn from the Summer Employment Programme with the federal government, as we have from the Canadian Job Strategy aspects of job development with the federal government. We have our own fund of \$12.5 million, Mr. Speaker, this year for job creation for those types of projects within Newfoundland. Seven and a half million dollars of that \$12 million will be spent basically by government departments, and \$5 million will be spent in an entrepreneurship programme wherein we will cost share fifty/fifty the salaries of new jobs created in this Province.

In all of that job creation \$12.5 million fund, we have designed that 40 per cent of those jobs must be for people twenty-five and below, which will take in both students and young people, to address the high unemployment rate among young people in this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, we have a very large number of applications on hand for our

entrepreneurship programme and we have already announced close to \$4 million or so for government sponsored jobs of which, as I say, 40 per cent will be for people below age twenty-five.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:
To the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies again. I have heard announcements from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), the Minister of Forest Resource and Lands (Mr. Simms), the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) about some of the jobs the minister has spoken about. I am asking has the minister anything to report to students in the St. John's area in the way of government assistance for Summer employment programmes? Am I understanding the minister to say that, "No, the government has nothing specifically in place for student Summer employment this coming Summer"?

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

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, I find it amazing that the spokesman for the NDP, who always talks about fairness and right, is now saying that we should seem to have a special programme for St. John's students and not for students in the rest of this Province. Mr. Speaker, that is not how this government works, we work on a fair basis. We have a \$12.5 million fund for job creation in this Province this

year and of those jobs 40 per cent must be for people age twenty-five or below. It does not mean that persons from St. John's cannot work on a fisheries project. The member may not be aware there is a large fishing community in and around St. John's, as well as other parts of Newfoundland, and those projects will be available to all persons in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, and we look forward to a very successful programme employing large numbers of students again this Summer.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:
My question is to the Minister of Health (Dr. Towmey). In the Estimates Committee we asked several questions with regard to the ambulance programme. The President of the Newfoundland and Labrador Ambulance Association, based in Corner Brook, took dispute with the minister's statement that two-thirds of people travelling in ambulances were accompanied by medical attendants, nurses, or various other first aid attendants going in the ambulances with the patients.

The President of the Association said that was a lie.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Would the hon. member please pose his question?

MR. HISCOCK:
The President of the Association ended up saying it was a lie and that there was not -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is persisting in making a speech.

MR. HISCOCK:

The question to the Minister of Health: Does the Minister of Health agree with the President of the Association when the present leader of the association states that many of the people who are accompanying patients in ambulances are friends, relatives, not proper medical attendants?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When I made that statement in the House I can assure you it was not just a slip of the tongue. I had it thoroughly investigated and, according to all the documentation that we have available to us in the Department of Health, it confirmed that the figure is about 75 per cent of trips made by ambulance operators in this Province are accompanied by someone in the cab and that is someone who is paid by the Department of Health.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

The Red Cross in this Province has been trying for years to have a first aid course and, of course, our Province uses St. John Ambulance. The Minister of Health just extended the St. John Ambulance first aid programme for another five years and said that

the Red Cross should stay at what it is best known for. Does the minister feel that there is not room for another group in this Province to be teaching first aid, particularly when the Red Cross do not want to be paid for it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

I know it might be old fashioned to feel that I am monogamous in my thinking, but honestly the St. John Ambulance Brigade have done a remarkable job since they have taken over the training of people in the first aid field, a remarkable job. They have been renowned, they have published booklets on it, they have been copied by many other organizations in the world, and that is one they really specialize in. We have been remarkably pleased with the service they have given, not alone I as minister, but a lot of confreres on this side of the House. A lot of the people who sit out there have been delighted with the services. Why mend something if it is not really broken?

MR. HISCOCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

To the Minister of Health: Is the Minister of Health not the Medical Director to the St. John Ambulance Society and is it not a conflict of interest to extend their contract by another five years? Also, if he is the Medical Director for the St. John Ambulance, is that a paid position?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that my friend opposite really believes in the question he has asked. Because does he think that I am naive enough to be caught in a conflict interest for a position that I held many years ago? I can assure that gentleman that shortly after I was appointed to this office I resigned that seat and my position and everything else but the Department of Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Notices of Motion

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Return Of The Business Of Fishery Products International Limited To Private Investors" (Bill No. 34) - and the great kudos which accumulates to the industry and the government thereof."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Any further Notices of Motion?

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, by leave can I revert to Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees? I have the report of the department, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave has been granted.

MR. BRETT:

I wish to table the annual report of the Department of Social Services for the year ending March 31, 1986.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, before calling Orders of the Day, I would remind hon. members, as it was suggested it would be better to do it on Orders of the Day than in the evening, that tonight, as I mentioned last weekend, the Department of Finance estimates will be commenced at seven-thirty; and tomorrow at nine-thirty a.m., the Department of Social Services; and tomorrow at seven-thirty p.m., the Department of Environment.

On Orders of the Day we will go to some first readings.

Motion 8.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies to introduce a bill, "An Act To Establish A Community College System In The Province," carried. (Bill No. 13).

On motion, Bill No. (13) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Establishment And Operation Of The Institute Of Fisheries And Marine Technology, The Fisher Institute Of Applied Arts And Technology And The Cabot Institute Of Applied Arts And Technology," carried. (Bill No. 12)

On motion, Bill No. (12) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Order 3.

On motion, that the House resolve into a Committee of the Whole on the Summary Proceedings Act, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird):
Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Order. 3.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Summary Proceedings Act." (Bill No. 1).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Order 5.

A bill, "An Act Respecting Occupational Therapists." (Bill No. 8).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Order 6.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Prisons Act and the Uniformed Services Pensions Act." (Bill No. 3).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bills Nos. 1, 8, and 3 without amendment and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Order 7.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department of

Development and Tourism Act".
(Bill No. 4)

The hon. the Minister of
Development and Tourism.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to the existing Act for the Department of Development and Tourism and basically it is just with respect to one subsection, Subsection 2 of Section 4 of that particular Act. What it is really is to bring the structure of the Department on a senior administration basis into line with what has been happening with the reorganization of the Department to recognize new technology interests and the initiatives of government.

Mr. Speaker, prior to 1986 the Department was divided into three branches, each with an Assistant Deputy Minister. However, during 1986 there was an organizational realignment to enable the Department to better address its mandate in specific areas of small business, research and development, international trade, investment promotion, marine industries development and tourism development. The impending development of Hibernia and other offshore hydrocarbon discoveries and the potential for business development in areas of supply and services, prompted the establishment of a fourth Assistant Deputy Minister position with specific responsibility for the development initiatives in these areas. The Department is now organized into four distinct branches. The first Small Business and Technology; the second Trade Investment and Promotion; the third Tourism; the fourth Offshore and Marine Industries, each of which is to be

headed by an Assistant Deputy Minister.

Section 4 Subsection 2 (a) of the existing Act now provides for three officers, each to be called an Assistant Deputy Minister, and to accommodate the organizational changes highlighted herein it is proposed to amend the Act to provide for the accommodation of the additional appointment of such Assistant Deputy Ministers as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may approve.

Mr. Speaker, the diversification of this Department needs no exemplification by me at this time, because I am sure even my colleagues opposite recognize the overall responsibilities of the mandate of this Department and how important it is to have a proper organizational structure in place to provide for the proper accommodation of this mandate.

Each of the sections or the branches of the Department have just undergone a rather intense review, so that we are able to concentrate on those elements within our governmental structure to provide the best possible overview and facilitate the orderly development of job creation initiatives throughout government. I have a great deal of pleasure then, Mr. Speaker, to support the amendment to accommodate this organizational change.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is it?

MR. BARRETT:

What else do you want me to say?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the minister says, What do we want him to say? We thought, in his maiden speech in this House, he would say more than he just said; we thought he would give us some rationale for this particular change. Surely, the immediate rationale must be he has a fourth person he wants to move in.

MR. FUREY:

But it is open-ended.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is the point. It is open-ended, but I will come back to that, Mr. Speaker. As the minister speaks he makes it sound all very clinical. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at this thing in perspective. You see, my colleagues on this side have no difficulty with whether there are three Assistant Deputy Ministers or ten, as such. That is not the issue. The issue that we are concerned about is what I should characterize as the iceberg issue. This is just the tip of a very large, clumsy and very treacherous iceberg. To make my case, Mr. Speaker, I point you to the front bench of the government which is so full that it cannot all fit in one row; the front bench is actually in two rows in part of the House. We have twenty-two ministers over there, twenty-one with the Premier. You lose track, Mr. Speaker. Over a third of the members are ministers. Everything over there with any competence, except the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), is in the Cabinet, and the only reason he is not in it is because he does not want to be in it. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if he wanted to he would be in there, because he is one of the more competent people over

there.

Twenty-one minister for a province the size of Newfoundland and Labrador, with 560,000 or 570,000 souls: Mr. Speaker, there are cities larger than this in the country, but that is not exactly the point, the more relevant point is that provinces with much larger populations do not require twenty or twenty-one ministers to administer, in a political way, the affairs of a government.

Now, add to that, Mr. Speaker, twenty-one or so deputy ministers doing lots of administering - I suppose that is what deputy ministers do, they administer - and add to that the entourage of associate deputy ministers you have in some departments - I am sorry I said that, because I might have just given the minister an idea. Lord knows, next week he will create two or three associate deputy ministerships - then on top of all that add twenty-one departments times three assistant deputies, and that is not enough we are told now, add another sixty or seventy or eighty or a hundred assistant deputy ministers, not to mention, Mr. Speaker, all the other types, the directors and the directors general and the general directors and the assistant directors and the assistant directors general and it goes on and on and on. Mr. Speaker, how many people do you need to administer the affairs of 500,000 souls? This is getting to be outrageous, not to mention, Mr. Speaker, the press secretaries and the assistant press secretaries and the other types that are there administering their little hearts out day in and day out.

Mr. Speaker, before I proceed just let me make it clear for the

record - I have to do this, because there are always some people of ill-will out there who would distort what we say in this Chamber - I do not count among that group the people who happen to serve these days as assistant deputy ministers and deputy ministers in the various departments. I do not count among that the DM in Development, Mr. Granter, whose record of service is second to none in this Province, or Mr. Palmer, the ADM for Development, or Mr. Burden, the ADM for Tourism, or Mr. Greenland or Mr. Staple. These people, Mr. Speaker, all serve the public service and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador very well. So my argument is not with them, it is with a system that is becoming increasingly bloated, increasingly top-heavy, far beyond what we can afford as taxpayers in this Province. A government that last month brought in a budget with a deficit that had ballooned from \$42 million to \$176 million in one year -

DR. COLLINS:

No, it is \$172.9 million.

MR. SIMMONS:

\$172.9 million. I was giving the Minister of Finance a little extra leverage, because we all know his past record of predicting deficits. He is sometimes out by a little. Nothing serious, just a few million dollars, mind you, \$10 million, \$40 million, \$50 million.

DR. COLLINS:

You are going to make me leap to my feet.

MR. SIMMONS:

To see the minister leap at anything would be an experience in itself.

MR. TULK:

He is like a cod fish after caplin.

MR. SIMMONS:

If I could so motivate him, Mr. Speaker, I would distort the figure even more, not by just \$1.1 million.

MR. TULK:

If you could put some life in that, what a man you would be!

MR. SIMMONS:

I would rush out and get it patented. I could sell it.

DR. COLLINS:

You are enjoying yourselves so much over that, you can carry on?

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you.

MR. TULK:

Of course we are going to carry on.

MR. SIMMONS:

We call this a kind of collaborative approach, we say a few words each. Now, if I could have the floor for a few minutes I will say what is on my mind, then the rest of you can all get into it.

Principally what is on my mind insofar as this bill is concerned is that this is another example of an increasingly bloated administration, an administration that has long since run out of gas and now is looking around for ways to administribulize: more things to administer, more people to administer. It is a top-heavy bureaucracy, it is a top-heavy system, with deputies and assistant deputies and associate deputies and directors coming out of your ears.

Now, Mr. Speaker, nobody argues

the need for good management, but this has nothing to do with good management. This has to do with creating a few more pigeon holes to tuck some more people away.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the minister's dilemma. He has such a wealth of confident people he does not want to make decisions, so instead of narrowing it down to three ADMs he wants an unlimited number. I say to him, let him do his job and focus on the problem, and if you have more talent down there than you know what to do with, give it to some other departments of government that could well do with it.

MR. TULK:

Make them ministers. Give up your own job.

MR. SIMMONS:

Maybe two or three of them might consider running, I hope with better results than the gentleman for Bay of Islands (Mr. Blanchard), mind you.

MR. J. CARTER:

What has the member done?

MR. SIMMONS:

I just complimented the member for the Bay of Islands by implying that he was a very good civil servant, a very good civil servant, and I have expressed the fond hope that if other of his erstwhile brotherhood and sisterhood, as the case may be, would want to make the quantum leap from shore politics, i.e., civil service into elective politics, they would have more success than the minister has had as a politician.

MR. TULK:

A one term member.

MR. BLANCHARD:

(Inaudible) given time.

MR. TULK:

One term. Sure Brian is calling an election in the Fall, Ted.

Take out some more ads over there and tell me you are their member, boy.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) has the floor.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, this apparently innocuous little piece of legislation may be actually innocuous as well, and that is the point. But it is a marvellous springboard, Mr. Speaker, I say to the minister, for someone like I, who has been waiting for an opportunity in this House for some days, to focus some of our concerns about the general patronage approach of this government. We saw it today with the minister talking about the Premier of Alberta. He skated all over it, he dragged in all kinds of red herrings about the competence of Mr. Lougheed, none of which is at issue at all. What is at issue, Mr. Speaker, is that this government is on one unlimited spending spree. There is no lid on her at all. Anything goes! As long as you are spending the taxpayers' money, anything goes, absolutely anything! But somewhere, Mr. Speaker, a halt has to be called. It will not voluntarily be called by this administration, because they are living so high on the hog they are completely out of touch with reality. The halt will be called as soon as the Premier calls that

election. I hope my colleague is right. I hope he calls it in the Fall. Indeed, I wonder why he is waiting until the Fall. I hope he calls it in June so that we can get this issue settled, so that the people out there who see a government by patronage, who see a government by sneak -

MR. J. CARTER:
Alive and well.

MR. SIMMONS:
Let us come back to what I was saying to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) earlier today, this green paper on commercial camps -

MR. J. CARTER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
I have a friend in the Chair right now and, I say to the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), if he wants to get hove out, he should persist in what he is doing.

I was in Burgeo on the weekend, on the Southwest Coast - now, Burgeo, for the benefit of the gentleman from St. John's North, is just to the West of Mount Scio as opposed to the East of Montreal - and in Burgeo, Mr. Speaker, a number of people who, over the years, have been able to up Grandys River and enjoy their cabins, and enjoy their salmon pools, and enjoy their outdoor activity and hunt their moose and caribou, now feel threatened by a Green Paper that this government put out a month or so ago.

Now, the Green Paper and the White Paper approach are a good

mechanism for soliciting public viewpoints on an issue. So I do not score the government for putting out the viewpoint on commercial fish and hunting camps, what I do score the Department of Forest Resources and Lands and also the Department of Development and Tourism for, because that minister's name was on the document as well, is the sneak approach that is being used, the sneak approach of covering themselves in the sense that they can say we put out a Green Paper and we asked for input, but sneak in the sense that they are not fully advertising the implications, not fully advertising the option for people to make submissions as to what their concerns are, and, then, after the deadline passes at the end of May, we will hear the government say, Well, we asked the people. We put out a Green Paper and we did not get very much input. The reason they did not get any input is the sneak manner in which they put the paper out. It is the best kept secret in Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker.

I say to the gentleman who happens to occupy the Chair now how would he like it if one day that Shangrila, that absolute Shangrila up there on Deer Lake which he sees as his almost ancestral home, where he takes his friends and would-be friends like me to enjoy a-cup-a, and some things not even in a cup, how would he like it if one day he finds out that his friend the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, in collusion with the Minister of Development and Tourism, have cooked up a scheme that says the following: If the gentleman has ownership title that is another matter, the example will not apply. He can

smile if he has ownership. But if he has a lease, one of the possibilities for that legislation is that when the lease runs out it can then be transferred to the outfitters and his cabin will become the abode of other people who want to take a-cup-a and he will be there only as a guest from time to time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that severely strains the impartiality of a very impartial speaker, to put that kind of a conundrum to him, but I ask him, when he leaves the Chair, to investigate what I am saying and to find that that possibility is embodied in the Green Paper. I realize the minister has a guest in town today - is he still in town?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Yes.

MR. SIMMONS:
The minister has a guest in town today, so I will not do him the discourtesy of delaying him except to say to him that my reference to the Green Paper is for the purpose of drawing attention to a general approach of this government, a general high-handed, out-of-touch approach, an approach that says we make the decisions.

The Premier, in Carbonear I think it was on the weekend, drew attention to it when he talked about dynasty. Is there a word that will ever come back to haunt him? That is the whole attitude, Mr. Speaker, that we are here by divine right, that those ordinary plebes in Burgeo and all the other places can like it or lump it. We write the regulations this way, we do it this way because we are the government by divine right. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador have news for the man who

used dynasty over the weekend, they have news, and the news will be delivered election night, as soon as we get that election called, and the sooner the better.

MR. WARREN:
Is that so?

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes.

MR. WARREN:
Not according to the polls.

MR. SIMMONS:
Whistle past the graveyard. We have polls, too, especially in Torngat Mountains. As a matter of fact, we would give the member for a price less than he was paid to go over, for a small price we would give him some of the more colourful comments that were made in Torngat Mountains.

Could we just get him that sheet? Could we get him just that sheet alone?

MR. TULK:
No, he is not getting that poll.

MR. SIMMONS:
Oh, come on guys be fair. He is a former friend of ours. Give him just the sheet with the more colourful comments about Torngat Mountains, just that sheet.

MR. TULK:
We cannot do it, 'Roger'.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I do not see what polls have to do with Tourism and Development, unless there are signs on them inviting tourists in.

MR. SIMMONS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for

another brilliant ruling, saving me from the oratorical invective of the gentleman from Torngat Mountains. I needed to be saved from that savage attack.

Now, Mr. Speaker, back to my good friend, the Minister of Development and Tourism, who has another agenda today as host of another province's minister. Just let me say to him in concluding that he must, first of all, before he gets the support of this side of the House for this particular amendment, give us in a little more explicit detail his particular rationale for wanting to go beyond three assistant deputy ministers. I can understand his decision problem of choosing among so many good people, but surely there has to be a better reason for adding to the public payroll than that. If he is going to close the debate, would he address that particular issue?

It does not subtract from the overall issue that we read in this bill, as innocuous and innocent as it looks, part of a general attitude, an arrogant attitude on the part of the government that they can go on ad infinitum, ad nauseam acknowledging and extending the bureaucracy, bringing in more administrators and generally draining the public purse without limitation. We would appeal to the minister, instead of being in here looking for ways to expand the bureaucracy he take some initiative, even a symbolic initiative, that would send out a signal that the restraint the government preached to other people is being practiced in their own governmental household.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Just a few words on this bill. The hon. Leader of the Opposition says this is an innocuous bill. It is not an innocuous bill, it is an important bill. Any bill that has to do with the Department of Development and Tourism is likely to be important, because the Department of Development and Tourism is one of the new thrusts of the Peckford Administration. Prior to that there was a Department of Industrial Development, I think it was called. It had a narrow focus. I am not sure that it had too many successes to point to, but it had a narrow focus and development aspects were spread throughout all departments as, indeed, they still are. But there was not a real push behind what development means: that is something new, bringing on something new, bringing on new initiatives and putting behind them resources and personnel and dedication and persistence. That is what this new Department of Development, which later had Tourism tacked on to it, formally, was designed to do and I think it has done its job very well.

Now, it is not an easy area to work in, development, by its very nature. It is easy to start things, I suppose, but it is not easy to make new things succeed. Statistics have been quoted any number of times, that for every new business that is started and succeeds another one is started and fails, something like that. So new ventures, new businesses, new undertakings do need the

attention of government to give them continuing support where it is needed, particularly in a province like ours where we have not been inclined, I suppose, ever to have the sort of innovative business approach to life that many other places have. There are any number of reasons for that, and this is not the time to go into them, but I think that is a fact.

Another unfortunate fact, from my point of view - this has been expressed before - is that our educational system does not seem to be terribly well attuned toward encouraging people to take on new ventures, to start things on their own and to make their own way in an economic way. Our educational system tends to say to young people growing up, aim for a job, aim for someone to employ you, aim to get employed with government, and so on and so forth.

Obviously, if we did not have anyone to work for government and we did not have anyone to work for Bowaters, and that type of them, we would not be in a very good position.

Nevertheless, we need, in addition to that, a sort of drive for young people who get their education, and then come out and say, 'I am going to start something new. I am going to be the author of something that was never here before.' Someone had to start everything. If everyone just waited, laid back and expected other people to do things, and they take advantage of it, clearly, we would soon wind down and nothing would be done.

Every generation has to have innovators, initiators and people who are willing to take a risk,

launch off into the unknown and take the benefits that come from it, take the risk, but also take the benefits, and, of course, spread those benefits, as often happens. When an individual gets something useful going, other people can be employed in that venture or other people take encouragement from what they are doing and take like measures.

This is the very difficult, very important, and very basic role the Department of Development has to take on. It is a relatively new department. It has only been there eight years. How long have other departments been here? How many have we had, say, an important department like the Department of Social Services or the Department of Labour or the Department of Health or whatever? They have been there for a very, very long period of time, as well they had to be. The Department of Development, in its present form, has been there for a relatively short period of time and it is still evolving the way it will be most effective. The minister has very clearly detected he needs more flexibility in terms of upper echelon staff to take on this difficult role, this very basic role which has to be performed.

So I think this is not an innocuous bill. It is an important bill. I think the minister has to be complimented for his initiative and for his incisive way of thinking about his department and for his willingness to try new things, especially for the young people of this Province.

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):
The hon. the member for Eagle

River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I basically want to comment very briefly on the bill, and again, as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) just pointed out, the need to have flexibility. We are not necessarily against the idea of flexibility and we are aware that the minister is probably one of the more competent ministers over on that side.

But the bottom line still comes down to where we are going to allow flexibility by having more than three deputy ministers when we know that there is a freeze on in the civil service; we know that hospital support workers, as well as people in the civil service are finding wages cut back or very little increases, and as I said again, having their positions frozen once a position becomes vacant.

Our concern is that if we allow this bill to pass without comment, then we are not doing our job. If we get in more than three assistant deputy ministers or an office for the Director of Administration, a question arises: How much is it going to cost the taxpayers? When we have the freeze on other hiring in the Province, is this legitimate in a time of restraint, particularly where we just borrowed \$436 million, \$172 of which is for day to day operating expenses? So our concern, and my concern, in particular is, if we allow one minister to come in with this, what is going to stop the deputy minister in each department, and each minister from coming in and building up larger bureaucracies and the reclassifying of salaries? It is not only that the deputy minister gets a half decent

salary, it is much better than the minister, but he also gets travel allowances. Also, at one time an extra \$5,000 was given, but that was done away with.

Are we just doing it from the point of view of attracting more qualified people into that department? With the definition of the salary scale and the scales that we have, do we need to reclassify? If we have to reclassify them, the best way to reclassify is give them the name of the Director of Administration or give them four or five assistant deputy ministers, and allow top quality people to come in that way.

If that is the point, then I think other ministers should bring it out, that we are not getting top quality civil servants coming into the government. Many of them are leaving the provincial civil service and going to the federal. All one has to do is look at the Department of Fisheries. The majority of the people in the Department of Fisheries are after leaving and going with the federal government, and mainly it is because of money. We have the same problem at the university. We are not attracting top quality, international professors like we did one time because the money is not there.

Under the Department of Development and Tourism, tourism is one part that is extremely important. We have been saying from time to time on this side, as well as the former member for the Bay of Islands, Mr. Luke Woodrow, he would bring in private amendments all the time. His statement was that ferries on the Gulf should be part of the Trans-Canada. By doing that,

of course, tourist dollars would come in. We have said it, but I am just reiterating that it is being said on both sides.

So when we talk about development and tourism, the thing is, we need an upgrading of the Trans-Canada. We need to have more tourists come into our Province. We are only getting 10 per cent of the bus tours that Halifax get. We have seen great strides take place in Gros Morne, L'Anse au Meadows and also in Red Bay. Parks Canada just did the house in Brigus of Whitmore, I believe, and Bartlett. They have stated it is going to take five years before they will even have a look at that.

You have the community out there in Conception Bay, Cupids, and it is one of the earliest settlements in the New World with European settlers, settled in 1610. What do you have? When I was out there the other day with the Liberal caucus, here is a sign out there by Parks Canada pointing out Cupids and it is falling down. Talking with the people in Brigus about the statues, one was put there over thirty-some-odd years ago and nothing has been done with it. The other one in memory to Captain Bob Bartlett, The Sails, is not being painted.

If you go around our Province and look you will find that in our Department of Development and Tourism, and our provincial parks, that we are not keeping up the historical parts of our Province. I would hope in the future to be able to see Cupids originally designed. You talk about making use of make work projects! The Minister of Forestry brings in his make work projects for timberland and cutting budworm and hemlock looper infested trees. What

better co-ordination of the Department of Social Services and Forestry and Tourism than getting the site originally built, because all it was was a wooden building and probably some stone, at Cupids in 1610, restored. For the life of me I still do not know after all these years with Tourism why that is not developed. I am pleased to know that out in Conception Bay North, they have now set up a development corporation to look into some of these matters.

I hope that the minister, when he does get up and address the reason why he needs to change this and why he needs to have more flexibility, will say if it is because of reclassification, that they need to reclassify them so they get top people coming in. I also hope, on a personal note, he will make comment upon Red Bay in my own district with regard to the progress that is taking place between Parks Canada and the provincial government and also if he has issued the terms for study with regard to Red Bay.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, my concern and the Opposition's concern with this bill is that it is allowing bureaucracies to become larger without safeguards. If we get into hiring two or three extra people, we are talking close to \$250,000 and \$250,000, even though it is in the Department of Development and Tourism probably could be utilized a lot more efficiently in other departments and other programmes in our Province.

We have people in Whitbourne saying they have to boil their water. We have the problem out in Central Newfoundland with water. We have the problem in St.

Anthony, and \$250,000 could end up providing chlorination systems to make the water pure for our people. But then again, if these people who are going to be hired are going to turn around and provide new jobs and get development and co-ordinate the Department of Tourism, Social Services and Forestry and get into building the centres like I mentioned in Cupids, then maybe it would be okay. But when I look at this, I just do not see Bill 4 on the paper with a few paragraphs on it, I see basically \$250,000 or \$300,000. I do not know really if we can afford it at this time.

Maybe what the minister should be doing is going to the Premier and saying, "You have top people in the Cabinet Secretariat, in the Premier's Office, can you give me a loan?" Can you go to another minister and say, "Can I have a loan of one of your senior people for a year?" I think there are other ways of getting top quality people within the bureaucracy that we have now instead of just adding to it to get him flexibility. I would like to know his answers on why he feels he needs the flexibility and why the other ministers have not come in with this before. The other question I want to ask is, will the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) now start coming in and stating, "Okay, I cannot have three assistant deputy ministers, I need to be more flexible."

In concluding I ask the minister if he would make a comment on Red Bay and the study particularly for Red Bay.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Is the minister permitted to respond without closing the debate?

MR. SPEAKER:

If the minister speaks, he will close the debate.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I too want to echo the comments of the hon. member for Eagle River with respect particularly to the expansion of the bureaucracy. We are kind of befuddled almost to the point of amusement when you consider, Mr. Speaker, that we are seeing the government ask us now to vote for a piece of legislation which would expand the bureaucracy at a time when they have frozen all expansion to hospitals and to schools.

I too would like to say that I believe this particular minister's motives are right. I have no doubt about that. I think he is a good, able and capable minister whose motives are right. But I think his methods have been sidetracked somewhat by advice that he is getting somewhere.

I cannot see how there can be any improvement to a department so flushed with so many advisers, with so many bureaucrats, with so many assistant deputy ministers, and with a capable deputy minister.

Surely this battalion of advice, this very indepth bureaucracy is enough to allow this minister to use his very fine capability and abilities to perform his duties under that particular dual umbrella of development and tourism.

But I would like to echo for a moment, Mr. Speaker, the sentiments of the member for Eagle

River (Mr. Hiscock) when he talks about various towns and various places around the Province in serious need of development. I think, for example, when we look at this expenditure of money to expand the bureaucracy, surely that money could be placed in the town of Port au Choix where right now, Mr. Speaker, they are in a crisis situation and have been for some time, with respect to the water supply there.

Fishery Products International's flagship is the plant at Port au Choix on the Northwest Coast of the great Northern Peninsula. It is a very profitable fish plant. It needs the water supply, Mr. Speaker, from the town's reservoir. We have to question whether this expenditure by this particular department to expand the bureaucracy is a good and sound and reasonable and valid expenditure when we see in jeopardy 450 jobs, solid, good, for the most part, permanent jobs, depending on the time of year, 450 jobs at the fish plant in Port aux Choix.

I am sure the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) would be crying in his beer pretty loudly, Mr. Speaker, if the water supply system in St. John's was in a crisis situation and his own private business of the savoury farm relied heavily on it and they had to shut it down and through him out of work and cut into his profits. So, that would be an interesting comparison, to see how rational he would behave and whether he would provide sensible comment to this Chamber. I understand he has not yet and he has been elected for a number of years.

Returning to this particular bill,

Mr. Speaker, we have to ask the Minister responsible for Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) a number of questions. When we look at the output, the expenditure, how much money is expended and spent by his department jet setting and highflying around a number of Continents, paying for people to be flying here, there and everywhere at government expense, we have to look at the right side of the ledger, a.) is the left side of the ledger. How much is he spending jet setting across the planet? I was going to say one Continent but all Continents, and there are parliamentary secretaries flying all over the place at the expense of government. I do not mind that, Mr. Speaker, I do not mind that a bit, if you can show me on the other side of the ledger how many jobs they have brought home from all this highflying jet setting. That is a fair statement.

MR. BARRETT:
Kruger.

MR. FUREY:
Now he shouts Kruger. Kruger was Bowater in crisis.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Come By Chance.

MR. FUREY:
Come By Chance was read in an ad by a company in Boston, that is two.

What do you want to go one for one? Flat Bay eighty-five jobs down the tube, Daniel's Harbour 165 jobs down the tube.

Mr. Speaker, we see the parliamentary secretary and his minister shouting in dual tones, in harmony about the number of

jobs that they have created. Let us ask the Minister responsible for Tourism and Development (Mr. Barrett) - a very important department run by a very capable minister - let us ask him, Mr. Speaker, to put on the right side of the ledger the expenses incurred by the Department for highflying, jet setting parliamentary secretaries, ministers and everybody else that decides to have a go over in Norway or Germany or Moscow or Australia and let us ask him how many jobs he has brought home from China, how many jobs he brought home from Norway, how many jobs he brought home from Germany and Ireland, Mr. Speaker, if he was in Ireland. I do not know if he was there yet but we will ask him that. So let us ask this good and capable minister, this hon. gentleman from St. John's West, let us ask him to provide the House with a break down, the ledger, the true picture of how much he spent in one fiscal year on the highflying jet setting, and maybe it is justifiable and valid, Mr. Speaker. I put the question out honourably and honestly. How many jobs can be put on the left side of the ledger? Give us the right side of the ledger with expenses, give us the left side of the ledger with jobs.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I would like the minister to address another issue which I admit freely is parochial but important to Bonne Bay. When he rises in his place I wonder would he mind telling us about any proposals he has received for the ferry system between Woody Point and Norris Point, whether his department has written that off or what, because I notice in the House Royal Commission they seem to think that rural Newfoundland

ought to be boosted in every possible way that that can possibly be done in terms of tourism. The minister knows because people have met with him. He has had representations from all walks of life on the West Coast and the Northern Peninsula and myself. He knows how much we believe this particular ferry system is in need between Norris Point and Woody Point. He knows that it is an attraction for tourism. He knows that it is part and parcel of developing rural Newfoundland as the House Commission calls for. I would ask him, if he would not mind when he is in his place, when he rises to close debate, if he would fill the House in and tell us whether or not any more approaches have been made, whether he is written it off, is it over or where exactly does he come from his department on that particular issue because there are jobs to be created, Mr. Speaker. There are tourist dollars to be brought to the Southside, and the Southside of Bonne Bay is hurting very badly, as I am sure the minister knows, so we will ask him to speak to that particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, I did not hear in the minister's opening remarks a good, sensible, logical argument for changing this particular act to allow him to supercede, to go beyond three assistant deputy ministers, to have Orders in Council prepared for any number that he chooses and sees fit. I really have not seen a good and justifiable, logical and valid argument for amending this particular act to allow that.

MR. J. CARTER:

If he offered you a job you would take it in a hurry, we know darn well.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) has a bad back over there, I think. He may have to see a chiropractor soon, he is slouching.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is from bending in the savoury patch.

MR. FUREY:

Bending in the savoury patch, yes.

Mr. Speaker, I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted by the hon. member for St. John's North that it would be interesting to hear the minister give this House a true and good and valid explanation for changing this act to allow him to have an unlimited number of assistant deputy ministers under the umbrella of Development and Tourism. I heard no clear, clean, logical explanation in his opening remarks, perhaps we will hear them in his closing remarks.

That is about all I have to say on this particular piece of legislation. I hope the minister will address some of the points that I raised, and in quick review I will say this: The expansion to the beauracry flies in the face of freezing any expansion to hospitals and schools. The expenditure for more assistant deputy ministers could be applied to Port au Choix to protect the 450 jobs there. The expenditure for more assistant deputy ministers could be applied to the ferry system between Norris Point and Woody Point to create and protect the jobs that were already there, to reinstate those jobs. And, Mr. Speaker, finally, the high-flying, jet-setting Department of Development and Tourism through all of the romps

across Europe and the Southeast Asian Continent, the North American Continent and, indeed, the planet at large, how much have we spent and how much have we in the bank for our buck, and how many jobs have you brought home?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I just have a few very brief comments to make on this bill. I would be very happy to support the bill if I could be guaranteed that the addition of new assistant deputy ministers to that department would have the desired effect. But I am afraid, and I will cite a few cases before I take my seat, that when we see a mushrooming bureaucracy then we see red tape. Of course, when you have red tape you know what happens, and I can give the minister and the House a couple of very good examples why I would find it awfully difficult to support this bill.

In fact, I made myself a promise some years ago, I guess, that I would take advantage of every opportunity and use every device at my disposal to fight an increased bureaucracy within our public service. I believe that we have come to the point now where development is being strangled. The bureaurats have finally got a stranglehold on development in this Province, and I am not just referring to the minister's department or to the provincial government, I am talking about all levels of government, the three

levels, municipal, provincial and federal. We have bureaucrats who are empire building, pyramid building to the point where it is virtually impossible today for a young person or any person to start a small business and to cut through the pyramids of bureaucracy that must be cut through. I will give you two examples: In my district there is a gentleman, a businessman not asking for any government money, he has arranged his financing through the chartered banks, who wants to establish a certain type business. I will not mention the name of the business or identify the person, because I understand that there are still negotiations going on.

This person wants to establish a small business in Twillingate district. In order to establish that business, this gentleman had to become a member of a certain closed shop type organization. It took him, by the way, Mr. Speaker, almost two years to get around the bureaucracy of the Department of Health, of the minister's department and other related government municipal, provincial, and federal departments.

Then he had to get a piece of Crown land. Now, I tell you, there is where the men are separated from the boys in terms of endurance. I was in constant touch with that gentleman. He is a good friend of mine and a constituent, a man for whom I have a lot of admiration and respect. He and I would talk frequently about the problems and how to get around this and how to get around that. Then, Mr. Speaker, he wanted to call tenders to have his building built in which he would operate his business. I think that was the straw that broke the

camel's back. Because having gone through the process of making the necessary applications and submission of drawings and plot plans and all that to the appropriate government department, he received a letter back, two full pages, Mr. Speaker, of requirements, of red tape, most of which, by the way, he could not possibly comply with.

He phoned me in frustration and said, 'Look, I have had it. I do not need that business, I am making a living anyway. I am prepared to invest a few hundred thousand dollars and create ten or twelve jobs, but I just cannot take any more of this red tape. I just cannot put up with it.' I dropped in to see the gentleman and he showed me his letter from a government agency. They were imposing on that gentleman, Mr. Speaker, who wanted to build a very simple, one story, wooden frame building, the same kind of regulations as if he were going to build a high rise apartment building in downtown Montreal. I swear the regulations that were being imposed on that gentleman were as stringent as if he were to going build a high rise building in the center core of a large Canadian city.

The National Building Code was being applied to a very simple, one story, 60 x 100 foot building in a small, Newfoundland outpost. That is when this gentleman decided he would throw in the towel, but I talked him out of it: I said, 'Look, if you do that, the bureaucrats will have won another victory. Hang in there and between us we will find a way to try to comply with those regulations.' That is one case, and that is not all over yet, by the way. That gentleman is still

not out of the woods, as it were, in terms of getting that business in operation. He is still having to cater to bureaucrats and comply with very obnoxious and unnecessary regulations.

I am sure these are typical examples of where government bureaucracy is having the effect of strangling business in this country, in this Province, in development. I have another case where a gentleman wants to build a couple of tourist cabins. He already has a piece of land that he owns on the waterfront in this small Newfoundland community on which he has already one well-built, attractive tourist cabin.

He got the idea eight or ten months ago that he wanted to enlarge his operation and maybe build two or three more cabins. We all know just how impractical it is to operate a one cabin operation; the overhead is high, there are certain ongoing expenses, and one unit does not generate sufficient revenue to make it worth this person's while. So he decided that he would start out and maybe enlarge his operation by building a couple or three more cabins.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that only the fit and the strongest will survive, because that gentleman, too, at one point was ready to throw in the towel. He just could not take any more of the bureaucracy and the red tape that was being imposed upon him.

The latest I heard from that gentleman was when he sent me a copy of a letter that he had come from the minister's department actually, the Tourism Department of the Department of Development,

another two-page letter couched in terms that would scare the fainthearted, very technical terms, making demands upon that gentleman to do this, to have a plot plan, a septic tank layout, a schematic plan of the whole area; information from the Department of Transportation and the minister stating that he had access to a provincial highway and that he had to undertake to do certain things with the grounds surrounding his tourist establishment. It is just absolutely ridiculous, and that person only wants to build just two small tourist cabins in a small Newfoundland outport. If that person were planning on building a multi-million dollar tourist establishment I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the conditions with which he has to comply would not be more rigid or more stringent. Mr. Speaker, maybe it is a personal thing, maybe as I get up in years I am beginning to realize the fallacy of some of the things that we do and government does.

When I was in the provincial Department of Fisheries I saw the effects of pyramiding bureaucracies, where you would appoint somebody in charge of something and that person suddenly got to be very ambitious and before you knew it he had a secretary, he had an assistant and that assistant had a secretary, and that was the way it went, pyramiding! Rather than asking for permission to be able to hire more assistant deputy ministers, I would much prefer if the minister were asking permission to maybe hire an expeditor. I am of the old school, I guess, when it comes to governments. I have served on all levels of government and I have always held the view that the moment the word gets out that Mr.

X is prepared to build a fish plant in Herring Neck, or a tourist establishment in Musgravetown, or a mortuary room in Grand Falls, the moment the word is out that people are interested in doing that kind of thing, I hold the view that there should be somebody from the appropriate government department, whether Development, Tourism, Health or Fisheries, who should immediately call upon that person. Now, maybe that is a bit far-fetched, but it can happen. It is not impossible. The moment there is a rumour that Mr. So and So is planning on expanding a business, or building a business, then somebody from the appropriate government department, whether municipal, provincial or federal, should visit that person and say, Look, Mr. So and So, I hear that you are now looking at the possibility of building a fish plant in Herring Neck, or whatever, what can we do to help? Let us sit down now and go over your plans. Is there any way at all that we can be of assistance? Can we give you some guidance as to how to comply with this, that, or some other regulation? Instead of that, Mr. Speaker, we have bureaucrats, aided and abetted by their ministers in some cases, whose antennae will immediately go up the moment they hear of somebody who wants to do something worthwhile in this Province, somebody who wants to do something to create a few jobs. The moment that happens, then their antennae will go up and they have to find ways and means of making it difficult for that person to do that something. That is the story of our life in this Province, and it has been for years. I am not saying that is solely the misgiving of this government, of course not! We have it in

municipalities. You go out today and seek permission to install a septic tank, for example, in a rural Newfoundland community and just see how difficult the bureaucrats will make it for you.

Go out and try to get a piece of Crown land on which you want to build a Summer cabin or maybe do a bit of farming and see how difficult they will make it for you. Go out and seek permission from some level of bureaucracy to build a house on a piece of land, anywhere in a Newfoundland outport where you do not have water and sewer and street lighting and proper roads and so on, and just see how difficult they try to make it for you. I am convinced that there are people within our system who stay awake nights dreaming up ways and means of complicating the lives of small business people and those who want to do something. I am convinced of that.

I know of a person - in fact, this was a member of my family - who had a small business on Duckworth Street, a small restaurant. That family member told me that he just could not put up with it any longer. He had to deal with eleven different levels of bureaucracy almost every day of his life to keep that little business in operation. He had people crawling over his premises from two or three different departments in Municipal Council and from the provincial government, and then, of course, he had big brother Ottawa breathing down his back the moment he was a day or a few hours late in remitting, for example, to the National Revenue Department, income tax deductions. There were all kinds of red tape and impediments and barriers being erected by the bureaucracy to make

life unbearable for that young man. Today, I say this to you now, in this Province and, in fact, maybe in the country generally, there is very little encouragement from government to help a small businessman get started. In fact, quite the opposite is true, there are all kinds of impediments and barriers and bureaucratic red tape that have had the effect of discouraging people.

I have untold admiration today for people I hear about who are planning certain developments. The other day I listened with interest to a newscast in which a certain Newfoundland businessman was outlining his plans to develop Freshwater Bay as a base for the offshore and I thought to myself, there is a brave man for you. That man should get the Victoria Cross. Because for anybody in this day and age, having to deal with the bureaucracy as we do, to take that sort of thing upon themselves, believe me they deserve to succeed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would strongly suggest to the minister that rather than talk about seeking permission to hire new assistant deputy ministers, he give serious thought to hiring an expediter, if that is the right word for it, the right title, somebody who will go out into the field and the moment they hear of somebody who wants to do something, try to find ways and means of helping that person rather than doing the opposite.

I am not imputing motives to the hon. gentleman opposite, the minister, but I suspect that if he succeeds, and I suppose he will, in getting this bill through the House this afternoon and having it become law, all it will mean is

the addition of new and bigger bureaucrats, an additional cost to the Treasury, as my hon. colleague from St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) said, at a time when we have Newfoundlanders drinking water that is not fit for human consumption, and having to live in areas where you have raw sewerage running in the ditches. I think Newfoundland today, Mr. Speaker, can ill-afford any further expenditures on highly paid bureaucrats, especially in light of the fact that in many cases by enlarging the bureaucracy we are having the effect of stifling and strangling development.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

It is a pleasure to rise and debate a bill. I wish I was rising to debate a bill with more substance. We find ourselves seeing a bill that wants to expand the bureaucracy. I would have no problem, as such, with expanding it if I knew what the benefits were going to be and if those benefits were going to be beneficial and would create employment in the Province. Looking at the past accomplishments of this government and their expansions of bureaucracy, I do not think the result is going to be a positive one.

So, it is unfortunate that we see the government today attempting to give itself more power to access another person to do work within a certain department, and yet not seeing exactly what those results might be or telling us exactly what those results will be. I do

not really count on the predictions of this government, as we have seen those go out the window over the past number of years.

Since this short amendment is on the Department of Development and Tourism, there are a number of topics I would like to bring up with the minister concerning a number of issues related to his department. The first one being the lobby for the sea cadet base which is ongoing now, which this government has ongoing, and which the town of Stephenville has ongoing separately. I firmly believe that that lobby should be a joint effort, one that brings both the town of Stephenville and area and this government together to seek out and deliver a sea cadet base to this Province. I feel the only way we are going to achieve such a facility for this Province is by that effort, by the joint effort, and by making it an issue in the Province. I feel that we have been discriminated against by the federal government when it comes to federal defence spending.

It is very evident in the research that has been done by the town of Stephenville, by the Chamber of Commerce of Stephenville and by local area groups that we are not receiving the proper monies that we should be receiving. I feel it is good, social spending that should be spent here which would help our economic base in areas of the Province that are in great need of it, and Bay St. George in Port au Port is a place such as that.

Recent statistics that I have been able to get my hands on show us that \$15 million was spent last year on cadet facilities in

Atlantic Canada, and of those dollars, the other three provinces in Atlantic Canada received monies, upwards of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and in some cases, in Nova Scotia specifically, millions of dollars to build or to renovate or to add on to present facilities they have in Atlantic Canada. Newfoundland received no dollars of the \$15 million, and we see ourselves now vying for a cadet facility which would bring benefits to the entire Province, which would keep our young people here in the Province to do training which would be beneficial to them and, hopefully, would give them a future. We see us now vying for a facility with Nova Scotia. We see the consulting firm that is doing the study from Nova Scotia recommending Nova Scotia as the site. So it seems like we are again out in the woods in our attempts to try and access something that should be automatically, rightfully ours.

So I bring that issue up with the minister because I feel that we cannot be doing enough. We have got to keep pushing it and pushing it and making it a public issue in this Province. We deserve it. It should be coming to us, because all of the arguments are totally in favour of Newfoundland and Labrador; they are totally in favour of this Province receiving its just dollars when it comes to defence spending across the country. We are, again, tenth out of ten when it comes to the dollars that are spent and we see the federal government not sending, I do not think, the right signals.

We have a really good lobby that has been going on for over a year. It is a lobby that has seen

people of all stripes, parties of all stripes, coming together and representing Newfoundland and Labrador in Ottawa, trying to achieve such a facility. But I am somewhat concerned that the federal government are maybe getting the wrong signals or getting signals from Nova Scotia and not exactly listening to our strong arguments. I say that not knowing for sure what their decision will be in Ottawa or not knowing how strongly our arguments have been put privately. So I ask the minister if he could address that issue when he rises as it comes under his department, relatively. We would see, if we were to achieve such a facility, the start of a recognition for this Province that it does deserve defense dollars that are being spent elsewhere in the country, that are helping build economic bases elsewhere in the country. They are building economic bases in Nova Scotia, PEI and New Brunswick but are not doing so here. We are the ones that are in special need of such monies right now. It is one avenue that was mentioned in the Budget Speech that it is something that this Province should be after. We have been neglected by the federal government, by the previous administration that was there and by the one that is presently there.

Also, with the new Green Paper or new defense paper that is coming out federally, we should be making it an issue in this Province that we deserve and should get our rightful share of the monies that are there. It is time that they recognized the fact that we are in desperate economic straits. One of the ways, one of the many ways that they can help us is by putting a facility in this Province that would see the young

people of our Province being trained in our Province with federal monies being spent in this Province which would expand the economy. Oh, the arguments are so great. It is an open and shut case as far as I am concerned, as far as a lot of people are concerned, and I am sure as far as the Minister of Development and Tourism and the Premier.

I bring those arguments forward again because it has not been out there in the public, it has not aroused as much interest, as far as I am concerned, as it should to let the people in Ottawa, the powers that be know, that this is an issue that should not be allowed to get away from us. It is a facility that, if we lose this one, if we lose the chance of acquiring such a facility, then I do not know exactly what future we will have in trying to acquire others because the case is so good, the case is just open and shut. There is no chance that we should lose it yet the signals are that this Nova Scotia firm will recommend Nova Scotia over Newfoundland, as usual, and other recommendations that are forthcoming are showing that maybe the signals are not the right ones.

So I ask the minister to keep at it and try to get more good signals from the federal government, to sit down and negotiate and to put our case as best he can as the decision will be made in the next few weeks. So, for us it could be a big decision that could help benefit the West Coast of the Province and, indeed, the entire Province.

I urge the minister, if he has not done so or, I am sure he has, but I would urge him again to have a

meeting with the Minister of National Defense, federally (Mr. Beatty), to meet with the federal government, to meet with the federal officials to let them know this sea cadet base is a start. We need a good start for this Province in starting to acquire the proper dollars. I expressed concerns that we may be falling a little bit behind, even though we have the best case that you can possibly have over the other, Nova Scotia, which it seems has always been the case in the past. I put those concerns forward to the minister because I think it is an urgent matter, it is a matter that should be dealt with, that should be made a public issue as much as possible and put in the public eye so that you get people's interests aroused to make the federal government very aware that people of this Province deserve such a facility and deserve more facilities such as those that will help the entire Province, help the economy and help the young people of this Province do the proper training that they so rightfully deserve.

That is one issue that I am very concerned about at the present time. I would hope that the minister, his officials and Intergovernmental Affairs are working on it and they will be reporting to this House shortly so that the decision will be a positive one; that it will be a decision that will be seeing a cadet facility set up in this Province for the first time. It is one that would be a breakthrough for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador as it comes to defense spending in this Province. I would ask the minister to continue his efforts and hopefully give us an update as to exactly where that situation

lies. I am sure there are a great number of signals being sent over this issue between himself and the federal Department that is responsible for such a facility.

Again, the case, in very short terms, is so open and shut. I have sent around a letter to all the members of the House of Assembly and, of course, we had an all party resolution last year. We have a former military facility in Stephenville. We also have over 60 per cent of the cadets from Newfoundland that are in Atlantic Canada. We have 60 per cent of all the cadets in Atlantic Canada. We have an airport. Most of the instructors come from Newfoundland and Labrador for Atlantic Canada and we have no such facility. The logistics of it, there is no other argument. I can only hope and pray that this government is putting our case forward, as the people of Stephenville are.

Just recently we have been getting letters and telexes and submissions from a variety of groups all over the Province, former mayors, mayor of other communities, major Chambers of Commerce at Corner Brook and other areas of the Province. So we have a very big joint effort ongoing here. I just would like to see the provincial government make it more of an issue, because I am afraid if we do not arouse enough interest, we will see it go by the wayside and a lost opportunity that should have been ours, that should be here, gone out the window again. So I hope that the minister will give us an update on that situation as it concerns many people in my area of the Province who are in desperate need of employment, who are in desperate need of seeing some sign of hope.

Another issue, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring up under this Department of Development comes up because we are talking about expansion. If we are talking about expanding the bureaucracy or bringing in another assistant deputy minister, if this is what this assistant deputy minister was going to do, I might think about supporting the amendment, but I doubt very much if that is going to be the case.

I have looked at a report that has been put out by the Department of Development and Tourism. It is called Investing in Newfoundland and Labrador. A very nice report, glossy and it tells you about all the different opportunities that this Province has. I looked at it and under Appendix II it says, 'Industrial Parks, Sites and Incubator Malls' in this Province. I was just looking through, with interest, the different areas of the Province that have industrial sites and that are trying to attract business in this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I look under Stephenville, the Harmon Complex. The year it was open, 1966; Total area, 2,400 hectares; Area developed to date, 850 hectares; Future hectares available, 680. As a matter of fact, it is the most of any area of the Province that is supposedly available for industrial land and for inviting businesses into Newfoundland and Labrador, specifically into Stephenville, Bay St. George.

It talks about rail access and it says we have that. Kilometers to the airport; we have right on in our economic complex. It talks about a seaport. It has a blank there, but we do have a seaport

right on the economic complex. We are fully serviced in all classes. Now, if you look at this thing, you would think the industrial part in Stephenville is one that is the top of the line and that there is no problem and there are people knocking on the door to try to come in there.

I bring up the concern to the minister, as the Harmon Corporation's future is now up in the air and many people of the area are quite interested in what the development will be as to the government's decision on the Harmon Corporation as its mandate for developing the Harmon Complex has now been put up in the air because of lack of funding. They have done a good job over the years in trying to develop the area and have seen the establishment of over 2,000 jobs since 1966. They have done a tremendous job over the years, but they cannot operate without some funding. Unfortunately, we see some monies allotted that look as if there is a possible close down.

I would like to get the minister's reaction or get some thoughts from him on that, if not today, at a later date, on the Harmon Corporation's future because it affects the economic development of Stephenville, Bay St. George, and Port au Port, as to attracting business to the area. That is a major concern of mine and of many people of the area, the Chamber of Commerce and the town of Stephenville, as there are a large number of assets there that have deteriorated over the past number of years. We have a forty year old facility that is not up to date, that has buildings falling down everywhere and they are calling it an industrial park. I have some major reservations about

it and our ability to attract business. I would ask the minister, when he addresses the bill, to bring in some comments as to what is happening, what is the future there, and what will be the future of the Harmon Complex itself, as we are trying to get businesses to come in there.

If you are going to go around advertising in this nice brochure that we have an nirvana out there of beautiful, industrial land, then it is far from the truth. I have seen many businesses come into that area and be hauled off to other areas of the Province. There is no need of it. We have an opportunity in Stephenville to be one of the biggest economic growth areas of the Province with an airport right in the industrial complex with a seaport right in the area, rail lines that come right in behind, and also a good connection to the TCH. So with all that there with us, we are blessed with the natural infrastructure, but we are not blessed with the proper industrial land and buildings.

I feel that it is time that the minister's department had a closer look at what is available out there, because it would benefit the entire area if the decision taken by the government of the Province was to further develop the industrial parks of Newfoundland and Labrador, especially of Stephenville. If that decision is taken, it will mean a much better economic boost to the area. It is a major decision that will affect many people in our area. It will affect the business climate of our area, depending on what is done. The future assets of those buildings, the future of the land that is there, the industrial land

that needs to be developed, all of those things have to be looked at. I am very concerned. I have asked the minister on a number of occasions and he has kept me informed. But at this point in time, many people are questioning exactly what the future is. I only hope that the minister will address this in his comments because it is of great concern to the economic development of the area. I would hope that he will be looking at a plan of future growth for the Stephenville area as his department is responsible for the Harmon Corporation and its operation. I would hope that they will look at providing with a solid foundation to continue its work and to keep the good work that they have been doing over the years up to scratch.

I would like to bring up another issue also under this department concerning West Viking and the future of West Viking, exactly what is going on with the operation. Vindholmen Offshore Limited and West Viking is a joint venture company that is supposed to be bringing in over 500 jobs to the Bay St. George area and Port aux Basques.

I am somewhat concerned as to recent press releases that are appearing over in Norway that have been brought to my attention about the company. I would hope that everything is okay and that they are going to be bringing in employment to the Stephenville area and also to Port aux Basques. I know that they have some projects ongoing, but I would hope that it is a solid foundation in which we will see employment created in the area. Many people from the area have expressed concern to me about the operation as to its future there. They have

been very positive about it, but they just want to make sure that Stephenville also will get some potential out of that realized as I feel that Stephenville is a great centre to take advantage of offshore activity because of the airport and its present infrastructure.

So I would ask that the minister when he gets up to address this bill if he could give us some update as to what is going on with West Viking and the future of its operations. There are many people in my area who are thinking about investing in some of the buildings there, but they are up in the air about any development because they are not exactly sure what this company may be doing and what it might be going after. So I would ask the minister, if he could when he rises in his place, to deal with that issue.

On the overall, I think the granting of a further ADM to the minister's office is not exactly a gigantic move that will see improvements in employment for the area or the Province, and in the effectiveness of his department. I am sure that the individual hired will be quite qualified, but I would like to see strong amendments coming in talking about good legislation, that will see improvements in legislation, improvement in what the development and tourism body can do, his department can do and to see what encouraging initiatives that should be taken will be taken to see employment created.

Unfortunately, we do not see that today, we see an expansion again of our bureaucracy. We see the expansion of another Lieutenant-Governor in Council decision that can be made at their

whim to do what they want. That is unfortunate because while, again, you have such qualified people, they are not the ones who are to blame for the economic situation in this Province. I find it somewhat amazing, Mr. Speaker, we have seen this advertising of jobs that have been created from all over the Province being put in the papers to tell people how good they are doing. Well, I can only tell you that on the West Coast of the Province there is 31 per cent unemployment and it goes up and down like a yo-yo by three or four percentage points, but it does not go down to where it should be. I do not know, one of these day this administration might accept responsibility for such a dire straits in the economy on the West Coast.

I have just mentioned some things, if dealt with properly and looked at, especially concerning Stephenville, and taking into account that I am Liberal, but do not hold it against me, if you looked at it and you looked at it properly and helped make some decisions with the area people, you would see that unemployment rate drop from 31 per cent. You would see it drop and you would see some movement of business activity. I hope that I will see signs, Mr. Speaker, but I have been at this two years and I have not seen one yet and I do not think I am going to see one for a while. I hope and I pray and I am looking forward to seeing this government's lobbying efforts bring a sea cadet base to Stephenville. I am looking forward to the announcement.

I tell the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), by the way, I will sit in the back

room. I do not even want an invitation, to tell you the truth. When you get a sea cadet base for this Province, do not even announce it, do not tell me, just tell the people. I think that maybe the problem has been probably that in your efforts you did not want to make it too public that, "Well, the member for Stephenville is out there so you have to be careful now. He might get some credit see for that lobby and we cannot have that." So I am a little bit perturbed at that but I am going to put that all aside now.

MR. SIMMS:

The member for Port au Port (inaudible.)

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, that is true. As a matter of fact I have got a full file here which I will be sending to the member for Port au Port and he can have it all.

MR. SIMMS:

It is an awful small file.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, but that is the first one. That is only the first one see.

MR. SIMMS:

You should see his file.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, that is great, but I am not too concerned. Mine has quality, not quantity, you see. So I am going to be sending him the file just to make sure that everything I have on it, the whole lobby, can be taken by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, not the Opposition members because they are not the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, even though they represent people now. They cannot have no say or

anything like that in what goes on; they cannot suggest good ideas which this government can take advantage of. The only thing is even when you suggest a good idea, you do not take advantage of that either. So I mean what can you do? You cannot win either way.

I am looking forward to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands. I invite him to Stephenville when they do have the sea cadet base announcement, when they do get that, just fly out, if you want, I will pay the ticket, but as long as he comes out and announces it, I do not care who does what. I just want to see it gets done and that the proper lobby is done and that the proper concerns are brought to the people of the Province, and that the proper concerns for such a facility are brought to the right people in Ottawa. Thus far I am somewhat concerned that we are not too sure about the signals that are being sent. So I am sure that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands will take that view under consideration as he sits around the Cabinet table, and will bring those views -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, I am sure he will.

MR. TULK:

Brian Blackmore will take care of you.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I do not have to worry about him. I know about him. That is no problem, but I am concerned about the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

I would like to see copies of

press releases that the government has issued on its lobby for the sea cadet facility. I am looking forward to those being tabled at the end of the lobby so that we know that full credit can be given to them on the lobby. I have no problem with that. I look forward to it. I look forward to seeing that facility.

I look forward to seeing the Harmon Corporation's future at Stephenville being extended and that proper plans for the future of the area being put in place by this government, as they have done so well over the past number of years as we see by the unemployment rate. I am looking forward to all that.

I am looking forward to seeing the West Viking take off, as I hope it will, and seeing offshore development benefits extended to the West Coast of the Province. But I am somewhat concerned at the number of actions so far and the results so far because I measure a government, Mr. Speaker, on its unemployment rate, on whether or not it brings it down or keeps it up. I am very concerned with the way this government has been acting about the unemployment rate, treating it so fragrantly as a - 'We created 2,000 jobs last month so let us issue a big full page ad', while we have unemployment on the West Coast going up by 5 per cent in the same month.

I mean that is real good. I commend the minister for a good job of advertising but it is not convincing anybody out there. As a matter of fact, they are getting a little poisoned with that type of advertising because they see the dollars going out the window and they do not see the jobs being

created. I do not think you can pull the wool over their eyes too much longer and I tell the government that because I am concerned. They had better be careful because, you never know, they might just decide that you are not doing the best job in the world and they might have something to say about that the next time.

I bring those concerns to the Minister of Development and Tourism under which portfolio this bill is today. I look forward to seeing, even though I know they are going to ram the bill through, but I look forward to seeing that there will be lots of economic development coming about because of this change in the bureaucracy and I look forward to seeing all kinds of results to be announced. I also look forward to the cadet base being announced by this government and the future of the Harmon Corporation being decided by them shortly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for listening to this and for the patience of the government side. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

(Inaudible) or are you going to clue it up for the Opposition?

MR. TULK:

I do not think so. I do not know but I may fall down dead. It is possible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Hope springs eternal.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a great deal of legislation that goes through this House is basically housekeeping and, therefore, does not require, perhaps, the time that we have taken with this little piece of legislation which, on the surface, seems to be a very minor piece of legislation but, in fact, what we are talking about here is one of the most important departments in government.

The Department of Development and Tourism is, I would have to say, perhaps the most important department that we have although I am inclined to believe that a department that the government itself pays very little attention to is perhaps even more important in terms of where I come from than is this one, and I speak of the Department of Rural Agricultural and Northern Development. This department, seems, for some reason or other, to be the one Department of Development. I would ask Your Honour to note that the Department of Rural Development is also a Department of Development, but this Department seems to be the one that the government, for some reason or other, pays all the attention to. Therefore it becomes one of the most important departments in this government and it is important.

You only have to travel around this Province and talk to people, whether they be young, middle aged or about to retire, and realize the tremendous amount of suffering that is going on in this department as a result of our high unemployment rate, as a result of the jobs that people wish to have and cannot find. This Department,

along with the Department of Rural Development, should be the two departments that government focuses on to solve that unemployment problem. A lot of people might think it is the Department of Career Development, manpower and whatever else they have thrown in with that Department. Indeed, some people might think it is the Department of Labour, but in actual fact the Department of Labour is just, as the Minister knows, is just a management of the relationships that exist between various factions of labour once the jobs are put in place. The Department of Development is one of the most important departments that we have.

I speak, Mr. Speaker, not only of the amount of employment and not only of the number of jobs, and God knows that is bad enough. If you travel this Province today and if you look and talk to people and if you look at the statistics that are out there for us, I have some of them here on my desk which I have been threatening to use but just have not got to it, you realize the Premier was probably right when he made the statement that this Province is bankrupt. This Province is practically bankrupt because there are a great many people who are not working.

MR. J. CARTER:

What a sleazy statement.

MR. TULK:

It is not a sleazy statement, it is the truth. If you travel the districts, and the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) will know what I am talking about, if you travel certain districts in this Province, you will find the unemployment rate is phenomenally high. The number of people

working are so small in terms of resource development and in terms of jobs that will develop the economy of this Province, it is practically shameful.

Added to that, one of the more important things that we should talk about and perhaps is as important as whether you have a job or not, is the amount of income that certain people in this Province are making. We talk about the people who work, of course, on the community development jobs, the community development projects. We talk about the people who work on what we call Canada Works, the job strategy programmes, the job developments programmes, who work on them for \$5.00 an hour, in most cases, and in some cases even less than that.

To be quite frank with you, how any person working for \$5.00 an hour for a forty hour week, that is \$200 a week, \$800 a month, with no deductions taken out, I fail to see how a person today can have even a poverty level of living with that kind of salary. I know that all of us in this House certainly could not live on it. It would not pay for most of our groceries, let alone clothing or anything else. So that in itself is a tremendous problem and indicates the tremendous amount of under development that is in this Province and indicates the importance, of course, of the Department of Development and the Department of Rural Development. So, in principle this is a very important bill.

Mr. Speaker, tourism is perhaps one of the most under-utilized sectors of the economy we have. I believe that there is a very important reason for that. That

is the fact that the major part of Newfoundland and Labrador is an island. The transportation link to the mainland part of this Province and to the rest of North America is done by one CN ferry. Any normal person who is travelling in the Summer -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want them to listen to me but they could at least be quiet.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of that link to the mainland cannot be underestimated in the development of tourism. I think in the next five years the Department of Development and Tourism, specifically the section on Tourism, is supposed to spend something like \$21 million. I believe it is in that vicinity, somewhere from \$19 million to \$21 million, on the development of tourism facilities.

Now, I say to the government, and I am pleased to note that the House Commission has taken up the same note, unless we solve the cost of getting tourists across the Gulf of St. Lawrence and into this Province, the tremendous cost - for example, if you take a trailer and a car and a family of five, I am told that to get to this Province and get back or to get to the mainland and get back costs something like \$250. That is the figure, somewhere between \$200 and \$250 for a family of five with a car and a trailer. Now, if you are a person who is on vacation you would have to be some silly, half out of your head, to say that you are going to spend \$250 to come to another part of Canada when you could perhaps take

another week, say, in Nova Scotia, P.E.I., New Brunswick or wherever. That is a tremendous barrier. That is the point I am making. It is a tremendous barrier to the development of tourism in this Province.

Let us face it! While Newfoundland and Labrador is a place where we want to live and while it is a place that is attractive to the rest of North America, where is the logic that makes us believe that Newfoundland and Labrador, to a person, say, coming from somewhere down in the United States or somewhere from Western Canada, is anymore important to see than, say, parts of Nova Scotia or parts of P.E.I.? If the costs were equal of getting here, then of course those people would love to come to Newfoundland, but if the cost is not equal, then I suggest to you that much of the cutoff from tourist trade in this Province is going to be in North Sydney.

MR. TOBIN:

The cost is not equal.

MR. TULK:

That is what I am saying, the cost is not equal. If the cost were equal, it would balance out that people would come here as well as go somewhere else.

So what I am saying to the hon. gentleman, if he can open up his mind and forget Frank Ryan and a few more of those fellows over there, and Dobbin and a few more of those - I can tell him a little story. I can tell the hon. gentleman about a lady who happens to live in my district who made the Premier of this Province the leader of the P.C. Party. She can give him the details on certain trust funds and who collected

them. One of those days, if the hon. gentleman wants it behind the curtain, I will give it to him.

MR. TOBIN:

Clyde Wells (inaudible).

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, not to be interrupted by the gopher. I want to continue my train of thought as it relates to the Department of Development.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

If the hon. gentleman wants to listen he may learn something, or otherwise I am going to have to turn him over to certain people in Rural Development and see what they do to him, certain of his former supporters in Rural Development who are no longer his supporters. I want to tell him about that little movement as well.

Mr. Speaker, let me get back to what I was saying about the tourist trade. It becomes very, very obvious that a cutoff point for our tourist trade is in North Sydney. If we are going to do anything that, I would say to the government and I would say to the hon. gentleman from Burin - Placentia (Mr. Tobin), if he can influence his government, his Premier, the man to which he is the Executive Assistant, in any way, shape of form, then one of the things that we need in this Province is that CN Gulf ferry made an extension of the Trans-Canada Highway. In others words, it should cost you no more as a Canadian to travel from Port aux Basques to North Sydney by boat than it costs to drive. That would make us really a part of this country and it would open up our tourist trade to tremendous

potential.

Then, the money that this government is spending, the \$21 million that is being spent between the federal and provincial governments, would indeed do something to help the tourist trade in this Province and bring in new tourist dollars. That is an initiative that the government should take. It is an initiative that we have said for years should be there and know I note that the House Commission has made it as one of their recommendations for the government to take into account in solving the unemployment problem in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

If you did a study you would find that it probably would not cost any more.

MR. TULK:

What does not cost any more?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Going across the Gulf.

MR. TULK:

Then what?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Driving.

MR. TULK:

Indeed it does.

It is 90 miles across the Gulf, that is the distance across the Gulf. If I take a trailer, my car, my three kids and my wife I can tell the hon. member that by the time I travel that 90 miles back and forth I will be out \$250. The facts are there. It will cost me \$250. If I take the same distance and travel from St. John's to Clarendville, 90 miles, I will not be out over \$40. So that

is a difference of over \$210. What I am saying to the hon. gentleman is this, that if I were a tourist coming from the Mainland of Canada and I had another week to spend, that is \$210 that allows me to stay another week in either Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick or even perhaps go down to some of the Northeastern United States.

The hon. gentleman and the Department of Development should also look at the cost of living in this Province and what it would mean if we could apply that same kind of economics to tractor trailers that cross the Gulf and the cost to those people that ship goods and bring services in this Province. I would suggest to him that if he did that - and there is people who have done it, by the way - if he did that, perhaps some of the major developments that we are taking about trying to get off the ground in this Province would be small in comparison to the benefit in this Province of making that Gulf an extension of the Trans-Canada Highway. The Department of Development and the government should take a look at it.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the Department of Development is one of the most important departments in this government. There can be no doubt about the importance of it. Normally with the minister asking us to approve a piece of legislation that just said he wanted to appointed say two more assistant deputy ministers, there would be no problem with that. But how does the legislation read?

What the minister is asking the Legislature for is a blank cheque to appoint as many people as the

Lieutenant-Governor in Council, which is the Cabinet, it is the front benches over there, made up of the Ministers of the Crown, the Cabinet, to appoint as many - he is not saying let me appoint one, he is not saying let me appoint two, he is not saying let me appoint three - he just says, "such Assistant Deputy Ministers as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may by order approve." I say to him that that is unacceptable.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is hard to get it through Cabinet.

MR. TULK:

Yes, I know there is some problem in getting something through Cabinet.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I just jotted this down. Perhaps the government members might very well look and say, "The member for Fogo now is going to start to throw up a bit of dirt." No, it is not dirt. Those are facts. Just this evening on back of Hansard here, while I was getting ready for this, wrote down the number of what has to be considered - you cannot call it anything else - patronage appointments by this government, and I am sure I do not have them all, just what I could recall off the top of my head. The former member for St. Barbe, the member that was here until 1985; the former member for Windsor - Buchans; the former Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development; the former Minister of Environment, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir; and a former minister in the Moores administration. Mr. Speaker, the Ombudsman in this Province; Mr. Loughheed \$800,000; Cabot Martin,

\$102,000 in the last year; eight press secretaries, \$250,000; Mr. Hickey, the former member for St. John's East Extern, who through it back in their face and decided he wanted to get into federal politics, \$65,000; the member for St. Barbe, \$40,000; the former member for Windsor - Buchans, \$40,000; the member for Naskaupi, at that point, the former minister, \$50,000; the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir a job with \$50,000; a former member in the Moores administration, Mr. Collins, \$50,000; the Ombudsman, something like \$60,000.

Mr. Speaker, I want to come back on this bill because I want to point out why we cannot give and we should not give this government this piece of carte blanche legislation that allows them to appoint whoever they wish.

So, Mr. Speaker, being 6:00 p.m. I adjourn the debate.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I do not know if any hon. gentlemen on the opposite side wish to speak or not. If not, what I would do is adjourn the debate on behalf of the minister but that means other people may wish to speak.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate because I wanted to get back into it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Right.

There is no need to say what is on the Estimates Committees because I did that at 3:30 p.m. or 4:00 p.m., whatever, but I will repeat it: This evening 7:30 p.m., Finance; tomorrow Tuesday at 9:30 a.m., Social Services; tomorrow Tuesday at 7:30 p.m., Environment.

I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 5, 1987 at 3:00 p.m.