

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 1982

The House met at 3:00

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. L. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Culture,
Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, because of the interest in this particular matter, I want to inform the hon. House now of the 1982 big game licence quotas and open season periods. Attached to the copies of the statement which will be provided to all hon. members, they will find two tables detailing the licence quotas and open season dates for each moose and caribou management area. I might note that season dates are essentially the same as they were in 1981. I do not wish to bore the House with all the details, Mr. Speaker, but there are, certainly, a number of matters here that should be highlighted for the information and benefit of all hon. members, especially in view of the fact that a great deal of interest has been shown by members on the opposite side in the past looking for this information.

The number of caribou licences available for 1982 will be 310 less than the number available last year. This year 1,265 licences are to be issued compared with 1,575 in 1981.

A significant reduction has been made in the Avalon Peninsula licence quota - Area 65. This year 125 licences will be available compared with 225 last year. During the past winter Wildlife technicians were able to carry out a thorough census of the Avalon Peninsula caribou herd. This census showed that the current population is less than that of 1980. I think that all members of this hon.

MR. L. SIMMS: House are aware too of several caribou poaching incidents that were detected on the Avalon Peninsula during the past winter. It is felt therefore that poaching has contributed to the decline. The 1982 census confirmed trend data that were gathered from big game licence returns. And these data suggested a downward trend in population numbers over the past two or three years, but, of course, did not indicate the magnitude of the decline. This year's census showed the population to be about twenty-five per cent less than the 1980 estimate.

The other significant reduction is in the LaPoile area - Area 61 - where this year 300 licences will be available compared with 400 last year. The latest census in this area was conducted in 1980, but the trend data from hunters' returns suggest a declining population. To stabilize and hopefully reverse this trend, a smaller number of licences will be issued this year.

Similarly in the Northern Peninsula - Area 69 - the trend data show a declining population and to hopefully reverse this trend the number of licences available this year will be fifty compared with 100 last year.

On a more optimistic note, the past winter's census in the Middle Ridge area - Area 64 - shows an increasing caribou population

MR. SIMMS: and the trend data also show an increase in population. In this area the licence quota there has been increased to 75 from 25 .

I also note that there will be no open season on the Grey Islands - Area 71 - this year as Wildlife officials are contemplating the capture of caribou on this island for relocation to the Northern part of the Northern Peninsula.

There will also be an open season of one week duration on Merasheen Island this year and twenty licences will be issued.

One further note with respect to caribou is that, should the Southward migration of the Buchans plateau herd commence earlier than usual, it is possible that the area known as Star Bog would be closed to hunting at that time. Normally the caribou reach this area about mid-November, but with unusual Fall weather the caribou could reach the bog before the season ends on October 30. Should this occur it might be necessary to curtail hunting activity in that area while the caribou are moving through.

Moose licence quotas are down by 855 licences this year. In 1981, 10,895 licences were available. This year 10,040 licences will be issued. The reductions result from better population information being available through censuses that were conducted during the past Winter. During the period January to March of this year ideal censusing conditions existed throughout much of the Island and Wildlife technicians were able to carry out more comprehensive censuses this Winter than in any other recent Winter.

The statement also further outlines the most significant reductions and where they will occur and it will be noted that most of the reductions have been sustained in the Eastern Newfoundland management areas.

MR. SIMMS: I might note also, Mr. Speaker, that the trend data for these areas suggest declining populations. The licence quota reductions should hopefully reverse these trends. It is obvious, I think, that the magnitude of poaching cannot be accurately evaluated in any given year. During the past Winter more poaching reports were given by Wildlife officers in Eastern Newfoundland than during any other year. This results from a much higher level of snowmobiling activities in Eastern Newfoundland than has been possible in recent Winters. More people travelling the woods on snowmobiles observed poaching incidents and reported them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: So they are to be commended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Good.

MR. SIMMS: As a result of these reports, a number of violations were detected and prosecuted. Wildlife officials are of the opinion that the rate of poaching in Eastern Newfoundland is a little greater than they anticipated and therefore the actual kill of moose, both legal and illegal, has been somewhat greater than the populations can sustain, hence the downward trend in population numbers. The general public has, as I have indicated above, been extremely cooperative in providing useful information to wildlife officers and I sincerely hope the cooperation will continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: In recent years the statement will also outline in a couple of exceptions that we have made in the Marystown-Winterland area of the Burin Peninsula where they have lost crops due to moose. And in hope of relieving this problem, two sub-areas have been identified for the two Burin Peninsula moose management areas.

MR. SIMMS: And it goes on to outline the other activities that will take place. And in the remainder of the two management areas the regular open season will not commence until October 23.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear;

MR. SIMMS: Finally, Mr. Speaker, in response to views expressed by people hunting in the St. Anthony, Portland Creek and Harbour Deep management areas,

MR. SIMMS: the moose hunting season has been set to open on a Saturday rather than on a Monday -

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear.

MR. SIMMS: - as per their request and this will be September 18th in St. Anthony and Portland Creek, and September 11th in Harbour Deep. It appears that most people hunting in these management areas now prefer a Saturday opening rather than a Monday opening.

And one final point is that the division -

MR. ROBERTS: We have some more requests if the minister would like to hear those as well.

MR. SIMMS: I would be happy to listen to them.

MR. SIMMS: One final point is that the division of the Northwest Gander-Gambo area - Area 24 - into two units having a different open season has been eliminated. This year there will be one season for all of this management area.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that although the hon. the minister is new in his portfolio that he took nearly a month after the licences went out to the individuals in the Province, that now he is finally letting the people know that, look, there are 310 less caribou to be hunted this year and 885 less moose.

Mr. Speaker, one thing the minister did say, and on this side we have been saying it for years, is that there is too much poaching going on in this Province, and the reason is that the minister

MR. WARREN: or his predecessor never had a handle on the functioning of his department. There have to be more Wildlife enforcement officers and unless his department can play a more larger role in trying to curtail the poaching that is going on in this Province, in particular on the Avalon Peninsula, then we may as well give it up

At the present time, and I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the coming year we will still find that poaching will be on the increase. According to one of the minister's officers he has indicated that in the last three or four years that poaching has continually increased every year. So unless the minister can convince his colleagues in Cabinet that more enforcement officers are needed, then I would venture to say by next year this time the minister will be coming out with another reduction in the quota. I will give the minister the benefit of the doubt, he has only been in the position for a little over a month that he can finally see the light that his predecessors did not see, he can finally see the light and make sure that there are adequate enforcement officers in place, especially during the hunting season and also during the mating season. So, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the news that there are some measures being taken

MR. WARREN: to have a moose and a caribou season continuing in the Province for some years to come. But unless we can tackle the serious problem of poaching, then it is labour in vain.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a very special week in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. The week of June 19th. to 25th., has been proclaimed by the hon. the Premier as Senior Citizens Week, a time whereby we acknowledge the continuing contribution of our senior citizens in all facets of society.

Senior citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador continue to play a vital role in our society. Their experience, knowledge, and wisdom contribute to the lives of ongoing generations, and this is a fact which must always be duly recognized and appreciated. These people have helped mold the society which we enjoy, and their hard work and achievements are evident in every aspect of our lives.

Senior Citizens Week is a time for each of us to do something special to show our appreciation to these people, and to re-dedicate ourselves to involve in our own lives activities which contribute to the quality of life for senior citizens.

I seek the participation of all members of the House in the activities during the week.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of activities going on all over the Province by local municipalities, by my own department, and I would urge hon. members to participate wherever they can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, again I will just say that here is a minister giving a statement and he never had the courtesy that the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) had of letting us see the prepared statement first.

However, Mr. Speaker, I have to go on record as saying that we on this side appreciate the senior citizens maybe even more so than the government does, because, Mr. Speaker, if we had the opportunity we would not have the senior citizen in this Province today having to pay for drugs. Why does the minister not introduce a free drug programme for senior citizens? This is what the senior citizens need, Mr. Speaker, just

MR.WARREN:

putting one week aside for senior citizens. I think there are 365 days in a year in which we should respect our senior citizens, not only seven days. So, Mr.Speaker, it is fine for the minister to get up and make a brief statement about senior citizens this week and about the handicapped next week, but what is his department doing about these people? I suggest that, number one, get a free drug subsidization programme in place and this is what the senior citizens have been asking the minister for for the last two or three years.

Thank you, Mr.Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): Are there any other Ministerial Statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR.NEARY: Mr.Speaker, I was hoping the Premier would be in his seat today but I understand he is still down causing trouble down in Maine and has being branded now by the Premier of Quebec as being a professional trouble maker. It is unfortunate, Mr.Speaker, that the Premier continues his squabble down South of the border in the United States, that he did not just restrict his squabbling with Quebec and Ottawa to the boundaries of Canada, he had to go outside of Canada, down in the United States. So in the absence of the Premier, I would like to ask the Minister of Energy (Mr.Marshall) that in view of the severe statements made over in New Brunswick on the weekend by the former Minister of Energy, the member for Mount Scio (Mr.Barry), who is a highly respected member of the Tory organization in this Province, in view of these statements that were made about the negotiators on both sides being partisan and carrying

MR. NEARY: on petty politics instead of hard negotiations on the offshore management, has the hon. gentleman withdrawn from the negotiating team on behalf of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear what the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) says but whatever the hon. member for Mount Scio says he always says it after a good deal of consideration and it is always received by us with a great deal of weight. I would not comment on the impression that the hon. gentleman may have with respect to any alleged statements made by any member, Mr. Speaker, or to the interpretation which the hon. gentleman puts on the apparent standing up for Newfoundland that the Premier is doing down in the state of Maine. If he chooses to parrot what Mr. Levesque says and Mr. Levesque's impressions of it, so be it for his impressions of anything that occurs in this firmament.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), the former Minister of Energy was fired out by the Premier because the Premier was afraid that he was going to resolve the matter and he would not have an issue in the election, the member has suggested that in the interest of getting this matter resolved

MR. NEARY: that both sides in the offshore disputes stop acting like heavy politicians and change negotiators. Now, this is my understanding what the hon. gentleman said and was widely publicized over the week-end. Now in view of these statements from the previous Minister of Energy, would the hon. gentleman indicate if he intends to withdraw, to turn in his badge and stop this bickering and squabbling and this partisan politics, and in the interest of getting this matter resolved, would the hon. gentleman consider withdrawing from the negotiations?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): the hon. President of the Council

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman will consider withdrawing from the negotiations when the hon. gentleman gets serious, so I anticipate a long tenure leading the negotiations. The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, the only reference that I know with respect to the negotiations, or any matter relating to this Province and calling people on this side petty politicians, emanates from Mr. Levesque. And the hon. gentleman has indicated in his remarks today that he seems to agree with Mr. Levesque as much today as he did in 1966 when he and his administration were negotiating with that gentleman for the purpose of giving land, and it resulted in the give away of the Upper Churchill

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: I know I am putting the hon. gentleman in a very difficult position, putting him on the spot because his boss is the one that should be answering these questions, because the hon. gentleman is the one, is the gentleman that the Member for Mt. Scio (Mr. Barry) was criticizing and suggesting that in order to save the offshore negotiations that the hon. gentleman be removed. That is what Mr. Barry, the Member for Mount Scio, was saying. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has discussed this matter with the Premier by long distance

MR. NEARY: phone, since the Member for Mount Scio made these statements in New Brunswick and, if so, would the hon. gentleman indicate whether the Premier has suggested that Mr. Barry be re-hired as Minister of Energy for the Province and put him back in the negotiations with Ottawa before all is lost?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I respond to serious questions but not otherwise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two or three questions, Sir, for the Minister of Health (Mr. House). They grow out of the government's decision, as announced in the Budget Speech, dealing with dental services to children. The Minister is familiar with it.

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible) at four o'clock.

MR. ROBERTS: Are we all ready now?

MR. NEARY: Is the Muppet Show over?

MR. E. ROBERTS: Now, I would ask the Minister, first of all, if he could tell the House, Mr. Speaker, on whose professional advice this decision was taken. And I ask that, since the budget, as he will recall, says it was taken on professional advice, I ask because the Dental Association appeared to have made it clear speaking through their spokesman, Dr. Gushue, that it was not on their advice, in fact they are completely opposed to it. On whose advice was it taken?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, we discussed this particular topic in the estimates, it was one of the topics that took a fair amount of discussion, and we talked about this kind of thing over a couple of years. As a matter of fact, it was not only a decision that was taken this year, it is something we had been looking at over a period of years.

For the benefit of the people, I have been sick with a bout of 'flu so I have to wet my throat.

So, as I said, we have a professional dental division in the Department of Health and, of course, we have a dentist heading that up and he is our main advisor in that particular thing. And his advice, of course, is that while two examinations, fluoride treatments and complete prophylaxis may be desirable, it is not completely essential, and, of course, the patterns followed by most dentists in the Province will bear that out. So it was on the advice of our own dental division and, of course, the literature that he has been able to gather.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I gather then, reading between the lines, if I understand the minister's somewhat troubled syntax, it was on the advice of the Director of Dental Services that this was taken. First of all, two or three in a little bundle for the minister to try deal with, did the director advise this or did he respond to a request for advice made of him by the minister or by the deputy? In other words, who initiated this particular cost-saving measure? Secondly, was there any consultation with anybody outside the Dental Division, either in this Province or outside? Thirdly, were any studies prepared to show what affect this could have? And I ask because - and perhaps the minister could comment on this as well, Mr. Speaker - the rumoured saving of \$300,000 or \$400,00, which is what I understand to be the figure we are looking at, the minister will agree will be spent many times over in the years to come.

MR. ROBERTS: by both the government and by private individuals in increased dental bills. So I am anxious to try to get to the bottom of exactly why this measure was done because it seems to be one of the most short-sighted that we could possibly ask for.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, obviously when you are preparing your budget you go to your own expertise and get all the information you can. We looked at a number of programmes and one of the mandates, I think, we have as ministers or as we have as a department is to try to be as frugal as possible and get a good return for the dollar.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HOUSE: We looked at the pattern and we had about 90,000, I think it was 90,000, pupils per year who are given a first treatment. Then, of course, a lot of them are requested to come back a second time and perhaps we do not get many more than 20,000, I think it is 20,000 who return for the second visit and only about 20 per cent - I am sorry 20,000 of these come back for second visits.

MR. ROBERTS: Is that because there are no dentists?

MR. HOUSE: No, that is because certain dentists believe certain patterns, they believe that one is sufficient. And that is exactly what is happening. And what I am finding is that in the rural areas they are only inviting them, most or a lot of dentists are only inviting them back twice because some of them say it is not necessary, and are inviting them back once.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) you said once.

MR. HOUSE: Yes.

MR. YOUNG: Do not be interrupting now while he is answering the question.

MR. HOUSE: If everybody was getting a double fluoride, you would have 90,000 getting the first one and 90,000 the second one. All you are getting in the second one is about 20,000 because a lot of dentists do not believe that is necessary for the second one.

Looking at the cost, it is about \$35 for each visit. We do not think it is cost efficient. The other thing we looked at, of course, was the patterns across Canada. There are only two other provinces having fluoride treatments.

MR. HOUSE: Every other province, the other eight provinces have one fluoride treatment, the same as we are recommending now, and we think that is sufficient, we think that is very good service. It may not be a Cadillac, but we think it is a very good service. We are not saying that a second examination is not necessary, perhaps it may be, but we think that the clients should pay for that one.

MR. YOUNG: It is better than none at all, like when he was minister.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we cannot debate here so I will not, but I understood the minister to say that he is saving approximately \$700,000, 20,000 visits at \$35 a visit. Do I understand him correctly? The mathematics is okay, if the numbers are okay.

MR. HOUSE: I do not know what the saving is but I am saying -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the minister says he does not know what the saving is, he tells us there are 20,000 visits that will no longer be paid for and he gives a figure of \$35 per visit -

MR. TULK: \$700,000.

MR. ROBERTS: - which is \$700,000. My school principal colleague confirms that.

MR. HOUSE: The mathematics are good.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister confirms it too. Now, Mr. Speaker, could he then put that in context with the compromise which the Dental Association have said publicly they offered whereby they indicate they are prepared to make certain modifications and changes which come down to less, I under-

MR. ROBERTS: stand again from what Dr. Gushue has said publicly, that they have come down to between \$150,000 and \$200,000 a year, and could he relate those two figures? He says a saving of \$700,000 and he has apparently rejected the Dental Association's offer which would bring it down to \$200,000. But would he confirm, just so we would have it on the record, that his saving of \$700,000 is cost sufficient? I mean, how many kids do we need to make up for that?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, a lot of pupils will be recommended for second treatments. It will not be a blanket. A lot of them will be recommended anyway and we have been doing this. There have been some pupils over the last number of years who have been coming back for third visits because of the particular status of their dental health.

With regard to the dentists, we met with the dentists, and you are talking about - this was news to me and as a matter of fact I do not think, I am not so sure about the spokesman or who is the spokesman for the dentists, to tell you the truth, We met with the committee and they made an offer to us, the offer that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) just mentioned, and we got back to them with a counter-offer and of course we have not heard back from them since except through the media this morning. So we are still awaiting word back from them and we told them we would be willing to sit down with them. So we were a bit surprised to hear this news release this morning. We were waiting for them to come back with a counter-offer. Because what we had told them is we have a certain saving within the budget and

MR. HOUSE: we would be certainly willing to discuss some variations, which they have come back with and we have gone back with a counter-proposal. We are awaiting for a further meeting with them.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir.

Well we are now making some progress because from what the minister is saying what appears to have been a stalemate is no longer a stalemate; he and his colleagues are open to further meetings. Could he tell the House then the magnitude of the saving which he has indicated to the dentists must be achieved? Because again what I understand him to say, Mr. Speaker, is that so much is to be carved off the childrens' dental health bill, which was about \$7 million last year, in round numbers. Can he tell us how much he has indicated to the Dental Association is to be carved off as part of this negotiating process?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, we have a certain budgetary figure, and I do not have the figure right here with me, it was discussed in the estimates. They came in with a proposal to say well, look, let us have the second examination - I think it is the second examination was the thing that they were high on, not the second fluoride treatments, the second examinations. We told them to go back and meet with their committee and make an offer, and they came back again and they did not have what we considered an adequate one, so we got back to them with a counter-offer and we have asked them to respond to that and they have not responded as yet.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. minister is switching his ground as he goes, and I realize he is on unshaky ground - I am sorry, he is on shaky ground, not unshaky, it is very shaky ground.

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: A bleat out of the gentleman for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young). Now if he is a bleated -

MR. WARREN: He is the cheer leader.

MR. ROBERTS: - I shall carry on, Sir. The hon. Cheer Leader from Harbour Grace.

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me come back to something - let me disregard the member for Harbour Grace and concentrate on something important, Sir. Now let me come back to this. The minister earlier gave us the figure of \$35 a visit, and then he says that is for the second examination and for the fluoride treatments. Can he tell us, from his capacious memory and his undoubted knowledge of all that is going on, the scale set down in the dealings between his ministry and the NDA with respect to the tariff items to be changed for simply a second visit? And I should say to him that his entire saving of course depends on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. YOUNG: Can you get a mouthwash for the hon. member so he can clean out his mouth once in a while?

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I want to recapitulate. We do any number of extractions that are necessary, any number of fillings that are necessary, and these have a \$2 co-pay. And what we had before was two full-fledged examinations of fluoride, prophylaxis, I suppose, prophylaxis is the total thing. But that is broken down into

MR. HOUSE: three items. There is the cleaning, \$12.00, the fluoride, \$12.00 and \$11.00 for the examination, which makes up \$35.00 for the full visit. That is the breakdown for these two extra visits. We do not think that the second one is totally necessary by the pattern that has evolved, by virtue of the fact that only twenty per cent are coming back, and this seems to be at the behest of the various dentists; some dentists do not believe this necessary or they would have them back. And the other one, looking at the trend across the Dominion of Canada or the Nation, whatever we may call it, where all other provinces, all but two, have just one complete visit, so the breakdown of the visit is the \$35.00 as I have just mentioned. And as I said, we have met with them, they made an offer and we went back with a counter-offer and we are awaiting their call for another meeting.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): A final supplementary. The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Or another new question, Sir. None of my colleagues seem to be rising, a little bit of organization on this side. Now the fog of the minister's syntax I will have a look at in Hansard and try to hack my way through it.

MR. YOUNG: You will read it line for line, will you?

MR. TULK: Listen to the old fogey over there.

MR. ROBERTS: When hon. gentlemen are ready, Sir, I will proceed, but I do not want to interrupt the minister, the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young), so seldom we hear anything useful from him that I am willing always to listen in that hope.

MR. ROBERTS: Now let me come back again to the minister. Could the -

MR. YOUNG: Useless (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman may not know the rules, but he ought to know some of the rules of common courtesy -

MR. TULK: Right on!

MR. ROBERTS: - and if he will not abide by the rules of the House, could he at least observe a little common courtesy and not show us what a rude boor he really can be. Now let me come back, if I might, to the minister.

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Would Your Honour admonish the hon. gentleman from Harbour Grace (Mr. Young), Sir. He is being boorish and insulting as well as annoying.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I ask that the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) be heard in silence.

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Is Your Honour going to admonish the hon. gentleman? He interrupted Your Honour just then. I mean there is no end to that man's insolence or ignorance.

Now let me come back to the minister because I am on a very serious subject and the minister is responding very helpfully. Could he tell the House, Mr. Speaker, what percentage, what proportion of the school children - I am sorry, the children under their thirteenth birthday -

MR. HOUSE: Up to thweve.

MR. ROBERTS: -twelve and down, up to the thirteenth birthday, what percentage of the children in Newfoundland have access to a dentist? Or another way to put it, what percentage of them see a dentist in any given year? He mentioned 90,000 visits a year, that is not too far off the number there would be under, but could he tell us what proportion of the children in Newfoundland have access to a dentist?

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to get the exact answer to that. It is a very high percentage. Most if not all pupils have access at some particular time of the year. At certain times we have - for instance, on the South coast, down in the Burgeo area, we were without a dentist for a while and then it was serviced by somebody from Central Newfoundland.

So generally speaking we are serving pretty well the whole of the Province. I do not have a percentage that is not getting any service at all, but I will certainly try and get that for the hon. member. One other thing we have to bear in mind is wherever there is a percentage of pupils not showing up, it may not mean that these pupils do not have access, it may mean that the pupils do not avail of the access. Because in a lot of cases you cannot get some pupils to take advantage of it. So generally speaking it is pretty well available all across the Province.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Just one more brief question - and I would expect the minister would not have this to hand but perhaps he could get it when he gets this other information for us - could he tell us, the 90,000 figure

MR. ROBERTS: of which he spoke, is that the number of examinations in a year or is it the number of treatments including examinations given? And I would say to him that at thirty-five dollars each there are not 90,000 examinations, because a brief glance at the budget will show that the total amount expended on examinations, Sir, in subheading 1509-04, is only - well, last year it was \$2.645 million and at thirty-five dollars each that is about 70,000 - between 70,000 and 75,000 overall. So could he tell us whether the 90,000 includes everything or not, and at the same time perhaps he could find out for us, Mr. Speaker, just how many visits the people of Newfoundland pay their dentists for through the children's dental plan in the course of twelve months, on all headings.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, that 90,000 was the two visits included; that is 70,000 and 20,000 roughly.

MR. ROBERTS: So there is one-third of them come back, not 20 per cent.

MR. HOUSE: No, we are saying there is about 90,000 and one-third of them do not come for any - 30,000 do not receive any.

MR. ROBERTS: How do you get 90,000 at thirty-five dollars each and only come out to \$2.6 million? I mean, I know arithmetic defaults me, but that does not work.

MR. HOUSE: I will try to figure it out.

MR. ROBERTS: Alright. Get the information and we will have a go at it.

MR. HOUSE: The number is about 90,000. We said there are about 90,000 pupils between the ages of birth - whatever age we take them - until they reach the end of their twelfth birthday. There was about 90,000 examinations last year; 70,000 of these were first examinations -

MR. YOUNG: He was not to the Estimates,

MR. HOUSE: - and the other 20,000 are -

MR. ROBERTS: You could not have had 90,000 at \$35 each, you did not spend that much money.

MR. YOUNG: Why did you not go to the Estimates meeting?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh shut up, 'Haig'.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. YOUNG: Why did you not go to Estimates

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I will check the arithmetic, the proper arithmetic, but these are the figures I have.

MR. YOUNG: Why did you not go the committees instead of being down in your law office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Careful 'Morgan' or we will ask you a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Back from your holiday, are you?

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions -

MR. TULK: Back from Calgary?

MR. MORGAN: Back to your law practice, are you?

MR. ROBERTS: You had a good weekend on the people. At least I work for my living 'Morgan'.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and I want to get some information re: the \$47 million which has been allocated for capital expenditures on the cost of building and equipping schools. And the question I want to ask the minister in this regard is what amount of this \$47 million will be spent on building schools in this fiscal year? Or to put it another way, what discretionary power do the school boards of the Province have in terms of building or equipping new schools, because there is a proportion of this that is already committed for servicing previous debts?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, \$47 million is the total amount allocated in the estimates for school construction in the coming fiscal year. That amount breaks down into three categories - \$22.8 million to make possible new construction, that is the erection of new buildings or the extension to present structures; \$23.2 million which will be spent on servicing debt incurred for previous construction; and \$1 million which is set aside for the deductible provision of the fire insurance policy for all schools in the Province. Those three figures add up to the total of \$47 million.

I explained this in more detail in response to the hon. member's repeated questions at the Social Services Estimates Committee hearings.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, there is another point that did not come out in these estimates and I am hoping to arrive at that in this line of questioning now. So what the minister is saying basically is that 50 per cent of this \$47 million is already committed to pay for existing debts, and we have 50 per cent to put into new school construction in this fiscal year. Can the minister indicate what proportion of that \$22.8 million will be allocated for the reorganization of the new high school programme, because last year the minister indicated that there would be \$20 million put aside for the reorganization of the new high school programme spread over a three year period, so I am wondering what proportion of this \$22.8 million will be spent on the reorganization of the new high school programme?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, of the \$22.8 million, which is earmarked for new school construction this fiscal year, \$12 million is dedicated for high school needs. Now that amount was announced by government over a year ago as the second installment of three phases of a high school construction programme totalling \$20.3 million. The first installment of \$5 million was provided in the last fiscal year, the second, or \$12 million, in the present fiscal year, and then the balance will be provided next year.

MS. VERGE: The three year programme announced last year has given the DECs and school boards considerable lead time in planning, and that is a trend started by this administration to give to the agencies responsible for capital construction sufficient time with which to plan meeting the outstanding needs in school construction.

These amounts which are provided by government for school construction are paid to the Denominational Education Committees who in turn look after in most cases 90 per cent of the cost of new projects. Under present legislation school boards have to pay at least 10 per cent of the cost of each project.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister can inform hon. members precisely as to what amount of this money, this \$22.8 million,

MR. T. LUSH: will be spent on the construction of new school buildings in this fiscal year? Because we have now broken that figure up into three or four parts. We have \$12 million for the re-organized highschool programme. We have \$9 millions for other schools in this year, making \$22 million, so what amount from that \$22 million will be spent on building new schools in this fiscal year?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS. L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that all of the \$22.8 million, 100 per cent of that amount will be spent on new school construction this year and that will be added to at least a ten per cent contribution for each project from the school board benefiting.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Just to make sure that I understand the minister in a clear manner, is the minister saying that none of this money is to be spread over a two year period, all of this \$22.8 million is to be spent in this fiscal year 1982?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, all of that amount is being made available by the provincial government to the Denominational Education Committees who, under our constitution and law, are responsible school construction. The Denominational Education Committees, in consultation with their respective school boards, allocate or distribute these funds, they approve school construction projects. All of the \$22.8 million for new construction is being made available to the DEC's, and as far as I know it will all be used this year for needed additional construction projects.

June 9, 1982

Tape No. 1530

MJ - 2

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The time for Question Period has expired.

Before we proceed, I would like to welcome to the galleries today, former MLA from the Province of New Brunswick and the former Minister of Natural Resources in the person of Mr. Bud Burden, I do indeed welcome you to the gallery today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS

Hear, hear!

000

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with

Orders of the Day -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

-I wonder if my hon. opponent

opposite would allow me to suggest that it might be fitting and appropriate and proper for this House to send off a letter or a telex of congratulations to Prince Charles and Lady Diana on the birth of a new Prince. Mr. Speaker, as the members know we are proud to be British subjects in this Province, we are Canada's newest province but Britian's oldest colony, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: and I believe as loyal subjects of Her majesty that it would be proper for us to get off a communications to London, Mr. Speaker, a letter of congratulations. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, but an invitation for Charles and Lady Diana to visit Newfoundland next year when we are observing, I believe it is the 400 th. anniversary of the landing of Sir Humphrey Gilbert in this Province, and if they accepted the invitation maybe they would bring the bouncing baby boy with them. But we would be proud to have them in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: They are going to call him Steve, by the way.

MR. NEARY: No, they are not going to call him Steve. Well, I have to say this, Mr. Speaker, that there were some very important and prominent people born on the twenty-first of June, some very, very important people born on the twenty-first of June. And when I was listening to the astrologer from Liverpool predicting the future for this new Prince, and identifying the Prince with all the people who were born on the twenty-first of June, Mr. Speaker, I was rather proud of that because yesterday happened to be my birthday, too.

But in the meantime, I believe seriously -

MR. SIMMS: You could be his god-cousin.

MR. NEARY: Well, I am. I am proud to be able to make this motion, Mr. Speaker, and I do hope that the gentlemen on the other side will concur and make it unanimous.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, in the temporary absence of the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), certainly members on this side are very pleased to concur and to join with the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) in the request that Your Honour, I suppose, communicate through the Lieutenant-Governor in asking him to transmit to the Prince and Princess the best wishes of the House of Assembly and the people of Newfoundland on this propitious birth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): All those in favour 'aye'.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Against 'nay'.

The motion is carried.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: The Concurrence Motion, Government Services Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Concurrence Motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: It has been my understanding that in previous years there has been an agreement whereby members can speak for ten minutes as opposed to Standing Order 49, for thirty minutes.

MR. NEARY: Back and forth.

MR. SPEAKER: Back and forth.

MR. MARSHALL: I think, Mr. Speaker, the agreement was that the rules of Committee would apply, ten and ten.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there unanimous agreement for that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS:

Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I wish to begin the Concurrence Debates.

The Heads that were considered in the Government Services Committee

MR. CROSS: were Finance, Public Works, Transportation, Labour and Manpower and Municipal Affairs.

The debates on Labour and Manpower, Public Works and Transportation were concluded in three hours. It took two and a half hours for each of Municipal Affairs and Finance. All heads were adequately covered as no Head was passed until questions had been answered to the Committee members' satisfaction, or so it seemed.

The total amount of money that was passed in these heads was \$257,326,000. The dollars spent in capital works projects, especially in Transportation for road construction and Municipal Affairs for water and sewer projects, will be a big help to the construction industry and create much needed employment in a time when jobs are not easy to come by.

I was personally pleased to see money made available for the construction of causeways, as money has been allocated for the construction of a causeway to link the historic community of Greenspond, in the district of Bonavista North, to the Mainland. The people of that community after years of dreaming are about to have their dreams become a reality.

MR. WARREN: Federal money.

MR. CROSS: Federal and provincial money, Mr. Speaker, and again I am pleased that some of the dollars for capital works in Municipal Affairs will be spent again this year in the district of Bonavista North, namely in the communities of Greenspond, Badger's Quay, Trinity and Gambo.

Mr. Speaker, as I have already stated there was ample time for questions to be answered in the meetings of the Government Services Committee. The spirit and rapport exhibited at these meetings were exceptional. I might add that they were far better than the spirit and good will shown in this hon. House at times.

June 22, 1982

Tape 1532

NM - 2

MR. CROSS: I have to commend the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) for his regular attendance at the Committee meetings. He was the only one in Opposition ranks who carried the ball all the way -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: The next leader, the next leader.

MR. CROSS: - as in most cases too, he was the only member from the Opposition present at committee meetings. I believe there are three hours for this Concurrence motion on government committess, so I will not waste too much of the time, I will leave it to the Opposition so that they can ask other questions. But in closing, I would like to thank all members for the worthwhile contributions that they made, say it was a pleasure and very enlightening to have been Chairman of the Government Services Committee.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I want to raise some questions today that I did not get the time to raise during the debating of the estimates in committee. There are several burning questions that I want to ask and several points I want to raise. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I think the Chairman, the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross), in speaking said that the estimates were passed to the satisfaction of all members. I want to say that some of the estimates were not to my satisfaction but there was not much I could do about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: There was not much I could do about it sitting in these committees all alone, Mr. Speaker, a voice crying in the wilderness. But, Mr. Speaker, I noticed with interest the member talking about some of the monies that were allocated for his district, and I certainly take a great degree of pleasure in hearing that there will be money spent for causeway construction in Greenspond and other monies that he alluded to. But, Mr. Speaker, one of the points that I raised in the committee was the fact that particularly the Minister of Transportation (Mr.

MR. LUSH: Dawe) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) came to the committee with large amounts of capital expenditures and hon. members had no idea where these monies were being spent.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. LUSH: And road construction and water and sewer projects and road agreements with respect to the cost sharing programme with municipalities, time and time again I asked for a list of all three areas that is where money was being spent for road construction in the Province, secondary roads in particular, and secondly, where money was going with respect to water and sewer in this Province; and thirdly, a list of the municipalities which would receive the grant under the cost sharing programme for roads. And to this point in time I

MR. LUSH: have not seen one list, I have not seen one list.

MR. NEARY: You will not see one either.

MR. LUSH: I read in the papers from time to time about various government members announcing the awarding of various road projects in their districts, and various water and sewer projects in their districts, and various municipalities receiving the cost sharing portion of the road programmes for municipalities. I have not yet heard of any minister or any backbencher announcing any expenditures for Terra Nova. I have been waiting for that, but I have not heard and to date -

MR. NEARY: Do not hold your breath.

MR. LUSH: - neither minister has done me the courtesy to send me a list so I can see -

MR. TOBIN: It is hidden away.

MR. LUSH: - where the monies are going so I can see whether or not the taxpayers, whether or not the residents, whether or not the hard working people of Terra Nova are going to get the equal treatment that the Premier talks about so much, and whether or not they are going to be treated as equal Newfoundlanders within this Province. I have been waiting for that, Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting and I hope that we are going to see these lists in all three cases; the list for the secondary roads in the Province, the list for the roads within municipalities under the cost sharing programme, and the water and sewer list. I hope that we are going to see these lists today, or in any matter before the estimates are completed. So that is the least, Mr. Speaker, that both ministers concerned can do to show their faith, to show their respect for the people of this Province, and to show their respect for this hon. House is to supply us with these lists. And maybe if Terra Nova is included that maybe the two ministers concerned could give me a little bit

June 22, 1982

Tape 1534

PK - 2

MR. LUSH: of notice so that I will not die of heart failure or anything, Mr. Speaker. Maybe they can give me a little bit of notice. In any event they should provide the House with that information today. It is ridiculous how we passed these large sums

MR. LUSH:

of monies for capital expenditures without knowing where these monies are going. And I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether we can hang up the passing of these monies until we know where the money is going or whether we can hang up the House indefinitely until a particular member gets monies for his district, I do not know if we can do those things, but I am almost game to try it because it is getting so desperate now, Mr. Speaker, in this respect, the pork-barreling that goes on in both those departments, I think is a matter that can be brought up with the United Nations. It is a matter of human rights and the Premier talked so much about human rights and -

MR. TULK:

And equality, equality.

MR. LUSH:

- equality. So, Mr. Speaker,

until we can see these lists we cannot say whether or not the Premier is practicing what he indeed preaches. And I for one would like to see these lists submitted today.

MR. TULK:

A man of very little substance.

MR. LUSH:

I would like to see these lists today so that hon. members will know where the capital expenditures of this Province are going and which communities, which municipalities are receiving the public dollars of this Province. I would like to see these lists. So, Mr. Speaker, it is important that the two hon. ministers concerned would certainly respect the privileges of this House, would certainly respect the dignity of this House and would certainly submit these lists to all hon. members today so that we can all be informed, so that we can all know where these capital expenditures are going and whether indeed

MR. LUSH: they are being distributed in a fair and just manner. Mr. Speaker, that is an important matter, that is a very important matter. We are talking about equality, we are talking about fair and just treatment to the people of this Province, we are talking about regional disparity, we are talking about how well the government is following this plan of regional disparity, how well they are treating the people of this Province and to what degree are all of our people being treated equally, fairly and justly. Now, Mr. Speaker, I can say all of that in other words, in another way using different adjectives and what have you, but I think I have made the point.

MR. TULK: Very strongly, I would imagine.

MR. LUSH: And I certainly hope that the two ministers concerned can provide us with these very important lists before this concurrence debate is finished.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to allude in these initial remarks to the Department of Labour and Manpower. I do have a lot to say about that particular department and I am sure that my first time allotment will not permit me to say all of the thing which I want to say on this particular department. First of all, I would think that the Department of Labour and Manpower is a misnomer if there ever was one. I refer particularly to the manpower, to the manpower section. The manpower section, Mr. Speaker, would give one the impression that the

MR. LUSH:

government is initiating, developing and planning manpower strategies in this Province for the future, that they are developing training programmes for our young people, that they are developing training programmes for the adult section of our population, that they are preparing training and re-training programmes for our workers so that they will not be displaced with progress and the new technology that is taking place in the world today and in Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, when one realizes and one looks at the expenditures of the Department, of the Manpower Section in particular, one realizes what a misnomer this Manpower Division is. Mr. Speaker, if I can just find the Labour and Manpower Section to illustrate the point that I am making; for example, under Development and Training, which one would expect, as I have said, to be a major part of Labour and Manpower, that Development and Training would comprise a major element, this Province should really be getting down to brass tacks in terms of training our people, in terms of developing new skills, in terms of developing the new skills that the future labour market will demand, in terms of the future industrial demands when one looks at the amount of money that is being spent, one realizes how little is being done. For example, Mr. Speaker, in Curriculum Development and Testing, Curriculum Development, one would see this as the most important element of any development and training programme, that this is where we study and do research to find out what the demands of the labour market will be, what the future industrial demands would be, they are spending a \$195,000, Mr. Speaker, \$195,000.00 - not a good high school budget really, for conducting research and study - \$195,000.00 of which \$118,000.00 of this comes from the Federal Government.

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

MR. LUSH: A \$118,000.00 a mere -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LUSH: Oh, my golly. Well, I will get at
it again and develop the points that need to be developed here.

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker. Where am I!
I am interested in the remarks by the Chairman of the Committee,
and I was also more than a little interested in what happened
at the Committee meeting and, I suppose, somewhat a little
disappointed in the type of questions that were asked by the
Member from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) in dealing with the
department's estimates and the extensive programme that is
ongoing throughout the Province and capital construction,
the new initiatives in the area of the licencing system and
new initiatives in

MR. R. DAWE:

the areas of seat belt legislation. The hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. T. Lush) dealt specifically with items pertaining to his own district. I am not saying that the member should not from time to time address himself specifically to those areas but, seeing as how he was the only member from the Opposition who attended the Committee meetings, it seemed to me that the questions coming from the member should have been a little more global in scope, a little more in-depth questions and therefore he would have received perhaps more in-depth responses from myself during the Committee meetings. The department this year, as well as the Department of Municipal Affairs- my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. H. Newhook) can speak for herself a little later on - we are involved this year, after lengthy discussions by the Premier and other members of Cabinet with the construction industry, both the highroad construction industry and the general construction industry - one of the things it was thought that would help stimulate the construction industry and get things onstream early in the year was the early tendering process, and this we accomplished, and it has met with, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of success. And there are people working on highroads throughout the Province, both in projects that are ongoing as part of an agreement between the federal government and the provincial government, an agreement I might add, which was to the advantage of the Province. I remember last year in Estimate Committee that the members opposite said we should never become involved again in a 50/50 cost sharing of the Trans-Canada Highway or a primary highroad system. Yet when the Province tried to negotiate hard and long for a better agreement than the 50/50 that was offered from the federal government, there were screams of 'Stalling', screams of 'Get on with it, Get on with

June 22, 1982

Tape No. 1537

MJ - 2

MR. R. DAWE: the project, Never mind the hard negotiations, never mind trying to get a better deal for the Province, never mind trying to make sure that the people of Newfoundland are treated equally with other Canadians, just do something.'

MR. DAWE: like the hon. members opposite always get on with things that are so inconsistent. Their alternative, Mr. Speaker, to any programmes, any positive programmes that come from this side of the House, are always so wishy-washy, they are one side of the fence today and they are on the other side of the fence tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: True.

MR. DAWE: No wonder the people of Newfoundland voted so overwhelmingly for this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, for the policies and the programmes of this particular government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: You have to agree. You have to agree.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, this year the Department of Transportation is involved in a number of construction projects, some of them expanded considerably from previous years, but the status quo, Mr. Speaker, the level of funding is not as great as it should be. The past two or three years has seen the Federal Department of DREE, which funded a number of secondary road projects in this Province, remove its funding for roads, The Labrador Straits Road agreement, or part of the Labrador agreement which involved the road section, was the last DREE roads programme that we have seen, even though the Province has a great number of legitimate requests in for resource development areas, for roads to resources, roads to develop resources. We have seen a blind eye turned to this Province in the area of DREE allocation of funding, but other areas of Canada, supposedly with better economic conditions than ours, have seen themselves the recipients of a number of DREE projects.

It has caused considerable concern in the road construction industry because people in this Province who had geared up over a number of years to meet a certain

MR. DAWE: level of funding, to meet a certain level of construction activity, were found with the rug pulled out from under them. The level of funding from the Province, Mr. Speaker, has remained consistently the same. We are doing everything that we can as a government to acknowledge the legitimate aspirations of the people of this Province in transportation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: It is unfortunate that our federal government has not seen fit to treat this Province in a similar manner as it has other provinces in the Canadian Confederation. And I would like to see this changed, Mr. Speaker, and we will negotiate, if it means prolonging some agreements from being signed so that we can get a better deal for this Province then, Mr. Speaker, I think that is what we should do. We have been successful in the highroad agreement in changing from a 50/50 to a 75/25 with the federal government paying the larger portion as they legitimately should.

There are additional funds this year, Mr. Speaker, in an area of bridge construction and causeway construction which is of particular interest to me as a member representing a district with several bridge problems that will be addressed in due course -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: - as a number of other projects around the Province will be addressed.

MR. REID: A good member.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, we have an extra \$1 million funding this year from the

MR. DAWE:

Provincial Treasury into bridge construction, provincial funding. There are a number of other areas of this Province which require extensive capital construction. They will be addressed over the next number of years in a number of terms, with or without federal participation.

Of course, if in addressing ourselves to the particular problems we were able to have the advantage that other Canadian provinces had when they were building their roads and getting their infrastructure in place, then we would not have to worry about whether there was enough funding to go around to meet the aspirations of the construction industry, but, more importantly, to meet the aspirations of Newfoundlanders who require and deserve better levels of transportation than they now enjoy, or do not enjoy as the case may be.

MR. SIMMS:

A good point.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I was

dissatisfied. I would hope that some of the questions that will be asked during this Concurrence Debate will provide an opportunity for a little more indepth questioning and answers on my department as well as other departments. I was disappointed. Unfortunately the members opposite do not consider the Estimates Committees the time and place, obviously, to ask the pertinent, indepth questions; they would rather be more willing to allow a couple of individual members opposite to take the forefront, to take the show on the road, if you will, and ask what they perceive to be embarrassing questions of government during the sittings of the House of Assembly rather than the kinds of important questions that will get the kinds of important answers that the people of this Province deserve.

MR. TOBIN: How can they ask them when they do not show up?

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Aylward): The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about indepth questioning. Well, let me illustrate the kind of indepth knowledge that the minister has. He talks about the 75/25 per cent deal that he has gotten with the Trans-Canada Highway from the federal government. He talks about how it was important to fight for the best possible deal that he could for Newfoundland. Of course, nobody objects to that. Mr. Speaker, when it follows along these lines, mainly that the federal government was allocating the same monies to the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as they did to the Province of Newfoundland, but the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia decided that they would match the federal government's contribution dollar for dollar and thus it became a fifty/fifty arrangement, but because we were only going to contribute 25 per cent it became 75/25 per cent. And the minister went around telling what a great agreement only because we were going to put in 25 per cent even though we got the same allocations from the federal government as the Nova Scotian Government and the Government of New Brunswick.

MR. TULK: A cute trick.

MR. LUSH: It was a cute trick. All the minister had to do was go a little further and not put in any money and it could have been a 100 per cent federal agreement.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. TULK: How much road would you want now?

MR. LUSH: The logic, Mr. Speaker, is something like the student who dashed home all out of breath and told his mother that he saved a dime because he ran home behind the bus. And his mother said: 'Why did you not save a dollar and run home behind a cab?'

MR. TULK: It is the same thing.

MR. LUSH: And it is the same logic, Mr. Speaker, the same logic that the minister talks about when he talks about this great 75/25 per cent deal. And again, of course, all he had to do was put in 10 per cent and we could have had a 90/10, or not put in any and we could have had 100 per cent. Granted we would not be getting as much roads done -

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, could we clear the galleries?

MR. LUSH: - not getting as much pavement done on the Trans-Canada Highway or as much improvement -

MR. TULK: He is waiting for his interview,

MR. LUSH: - as the people in Nova Scotia and in New Brunswick. Mr. Speaker, the minister, in wheeling and dealing and delaying that project for one year, brought Newfoundland very little and we are not getting as much in terms of improvement to the Trans-Canada Highway as the other two Maritime Provinces only because, of course, this Province did not put in the monies that the two other provinces put in.

MR. TULK: Right on.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, that is the logic the minister uses when he talks about in-depth and profound questions and profound reasoning and logical reasoning, that is the kind of reasoning that the minister

MR. LUSH: enters into. Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister still did not say anything about the list, this most important list, of which communities in Newfoundland would be receiving capital expenditures for upgrading and reconstruction and paving of their roads. The minister still did not mention that. And what is the situation? Have all the areas been decided upon?

MR. TULK: Be quite. You did not answer questions in committee. Be quiet.

MR. LUSH: Have all the monies been allocated, if so, which areas, which communities -

MR. TULK: You did not answer any questions in committee, now be quiet.

MR. LUSH: - have received monies for the upgrading and reconstruction of secondary roads?

MR. TULK: Go away, boy.

MR. LUSH: And that is most important and this hon. House should know the answer to that important question. Which areas, which communities, which regions are going to receive the monies for the upgrading, reconstruction and paving of roads in this fiscal year for 1982? That is important, Mr. Speaker, and the minister chooses to ignore that very important question. And I hope that the minister will certainly come up with that information, and also the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) come up with the same information which I have requested from that particular department. Millions and millions of dollars being spent, Mr. Speaker, and nobody in Newfoundland knowing where they are going other than those communities receiving them, except by the various announcements and this paper and that paper about various ministers and backbenchers announcing which areas of the Province, their own ridings, their own districts, are receiving these monies,

MR. LUSH: which areas are being recipients of this pork barrelling in the Department of Transportation and in the Department of Municipal Affairs.

The minister talks about, Mr. Speaker, talks about concentrating on district questions. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to continue to do that in this House, I am going to continue to fight for a fair share of the public dollars of this Province for the district of Terra Nova. I am going to continue fighting for that as long as I am a member of this House, And as long as I see any discrimination shown, as long as I see that the monies are not being spent fairly, are not being spent in a fair and just manner, then this hon. member is going to keep fighting for the district of Terra Nova -

MR. TULK: Right on!

MR. LUSH: - the district, Mr. Speaker, that keeps electing me election after election and I guess that is why they do it. I guess that is why they do it. That is why they do it, Mr. Speaker. That is why they do it. And the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) is going to keep pressing on the upward way, Mr. Speaker, going to keep pressing on for the people of the Terra Nova district, pressing for roads, pressing for water and sewer, and nobody on the opposite side is going to stop me. I know very few of them mention their districts but, Mr. Speaker, I will mention the district, my district, the Terra Nova district in the Estimates Committee, in the concurrency debate and every chance I can get, because the people of Newfoundland certainly know where the Terra Nova district is and they know the unfair and the unjust treatment that it is receiving from this provincial government. And as long as that is the case, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: Do they need a stronger member?

MR. LUSH: They cannot find one. They cannot find a stronger member, Mr. Speaker, and they know it. They know it.

MR. TULK: Even the Tories down there said that over the weekend, did they not?

MR. LUSH: Pardon?

MR. TULK: Even the Tories down there said that over the weekend.

MR. LUSH: They acknowledged it over the weekend. They acknowledged it over the weekend.

MR. TULK: The Tories?

MR. LUSH: The Tories in the Terra Nova district acknowledge what a great job their member is doing for them, fighting, and begging and struggling and scratching, trying to get a few cents, trying to get a few dollars of their own money returned back to their district -

MR. TULK: And they said, "What is wrong with our Brian"?

MR. LUSH: - the money, Mr. Speaker, the money that comes from agriculture, the money that comes from logging, the stumpage fee that the minister just put on, because the large amount of money that is going to come from the Terra Nova district on this stumpage fee, Mr. Speaker, a large amount of money that comes in from fishing, the amount of money that comes in from tourism. It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, if it were all totalled up, the

MR. T. LUSH: money that come into the Newfoundland Treasury, the Newfoundland Government from the hard-working residents and the hard-working taxpayers of the Terra Nova district, And they deserve more, they deserve better treatment, they deserve a more equal treatment-if we can have that terminology, 'more equal' - they deserve more equal treatment than what they are getting. They deserve without any adjectives at all, Mr. Speaker, without any adjectives of comparative or superlative degree, they need better treatment than what they are receiving from their provincial government. But, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to get on to again, and I hope that the minister will tell us this afternoon in this particular sitting, I hope that the minister will tell us whether or not he is going to give us that list, that list of secondary road construction, upgrading and paving in the Province this year so all hon. members can see and so that all of the people of Newfoundland can see where their dollars are being spent. And I hope that the minister will provide that list this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to get back to, and I suppose I have got nobody to respond on the Manpower section of the Department of Labour and Manpower, the section which one would expect would be putting in programmes, putting in courses of study, Mr. Speaker, to meet the future demands, the future labour demands, to meet the industrial demands of the future. Mr. Speaker, it has been known for some time now that our vocational schools are teaching courses that are outdated, are teaching courses for which there is no demand in the labour market, and schools that are equipped with obsolete and practically archaic equipment. And training people today, Mr. Speaker, for a world of technological advance and teaching with equipment and facilities that are outdated and teaching courses for which there is no demand, Mr. Speaker, in

MR. T. LUSH: the modern terminology we call it an imbalance between what we are teaching in our trade schools and what the future demands and present demands of the labour force are. And all hon. members know that right throughout Canada today there is a problem with respect to training skilled people, and this at a time when we have such outrageous high unemployment, what a challenge, Mr. Speaker, what an opportunity for any government in power today to be training its people, when we have so many idle people, so many people doing nothing, so many people wanting jobs, so many people wanting to be trained, and here we are doing nothing, doing absolutely nothing in terms of training our people for the labour demands of the future, and not only of the future Mr. Speaker, but of today.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I will have to get on to that again. I will have to get on to that again at another time because this imbalance and mismatching of the courses in trade schools and the labour force is absolutely ridiculous.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister for Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is not available today, he is out on public business, and I am sure that if he were here he would respond to the hon. member and set him straight on some of the things that he seems to be astray on. So I do not pretend to be able to fulfil that role as well as the Minister of Labour and Manpower, but I certainly can fulfil it to the extent that is required by the hon. member's remarks.

He seems to indicate that there is not sufficient thrust being put into the Department of Labour and Manpower, but I can only presume that he just has not read the Budget. He has made sort of bald statements without any backup whatever. I think if we turn to the Budget we see that for the Department of Labour and Manpower, the revised figure for 1981-1982, there was an expenditure of \$3,345,200, \$3.3 million approximately, for 1981-1982, the fiscal year just finished. And in this fiscal year the hon. member would seem to suggest that there was not sufficient monies put in there, I suppose there is never sufficient, but suggesting that there was not a matching amount of money, and what do we find, Mr. Speaker? Instead of \$3.3 million last year we find \$4.4 million this year.

DR. COLLINS:

So that is a 30 per cent increase.

In other words we are budgeting a third more this year for

Labour and Manpower than was actually expended last year.

Now I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that one would have gleaned

that from the hon. member's remarks.

DR. COLLINS:

I think that one would have thought from the hon. member's remarks that we were short-changing this department whereas in actual fact, if we look at the figures, we find that exactly the reverse is so. So that is rather strange, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. member specifically referred to development and training. He mentioned curriculum training, for instance, and that is part of development and training, What do we find as part of the department's expenditure? The total manpower development expenditure in 1981-'82 was actually considerably less due to a fortuitous amount of receipt from the federal government, was considerably less than was budgeted. In 1981-'82 the amount budgeted was \$556,900. Say \$.56 million was budgeted in 1981-'82, there was only an expenditure of \$155,100 and, as I say, that was due to increased receipts that we did get from the federal government rather fortuitously.

Now, we actually spent \$155,00 in manpower development last year, 1981-'82. What do we find this year, Mr. Speaker? We find we are spending \$883,000 this year. So that is not only considerably more than was actually expended last year, but it is at least almost 50 per cent more than was budgeted last year. So, I mean, the hon. member's remarks in regard to Labour and Manpower give one impression, where in actual fact, if you look through the budget and see the figures, you find exactly the difference.

MR. NEARY: Tory talk. Tory talk.

DR. COLLINS: Now, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) says that I am just giving Tory talk.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Tory talk.

DR. COLLINS: When I give facts he falls back on just these sort of irrelevant partisan statements.

DR. COLLINS: There is nothing Tory or Liberal or anything else about that, the facts are there. It means that last year we spent \$3.3 million in Labour and Manpower, this year we are budgeted to spend \$4.4 million. Last year we spent \$155,000 on manpower development, this year we are spending \$883,000. Now, these are very, very different figures than the figures that were sort of implicit in the hon. member's remarks.

So I am sure when the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) comes back he will go into this in much more detail. He probably will absolutely devastate the

DR. COLLINS: hon. member opposite with his retorts. So I just very mildly would like to correct the erroneous, I would suggest, the erroneous impression left by the hon. member when he spoke that we are not putting sufficient monies this year into Labour and Manpower when in actual fact we are putting in considerably more than was expended in that department last year.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a few comments and perhaps ask a few questions regarding the various departments which were studied, scrutinized, whatever, to the best of the ability of the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) who was in attendance at these committee meetings. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask again for what it is worth, to ask again, a couple of the same questions that the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) has already asked without very much forthcoming, at least from the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), who got up and responded in his own peculiar way -

MR. WARREN: Nasty manner.

MR. CALLAN: - his own peculiar way.

MR. WARREN: We will set him straight at once.

MR. CALLAN: He was asked a simple question. The minister who just came back into the legislature was asked by the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) when will he be in a position, and why does he not do it now, this afternoon, why does he not table the list containing the roads programme for this Province for this construction year? The only bit of information that we can find so far is, of course, by looking through the public tender calls in the various newspapers.

MR. WARREN: That is right. Yes.

MR. CALLAN: Pick up the newspapers on the weekend, or on the weekday for

MR. CALLAN:

that matter, and there you see various public tender calls for various roads and bridges throughout the Province. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is an insult to members of the House of Assembly to have to wait half the Summer to find out whether or not they are in fact going to get any of the taxpayers' dollars in road work for their various districts. The same thing applies, of course, in the Department of Municipal Affairs. The water and sewer project approvals are kept top secret until the middle of the Summer, sometimes long after the House of Assembly has closed for the Summer recess, and in any event weeks after the Budget and the estimates for the various departments have all been approved.

MR. WARREN: Shameful.

MR. CALLAN: So, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) a point blank question, and I would ask that when the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the member for Gander, when she does stand that she will not side-step and evade all of the questions and talk the sort of roundabout nonsense that the Minister of Transportation gave us ten minutes of earlier, Instead of answering the questions, dragging in red herring that had nothing to do with his department -

MR. DAWE: We improved the environmental legislation. There is no more red herring there now.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Minister of Transportation, when he gets up again before the day is finished, will tell us -

MR. WARREN: Red caplin though.

MR. CALLAN: - that, yes, I have in front of me the roads programme for this year, outlined district by district as we have had it done in the last three years,

MR. CALLAN: I think it has been on the go anyway, and that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) will do us the courtesy of tabling the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, over the weekend and every day that goes by I ,and I am sure that all especially the members who represent rural

MR. CALLAN: districts in this Province, you know, get phone calls and letters asking about, 'I wonder where can I get a job, where can I get some employment?' And, Mr. Speaker, we heard in the middle of the Winter, we heard the Premier, long before the election was called, even though it was designed as election bait no doubt, but we heard the Premier in the middle of the Winter telling us that this year government will be embarking on a new policy, it is called pretending, the pretending policy, whereby road work projects and other construction projects can be tendered early and therefore work can start early.

Well, Mr. Speaker, where are these construction jobs? The tenders have not even been let yet and here it is close to the end of June, a couple of construction months have passed us by, and still not only do we not have a list from the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and from the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook), a list of the various projects contained within this year's budget for the Province, but the tenders have not even been awarded and I suppose they have not been awarded in not 5 per cent of the projects throughout this Province.

MR. DAWE: I wish you could say something provocative so I could get up and answer you.

MR. CALLAN: I do not intend to be provocative, I am asking simple straightforward questions. I would say one provocative thing, and of course I think it is becoming quite evident now to people all across the Province that what we saw and what we heard announced in mid-Winter and what we heard during heard, during the election campaign -

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. CALLAN: - had nothing to do with pretending, but it had an awful lot to do with pretending.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: And I would say that the Premier now in the minds of a lot of people is becoming known as the great pretender - pretending to do one thing -

MR. TOBIN: Pretending that you are not around.

MR. CALLAN: - pretending to plan to do something and in essence not taking the road that people thought he was going to take at all.

MR. STAGG: The highroad, he is taking the highroad

MR. CALLAN: No, the Premier on practically every issue is taking the road that leads to antagonism and confrontation and all of the other adjectives that I could use.

MR. TOBIN: You are not very good at your adjectives. You had to look for them.

MR. STAGG: These are not adjectives, they are nouns.

MR. CALLAN: Well I do not care what they are, they could be pronouns or adverbs. Mr. Speaker, perhaps, when the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) gets up, I think she is going to get up now, perhaps she can also tell us,

MR. W. CALLAN: is one of the reasons why she has not announced the programme for the year, is one of the reasons going back to something that happened last summer, that a lot of municipalities across this Province- and perhaps the minister could tell us how many -

MR. BAIRD: You were not around here last Summer. You do not know. You stepped aside last Summer.

MR. CALLAN: No, no I came back here last year, it was April 10th; this year it was four days early, April 6th. I do not believe -

MR. STAGG: You should not have got back then.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the member was out there trying to do his part to make sure I did not get back but he only did me good.

MR. WARREN: He increased your vote.

MR. CALLAN: He increased my vote by being out there. But, Mr. Speaker, last year there were a number of municipalities in this Province which refused to accept their offer of water and sewer - Phase I, or whatever - there were a number of municipalities where the town councillors said, "No, thanks. We will not accept your offer of water and sewer for this year because hand in hand with it you are saying to us, 'Now you can have your water and sewer but you have to agree to impose property taxes.' "And so last year there were several. Just now I used the word 'many'. I will take that back; there were several municipalities that just absolutely refused to accept their water and sewer offer from the government because they were not satisfied.

MR. STAGG: Name them.

MR. CALLAN: I am going to ask the minister to do it; the minister knows that it is a fact. I am asking the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs.H. Newhook) will she name

June 22, 1982

Tape No. 1548

MJ-2

MR. CALLIAN: them. And I am asking her also is that the reason why she has not made the list available, because she does not know how up-to-date and how firm the list is. Because the minister may discover that when the offer is made that some and perhaps other municipalities will come back this year and say, 'No, thanks. We do not want to accept your offer of water and sewer for our

MR. CALLAN: town or municipality
because we do not believe in property taxes and we do
not have the will of the people to impose it so, therefore,
we will not accept it.' Perhaps the minister can answer
that one. I hope that the minister, and I am sure that she will -

MR. BAIRD: Do not be talking so foolish, boy.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!
The hon. member's time has
elapsed.

MR. WARREN: By leave. By leave.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the last word
was by the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird).

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I
will continue some other time.

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, first of all I
would like to respond to what my hon. colleague has just
said about property tax. I would like to advise you,
Mr. Speaker, that we have sixty-one municipalities now
with property tax in place. We have ninety-five other
municipalities which have requested property tax, and in
thirty of these we are doing the assessments this year.

We have also about 120
municipalities in our Province in which property tax is
not mandatory. These are municipalities which have very
small systems or they have acquired them through Canada
works projects or in other ways, or maybe they just
drill wells systems and these sorts of things. Actually
we only have twenty-four municipalities that have not yet
requested the property tax. These are the ones which
would have at least 50 per cent or more of their towns'
services, water and/or sewer.

MRS. NEWHOOK: And I am quite sure that if we did not have the long list for which we have to do assessments no doubt some of these twenty-four that have not yet requested it would be doing so. They know now that it is going to take us probably three years to get these assessments finished, so, therefore, they have not made the requests.

I would also like to respond to my hon. colleague there who said that he cannot see any construction yet. I would like to point out that first of all once a project is approved for water and sewer and capital funding is guaranteed, then design work has to be done. This takes possibly a month or a month and a half or so, maybe even more than that, to get the design work done. This has to be done by the engineers and then it has to come to my department to be approved.

MR. CALLAN: Design work was done on Norman's Cove five years ago. Five years ago.

MRS. NEWHOOK: There are

MRS NEWHOOK: a few projects that were pre-designed and these have all gone this year, everything. Actually the Premier said,before the Budget came down, he said that the capital works project will be announced early,and it was announced early because it was announced during the election.

MR. CALLAN: Election bait.

MRS NEWHOOK: No, it was not election bait, Mr. Speaker. It had been planned all along because the Premier had made a public announcement and said he was going to do it,and at that time there was absolutely no idea or no plans at all for an election.

MR. CALLAN: The minister knows different.

MRS NEWHOOK: No, I am being absolutely truthful.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MRS NEWHOOK: I am not the type of person who tries to make misrepresentations. I would not do it to my own colleagues and I would not do it to the colleagues on the other side of the House.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS NEWHOOK: But,anyway,I would like to point that out. My hon. colleague from the district of Terra Nova (Mr.Lush) was talking about discrimination, that it was not spread out fairly,and I would like to say that at the time that these announcements were made we had no idea then how the elections were going to go,and I would like to point out that there was a great deal of that money that went into districts that were formally Liberal and we had no way of knowing that they were going to be on our side this time.

MR. BAIRD: We had an idea though.

MRS NEWHOOK: My colleague from Bonavista North

MRS. NEWHOOK: (Mr. Cross) there, he was just shouting about all the money that is going into his district this year. And we had absolutely no idea that the towns of Gambo and Hare Bay and - where was it? - Hare Bay and Trinity - no, Trinity and Gambo, Badger's Quay and Greenspond, we had no idea that these were not going to still be Liberal this year, and this announcement was made during the election.

Also this year we are spending a great deal of money down in Burnt Islands and,

MRS. NEWHOOK: you know, that is a Liberal district now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MRS. NEWHOOK: These were announcements that were made during the election, or prior to the election - anyway, whenever the Budget was decided on and what amount of money we were going to spend. I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this year we are spending possibly \$33 million to \$35 million on water and sewer projects, which is more than we spent last year, and last year we spent more than we did the year before. And I agree with my colleague from Terra Nova district (Mr. Lush) when he says there is not enough money, we all agree with that, and I would like to see about \$100 million to be spent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MRS. NEWHOOK: And actually this is the amount that we really need to spend to catch up, because every year there are requests for over \$100 million worth of water and sewer projects. Last year I think it was about \$120 million, this year it is somewhere in the vicinity of \$105 million or \$110 million. And as we go ahead and deliver more water and sewer, it seems that the requests still keep coming in and piling up, so there seems to be no catching up. And I do agree that we really need to do about one hundred million in one year, and then I think possibly we could, maybe, keep on an even keel and be able to provide the water and sewer projects as they come in. Now, my colleague from Terra Nova District (Mr. Lush), he was complaining about the money spent in his district. Well, I know that we have spent upwards of \$3 million in Glovertown, we have spent a great deal of money in Eastport. As a matter of fact, Eastport is now spending money that was provided to them last year, and they had it left over. And we

MRS. NEWHOOD: co-operated with the Town of Eastport and they want to use the money for something different from the original plans, and we approved all this, Mr. Speaker, so I cannot see how the hon. colleague from Terra Nova District (Mr. Lush) says that we are not doing things fairly. Also, I can point out that, you know, that Salvage has water system, that Happy Adventure has a water system, Sandy Cove, I am going to meet with Sandy Cove now in the next week or so, they just need a small

MRS. NEWHOOK:

extension. I have met with the town of Happy Adventure and they need some upgrading. And I realize that it is important to the town of Happy Adventure and I am going to do my best to see that they get some monies for that as quickly as possible. So my colleague over there, he had better be pretty nice if he wants to get the money value.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: The iron lady, boy, the iron lady. We have her on our side.

MRS. NEWHOOK: But during the Estimates Committee, Mr. Speaker, I did say to my hon. colleague that I would provide a list of water and sewer projects for this year, and we will do that. I promised I would do it and I will. But first of all we have a policy in our department that we make sure that the various municipalities are advised of the projects they are getting and what they are not getting before we advertise or announce the full programme, our budget. Before we announce that we make sure that municipalities are advised. And we are in the process of doing that now, Mr. Speaker, and as soon as that is completed - you know, there are so many that we have to advise whether they have been approved or not approved and we are talking about hundreds and hundreds of letters and this takes a little while for them to go through the usual process - but when that is completed my hon. colleague will have the list of the water and sewer projects. And the same thing applies to our programme on the sixty/forty cost sharing for the local roads in municipalities, and he will certainly have that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased
with my -

MR. SPEAKER (MCNICHOLAS): Order, please!

The hon. minister's time has expired.

MRS. NEWHOOK: - hon. colleague's performance at my Estimates Committee. You know, he asked some very meaningful questions and these questions -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. minister's time has elapsed. Is it agreed by leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Yes, I am sorry. I will just

take another second. He asked some

MRS. NEWHOOK:

very good, pertinent questions, and I thought these were answered to his satisfaction. I must say that my colleague from the district of Bellevue (Mr. Callan), he was not there, and if he had been perhaps he could have gotten all the answers then that he is looking for. Thank you.

MR. PATTERSON: He does not want answers. He just wants to complain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I do not find it difficult to respond to the hon. ministers' deliberations and announcements, because the hon. minister is such a kind, generous, broad-minded person, Mr. Speaker, and I know she cares about the Terra Nova district as she does Bonavista North, having spent a large part of her life in that area and knowing the potential of the areas concerned. I know she does what she can. I am delighted to hear that she is going to be doing some work this year in Sandy Cove and Happy Adventure. The minister, of course, does not decide all of the expenditures, particularly during the time of election, but I know if the minister did decide it, there would be no pork barreling. I know that. If the minister decided where the monies were going she would have no pork barrelling, she would be no part of that kind of nonsense, because she is a fair and honourable lady. Accept what she says, and I know that she tries to treat all parts of the province equally, and I know she has a special place in her heart for the Terra Nova district. As I said before, she is not alone in making all of those decisions and sometimes I am sure what she recommends gets scuttled, I know that. But, I know that if I had to count on her support and her allocations to the Terra Nova district and other districts throughout the Province, that it would be done in a more fair and equal manner. I do thank her for her announcement this afternoon, that

MR. LUSH: she will be trying to help out the people of Eastport Peninsula, Happy Adventure in particular, and Sandy Cove, where there are some great needs, growing needs, pressing needs for water and sewer. I would hope that the minister would be able to make a similar announcement re Glovertown, which is one of the fastest and most rapidly growing communities in Newfoundland today, and is stymied and stifled in that development because of a lack of a proper and adequate water and sewer system. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the list. I think what is happening is that the ministers are keeping that list away from us deliberately, and I expect that that list will be published when the house is closed, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: I expect that that list will be published,

MR. LUSE: if ever, when the House of Assembly is closed. And I believe that both lists, the list from the Department of Transportation and the list from the Department of Communications, should be published before we get out of this particular debate, the Concurrence Debates, on these government services. I believe these lists should be published before this section of the debate is done and over with.

But, Mr. Speaker, again I want to come back to the Manpower Division. Now, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) got up and in a feeble manner tried to defend the Manpower Development section of Labour and Manpower. I said it was a misnomer, Mr. Speaker, and I maintain that, that it is a misnomer in terms of the work that it is doing, in terms of developing manpower training skills in this Province today.

Mr. Speaker, it is simply dispensing money spent by the federal government, that is all it is doing. That is all the Manpower section is doing. The Minister talks about the large expenditure of money. The expenditure of money, Mr. Speaker, by the Province for development and training of our labour force in this Province was \$600,000. A little better than a half million dollars. Now tell me, Mr. Speaker, what that amount of money will do in terms of bringing in new courses, computer courses, and technological courses, courses that are very expensive? What is \$600,000 going to do? What is a half million dollars going to do in terms of training our people in these highly technological skills, in terms of purchasing the equipment and facilities, very expensive equipment and facilities needed today? The Minister boasts and is very proud of the fact that the provincial government is spending \$608,000, a half million dollars, not enough, Mr. Speaker, to equip one vocational

MR. LUSH: school in the Province. Not enough to equip one vocational school in the Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, one only has to take a quick look at the task force or the report of the task force, the federal task force that was presented to the government a year or so ago, a task force having to do with employment opportunities for the eighties. Mr. Speaker, one only has to take a quick look at that to see what the situation is across Canada and can easily generalize from that report what the situation is in this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, one finding, for example, says, 'With an even more rapidly developing technology it will be essential to have continuing education systems where individuals can train, retrain and upgrade throughout entire lives.'

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, it talks

about - another recommendation or another finding talks about 'nevertheless, for those who are properly trained there will be many interesting employment opportunities, especially in electronics, computer science, programming and maintenance, engineering, energy developing, conservation, management, finance, health services and biotechnology! Mr. Speaker, all of these areas represent areas where we are not training our people sufficiently, it demonstrates the great imbalance and the mismatching that is taking place in our post-secondary institutions today, particularly in our Vocational Schools. It illustrates the imbalance and the mismatching with respect to the courses which are being taught and the future industrial demands. And, Mr. Speaker, that is verified by this task force on employment opportunities for the 80's for what the situation is all across Canada.

MR. STAGG:

Is this the Federal one?

MR. LUSH:

Yes, this is the Federal one.

And, Mr. Speaker, this illustrates the great imbalance and the great mismatching with respect to training in Canada and the future industrial demands. As I said earlier, one only has to generalize from what the Canadian scene is, from what the picture is in Canada to what it is in Newfoundland. So, Mr. Speaker, to defend the indefensible, to get up and to suggest that the Department of Manpower is doing its job in this Province is something, Mr. Speaker, rather ridiculous. And to think that with \$600,000 we can take care of training our people, it is only a drop in the bucket, Mr. Speaker, it is only a drop in the bucket. The task force also speaks about the difficulty of young people entering post-secondary institutions today because of the cost, because of the cost of food, shelter and clothing. In short, because of the cost of living it talks about how difficult it is for our young people to enter post - secondary

MR. LUSH: institutions, vocational schools and universities to train themselves for the future. What have we done this year, Mr. Speaker, what have we done? We have removed the allowance that was given to students in vocational schools and we are now charging them a fee. And, Mr. Speaker, there is a great fear of the particular measure in this Province today, there is a great fear that there is going to be a decline in the enrollment throughout our vocational schools next year. Such a fear, Mr. Speaker, is present. Many people think that there is going to be such a decline over the next couple of years that maybe some of our vocational schools will close.

MR. LUSH: And I am just wondering whether or not that was not the intention of the government. I am just wondering whether or not that was not the intention of the government, so that we could reduce the expenditures of the government by closing down some of our trade schools in some of the smaller areas of this Province. We have proof of that, Mr. Speaker, when just some weeks ago the government laid off eighteen vocational instructors. And even though the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) tried to say that we are putting in new courses, there was nothing, Mr. Speaker, to compensate for the layoff of these eighteen instructors. And I want to make the point very emphatically and I want to make it crystal clear, that there is a great fear among our people in this Province that there is going to be a reduction in the vocational services in this Province, a reduction, Mr. Speaker, in a vital area.

MR. TOBIN: They were underpaid. That is only part of our education subsidy.

MR. LUSH: I am talking about manpower, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about manpower training and this has to do with manpower training. The courses in our trade schools - sometimes, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to tell which department is responsible for what. Maybe this manpower -

MR. BAIRD: The hon. member is right.

MR. LUSH: As I said it is a misnomer. Maybe it should come under Education, because it is simply dishing out, spending the money sent in by the federal government to pay for certain courses. That is all manpower is doing. They are certainly not doing any development or any establishment of their own programmes. They cannot be, Mr. Speaker, when one looks at \$500,000 to bring in the kind of technological and scientific courses that are going to be

MR. LUSH: needed in the future, the kind of technological and scientific facilities and equipment which will be needed. Mr. Speaker, \$500,000 will do nothing, a measly amount, Mr. Speaker, in terms of developing programmes to train our young people for the work force of the present and for the work force of tomorrow. It does not show very much insight at a time, Mr. Speaker, when unemployment is outrageously high.

MR. LUSH: And what a job this government could be doing. What a challenge to any government, to train our people, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please! Order, please!
The time for the hon. member has elapsed.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I will get a chance to carry on, I suppose. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, I had the honour to serve on the Estimates Committees with the member for Terra Nova(Mr. Lush) for a couple of years, and I must say that what he says is very repetitive, he has been saying it since 1979. He had weak arguments in 1979 and, as a matter of fact, they appear to have been diluted over the past number of years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I heard from a fairly reliable source that the federal government is coming up with a new budget on Monday.

MR. YOUNG: Hear, hear! That is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: I understand that that is correct. Now, they had the last budget in November of 1981 and, as you know, that budget has just about devastated the economy of Canada and, of course, we being part of the country most susceptible to deterioration in the economic climate of the country, it has been very, very difficult for us to survive under these circumstances. So my hon. friend opposite said that the Province is not showing very good stewardship of the monies sent down to Newfoundland from Ottawa and this, of course, is typical of the kind of mentality that has always pervaded the

MR. STAGG: Liberal Party in this Province and is typical of the eight Liberals opposite, that they are of the opinion that the money is sent down from Ottawa, the great God in Ottawa manufactures the money. It comes from a source which is known as Ottawa and Ottawa has no correlation to the public or the people of Canada.

Now, my friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) on Friday morning, I believe it was, the last time the House sat, gave a very good speech on where the money comes from in Newfoundland that ostensibly comes from Ottawa. And vast amounts of that money, hundreds of millions of dollars that have been mooted by the Liberals in this Province to come down from Ottawa, as if they are gifts to Newfoundland, foreign money so to speak, money coming into the Province for which we should be down on our knees forever in gratitude, strange to behold that an awful lot of that money, a very significant

MR. F. STAGG: amount of the money, I will not say 100 per cent of it, but a very high percentage of it actually comes from Newfoundland. And where does that money come from, Mr. Speaker? Well, that money, the money for these very worth-while projects that are involved in these Government Services Estimates, The Department of Transportation, The Department of Municipal Affairs, the Department of Labour and Manpower and the other departments, the Department of Public Works and Services and one other department, the money that keeps the Province going, and behold considerable amounts of it, practically 100 per cent of it, comes from provincial sources. Because our income tax is collected by the Federal Department of National Revenue, Mr. Rumpkey's department -

AN HON. MEMBER: Rumpkey, Rumpkey.

MR. STAGG: Some of my colleagues prefer to change the name somewhat, but I call him Mr. Rumpkey with an 'O', others would prefer to spell it and pronounce it otherwise. The federal tax department collects money from Newfoundlanders and takes it up to Ottawa, to the coffers in Ottawa, and through various formulas, equalization formula, through unemployment insurance and recently in diminishing quantities through things like the DREE programme, some of that money comes back to Newfoundland. But it needs to be said by Newfoundlanders time and time again, and it needs to be understood by members of this House of Assembly, because through repetition, and the members of the Opposition have, to some extent, occupied the field as far as that argument is concerned, people may be believing that all the money that comes

MR. STAGG: down from Ottawa from taxing the people of Canada, is money that Newfoundlanders had nothing whatsoever to do with. Well, that is absolutely not the case. Hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars a year are collected from Newfoundlanders, are brought up to the Department of Finance in Ottawa and some of it gets back down to Newfoundland. Now, it may very well be that on a straight balance sheet, Mr. Speaker, look at that situation, it may very well be that there is a slight balance

MR. STAGG: in favour of the central government, in that there may be more comes down than goes up. But let us look at the strategic value of Newfoundland. Where is Newfoundland? Newfoundland is on the east coast of Canada, occupying and having brought into Confederation practically the whole Eastern offshore portion of this country. Practically all of the fisheries in this country emanate from waters brought into Canada by Newfoundland in 1949.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. STAGG: The vast proportion of that resource is exported to other countries and the money comes into Canada and helps our balance of payment and enables Canada to keep its dollar - it used to enable Canada to keep its dollar around 100 cents American. Through the mismanagement of our federal colleagues who are the bosom buddies of the hon. members opposite, through their mismanagement, now the Canadian dollar, when we last heard of it, it was at 76 cents and falling. Mr. MacEachen, the wile Scot, is now trying to get his irons out of the fire by bringing in another budget. I do not know if it is unprecedented in Canadian history, Mr. Speaker, or not, but it is very, very unusual to have a budget in November of one year and then to be back to the people again with another budget in June, an eight month budget. We talk about the John Crosbie budget, or the Clark government that only lasted nine months. Well, it looks as if Mr. MacEachen's budget is going to have an even shorter life, and that in a government in which they have a considerable majority made up of toadies and basically politically unprincipled people, who are going to vote for the security of their offices in any event. Now,

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things that hon. members opposite should be directing themselves towards. They should not ignore these major issues, they should not ignore where this Province stands at this particular time, and where the money comes from. When the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) gets up and whines about not enough monies being spent

MR. STAGG:

here or not enough monies being spent there. he should direct himself to the dilemma that we have in this Province, the dilemma that is brought about by him and his friends unwavering support for Mr. MacEachen and his policies.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in November of 1981 there were only two people in this country who supported Mr. MacEachen's budget, Mr. MacEachen, because he had brought the budget down and if he did not support it who would, and the other person was Mr. Stirling, the then Leader of the Opposition, he supported it. Of course you know what happened to Mr. Stirling. We now -

MR. NEARY: The debate was good this afternoon till you brought it down to such a low level.

MR. STAGG: I see I got the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) into the House for the first time this afternoon. I must be getting to him, Mr. Speaker. I predict that the Leader of the Opposition, the in-House Leader of the Opposition will speak next because he realizes that -

MR. SIMMS: What about Mrs. MacEachen, can she (inaudible)?

MR. STAGG: No, he is a bachelor. Mr. MacEachen is a bachelor. No one would have him apparently. He had himself out on tender but no one would have him. No, he is a bachelor.

MR. SIMMS: No wonder.

MR. STAGG: And he has no children.

Mr. Speaker, these are items that I would like for hon. members opposite to deal with. Some of the reasons why we in this Province have some difficulty in maintaining the type of service that we would like to maintain, or to get into areas that we would prefer to get into, is because of the unwavering and unquestioning support of divisive and destructive Liberal policies that are perpetrated upon this country by the friends of hon. gentlemen

MR. STAGG: opposite. I heard the member
for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) refer to the federal committee
that was reviewing employment opportunities for the 1980's -

MR. NEARY: The task force.

MR. STAGG: The task force, yes, that came around
here some time ago. That one was not too bad. It was
preceded in about a month or so by another committee that
sat in various places throughout the Province and was dealing
with DREE. That one, I must say, was a real laugh.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who was on that one?

MR. STAGG: Oh, that was the one that had as its
Vice-Chairman Mr. Tobin, the member for Humber-Port au Port-
St. Barbe. And, I must say, Mr. Tobin did his work very well.

MR. F. STAGG: All the Liberal Members on the West Coast of the Province, took their cues from Mr. Tobin before they went before the Committee, particularly the Member from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and the Member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts).

MR. SIMMS: What about the Member for Lapoile?

MR. STAGG: The Member for Lapoile, (Mr. Neary) I am not sure. I believe -

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

MR. STAGG: - the Member for Lapoile, if he appeared before the Committee -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: - actually showed a little more spark than the other members, in that he did talk about the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: - problem with the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

MR. STAGG: - ferries and so on.

There were not enough ferries on the gulf, I think he said.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. STAGG: Ah! I was just getting into it, Mr. Speaker, too.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Bellevue. (Mr. Callan).

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was going to rise just now on a point of privilege, or a point of order or something, but I would rather do it this way - I think that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook)

MR. CALLAN: will apologize anyway, because I believe, as the Member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) does, that she is a lady and the reason that we do not get equal treatment, I believe, is that she has other colleagues in Cabinet who prevent her from doing the things fairly and squarely as she would like to. But the point that I wanted to raise is just before she sat down, just before she took her seat the Minister of Municipal Affairs said, 'That at least, or words to this effect, that the Member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) attended these meetings whereas the Member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) did not.' Now the Minister knows, I am sure, or perhaps she was not aware, that there are only eight of us on this side of the House and we are delegated to certain Committees, Committee meetings, and I happened to be on the Resource Committee and, therefore, there was no onus at all on me to attend the other meetings, the meetings under which Social Services -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! Point of order, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: I wonder if the hon. member, in fact, might be misleading the House either deliberately or otherwise, because I distinctly recall being at the Committee Meetings for the Resource Department, where the Department of Mine and Energy and Housing were discussed, and the hon. member was there for the whole morning and asked no questions whatsoever. So, I think the hon. member owes the House an apology.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of Order. The hon. Member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously there is no point of order.

MR. CALLAN: The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), of course, has a good reputation in this House for doing uncouth things and being rather insulting and what have you. But, anyway, I am sure the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) understands what I am saying. Perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs will also recognize that there was no onus on me whatsoever to attend the meetings of the Social sector of the budget. And the Minister of Municipal Affairs knows also that, of course, we had meetings going on simultaneously. So even if I wanted to be at the meeting on Transportation or Municipal Affairs, I could not very well be there for a couple of other reasons. The minister also knows that it was about that same time that we had the big furor and the big controversy over one of the items that came out in this year's budget, of course, and I refer to the close down of the Markland Cottage Hospital, which tied me up with phone calls and in other ways.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I can go back and refer to some of the things that the member for Stephenville just raised. He did not say very much, but he did talk about Newfoundland/Ottawa relations. It brings me, Mr. Speaker, to spend a couple of minutes on raising a point that I raised earlier, just now. You see, Mr. Speaker, I do not mind saying that during the last election campaign, as I travelled through my district against overwhelming odds and many, many buses travelling to and from attending big rallies here and there - I left Sunnyside one night at ten o'clock and I met nine school buses between Sunnyside and the Long Harbour or the Chapel Arm access road. How many went towards Whitbourne and the other area I do not know, because I turned off there and headed home. But during that infamous campaign -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

June 22, 1982

Tape No. 1562

IB-2

MR. STAGG:

MR. Speaker, the member for
Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) knows quite well that I did
not interrupt him when he was trying to make a few points.

MR. CALLAN: But, Mr. Speaker, he was talking about the Ottawa/Newfoundland situation. And, as I was going to say, I do not mind admitting, and it seemed to make a lot of sense to me and, therefore - the results of the April 6th. election were a little bit of a shock, I would say, to a lot of Tories, by the way. Nobody expected that it would go as overwhelmingly in favour of the Tories as it did.

MR. NEARY: Do you realize there are two categories over there? There are Tories and there are P.Cs.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, that is true.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the election of 1979 a poll was conducted, as perhaps all members on the government side of the House know, and one of the questions in that poll asked a very sensible question and the answer that came back made a lot of sense as well and this is why -

MR. SIMMS: What was the question?

MR. CALLAN: I will tell you in a moment. And this is why the results that we just came through do not necessarily add up. They do for other reasons. The question was this, 'Now that we have a P.C.Government in Ottawa' - and, as you remember, we did. For nine months we had a P.C.Governmnet in Ottawa under Joe Clark and the fish and chips boys, in June of 1979 - 'do you think it makes sense for us to vote in a P.C.Government in Newfoundland?' And the answer came back and the answer and the results were quite sensible. I think it was 70 per cent of the people who responded to that question in the poll said, 'Yes, it makes all the sense in the world for us to vote for a P.C.Government in Newfoundland now that we have a P.C.Government in Ottawa'. And, of course, that is what happened in 1979.

MR. SIMMS: That is right. Now what about the other two questions?

MR. CALLAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, using that same kind of logic, and a half dozen other factors in between, it would have made a lot of sense - using the same kind of logic and using the same kind of a question in a poll in March or April of this year you would have expected people in this Province to vote for a Liberal Government in this Province because there was and there is a Liberal Government in Ottawa. You know, using the same kind of rationale and the same kind of logic. But it did not turn out that way. Now why?

MR. SIMMS: You did not ask the question.

MR. CALLAN: Whether the question was asked or not in a poll,

MR. CALLAN: I am sure that it did not have anything to do with the election results. But, Mr. Speaker, to respond to what the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) was saying, what happened in March and April? What happened in March and April? It is quite clear now, hindsight is a wonderful thing, hindsight is a wonderful thing and it is quite obvious to everybody what happened now, that the election in April of this year was a one-man election and the forty-three - not all of them. Outside of the Premier - there are probably eight or ten, or perhaps a dozen other people, outside of the Premier, who would have been elected on that side of the House in their own right because they were representing traditionally Tory districts. But for most of the other people who got elected, Mr. Speaker, they know as well as I know, and as well as anybody knows, that they got elected on the coattails of the Premier, who was preaching something-

MR. MATTHEWS: The hon. gentlemen were (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The bearded wonder for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) got in on the Premier's coattails.

MR. CALLAN: - that made the poll of /79.

MR. SIMMS: He did not go to my district.

MR. CALLAN: He did not have to go to yours, you are one of the ten or a dozen I am talking about who lives in a Tory district.

MR. WARREN: He was down there, he was down there three times. Down in Twillingate three times.

MR. CALLAN: But, I am not talking, you see - Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), I am not talking about where the Premier was. It was totally immaterial where the Premier was. If it was important where the Premier was, then the district of Bellevue would have gone about 80 per cent PC. That was not the issue, you know. I mean, the Premier made a last-ditch effort to

MR. CALLAN: try and get back to St. Barbe. But he did not get back, and the hon. gentleman whose name I forget, got elected anyway. So, whether the Premier got there, - you know, let us face it, the election of April 6th was won in the media, won in the media.

MR. SPEAKER(Aylward): Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: It was won in the media.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, some other time I will continue.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear! Good minister.

MR. SIMMS: I will give him some notes now.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, a number of weeks ago in this hon. House I was asked a question about the tabling of a list of capital construction projects, and I indicated at that time that that list was in the process of being finalized and as soon as it was finalized it would be presented to this hon. House as has been the practice last year, the year before, and the year before that, and it will continue to be the practice, Mr. Speaker, and as soon as that list as been finalized- there are a number of extenuating circumstances that would not have the list finalized at this point in time, one of the things being, on a priority listing, when you tender some projects on the money that you have available,

MR. DAWE: sometimes the tenders come in above what the estimates were and so there are adjustments that have to be made further down the priority list and some projects that had been planned to go ahead will not possibly be able to proceed. And that decision - once we have reached a final listing it will be presented to this hon. House, hopefully within the next few days.

MR. SIMMS: Very reasonable, very reasonable.

MR. DAWE: I might mention, Mr. Speaker, an area that has been questioned a couple of times in this House. I thought perhaps the member, the only member in his seat today on the opposite side representing Labrador, might ask me a question relevant to the airstrip programme that supposedly was ongoing in Coastal Labrador this year.

Back in January this government, along with the federal government, through the Department of Transportation provincially and the Department of Transport federally, after a lot of negotiations and talks both between officials at both levels of government and between the Minister in the federal cabinet and myself, we reached a tentative agreement which we outlined in a letter of intent. The purpose of this letter of intent back in January was so that the necessary physical work, as it related to designing what was included in the letter of intent as a schedule of three proposed airstrips for this coming Summer to allow the necessary physical work for design to go ahead, which was a responsibility of the Federal Department of Transport through their Air Services Division in Moncton that were to do the design for the three airstrips, to allow that process to continue on even though the formal agreement had not been signed but would ultimately be signed along the guidelines

MR. DAWE: of the letter of intent, and to allow the necessary submissions, through the Federal Minister of Transportation (Mr. Pepin) to his colleagues in the Federal Treasury Board, so that that process could all be in place as soon as the agreement was signed and we could be away to the races. And based on this, as hon. members can see from the department's estimates, these amounts of funding, or estimated amounts, have been included in the capital expenditure under landing strips in the department's estimates for this year. Hon. members might say, 'Oh yes, that is 100 per cent federal funding for the airstrips in Labrador,' and so it is, Mr. Speaker, but the real financial obligation then becomes that of the Province. The ongoing expense of maintenance, the ongoing expense of the manpower associated with maintaining those airstrips, the ongoing operational costs of the airstrips, all fourteen airstrips, infinitum become a responsibility of the Province.

MR. DAWE:

The

federal government had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that by doing this and transferring the capital money that they would have used to refurbish their coastal marine service in coastal Labrador would not be transferred to the Labrador airstrip programme and transfer the responsibility of subsidizing the coastal service to the Province in the form of subsidizing the air service.

The member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) stood in his place in this House and I heard him on media subsequently, indicating that that was what the people of coastal Labrador wanted, an airstrip programme which was more preferable to the coastal boat service. Well, I told them that that was not what I understood from the people of coastal Labrador and subsequently, later on, Mr. - who was it? - Rompkey, that is his name, said in an interview in Goose Bay that he too believed that the airstrip programme and a good air service was much more acceptable to the people of coastal Labrador than the passenger marine service.

Well, both these gentlemen found that this Province, my department and this government was correct, the people of Labrador were correct in saying that they wanted both. Why should they be relegated to a single service? Were they treating them as second-class citizens? And they found out that this was the case, that the people of Labrador wanted both services and not only did they not want to give up their marine passenger service, but they wanted it improved extensively. So the federal government have found themselves in a bind.

And I explained in this House of Assembly a couple of weeks ago a number of actions that I have taken in trying to speed up this process, of going ahead for the airstrip programme in Labrador. There

MR. DAWE: was a meeting last Wednesday of officials of my department and Transport Canada that we assumed would be the final meeting in the agreement so that we could go ahead with the airstrip programme. And what did we find, Mr. Speaker? We found that the Moncton Office of Transport Canada had not prepared the necessary design documents for the three airstrips in Labrador.

MR. SIMMS: Shocking!

MR. R. DAWE: The only airstrip provided for in completed design and ready for tender was the airstrip at Postville.

MR. SIMMS: Only one?

MR. DAWE: Not only that, Mr. Speaker, we found that not only had the Federal Treasury Board not approved funding for the three airstrips in Coastal Labrador, but the only submission that had gone before them was for the possibility of an airstrip at Postville and it had not been finalized up to that point in time.

MR. STAGG: What did Rompkey say?

MR. SIMMS: This is incredible.

MR. DAWE: Well, in order to try, and showing the good nature and the well being of myself and this government, I placed a phone call on Thursday to Mr. Rompkey.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. DAWE: I called Mr. Rompkey, I put in a phone call to Mr. Rompkey in Ottawa on Thursday after the officials came back from Ottawa and I said -

MR. SIMMS: Listen now, this is true.

MR. DAWE: well, of course, I did not speak to him, because either he was not there or he -

MR. WALSH: He never returns a phone call.

MR. DAWE: But, anyway, I left a message for him to return-but he did call back Friday. He did call back Friday. As I suspected, he was unaware of what was happening with the airstrip programme, but be that as it may, I explained it to him, I explained it in some detail and told him that we were told by

MR. DAWE: the officials of Transport Canada that there was a possibility, if the agreement was formally signed this week, if it could go to Ottawa for ratification from the federal minister, and then it would go on to Treasury Board, maybe within a six week period they might get the approval for funding through Treasury Board. Now hon. members Opposite should know, hon. members on this side do know, that the construction season in Labrador is very short, and if we have to wait another six to seven weeks before we can tender a project there, for all practical reasons the construction will not go ahead.

MR. NEARY: You will get your answer now in a minute.

MR. DAWE: Now then, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rompkey, I asked him, I said, 'Bill, -

MR. WARREN: You called him Bill.

MR. DAWE: I called him Bill. From time to time we do operate on a first name basis. I said, 'Bill, look, I have not said anything about the lack of action on behalf of the federal government in this particular instance, and I will not make any significant press releases or comments on it until after it has been finalized. There will be opportunity to make political hay for and against after the agreement has been formally signed and it has been through Treasury Board, as hon. gentlemen, and he said, 'Yes'. Lo and behold said yes, that he would try and get it through Treasury Board as quickly as possible and that he would not make any official statements or press releases on it until after that had happened. A half hour later, Mr. Speaker,

MR. DAWE: the news media in Newfoundland had a full press release from Mr. Rompkey explaining how he had negotiated with the provincial minister and it was about time that the airstrip programme was going ahead. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that it will go ahead. I hope that that particular airstrip will go ahead in Postville. It has been in the hands of the federal government since January to make sure that they did their side of the bargain. The Province was in place, had everything in place for its share of the agreement. It was willing and able as we have done with other airstrips in Labrador. We were anxious, Mr. Speaker, to try and acknowledge some of the legitimate aspirations of the people in Coastal Labrador. We were more than willing, more than anxious, to make sure that that airstrip programme in its totality went ahead this Summer. Unfortunately the federal government did not and has not and apparently will not live up to its side of the negotiated agreement signed in January of this year.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of thing hon. members opposite will get up and, I am sure, will find some way of trying to defend the federal government and their actions in this area, in opposition to the member who -

MR. SIMMS: Not the member for Torngat.

MR. DAWE: No, I am sure the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) will not get up and try and defend the actions of the federal government. Conversations I have had with the hon. member indicate that he is more than supportive of the Province's position on this and is against, and has been for some time, against the action taken by his federal colleagues. I am sure he will support that statement when he gets on his feet.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I am anxiously awaiting some comment from the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that I have the opportunity to make a few comments on Government Services. I am surprised that, well I am excited too, I can respond to the minister talking about the Labrador airstrips. To quote some of the adjectives or adverbs that the minister was using, he said, 'His government was anxious to get the airstrip programme going'. I think he said, 'Shortly'. He said, 'We are ready to get the airstrip programme going'. He said, 'It is incredible how the federal government is delaying it'. Now, Mr. Speaker, I thought that I should be prepared now to get up and say, you know, is it all the federal government's fault?

MR. SIMMS: Do not tell me you are going to back up the federal government!

MR. WARREN: No, I am not going to back up the federal government at all. But up until about two o'clock today, when I received this letter, I sort of believed what the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) was saying all along, but now I do not believe him no more. Now I do not believe the Minister of Transportation anymore.

Now, I want to just read off a letter. In fact, I will put a copy of the letter on the table that anyone else can read. Now,

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, here is what the letter said - there is a particular sentence here that will be noteworthy and we can blame it all on the federal government if we want to, but let us wait until we get to this sentence and just see what it says. I am going to read the letter in its totality. "This is a reference to your telex of the 29th of April 1982 concerning the delay in construction this year of an airstrip in Postville. It appears that the overall agreement in principle which the federal and provincial governments arrived at with respect to Newfoundland transportation may have been misinterpreted. On the 30th of January 1982," - now, remember that date, it is very important as I go down through the letter - "on the 30th of January 1982, I sent a letter of intent, on behalf of the federal government, to your Minister of Transportation." Now who was the Minister of Transportation on the 30th of January, 1982? The same gentleman who just spoke. Okay. Now, "This letter set out the main elements of a proposed agreement between our governments on the provision of airstrips to serve selected communities along the Coast of Labrador, and on an associated adjustment in Labrador Marine passenger services reflecting the availability of air service. The letter also indicated a tentative schedule for airstrip construction". Now the letter indicated a tentative -

MR. SIMMS:

Who sent the letter?

MR. WARREN:

Okay, you will know when I tell you who signed the letter. "The schedule would be subject to the timely conclusion of a formal memorandum of understanding between Canada and the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador" - now this was on the 30th of January, 1982 - "as well as to obtaining the necessary financial approvals, the availability of funds and a satisfactory response to tender calls. It was the intention of the federal government to commence construction of the airstrip at Postville in 1982 - 83, with the completion

MR. WARREN: in 1983 - 84". Now we are getting into something, whom do we believe, I wonder? "It was only on 13th of April 1982 that I received an initial response from the provincial minister to my 30th of January letter". Now, Mr. Speaker, there is the answer. On the 30th of January the minister wrote to this minister, and on the 13th of April 1982, the minister found time to respond. Now who was delaying the airstrip program? Was it the federal government or was it this government?

MR. G. WARREN:

the letter and I will continue to read it, I will continue to read it.

MR. NEARY:

bind.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, now, this is " Moreover , technical and"-
now this is what happened, Mr. Speaker- " technical and financial
aspects which had already been subject to federal/provincial negotiations
and agreement at the officials level were reintroduced"- because the
Minister waited two and a half months to respond - " As a result of
this unforeseen delay in the conclusion of the federal/provincial
agreement, it has been necessary to review the construction schedule
for the programme." Because the Minister did not see fit - I know there
was an election, there was an election and a 21 day break, but the Minister on
January 30th, February 30th, March 30th, you know, three and a half
months. And he was still a Minister, and he is still the Minister.
"With respect to Postville, however, I am endeavouring to have this
project given special consideration by the federal and provincial
governments, and I am hopeful that I will have an early, positive
reaction. If so, it should be possible to have on-site work commence this year
with a view to completion in 1983-84." So, Mr. Speaker, this letter was
signed by the hon. Jean Luc Pepin, the federal Minister of Transportation,
and it is dated June 8th, in response to a telex of the 29th of April,
which, by the way is not very fast either. So here we can see, and I
will put the blame where it belongs, it belongs on the shoulders of
the Minister of Transportation provincially and on the shoulders of
the federal Minister, because both of them are playing politics with the
lives of the people along the Labrador Coast. And that is what is
happening, they are just playing plain politics with the people. Now,
Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that today the Minister of Transportation
could

MR. WARREN: could get up and say, 'Well, we hope to get the programme started in Postville very shortly.' Yes, if the Minister had responded, say, five days or even ten days after January 30th, there would have been tenders called for the airstrip in Postville now, and there would be people in there working. But, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of thing that is going on with the Department of Transportation and with other Departments in this government. For some reason, 'If we cannot get our own way we do not want anyway.' We cannot negotiate. Whether it is in offshore oil, whether it is in air transportation, or whether it is highway construction, it makes no difference. So, I would think that the first thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) should table all the correspondence that he received from the date that agreement or the intent of that agreement, was signed. One was signed down in the Newfoundland Hotel and one was signed in the Confederation Building. Take the whole thing and table it in this House and let the people of Newfoundland and Labrador see for sure who is telling the truth.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. WARREN: As far as I am concerned, the Minister of Transportation did not tell me the whole truth today

MR. WARREN: nor did he tell the people here in this House. And, Mr. Speaker, he never told the whole truth. He might have told some truth but not the whole truth. So, Mr. Speaker, let him lay it on the table and then we will see who is telling the truth, who is causing the delay in the construction of airstrips along the Labrador Coast. And as of now, Mr. Speaker, until I have something else to verify it, something different, I am going to blame it on the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, how silly! What -

MR. SIMMS: Rubbish.

MR. DAWE: Where is my friend who says, 'Rubbish'.

What utter rubbish! Mr. Speaker, when I began speaking about the Coastal Labrador airstrip programme I specifically said that when we were discussing the whole transportation agreement we said that we would sign a letter of intent which outlined what the ultimate agreement would be on January 30th. of this year so that the necessary work could proceed with design. And it was the federal government's intention, based on the letter of intent, to go ahead and prepare the necessary design documents for the three airstrips, to go ahead and prepare the necessary Treasury Board submissions based on the letter of intent. The April 13th. date is completely irrelevant as it relates to a time schedule for the development of the airstrips in Coastal Labrador. It was more than adequate as far as time is concerned for the construction season. It was more than adequate to get tenders called and get the necessary construction equipment and get the bids in place and go ahead with the programme.

The whole purpose, Mr. Speaker, of signing the letter of intent on January 30th. was so that

MR. DAWE: the federal government could go ahead and do the two things that they were required to do as part of that letter of intent. One was to prepare the design work so it would be ready when the final agreement was signed. Two was to prepare the necessary Treasury Board submissions so that the funding would be in place when the agreement was signed. January 13th., when this Province and my department sent to Ottawa a formal agreement for them to sign, was more than adequate time, was many weeks ahead of when it had to be sent there in order to make that time sequence available.

MR. WARREN: Blame it on Ottawa! Blame it on Ottawa!

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not have to blame it on Ottawa. The fault is obviously Ottawa's, in that they had from January 30th. until now to prepare, to do their part of the bargain and prepare the design and to make the Treasury Board submissions and they did not do it. Mr. Speaker, that is simple, they just did not do it. They are trying to say now that because the formal agreement from this Province was not sent up on April 13th., Mr. Speaker - I will bow to my colleague representing another district in Labrador to indicate, when does the construction season legitimately start in Coastal Labrador.

MR. WALSH: July 1st.

MR. DAWE: July 1st. Go back three weeks from July 1st. you are into

MR. DAWE: the first week in June when tenders could have been called, the 13th of April, I think we are looking at about two months, Mr. Speaker,-

MR. WARREN: You signed it, sure.

MR. DAWE: - two months when the tenders could have been called, two months when the tenders could have been called and the federal government could have had the design work and the necessary documentation through Treasury Board any time from January 30th up to this present date and they have not done it. The fact that we did not send back the formal agreement until April 13 has nothing to do with it, Mr. Speaker, absolutely nothing to do with the time schedule, nothing to do with who is to blame for the programme not going ahead. The hon. member did what I thought he was really too honourable to do, stand in his place, representing the people of Coastal Labrador who will most benefit from this airstrip programme, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE: - stood on his feet and wish-washed and tried to pick something that was -

MR. WARREN: Tell the truth boy, tell the truth.

MR. WALSH: The truth is no co-operation.

MR. DAWE: There is no reasoning, like I indicated, Mr. Speaker, it was just too silly. From January 30th to the present date the federal government made an obligation to this Province that they would do two things. One is to prepare the design work in preparation for the airstrip programme. Two to submit the necessary documentation to the Treasury Board. They have done neither one of it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: Because you were too late in replying.

MR. DAWE: The other dates are - Mr. Speaker, the

MR. DAWE: hon. gentleman will try if he will to make something of the date of the 13th, but every hon. member of this House, the people of Coastal Labrador will realize that the April 13th date is a completely irrelevant one as it relates to the programme of airstrip development in Labrador.

MR. WARREN: Blame it on the federal government.

MR. DAWE: I do not have to blame it on the federal government, Mr. Speaker, the facts speak for themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Resign, boy. Resign, boy.

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

MR. BAIRD: Why do you not make up your mind over there. Who is going to speak?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo yields to the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. RIDEOUT: The hon. member speaking now is the one who wanted to do away with-

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the transportation agreement and the coastal airstrips, I wonder, with the reaction of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) if he really is conscious or even aware of the people down in Southern and Eastern and Northern Labrador?

MR. BAIRD: Not a very hon. gentleman.

MR. HISCOCK: with regard to Black Tickle having to be out of food supplies, and all along the coast,

I would like to get on with this and ask the Minister of Transportation what he would be doing for next year to make sure that there will be no shortage of food in several of the communities? Will the government be

MR. HISCOCK: putting a government store in Black Tickle like they do in the other areas? Do the businessmen all along the coast of Labrador because of high interest rates etc., have to stockpile \$100,000 worth of food over the Winter months or will the government be picking up that as they do in the Northern communities?

MR. SIMMS: Stores?

MR. HISCOCK: It is also transportation, getting it down there. So with regard to the other parts of transportation,

MR. HISCOCK: it is one of the most critical things in Southern, Eastern, and Northern Labrador. And I agree with my colleague from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), that people in Labrador are being kicked around like a political football between the various departments and various levels of government. And when you have the Minister of Transportation who gets up and says, 'Oh, that minister, what is his name? - Rompkey', no wonder, no wonder this Province is losing out and we are not getting the share that we should be getting from the national government. The Minister of Transportation has to realize that there is a full nation, which has to deal with the Department of Transportation, federally, and there are other things on the table besides twelve or fourteen airstrips, as important as they are to us. There are the problems with the corridor in Ontario, Mirabelle Airport ecetera, as well as finishing the airstrips in parts of the Northwest Territories. But no, we are seeing blatant, political, response with regard to the airstrips. I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation what he is going to be doing? Is he going to increase the food subsidy to coastal Labrador next year, or are we going to see having to pay \$3 for a dozen of eggs? These are some of the things. The airstrips, I might like to point out to members in the house as well as to people in the gallery, the federal government not only builds them, not only puts the garage there, but even puts in the tool box as well as the grease for the tools. That is what the federal government does with the airstrips. And here we have a government and a Minister of Transportation bickering over the past four, five, six, or seven years that we have been trying to get these airstrips on the go, on what should be done and when they should be done. But, once the airstrips are done, that is not the answer, that is not the answer to transportation in Labrador. You are finding in the coastal Labrador only one person working,

MR. HISCOCK: You are finding the cost of food going up, you are finding the cost of gasoline and hydro, because of diesel, going up. I feel in the future, unless the government looks at some way of getting food in there and getting it there cheaper, that we are going to see a greater eroding of their own dollar, and poverty returning to rural areas of Canada again. But is the Minister of Transportation really concerned with this? Is he concerned about the road from Lodge Bay to Mary's Harbour, where he asked the Federal Government for \$4.5 million and never even had the planning done, or any survey work done? When they asked for \$2 million they got \$2 million dollars. The same is true for the Strait Road, from L'anse-au-Clair to Red Bay, signed the agreement, and the end result was, after the agreement was signed, the worst part of the road was still not done.

MR. HISCOCK: So when it comes to the idea of really feeling for the people of Labrador, basically you use them as a political football to try to get back at the Federal Minister whom you do not particularly like because of his stripe, and also because the federal government deals through regional ministers. And, of course, the Premier does not want to deal with the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Rompkey), he wants to go and deal with the twenty-eight or twenty-nine cabinet ministers out of Ottawa themselves. But when the minister gets up, I hope he will address the question of the road from Lodge Bay to Mary's Harbour. Why, when they asked for \$2 million and was given it, they never even had the survey done. And the people in Lodge Bay who have to haul their children over the ice in a boat so that they will not go through the ice in the Spring, is he really concerned with that? Is he really concerned about Red Bay and the worst part of the road, with the great tourist potential of the Basque whaling site? Is he concerned about the airstrips down there, or is he only concerned about political points? I would go as far as to say, Mr. Speaker, that what we are seeing here is blatant, downright politics. And we are seeing the people of coastal Labrador getting caught in between.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HISCOCK: And instead of coming up with some communication aids to -

MR. SIMMS: Rubbish.

MR. HISCOCK: - get things straightened out in Labrador, all you hear is rubbish, because what we are getting from government side is pure unadulterated rubbish.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one thing, that the people of coastal Labrador are long awaiting their airstrips, they are also long awaiting the road from Lodge Bay to Mary's Harbour. If there is anything

MR. HISCOCK: that this government can do, and the most important minister for Labrador is the Minister of Transportation - now we have the Department of Communications - but are we having that? Are we having a little bit of statesmanship? Are we having a little bit of high ground from them? And can the people of coastal Labrador as well as Central Labrador and the Freedom Road, look for leadership from the Minister of Transportation? Are they saying he is a first - class minister? No, they are not. They are saying he is turning around and playing with them like you would play with a yo yo. So I hope that the Minister of Transportation, instead of calling him 'Rumpkey' or whatever, will get up and try to straighten out some of the concrete rural problems that they have not only in coastal Labrador but in Change Islands and Fogo and Petites and other areas of this Province. And now that we have a parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Rural Development, hopefully with those two people now working together and all of us working together for the betterment of that part of our Province, we will probably see some progress in the next four or five years. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief in my closing comments in this particular area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DAWE: I would just like to correct a couple of things that the hon. gentleman said. He referred to the bickering which slowed down the coastal Labrador airstrip programme. And I have to remind the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock)

MR. DAWE:

that if the Province had not, as he calls it, bickered and argued strongly the federal government's intent through CN Marine and its coastal marine passenger service and freight service in coastal Labrador as well as other parts of the Province, but specifically as it relates to the airstrips, to the marine service in coastal Labrador, the federal government's intention was to completely eliminate passenger coastal service from Goose Bay North in Labrador, to restrict the passenger service to communities without airstrips that would feed into communities with airstrips from Goose Bay South. Mr. Speaker, it was only through the valiant efforts of this government that we were able to cause the federal government through sheer embarrassment without the help of the hon. member opposite who indicated, as I said in this House, that he was willing and he thought the people of Labrador were very appreciative of the fact that they would be getting airstrips and they could do without the coastal marine service. He subsequently changed his mind as the people -

MR. SIMMS: He went along with it?

MR. DAWE: Oh, yes he certainly did. But subsequently he has changed his mind and I give him credit for that. He has changed his mind and fine and I hope he applies the necessary pressure to the federal minister and other federal officials to make sure that a good marine service in Labrador continues as well as a good airstrip programme. As it relates to whether there will be a government store in Black Tickle I will leave that to my colleague responsible for Labrador Affairs to answer that question.

This government will continue with its subsidy programme, its airlift subsidy programme for food supplies to coastal Labrador as we have in the past, and

MR. DAWE: we will continue to do so in the future. There seems to be some question, and I do not have the inside information, but there is a question of inventory stocking on behalf of the merchants who operate private stores in that area that perhaps could be refined, and perhaps again, through the good graces of the minister responsible for that area, maybe some help in management techniques could be offered to these people to make sure that they have an adequate supply in the Spring. But that is another area.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will you continue with the subsidy programme?

MR. DAWE: Yes, we will continue with the subsidy programme, and it will be assessed, and if we find that it is necessary and it is within the financial capabilities of this government to increase it, if we find it is necessary and it is within our financial capabilities we will certainly do so. As it relates to the Lodge Bay to Mary's Harbour road, suggesting that the department did not have an accurate assessment done of the requirements for that road is not true, Mr. Speaker. They did not ask for \$2 million. If hon. members will remember - and I am not sure of the exact figures - the coastal Labrador agreement called for about twice the expenditure of funds as we got. A number of projects had to be scaled down and downgraded and we were told, 'You take what we give you'. So there was an area identified for that Lodge Bay to Mary's Harbour road and we just took

MR. DAWN: and we are now, Mr. Speaker, faced with the position without additional funding for that road. And I could speak to the hon. member privately later about some conversations that I had with his federal counterparts in relationship to funding for that road. It might have something to do with the eight kilometers that will be done in the Roddickton area, but I will leave that until a further conversation. We did not have the funding because it was not made available, even though the Province asked for it.

So, this week, just this past week, Mr. Speaker, engineers from the department were up to survey that particular section of road to see what could be done with the funding that we have available and we should have something very shortly. I accept the offer of the hon. member to work co-operatively in servicing the citizens of coastal Labrador and I welcome the change in attitude.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get the minister perhaps to cool off a bit and just ask him a very few simple questions about a commission, I think it was, or an enquiry, an appraisal of Newfoundland's intraprovincial ferry services in the Province. That commission met - and I am going to try to do it very quickly so that the minister can answer if his colleagues will be quiet - they made a couple of recommendations in that voluminous report, the two volumes. One of them was that the Province take over the provincial ferry services, either through a single operator or take it over themselves. Now I think the minister made some sort of commitment on that last fall but I would ask him now, what progress has there been in that regard? Has he moved any further towards a single ferry system for the Province? Are we going to see a single operator? Has that operator been hired? If so, who

MR. TULK: is it, or does he have anybody in mind?

I would like, too, Mr. Speaker, to ask him a question about my own district. I did not get a chance to get to his Committee hearings. I think I was in another one at the time.

MR. STAGG: A likely story.

MR. TULK: A likely story, yes. That is the Green Bay Transport 1 which was formerly known, I believe, as the Lowland. I believe that was the name of the boat, it was recommended by that same enquiry or commission or whatever you want to call it, that this vessel, once it had met the CSI standards and had certain things done to it, be placed on the Fogo Island run in 1981-1982 and that in 1984 both the Hamilton Sound and Green Bay Transport 1 be used on that route. I would like to ask him what progress has been made in that regard. And if he has to buy out the Green Bay Transport 1,

MR. TULK: has this been done? Has he bought out that ferry itself or is he about to? What was the cost of it? And I would also like to ask him what the cost of that boat was originally and what the cost of buying out the contract would be?

MR. NEARY: Good questions.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I indicated last year in a Ministerial Statement just exactly what the government's intention was as it relates to the ferry operations that we are responsible for in the Province. And it essentially said that no, the Province was not leading towards a single operator of the ferry systems other than the fact that government, itself, would ultimately, eventually over time, own the boats in the ferry system but that we would subsequently then let out under management contracts the operation of each of the ferry systems. Also, the report indicated the direction and identified some vessels where replacements were necessary. It identified moving some existing vessels from the service that they were in to others. We were in the process of doing that. We also indicated that we were working towards purchasing, since that time up to this present year, three vessels. The question was asked which ones were they and how much would we be willing to -

AN HON. MEMBER: That was not asked.

MR. DAWE: - No, no, I am saying the question was asked at the time how much would we pay and I said then that they were under negotiation and it would be difficult for us to - it is like trying to dicker with someone. We would like to get the best price and so safeguard the taxpayers' funds as best we could. But two of those vessels that were identified have been purchased, There was a vessel

MR. DAWE: identified in New Brunswick that was purchased and now will be put into service shortly, there were some minor modifications. There was a vessel that was identified as a most suitable vessel for the Burgeo-Ramea run, it was identified as a vessel in Scotland and that has been subsequently purchased.

MR. DAWE: It is now having some CSI work done on it in Britian and will be brought across within the next month or so. And the third vessel that we are negotiating for is the one which the hon. gentleman mentioned, but nothing has been finalized on that yet and we are still in the negotiating process.

MR. TULK: What will be the cost of the boat?

MR. DAWE: I do not have that information available to me, but I can certainly find out and provide it for the hon. gentleman.

MR. TULK: But what will be the cost of the boat and the contract?

MR. DAWE: The cost of the -

MR. TULK: Boat and the contract.

MR. DAWE: Certainly. All that is very public information that we can make available to the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Will you have that here tomorrow?

MR. DAWE: If I can gather the information I do not see why I should not, certainly. And that is the process that we are following and it is the one that we will continue to follow. If there is anything else that I can provide I will certainly be glad to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the report of the Government Services Committee be concurred in? Those in favour 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against 'Nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: Carried.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

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