

VOL. 1

NO. 28

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of proposing a motion that I know all members of the House on both sides would wish to be associated with and this is for the purpose of expressing sympathy to the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) on the passing of his brother, Dr. Randolph Young.

Dr. Young was a dentist in Bay Roberts and he was well known in the area. Unfortunately he has been sick for a long period of time and passed away in the early hours of this morning. So, Mr. Speaker, I move that an appropriate message of sympathy be sent to the Minister of Public Works and the family of Dr. Young.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are sorry to hear of the sad passing of Dr. Young and we wish to join with the other side of the House in having an expression of sympathy go out from the House to the family and relatives of Dr. Young.

\* \* \*

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I really do not know if I can put this under the category of a point of order or not but I will try anyway.

Today at our caucus- we have a

MR. NEARY: caucus meeting every day - and today at our caucus meeting one of the matters that came up involved the decorum of the House. Now I want to make it clear before I talk about the things that I want to talk about that it has nothing to do with the bantering back and forth across the House or speeches in the House, it has nothing to do with that sort of thing at all, or whether somebody is shouting or whether somebody is interrupting. That is not what I am talking about. But we are very concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the way the atmosphere seems to be deteriorating outside of the House, especially over in the corridor on that side of the House, and outside of the Speaker's gallery, and sometimes even in the gallery where you have members going out talking to visitors. The other day, for instance, a member went out to talk to somebody in the Speaker's gallery and they were snickering and laughing while somebody was speaking in the House. It is awfully distracting. We have common rooms on both sides of the House, Mr. Speaker. I would submit, especially to the newer members who probably do not understand, yesterday we had a member standing in the doorway shouting remarks from the doorway with a cigarette in his mouth as if he was in a tavern somewhere downtown.

MR. NEARY:

Now this sort of behaviour, Mr. Speaker, on the part of members is improper and I believe that we should stop it before he gets out of hand, and even behind the curtain. I saw my colleague the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) who was speaking in the House - yesterday I think it was, and there were so many conversations going on - not in the House, I am not talking about what happens in the House because we can control that, and Your Honour can enforce the rules, but what I am talking about is what is happening out in the side corridors, especially on that side of the House. They have a common room. If they want to have a smoke they can go in the common room and smoke, or if they want to have a cup of coffee or tea, or a snicker or a joke. But, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that it not be done behind the curtain or in the corridors on either side of the House, or even in the galleries. And I believe, it may sound frivolous, that one thing we must do, Mr. Speaker, is maintain the respect of this House.

I do not know if Your Honour has it within his power to clear the corridors and to place some restrictions on these matters that I am raising, but we are very serious about it because it is interrupting and distracting from the decorum of the House.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Coming from anyone other than the hon. member it would be ludicrous. That is not a point of order. I notice the hon. gentleman refers obviously to this side when he talks about the newer members because this is the only side that has any 'newer' members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I can advise the hon. members that the newer members on this side of the House are more conversant with the rules of parliamentary procedure than the hon. eight members on the other side for all of their years in the House.

You know, that is not a point of order. And members of this House can get up and if they cannot be heard and they think the decorum is not appropriate they will rise on a point of order at that period of time. That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is a point of politics, and also it is a point of humour.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The Chair feels that really it is not a point of order. Maybe it is something that each caucus can talk about within the confines of its meetings.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). Yesterday at the end of Question Period in a reply to a question that I put to him on over-the-side sales, the minister indicated that if there was a fish plant in this Province that could process fish he would not be in favour of over-the-side sales. Now I understand from a news release today - they can be either right or wrong, I suppose - but I understand from a news release today that the minister has changed his mind on that somewhat and that he is now saying that the Province will not oppose, if the federal government says over-the-side sales are in order, then the Province will not oppose them.

MR.TULK: I would like to know, Mr.

Speaker, if indeed that is correct, and if the minister has changed his mind and why has he changed it?

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

MR.MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, there is no change of mind, there is change of position. The media are also correct in what they are saying today. The fact is that I said yesterday in the House, in answer to questions from the same hon. gentleman, that we would check and see if companies were able to buy or accommodate the fishermen on the Avalon Peninsula by buying additional fish. Well after the employees of the distribution desk working all yesterday afternoon and all evening, in fact all night, checking with all the companies throughout the Province, they found that no company was willing to put transportation on, like, for example, trucks and supply ice and come in and buy the fish from the Avalon Peninsula. A few companies indicated they were interested in getting additional fish, but they had no means of transportation and were not interested in buying the fish, especially if it was of a small size. So the bottom line is we found nobody in the Fish Trades Association, we have been in contact with the Fish Trades Association and I am rather annoyed, to say the least, with the somewhat lack of co-operation from the Fish Trades Association because I hear reports of some plants that are operating only a few hours a week yet the companies tell us that they do not want to buy any additional fish from the Avalon Peninsula. So because of that our position now is that we have changed our position, Now that the facts have been gathered and because there is fish available which we view now as surplus to the needs of the fish companies and plants in the Province, I will use the term that we

MR. MORGAN: have opened the doors because this cod trap season is too important to the Newfoundland fishermen. Last year they had almost a disasterous year with no fish to catch, and this year the catch is good and they have to dump it. Because it is so important to the fishermen and because the season is relatively short, the cod trap season, we have now opened the doors; we are not going to oppose companies from any part of Canada who want to move in and truck fish across the Province and out of the Province, buy it from fishermen whether it be on the Avalon Peninsula or anywhere else in the Province where indeed it is surplus. And, number two, I have now wired Mr. LeBlanc, the federal minister, with a copy going to the Fishermen's Union to indicate that because we are of the opinion there is a surplus, a surplus to the needs of the inshore plants, and because the Fish Trades Association and because the Independent Processors Association, these two groups which represent almost all the companies in the Province, because they indicate to us that they cannot accommodate the fishermen, that we will not oppose, we will not oppose any effort by the Fishermen's Union - I understand they have applied for a license, for Mr. LeBlanc to issue a license to a factory or a freezer ship in the same way as he has issued a license to an operation ongoing on the Great Northern Peninsula. As we see it, fishermen in Petty Harbour, Bay Bulls, Flatrock or Torbay are just as good fishermen and Canadian citizens as those on the Great Northern Peninsula. He has arranged for a ship right now to be in the Port Saunders area buying fish from fishermen directly because the plants could not

MR. MORGAN:

accommodate the fishermen. So because it is done there, we feel that he should now do it immediately here on the Eastern part of the Province to prevent any further dumping of fish by the fishermen.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Fogo,

a supplementary.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I find it

rather strange that the minister, who has in the past in this Province threatened to take away the processing licences of companies if they do not obey his wishes, has suddenly bowed to the wishes of those companies. Now he is right.

I understand that from St. Anthony to Bonavista the plants are operating at about 50 per cent capacity. The truth of the matter is that they refuse to take small fish; they want big fish, that the truth. And the question for the minister is since he controls the licences, and since he therefore controls the processing jobs that goes with that fish being processed in Newfoundland, why has he not told the companies that they must, if they are going to hold on to their licences, why has he not told the companies that they must buy this fish?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, the answer

is very simple that if, for example, we put a regulation in place this morning or tomorrow morning telling those companies they must buy what they term poor quality fish, a small sized fish, and if they were forced to buy it by means of regulation they would automatically be back to us within a matter of weeks saying, 'We are losing money on that fish, we cannot get any kind of an economic return, it is producing poor quality and it is not just feasible for us



MR. MORGAN: to take and buy that fish and process it; therefore will you cover our losses? That is what the Fish Trades would do and the companies would do. I am convinced of that. And as I said earlier, there is somewhat of a lack of co-operation, there seems to be in many cases not too much concern by some of those companies for the fishermen and their problems. And if they do not want to buy from the fishermen in this Province and keep that supply of fish in their own plants for processing, we are saying, let us open the doors, let us have free enterprise go all the way. Let us bring in the outside companies into Newfoundland, companies from Nova Scotia who want to buy the fish from fishermen and, if necessary, and it is entirely up to the federal minister, if he wants to approve a freezer ship to be anchored in the Port of St. John's or somewhere else along the Avalon Peninsula, the same as he has now done for the Great Northern Peninsula - I did not hear any screams from the Fish Trades Association protesting a freezer ship, a Portuguese freezer ship now in Port Saunders buying directly from fishermen. The reason being -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: - the companies did not want to buy the fish up there from the fishermen, so they could not very well complain; if they do not want to buy from the fishermen and somebody else wants to buy it let them buy from the fishermen.

MR. J. MORGAN:

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford-and other members of the House who represent fishing districts will agree that we cannot afford-to have fishermen,who last year had a disastrous year, this year-now suddenly the catch is good-to have these fisherman continue to dump their fish at a time that is so important to them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) and the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. R. LeBlanc) are just about on side when it comes to their idea of when we should have over-the-side sales. And I think it is a last ditch effort by both of them. But the minister, regardless of whether he likes it or not, has bowed to the companies, He has said, 'Alright, let us have open season, free enterprise throughout the Province.' And I agree that the fisherman have to sell their fish, there can be no argument about that. But in the meantime we do not want to lose the jobs that are in the processing sector of the industry. So my question to the minister is, is this now policy of the government? Is this going to be a trend that we will allow over-the-side sales or we will allow everybody to come into the Province to buy fish for the rest of this season, for the next year and so on? Or is the minister going to allow the companies in this Province to tell him -when he finances a great many of them- is he going to allow the companies in this Province to tell him when they will take fish and when they will not? Or does he know what he is doing? It is apparent that he does not.

June 24, 1982

Tape No. 1645

MJ - 2

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I already indicated that the companies have advised us, the Newfoundland Government - I cannot very well stand in the House of Assembly or outside and say that the companies are lying to me. I cannot say that because we have checked with every single company across the Province, every buyer of fish, and they tell us they are not willing, not interested and do not want to buy fish on the Avalon Peninsula. So we have already concluded that they have a surplus of fish now. They have fish in their own plants, they do not want to come and buy additional fish. So what I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, is read and table this telex to make sure our policy is clear, the telex sent to Mr. LeBlanc today. I will quote part of the telex to make sure it is understood. "Under such circumstances, while there is a surplus to the needs of the onshore processing plants in the Province, I cannot oppose your department granting an over-the-side sale licence to the Fishermen's Union similar to the licence you already granted earlier this season to the union for an over-the-side sale on the Northwest coast of the Province."

MR. S. NEARY: Now that is a reversal, that is a change of policy.

MR. MORGAN: And what we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is as long as it is surplus to the needs of the onshore processing plants. And if the companies are lying to me, well they have to bear the consequences. I am taking their word -

MR. NEARY: What a flip flop.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has problems over in Port aux Basques in the fishing industry as well, so please be serious now.

If the companies, and I understand

June 24, 1982

Tape No. 1645

MJ - 3

MR. J. MORGAN:

from what I can gather the companies have already viciously attacked me for what I am doing for the fisherman, I am willing to take that because I think what we are doing is right. The companies have not co-operated in trying to help the fisherman.

MR. MORGAN: They tell me the plants are filled with fish. They tell me they have lots of fish, they do not want anymore fish. I am not going to call them liars as companies. I am taking their word they are telling me the truth. So if they are full of fish that is surplus to the needs of the plants in the Province, therefore there is no reason why the fishermen should not be allowed to sell their fish on the Avalon Peninsula to a foreign boat in the same way as fishermen are now selling -

MR. NEARY: The minister is giving them the runaround.

MR. MORGAN: - Mr. Speaker, please! - selling fish in the same way as the fishermen are now selling, and have been selling for almost two months, on the Great Northern Peninsula - well not two months, it is now about three weeks - to a foreign Portuguese freezer ship anchored just in the harbour and fishermen selling directly to that freezer ship. If Mr. LeBlanc can do it for the people of Port au Choix and the St. Barbe coast area, there is no reason why he cannot do it for the fishermen on the Avalon Peninsula. That is what we are saying right now.

MR. NEARY: You told us yesterday you would not listen to him.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, what I said in the House yesterday I am saying right now, the same thing. I am saying now, Mr. Speaker, the same as yesterday. If the companies all are filled -

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order. The hon. minister is trying to respond to a question. I think the decorum of the House, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition

MR. MARSHALL: (Mr. Neary) was talking about a few minutes ago, dictates for him to remain silent while the minister has an opportunity to answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: My response to that point of order is this, Mr. Speaker, that a minister responding to a question is supposed to be brief, not controversial, and non-political. The hon. gentleman is playing little political games like he is used to playing, learning probably from the Government House Leader. And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the rule of relevancy be enforced and that the hon. gentleman be asked to be brief in his answers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. members to my right and to my left are aware that any member when speaking does have the right to be heard in silence. I would ask them to abide by that rule.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to answer the question in a sincere way because the question was asked in a sincere way on the problems of fishermen. It is important we all be concerned with the problems of the fishermen, the most important industry we have in this Province. I say again that our position today is the same as yesterday. We said in the House yesterday that if there is surplus to the needs of the processing plants in the Province we will not be opposed to any freezer ship, foreign ship buying directly from the fishermen. We are convinced today, as a result of checking with all the companies, that there is a surplus of fish being caught by the fishermen in the Province, a surplus to the needs of the onshore processing plants in this Province. And because of that we cannot oppose the arrangement of an over-the-side sale

MR. MORGAN: to accommodate fishermen  
at a time when the season is so important to them,  
the cod trap fishing season.

I will add, Mr. Speaker,  
for the benefit of the hon. gentleman who asked the  
question, I said almost a total lack of co-operation.  
We did get some co-operation from a few companies. For  
example, National Sea in St. John's here, St. John's  
South, on the South side of the harbour, they agreed  
to take approximately

MR. MORGAN:

100,000 pounds of additional fish a day from the Avalon Peninsula by means of taking on additional plant workers. That is co-operation. They arranged that. The only other co-operation we had was from two small companies out in Trinity Bay. One was E.J. Greene Limited, in Winterton, Trinity Bay. They agreed to take 20,000 pounds a day, my good friend from Trinity Bay de Verde (Mr. Rideout) is aware of the company. They arranged to take 20,000 pounds extra a day from these fishermen. And George Dawe and Son, out in the same area, has agreed to take 25,000 to 30,000 pounds a day extra as well. But the Fish Trades Association, I am under the wrath of the Fish Trades Association. A telegram came in to me this morning - I would not dare table it in the House. The Fish Trades Association are just vicious over this kind of effort on the part of the Newfoundland Government and myself to make sure the fishermen are being assisted. And all we are doing is saying, "You say you cannot handle the fish, you say you are not going to co-operate and help the fishermen, well we are taking some action." And I am going to be subject to some criticism over the next number of days, I am quite aware of that, from some of those companies which are somewhat annoyed over the decision we have made.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Talk to your buddies you gave the crab licence to and make them take some extra fish.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the minister seems to be shifting position all the time. A few minutes ago in his opening answer he said that there was processing capacity in the Province, there is. Now he is saying that he is determined that there is a surplus. He does not want to call the fish companies liars. But he goes on record as wiring the federal minister -



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

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please! The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: This is the question period. It is a time for members to ask questions. Members of the Opposition are perfectly entitled, of course, to ask questions but as much as we might be treated and elucidated and uplifted by speeches by the hon. member, this is not the time and place to do it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: We are not operating under martial law in this House, Mr. Speaker. The same rules apply to that side of the House that apply to this side of the House. In responding to a point of order a few moments ago I talked about brevity, brief answers to questions. And the hon. gentleman just ranted and raved and talked on for about another four or five minutes playing little political games. And I think my hon. friend is entitled to a fair preamble, Mr. Speaker, and anybody who watches the proceedings of the House of Commons will see that in the Parliament of Canada they have much longer preambles than we have in this House.

MR. SIMMS: Not on supplementaries.

MR. NEARY: And I would submit that my hon. colleague is perfectly in order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am sure all hon. members are aware that both the question and the answer should be brief, and I will again request them to try to adhere to the rule, all members on both sides of the House.

MR. TULK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying the minister is just trying to cover up his own

MR. TULK:

inadequacies by attacking the federal minister. Now let me tell him that Twillingate has a supply problem, Little Harbour East is closed. But let me ask him a more important question than that perhaps, Mr. Speaker. Would he consider, if the fish companies would agree to take the surplus fish, and if they say it is too costly and the quality is low, would he agree perhaps to subsidize some of the trucking costs of fish companies in this Province in order to see that our fishermen sell their catch and in order to see that the processing jobs are available? Would he consider that?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman and his colleague no longer than a few minutes ago were criticizing us for giving the companies money -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on.

MR. MORGAN: - and wanting us to be more dictatorial in dealing with the companies and refuse to give them any subsidies or assistance. Now they are asking for additional subsidies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to say and I want to say it sincerely, the fishermen, according to the calls -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - at my home last evening and last night and early this morning - my phone is listed everybody knows my phone is listed, they can get hold of me - and according to the phone calls from fishermen who are having a very serious time, having three or four

MR. MORGAN: totally frustrated, the companies do not want to help them out, the companies say they have lots of fish, they are not going to buy any more. And I am saying now there is no obstacle in the path of the Federal Minister of Fisheries doing the same thing for the fishermen on the Avalon Peninsula as he has already done on the Great Northern Peninsula. Let the foreign boat come in and buy fish from fishermen.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health (Mr. House). Could the minister advise the hon. House how many cases of salmonella poisoning have been reported to his office as of today?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I think there were about twenty-two cases on the 17th of this month. There were twenty-two cases of sickness down at a particular lodge - Glenbrook - and there have been twelve cases of salmonella isolated. That is the last information I have on that.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: The minister is saying that there were twelve cases reported from the Glenbrook Lodge here in St. John's. A supplementary question to the minister, What steps has his department taken to investigate the cause or the causes of the outbreak at the Glenbrook Lodge?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, as I just said the sickness occurred between the 10th. and the 17th. On the 17th. our department was called in on medical advice by a medical doctor in the institution, I believe Dr. Adams called in the department. The department has been working on it ever since. It is still under investigation. They have not isolated the cause to their own satisfaction as yet, but it is still being worked on and investigated.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, another supplementary. Last night about two o'clock a member of the staff was taken to the Health Sciences Centre with the symptoms of the same poisoning. Could the minister advise if his department has been contacted by the staff at the Glenbrook Lodge concerning their health and safety at that lodge?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, it was not twenty-two patients who were affected, I believe there were seven staff members and fifteen patients. Yes, they have been contacted obviously and as I said it is being investigated and everything -

MR. NEARY: What is the cause?

MR. HOUSE: Salmonella.

MR. NEARY: What caused it?

MR. HOUSE: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: Is it the water?

MR. HOUSE: They are investigating it. Most of these cases lead mainly to poultry, but they have not isolated it as yet. But that is the biggest threat in that particular thing, poultry. But as I said the whole thing is still under investigation and when it is found it will be reported.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the minister has left us with the impression that they are still trying to find the cause of that. I want to ask the minister a point-blank question now. Are the patients and the staff going to be left at Glenbrook Lodge until they find out what is the cause?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: There are medical judgements being made on this. My staff in the Division of Inspections, Dr. Severs office is in constant touch with the division. I do not think there is any thought yet of evacuating anybody or taking them out, but certainly if it is necessary it will be done. I know they are doing everything that can be done. And I would suggest they have pretty well isolated the problem, but I do not think they are going to make any final statement on it until, of course, they are very sure.

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

MR.LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr.Dinn). I wonder if the minister can indicate to the House how many groups within the public service have not negotiated a contract for 1982? I am thinking of some of the major groups, the nurses, the teachers. Realizing that some of these groups have two year agreements and this sort of thing, I am wondering how many of these large groups have not yet negotiated their collective bargaining agreement for 1982?

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

MR.DINN: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to give an exact number at this point in time. I reviewed it only yesterday. Obviously I can get the exact number for the hon. gentleman and the number of people involved but there are several major ones, General Service, Maintenance and Operation Staff, Teachers, Waterford Hospital, the Workers' Compensation. There are some large and some small groups, but I can get the exact number for the hon. gentleman and get back to him and so on.

MR.LUSH: A supplementary.

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova, a supplementary.

MR.LUSH: I just wonder if the hon. minister can give hon. members any indication of any ongoing negotiations now. I am sure he might not be aware of all the ones that are not settled, but he must be aware of ones that are ongoing now, and what is the status of the negotiations in these that are ongoing?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Russell): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, policemen and firemen, the police are into arbitration right now. General service, there is a conciliation board set up in the case of the general service dispute. Some of the other sets of negotiations are waiting the outcome, of course, of that conciliation board, one would be probably the maintenance and operations. The warders group are going to conciliation, that is the warders in the penitentiaries. Waterford Hospital support staff are currently into negotiations. Teachers are in negotiations and they have a conciliation officer appointed. Obviously they will go through that conciliation process, and then possibly request a board or conclude negotiations without the assistance of the board, so these are the major ones that current. Police and firemen have arbitration; warders do not have arbitration, they have conciliation; general service has conciliation, MOS, Workers Compensation and people like that will be awaiting the outcome of the general service one which generally sets the rates for government and so on. So these are the several important ones that are ongoing now. And, of course, the teachers are into negotiation and have a conciliation

MR. DINN:

officer appointed. That was done through the Labour Relations Board, not the minister. That is the only one that is outside the ambit of the minister appointing conciliation officers.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister can elaborate a little further on the status of negotiations with teachers because I understand that everything is not going well in these negotiations. If they have not reached an impasse, they have come pretty close to it.

Supplementary to that, the minister has indicated there are a large number of public servants according to the list that he has given who have not yet reached a settlement, they have not yet been able to negotiate a settlement with the government. In view of the large number of public servants that have not yet negotiated a settlement, in view of the fact that the government have announced that they are putting freezes on increases to senior civil servants and the like, I am wondering if the government has reached any policy with respect to an increase they are going to be giving to all their workers in terms of percentage, whether they have a ceiling of 8 per cent, 10 per cent, or whether they have established a policy with respect to the increase they expect to give all of their workers and whether they have announced that policy or whether they have any policy restricting increases or with a ceiling of a percentage amount?

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



MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, with respect to negotiations, the hon. member knows, of course, that there is a certain timing process that is set into play in all negotiations and that takes place generally when there is a request for a board. At that point in time the timing is set in place. So as to how long negotiations go on, or whether there is or is not a collective agreement, the timing is set in place. So any side, either the employer's side or the employees' side, can set that timing in place by taking a specific action.

With respect to the teachers, the teachers have been negotiating for a short period of time up to this point in time. Last week or a week and a half ago they requested a conciliation officer through the Labour Relations Board. That will take a specific period of time and then, of course, the process is set into play when conciliation boards are requested. Now with respect to the public service, the general service is into the conciliation board process now. So they have a board appointed, the board will hear the case and then they will report, and the timing is set into play right after that report comes in, the fourteen days, on receipt of the report, acceptance or rejection of the report and so on. But the timing is set into play.

MR. J. DINN:

With respect to police and firemen, that process is set into play, and the timing of that process is basically at a point where a conclusion cannot be reached by both sides, they go into arbitration. The police are now into arbitration and when the arbitration board decides, then that ends that process. I mean, there is no negotiation after that. Now, with respect to the Waterford Hospital, they are into negotiations now. They have requested a board - or no, I do not believe they have. The Waterford Hospital are just into conciliation right now. The warders have requested a board. So, there is arbitration in the police case, there is arbitration in the firefighters, and a conciliation board in the case of the warders. The General Service have a conciliation board, and that timing will be set in place when the board reports back. MOS generally will await the outcome, they do not have to, but they generally will await the outcome of the General Service conciliation board and so on. The teachers have a conciliation officer. There is no timing in place now for the teachers until a board is activated. And their contract does not run out, I believe until August 31st. So, just about all of the negotiations are going along the normal process and any time that normal process is not satisfactory to either party, then to set timing in place as to what action you may or may not want to take, that timing is set in place when the point at which a conciliation board is requested is done. In the case of police and firemen, it is arbitration; in the case of the rest it is conciliation.

MR. T. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to know that

June 24, 1982

Tape No. 1652

MJ - 2

MR. T. LUSH: the government have not then,  
according to the response from the minister, established any  
ceiling, any percentage ceiling or any other kind of ceiling  
with respect to wage increases for workers in the

MR. LUSH:

public service. My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is again related to the teachers, in view of the fact that they have asked for the conciliation procedure, I am just wondering if the minister is in a position to indicate what might have been the hang-up, having to go to the conciliation procedure, whether it was related to salary, or whether it was related to -

MR. HISCOCK: Labrador benefits.

MR. LUSH: - other working conditions? Because, as the minister is aware, the teachers in particular always present a rather large package and I am just wondering what might have been the hang-up with respect to having to go to conciliation procedure, whether it was salary or other working conditions.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: No, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the things that generally happens when two parties get together, whether it is in the private or public sector. Our conciliation officers have a pretty fair reputation for concluding positive negotiations so that you do not have strikes or lockouts. And last year, just to indicate what the record is looking like, last year we had something like 40,000 man-days lost, which is one of the best records in Canada for the number of sets of negotiations that we concluded last year. So they have a pretty fair record and many groups just request the assistance of our conciliation people. We have conciliation, for example, in the construction trades. There are something like twelve or thirteen trades. They all have the assistance of a conciliation officer. They always request that you know, especially when there are a number of items that are contentious on both sides. As to what these contentious items are, you know, I am certainly not going to discuss that here in the House of Assembly. Whether there are 50 or

MR. DINN: 100 or 80 generally, that is what we start out with and the conciliation officer attempts to get the parties together and pare that down to a reasonable number, at which point in time, if there is still a bit of an impasse, then they request the appointment of a board. And, of course, in some cases the minister appoints a point. Last year I believe we had a total of six boards. At this point in time this year I believe the total is four public and one private sector conciliation board appointed. So it is just a process that is set in place.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The time for Question Period has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MARSHALL: Order 3, Social Services  
Concurrence Motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 3, Concurrence Motion, Social  
Services Committee.

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

MR. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the Social Services Committee again this year had a very successful series of hearings. Six headings were referred to it and a number of topics were discussed. I will just, for the purpose of beginning the debate, very quickly go over the topics that were discussed in each heading so as to refresh members' minds if they wish to discuss these topics further. These all had exhaustive discussion in Committee but, of course, everyone was not there and they might like to go over them again.

In Health, dental programmes came in for a considerable amount of discussion, as did mental health, tuberculosis, the senior citizens' drug subsidy, hospital admissions, Medicare and the abuse of it or possible abuse of it, doctors' fee for service as opposed to salary and which is better, and the ambulance service. There were many other topics as well but these were the main ones that were discussed.

In Culture, Recreation and Youth, the Amateur Sports Exchange Programmes, the Aquarena, the Norma and Gladys, hunting licences, wildlife management and the Exploits area for the 1984 Summer games, were discussed.

In the Department of Environment: tourism, the problem with car wrecks, industrial development, the Environmental Assessment Act, acid rain and budworm spraying.

In the Department of Justice: a very general discussion on prosecutions, law enforcement generally, the RCMP contract as opposed to the area about to be policed by the local police, jury selection, especially the problem with not enough native people being chosen for jury duty, liquor licencing, the electoral office, the problem

MR. CARTER: of sentencing generally, fire fighting, consumer protection and a number of other topics.

In the Department of Education: the problem with financing education, Grade XII, literacy, vocational school, operating and capital financing were discussed.

In the Department of Social Services: social assistance, the numbers of single able-bodied and who qualifies for assistance and who does not, separated families, the rental paid by the Department of Social Services, a number of work activity programmes were discussed and how successful they were,

MR. CARTER: the cost of living, generally,  
and the problems associated with foster children -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER ( Aylward ): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: There is a loudspeaker or  
radio or something on outside the House, I can hardly hear  
the hon. gentleman, I wonder if Your Honour could send  
a page out and ask them to either close the door, turn off  
the radio or loudspeaker or whatever it is?

MR. SPEAKER: I will have that checked.

MR. NEARY: It sounds like it is coming  
from over there, It may be upstairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CARTER: I do hear something, Mr. Speaker,  
but it is not bothering me, I do not know if it is bothering  
the other members.

MR. NEARY: I cannot hear the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: I should speak more closely to  
the microphone. Is this better?

The Minister of Social Services  
(Mr. Hickey) did promise to furnish the policy manual used  
by his department for his officials to the Opposition and  
to other interested backbenchers or members generally and  
this seemed to meet with the general satisfaction of the  
committee.

Now, these were the general  
headings that were discussed and, of course, in all of the  
discussions I myself felt that there was an undercurrent  
of concern regarding the shape of the economic pie  
that the provincial government uses. If you look at the  
Budget book you will see how it is divided. The amount for  
Health, Education and Welfare, which are the three main  
branches of Social Services, consume something over 60 per



MR. CARTER: cent of the amount of available money each year, whereas the amount that is spent on resources is almost miniscule by comparison. And I think this is a concern to many people. They would rather it, perhaps not the other way around because obviously Social Services is very important, but they would hope that the amount of money being spent on resource departments could be increased. Of course, the problem is that the private sector is unable to invest as much money as perhaps it should in the resources of the nation because the federal government is soaking up so much of the individuals money in the form of taxes, and at the same time they are soaking up a great deal of the money that is available in the capital markets. And Mr. MacEachen, of course, is about to bring down a new Budget

MR. CARTER: and if he wants to do some good and perhaps revise the slugging economy, the first thing he should do is try to reduce taxes a little bit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: It should not be a surprise to anyone that what is now happening economically all across Canada is the natural result of misguided government policies. When I say "misguided government policies", I am referring to the federal government. Because the amount of money that the provincial government takes from the individual is miniscule compared with the amount of money that the federal government takes.

If I had more time, or if I get another ten minute slot, I will gladly argue that point with the hon. gentleman. A lot of the federal taxes are, of course, hidden, they are taken off at another level not directly by -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to bringing in the estimates of Social Services, I fail to see how bringing down a new federal budget, what the budget has to do with these estimates being brought in on the floor of the House, particularly when in education, and social services, and welfare, some 50 per cent or 60 per cent comes from the federal government. And I am asking the question on a point of order; Is it that the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is saying that the federal government should cut back on taxes and cut back on these services?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Now, Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, I will gladly defend the relevance of what

MR. CARTER: I am trying to say. The whole exercise of the budget, the whole exercise of the estimates was to pass the estimates as they were presented to this House, and they were presented to this House and to the various Committees in the shape of a pie, if you like, a certain proportion goes to each department. And I was deploring the fact the pie was the shape it was; I was rather hoping that more money would be able to be found for certain departments. And from that I was pointing out that the money needs to be found for these departments because the federal government is soaking up so much money in the private sector. And I think it is perfectly relevant and it is certainly not as far-fetched as most of the discussion that takes place in this House, unfortunately.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, as all members are aware during the Budget debate, sometimes in the Estimate Committees debate, the debate is rather wide ranging. So I rule that there is no point of order.

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: So if the federal government wants to do something, and it is mostly in the federal government's hands, then they should reduce taxes and they can probably do that by spending the money that they get less foolishly. Example after example can be given of the foolish way they spend money.

MR. CARTER: But to get back to the discussion of our provincial estimates, it was a very successful exercise. This is the fourth year that I have been associated with the Social Services Estimates Committee. The format that we have used, while varying slightly perhaps from the formats of the other Committees, still is generally the same. Informality seems to have been the key word. Discussion is wide-ranging, frank and, I must say, free from a deal of the acrimony that seems to take place in this House of Assembly.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee system is the best thing since sliced bread and I highly recommend the system generally. I must say I enjoyed the exercise myself immensely, and I think that everyone found it very worth-while. I thank you.

MR. SPEAKER(Aylward): Order, please!

Before recognizing the next speaker I would like to rule on a point of order raised yesterday by the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) about certain words which were supposedly attributed to the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk).

On checking Hansard I see that the hon. member for Fogo did not say these words, or they are not listed in Hansard, so I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that I have the same words of commendation for the Committee system as does the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter).

MR. LUSH: I do not object to the Committee system, I never did until this year. Of course, I can understand why the member would be so pleased about it and what his definition of success is. As long as the government have the large numbers in the Committee, and set up in such a way where we can only have one or two members there, then I can see why the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) would like that kind of setup.

As I have said before, I have no objection to the Committee system provided that the Opposition is of the nature that they have the numbers to be able to go to these Committee meetings.

And the government was not all that favourable to many of our suggestions. Number one, we thought that the Committee system would be unworkable with just a small Opposition. With three Committees working, and two people on each Committee just leaving two people free, we asked that they have one Committee meeting, one Committee meeting, which would give us a little more flexibility. But the government would not agree to that, they carried on, most of the time, two meetings simultaneously. And with members having other commitments out of town, the other commitments that one has as a result of being a member, sometimes it was practically impossible for any more than one to attend the meetings. And this certainly did not, with meetings going on just about

MR. LUSH:

every other day, and simultaneous meetings, it did not give the member a lot of time to prepare. So I can see why the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) would be so high in his praise for these committee meetings. But, Mr. Speaker, again I do not object to the principle of committee meetings. I would like to hope that the government would be a little more flexible in terms of spacing out the meetings to give more flexibility and give members the opportunity to attend a few more of these meetings and give a little more time for preparation.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have some concerns today that I want to raise in education. It is unfortunate that the minister is not here, but when these debates are carried on and one has to raise the concerns that one has, I would hope that there is somebody here, some hon. minister who can address the concerns, the very large concerns that I have in the field of education, particularly with respect to the new high school programme. Several times during the committee meetings and during this session I have tried to get some answers from the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) re the capital expenditures for the high school programme and tried to find out just exactly how these monies are going to be allocated and how much school boards can expect to get over the next couple of years. Hon. members will recall that in last year's Budget, the 1981 Budget, the government allocated \$20.3 million to provide facilities for the re-organized high school programme, \$20.3 million, and in this Budget this year there is \$47 million allocated and I have been trying from time to time to get from the minister just exactly how much of this money will be spent on the new high

MR.LUSH:

school programme this year.

And, Mr. Speaker, my purpose for doing that is that this \$20.3 million , the money that was allocated last year, is spread over a three year period and I wanted to find out exactly how the government arrived at this figure of \$20.3 million. I understand that the government set up a committee to look into the facilities that would be required as a result of the new high school programme. I understand that in the beginning that committee did not do what it was suppose to do, or for some reason or other it was aborted, and then the government realized it and got into a panic situation , they got into -

MR.TULK:

Like they always do.

MR. LUSH: a real panic situation, realizing that the high school programme was now a fait accompli, and that something had to be done in terms of trying to ascertain just what the cost would be, what the extra cost would be to provide those facilities that would be needed as a result of the Grade XII, or the new reorganized high school programme. So when this Committee did not have its work done, it is my understanding that the department set up a one-man committee to go around the Province and try to ascertain what the needs would be with respect to facilities. This man was a competent man, there is no question about that, he was a competent man, but the thing was he did not have any time.

MR. TULK: What did you say happened to the committee?

MR. LUSH: The committee just was aborted for some reason or other. I do not know what happened. They did not do their work so then they had to, in their panic situation, assign this job to a one-man committee who, as I say, was a very competent person, but because of the time, because they delayed with the first committee, it did not leave this very competent person much time. And I understand that it was not a very thorough study because of the time frame, the time element involved. And, Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have been asking the minister how this figure was arrived at, this \$20.3 million. Of course I found out that it was done through this one-man survey of school boards throughout the Province, trying to ascertain what their needs would be with respect to facilities, extra facilities, new facilities, for the new high school programme, Facilities such as extra classrooms, extra laboratories, and gymnasiums, or gymnasia, whatever happens to be a person's preference for the plural. So this is how it was done, Mr. Speaker, and this was done in con-



June 24, 1982

Tape 1659

NM - 2

MR. LUSH: sultation with school boards. And they arrived at a figure of \$20.3 million, that was the amount that they arrived at that would be the minimum requirement or would be the dollars required to bring the facilities up to minimum standards.

I understand, and I have asked the minister whether or not this was a realistic figure,

MR. LUSH:

because school boards throughout the Province started flexing their muscles saying that this was an inadequate amount of money, that this would not go anywhere near meeting the minimum requirements as laid down by the government for Grade XII. It would not go anywhere near meeting that need. I understand also, and this is very enlightening, Mr. Speaker, that while this study was going on, while this department survey was going on, capital works survey, you might want to call it, because that is what it was doing, looking into the capital expenditure, what monies would be needed, while this survey was going on, that the IEC and the Roman Catholic Committee conducted their own survey, their own study of what the needs would be. And the figure that they arrived at was twice that arrived at by the provincial Department of Education. The figure that the IEC arrived at, two studies, two separate studies, the figure which they arrived at from their own studies, the IEC, and the Roman Catholic Committee, that revealed that they would need, each committee, the IEC - and I hope hon. members understand that the IEC is the Integrated Education Committee - and the Roman Catholic Committee, both these under separate studies revealed that they would need twice as much as that allocated or that determined by the one-man survey in the Department of Education.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is certainly revealing and enlightening, to find out that two committees came up with a figure twice that arrived at by the Department of Education. And, Mr. Speaker, that points out the dilemma that we are in with respect to bringing in Grade XII in Newfoundland. That points out the dilemma that we are in. There are schools next

MR. LUSH: year that are not ready, they do not have the facilities, they do not have the classrooms and, Mr. Speaker, here we are one year away and we find schools in the Province not ready. They do not know what they are going to do. There are at least five schools within the IEC division right now, five schools, that are in serious trouble with respect to bringing in Grade XII, and I mean with respect to classrooms. They do not have the classroom space. They are probably going to have an extra 200 students next year and nowhere to put them. And what is going to happen in many of those areas, we are going to be faced, the superintendents, the school boards will have no other choice but to bring in a shift system. They are going to have to bring in a shift system. And I can tell hon. members there are going to be a lot of parents throughout this Province who will object to a shift system because the shift system is very difficult to get it to fit in with a work pattern, peoples' hours of work and this sort of thing. And that is what is facing

MR. T. LUSH: several school boards throughout this Province this year, because they do not have the facilities to take care of Grade XII, they are going to have to work on a shift system. They do not have the classrooms, to say nothing about other support facilities, Mr. Speaker, to say nothing about science facilities, laboratory facilities throughout the Province, to say nothing about that they just do not have the physical space. And here we are two years into the programme, one more year - next year will be the big year, this was the year, since 1983 will be the final commitment of all the funds.

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

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LUSH: Time is up? Well, I will have to follow on, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will just make a few brief remarks and then perhaps my hon. friend can continue with his remarks to the House which appear to be very interesting. I am really shocked. I do not know if hon. members have been listening to what the hon. gentleman was saying -

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no. We do not want to hear that.

MR. HEARN: We heard that in the Estimates Committee.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. HEARN: We heard that in the Estimates Committee.

MR. NEARY: No, you did not hear it before. This is something new that has been raised by the hon. gentleman. Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman is saying is that the Department of Education carried out a capital works survey, at

MR. S. NEARY: least that is what I understand from the hon. gentleman, carried out a capital works survey, without any approval from the DEC or from the Roman Catholic School Board as to whether or not the recommendations of the Minister of Education (Ms. L. Verge) would be accepted by the school boards, that is what I heard the hon. gentleman say. Mr. Speaker, So money was allocated to the school boards by the Minister of Education, but it had to be distributed on the formula that is used for granting funds to the Denominational Education Committee.

AN HON. MEMBER: DEC.

MR. NEARY: That is right, DEC. That it was I said.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, you did not.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon, I did. The hon. gentleman is a little hard of hearing today.

But, Mr. Speaker, it had to be granted along the lines of the formula that is being used. And so one board was short-changed, as I understand the hon. gentleman, by approximately \$2 million. But the funding, this is the important thing, the funding was earmarked for specific projects-and yesterday I mentioned one, the gymnasium in Harbour Grace, St. Paul's School in Harbour Grace - and when the minister allocated the funds for specific projects the boards said, 'No, we are going to spend the money the way we want to and not the way the Minister of Education wants to.' Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me

MR. NEARY: the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) either has to recover these funds or resign her position. It is a pretty serious matter, Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious matter, and I hope my colleague will pursue his line of debate when he resumes his place to further debate this matter, What has to happen is that the minister - Mr. Speaker, I tell you that we are very concerned. We are discussing Education and Health, Social Services and Justice. The Minister of Education is not in her seat; the Minister of Health (Mr. House) has been out of the House most of the afternoon; the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) is not in the House; and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) was here for the Question Period and then disappeared. And here we are discussing four big spenders, four departments that spend - Health, Education and Social Services - three of the biggest spending departments. And only now the Minister of Health is back.

MR. HOUSE: I have been here all afternoon.

MR. NEARY: But the Minister of Social Services and the Minister of Education have not made an appearance in this House today. And this is a very serious matter involving the hon. Minister of Education. The Minister of Education said, 'We will grant funds for specific projects without the approval of the board.'

MR. HOUSE: No.

MR. NEARY: The minister shakes his head, That is true and I am hoping my hon. friend will carry on with his disclosures.

MR. HOUSE: I hope your hon. friend has the facts.

MR. NEARY: He certainly has got the facts. If I know my hon. colleague, who does his homework, he does have the facts. But I am not going to pursue that, I going to leave that to my hon. colleague, I just want to raise another matter involving the School Tax Authority.

MR. NEARY: The School Tax Authorities are agents of this government. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker, the School Tax Authorities are agents of the provincial government. They are either acting for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) or the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) so I am going to address my remarks to both ministers. And before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I want to read a letter from a lady in Burnt Point in Conception Bay in connection with the school taxes. You know, Mr. Speaker, I am becoming more convinced every day that what we are seeing happening in this Province now is what happened leading up to the Great Depression. The kind of things that are going on and the kind of remarks and the kind of things that are happening are the same type of things that happened before the Great Depression. And I am going to give an example now.

MP. NEARY:

It is addressed to me, "Dear Sir, I am writing you as a last resort about the way the Avalon North School Board at Bay Roberts are treating the unemployed people of the North Shore who have no means of paying school taxes. They are being harassed through the mails, threatened and bullied by this school board. Now they are being arrested. My son," and she mentions his name, "has been out of work for a year, On Sunday he was arrested, taken to jail in Harbour Grace, because he had no money to pay a \$25 fine. He spent sixty-five hours in jail at a cost of about \$700 to someone, guards around the clock at \$10 an hour, and his meals. They let him out today in a rain storm. He had to thumb his way home, about twenty-five miles. He was soaked to the skin when he got home.

"Now we all know the government is responsible for the unemployment state the Province is in and not my son or some other unemployed person. I would appreciate anything to help the situation we are in."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a pretty sad letter indeed. And it is a condemnation of the administration who have been criticizing the National Revenue of Canada for collecting income tax from fishermen, for the way they have treated the fishermen in this Province. Well now just look at the way the administration, the government, is treating the unemployed in this Province. There is an example, Mr. Speaker, If you are unemployed and you have no money to pay your school taxes and you are prosecuted under Section 48 of the act, and you cannot pay your \$25 fine, you are dragged off to jail.

AN HON MEMBER: How do you know they could not pay it?

MR. TULK: At a bigger cost to the taxpayer.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the puppet asked me how do I know they could not pay it. I would take the word of this lady who wrote me the letter before I would take the word



June 24, 1982

Tape 1663

NM - 2

MR. NEARY: of the hon. gentleman.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And listen to this, Mr. Speaker,  
this is a part I did not read.

"I am an old age pensioner " -

Mr. Speaker, listen to this "I am an old age pensioner and I never knew the misfortune of having no money was a crime deserving of a jail sentence. It is a disgrace and something has to be done about it. Is this school tax really legal? And can you tell me what section 48 of the School Tax laws are? The police do not know anything about it. But they are continuing to arrest people."

MR. WARREN: Boy, is that not a shame.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the same administration, the policies of the same administration that condemned the way that Ottawa was collecting income tax and treating fishermen of this Province. Mr. Speaker, this kind of treatment to our people, to our unemployed, to the unfortunate, to the sick is not good enough. The hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can look at me over there all he wants. These school authorities are following the directives and the policies laid down by this government, following their directives, Mr. Speaker. There is a provision in the Act, I might, say for exemption or abatement under Section 152(a) "An authority may grant an exemption or abatement from the school tax imposed on real property subject to the approval of the minister."

MR. HOUSE: Who brought in school tax authorities?

MR. HISCOCK: Do you not have the authority to change it?

DR. COLLINS: Yes.

MR. HISCOCK: Then why do you not change it?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman says, who brought it in. The hon. gentleman has the authority to change it.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. NEARY: And in these crying times, Mr. Speaker, in these times of record unemployment in this Province and the high cost of living we have in this Province and all the other problems that our people have, I think it is shameful for the administration to sit back and allow our people to be dragged off to jail because they cannot pay a \$25.00 fine for not being able to pay their school tax.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: I do not know if the hon. Leader of the Opposition is going to table that letter.

DR. COLLINS: I only mention that in that by having excerpts of a letter read out one really does not know what the issue is all about.

MR. NEARY: I do not read excerpts, I read the whole letter.

DR. COLLINS: I see. Well, perhaps even the whole letter. The hon. member is suggesting that the government was directly involved in incarcerating some individual who was destitute. In other words, some individual who has no resources of his own and presumably could not pay some taxes. I do not know if the hon. member did lay out that the individual was purported not to have been able to pay his school tax but anyway some taxes, and that the government was involved in incarcerating that individual. Now, you know, all I can say is that seems so highly unlikely that one would certainly want to study this issue in detail before accepting it. To think that government would even bother, would have the time, would have the interest or would want to incarcerate a person that is totally indigent is so outlandish

DR. COLLINS: as to be incredible. I mean, what point, what is to be gained by all that? I would think that this is a garbled account of a perfectly ordinary, straightforward, perhaps civil case, or whatever. But I think it is being presented in such a way, you know, that it boggles the mind and just cannot be accepted on its face.

So if the hon. member wishes to table the letter, I am sure the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), who is a champion in the case of the downtrodden and the destitute and spends almost every waking hour trying to right the wrongs done to society, and trying to help those who are not able to help themselves, I think the hon. the Minister of Justice, if he had that letter, he would study it in great detail and if there is even a smidgen of a doubt that there has been some wrong done to this individual, the whole weight of the Department of Justice will descend upon those who are perpetrating such a villainous act.

Now, getting down to the hon. the member for Terra Nova's (Mr. Lush) comment about how - and the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) is here now, so I am sure she will want to answer in more detail, but the hon. the member for Terra Nova paints the picture where government says, 'I am going to arbitrarily and without speaking to anyone, I am going to go out and say what schools you should build, and if you want to build them there I am going to say, No, Sir, you are not going to build them there, you have to build them here. It does not matter whether they are needed there, if you want to build them there just because you need them, I am going to build them somewhere else'.

Now, this is the way, he sort of purports, the way the Department of Education

DR. COLLINS: operates, that they take one individual, without any advice, without any consultation, without any intelligence, as a matter of fact, this one individual going around the Province and arbitrarily saying, 'I am going to give you money to build something here. It does not matter whether you need it or whether you feel it is a good idea or whether it is going to help anyone, you are going to build it here or you are not going to get the money'. Now, that is the image that the hon. member painted of this government.

Well, that is so silly, that is so farcical, that is so outlandish, it violates one's intelligence so much that you can hardly respond to it. What I would suggest is the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) perhaps may go over the ground again, think more carefully what he is going to say, lay it out, and I am sure the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) will answer any legitimate questions

DR. COLLINS:

he has and will show the fallacies of any misconceptions that he might entertain.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. member for

Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

What I said, Mr. Speaker,

I was pointing out how the government's survey with respect to facilities, or we will call it the capital works survey, I suppose, but it was a survey to look into the facilities for the new reorganized high school programme. And as a result of that survey they arrived at the figure of \$20.3 million. And I also indicated that two separate studies, a separate by IEC and a study by the Roman Catholic Committee indicated that they needed twice that amount. Two separate studies indicated that they needed twice that amount.

And I was just pointing out to hon. members the inadequacy of this amount of money, something I have been saying for two years, to bring in this new high school programme. But in addition, Mr. Speaker, to that, having identified the needs and the way it was done, having identified the needs of each school board area, having identified those needs and getting the school boards to verify them - they were identified specifically - if I could take, for example, in St. John's, it was identified that St. John's would need, Prince of Wales Collegiate would need a gymnasium, it would need three classrooms, this sort of thing, all itemized and the price put in, and the school boards verified that was the price, that was the cost for bringing in Grade XII.

But the department then in their wisdom having identified this need only gave the school boards, only gave the DECs 90 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:

That, by the way, is the regulation 90/10 for building a school. But the school boards thought that in view of this pressure put on them as a result of having to bring in Grade XII, they thought this would be a special deal and they would get 100 per cent, but they only got 90 per cent. They were only given 90 per cent, just 90 per cent.

But, Mr. Speaker, to complicate things further, having indentified the specific needs of each school board, then they gave the money out applying the per capita formula.

SOME HON. MEMBER:

Oh!

MR. LUSH:

They did it on a per capita basis.

MR. TULK:

They did not!

MR. LUSH:

They identified the needs, but, I mean, it was an exercise in futility.

MR. TULK:

What for Grade XII?

MR. LUSH:

They identified the needs for facilities in each of the school board areas -

MR. TULK:

Well, well, well!

MR. LUSH:

- then came back to the formula of a per capita, based on a per capita formula or given out on a per capita basis, the same way that they have been doing it for years. Of course, the result of that was that one of the committees experienced a short fall

MR. LUSH: of approximately \$2 million, a short fall of \$2 million. So here were the needs identified -

DR. COLLINS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. -

MR. LUSH: - and when the total was brought together in addition -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

A point of order, the hon.

Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member but, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) read a letter a short while ago. He said he read it in total. I asked him if he was going to table the letter. He has not done so as yet. So on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the hon. Leader of the Opposition be ordered to table the letter.

MR. SPEAKER: I will check the rules of Beauchesne to see if it is necessary for the hon. Leader of the Opposition to table that letter.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, there are three elements here. One was the fact that the DEC's themselves, or element segments of the DEC verified that the money was not enough that the government was giving, that indeed they needed twice that amount. Point number two, that they only gave them 90 per cent of the cost analysis of the survey done. They only gave them 90 per cent of that. So, Mr. Speaker, thirdly, in addition to only giving 90 per cent of the monies when they indeed expected to get 100 per cent thinking this was going to be a one shot deal, here they were on



MR. LUSH: two counts, Mr. Speaker,  
not getting the monies that they thought they were  
going to receive.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other  
problem - this is the major one - associated with it  
was that school boards were all under the impression -  
this is the information that I get - that they were  
going to get the monies which the survey showed that they  
need in each of their areas. They thought they were  
going to get this money. For example, if in the Terra Nova

MR. LUSH:

district it was understood that they were told that the survey showed that they needed \$2 million for x classrooms, or a gymnasium, then they understood they were going to get that. But, Mr. Speaker, this is where the complication comes in. Now the minister gave the money to the DECs, gave the \$20 million to the DECs -

MR. TULK: Which is right and proper.

MR. LUSH: - which is right and proper, that is the way monies are all given.

MR. NEARY: Earmarked for specific projects.

MR. LUSH: Boards understand it was earmarked, it was earmarked for specific purposes, that it was earmarked for specific purposes.

MR. TULK: We have the evidence.

MR. NEARY: We have the evidence from your department.

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, this is not the way it happened. Or at least it is not the way it happened with some school boards, that they have not received this money when they believe that they were promised this money, that they were given the list of what the needs would be. But no, the minister is saying, "No, that is not the way it is." The minister has been saying all along that she gave the money to the DECs in the way they always give capital money, and they divided it out according to the needs.

But, Mr. Speaker, no, the minister is saying this was not the case. The school boards understood, because this was a special project, that monies were need immediately, that there would be extra facilities needed. The

MR. LUSH: school boards understood that they would be given the monies, naturally, as the were identified in the survey, otherwise what was the point of the survey? What was the point of the survey?

Now the third point, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention. I have mentioned the fact that school boards thought that they were going to get the

100 per cent as opposed to the 90 per cent. They thought that they were going to get all of the monies that were required according to the study, and also, Mr. Speaker, also they thought that the minister was going to honour her word with respect to the allocations, with respect to the needs in each of the areas. And that did not happen. That did not happen.

MS. VERGE: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) is imputing that I lied or, to use his words, 'did not honour my word' and I take exception to that. I have always honoured my word with respect to the distribution of capital funding for education.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister's feeling may be hurt, but my hon. colleague did in no way impugn or allege that the hon. minister was lying or had lied. My colleague said that the minister had not honoured her commitment, and that is a fact. My colleague is proceeding to lay out a strong case to prove that the minister did not honour her commitment to these school boards as a result of the capital works survey that was done directly by the Department of Education. There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I rule that there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, just to recapitulate what I have been saying: One, I have tried to establish that the \$20.3 million was inadequate and point out the difficulty that the DEC's are in administering this programme, that the \$20.3 million was inadequate, that they only received 90 per cent when they thought at this point they would receive 100 per cent.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the third point being that they thought that they would certainly get the allocations as identified by the survey. They thought that this would be a different procedure. They were under the impression that this would be a different procedure -

MR. TULK: Sure they were, naturally.

MR. LUSH: - that the monies would not be given to this -

MR. TULK: You had no business to do the survey to start with.

MR. NEARY: A one-shot deal.

MS. VERGE: The member cannot (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No. Why not?

MR. LUSH: And the third point, Mr. Speaker, is that then having done the survey they allocated the money on a per capita basis, which meant that the survey was of no point anyway. They identified the needs but then gave out the money in a different fashion. They gave out the money on a per capita basis, which meant that one of the divisions in the DEC was just about \$2 million short. Now, how could those people meet the commitment to school boards as determined by the survey when they were \$2 million short when they got their monies? They were \$2 million short. But, Mr. Speaker, the point is that many school boards in the Province thought that they would get the monies that were identified to be needed by this survey.

MR. LUSH: Here is a letter from one school board in the Province - it is not from a school board, it is from a member of a school board and it is a public letter, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: I cannot table my letter?

MR. TULK: No, you will want to read it the next time.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present in the House when the discussion on Education began, I was attending the closing and graduation ceremony for the School for the Deaf at the Little Theatre at the university.

A number of points had been made to which I must take exception. First, I would like to rebut the comments made by the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), the Education critic, about capital funding for the re-organized high school programme. The matter of capital fundings as well as all the other aspects of the major change that has been introduced in our high schools was planned over a period of months if not years by a Steering Committee comprising representatives of the major education agencies in the Province. That Steering Committee was established in early 1979 and worked during the two years leading up to the start of the changes in high school in September past. The Steering Committee was made up of representatives of the Department of Education, of course, which had the major co-ordinating responsibility, but also the Denominational Education Committees, the Federation of School Boards - that federation takes in each of the thirty-five school boards in the Province - the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, the Faculty of Education at Memorial University and, in addition,



MS. L. VERGE: students who will be in the schools as a result of the lengthening of high school, and also program support rooms that are needed to make possible the greater number and variety of courses, which is one of the chief benefits of one of the re-organization. The Steering Committee actually assigned top priority to that particular task. I think there were about five tasks which were considered the most important. A subcommittee of the Steering Committee was established to carry out each of those five key tasks, and there was a subcommittee on capital requirements. The subcommittee carried out a survey of all the school boards to determine what the needs were for additions to buildings to accommodate the expanded high school program. The subcommittee and the parent Steering Committee were assisted in this process by the officials of the Department of Education, who went through the whole Province, consulted each of the thirty-five school boards and completed a survey of every single building housing high school grades, making projections of the number of students who would be participating in the re-organized high school programme in each building, predicting the courses likely to be offered, courses which were feasible to be offered, and then making an assessment of the need for extra space with a price tag attached. A list was compiled of each of those needs with an accompanying dollar number and the total list added up to a total cost of \$20,3 million. That list was submitted to the Steering Committee, which approved it, and in turn handed it to me, and government was able to approve funding to meet that total recommendation, the full \$ 20.3 million for additional space requirements for the re-organized high school programme as recommended by the department officials, the



MS. VERGE:

subcommittee and a steering committee, which is representative of the Denominational Education Committees, and the Federation of School Boards, was met by government. Now it was understood at all times by all participants in this exercise, the agencies that I have enumerated, and of course the officials of the Department of Education and members of government, that this exercise was being conducted within the framework of the denominational education system. The principles of that system were codified in the Terms of Union with Canada in 1949 and have now been entrenched in the new Constitution of Canada, patriated version. The Constitution says that capital funds for education in our Province have to be distributed by government in a non-discriminatory basis. That is they have to be given to each group of churches or denomination involved in education which has rights in education, having participated prior to 1949, in proportion to that denomination's share of the total provincial population as determined in the most recent provincial census.

At the moment, Mr. Speaker, that ratio is as follows, approximating figures. The integrated group of denominations, which include five Protestant churches - the Anglican, Moravian, the Presbyterian, United, Salvation Army and United Churches - receives about 57 per cent of capital funding, the Roman Catholic Church receives about 37 per cent of funding, the Pentecostal Assemblies receives about 5.5 per cent. The Seventh Day Adventist Church receives a small fraction of 1 per cent. These total 100 per cent.

At all times in the exercise of planning for the reorganized high school program

MS. VERGE: a co-operative undertaking on the part of the agencies that I have listed, it was understood that the distribution of capital funds would have to be in accordance with the constitution and would have to follow the denominational ratio.

The purpose of the survey of capital requirements was to pinpoint the precise needs. That was an undertaking which was done with the full participation of the thirty-five school boards, with the Denominational Education Committees with which each of the school boards is affiliated, the Integrated Committee, the Catholic Committee and the Pentecostal Committee, as well as all the others I have mentioned.

The \$20.3 million being the total of the projects identified as needed was and is being distributed over a three year period to coincide with the phase in of the reorganized high school programme, according to that denominational ratio, with 57 per cent of the amount going to the Integrated Committee, 37 per cent to the Catholic Committee, and 5.5 per cent to the Pentecostal Committee.

Now, that requirement laid down in our constitution was understood by all participants at all times. To my knowledge there was never any proposal to distribute the money along any other lines. And, Mr. Speaker, I have to reiterate that my statements regarding funding for the high school programme have always been consistent with that kind of distribution which accords with our constitution.

A second point, Mr. Speaker, is that present legislation requires that a school board receiving a capital project, benefitting from school construction, has to contribute to that project a minimum of 10 per cent of the cost. That arrangement has been in effect for several years. There was never

MS. VERGE: any word or commitment on my part, or on the part of any other member of government, in the exercise of planning for the reorganized high school programme that that requirement be changed. The Federation of School Boards presented a report to government last November in which they recommended major changes in the financing of education.

With respect to capital funding, the Federation of School Boards recommended a significant change which would be that government assume total responsibility in future for the cost of school construction.

MS. VERGE:

That is a recommendation which has been considered, There has not been a commitment one way or the other as of yet as to government's response.

On the operating side, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. minister's time has

elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave has not been granted.

MS. VERGE:

I will have to conclude my

remarks later, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to

recapitulate because I realize it is a difficult and complex topic for hon. members -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before the hon. member for

Terra Nova starts his time, I would like to rule on a point of order raised by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

It is referring to a letter quoted by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). The only reference that I can find in Beauchesne, paragraph 327, Section 6,

' A private member has neither the right nor the obligation to table an official, or any other, document'. I would entertain any other references.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, just to recapitulate,

I have been pointing out for some time that according to school boards and other educators throughout the Province that \$20.3 million is not sufficient money to bring in the Grade XII programme. Point number two is that the school

MR. LUSH: boards only receive 90 per cent of the determined cost of the facilities that would be needed to bring in Grade XII. The government conducted a study found out that the cost would be X number of dollars and they only gave them 90 per cent, thus that \$20.3 million is only 90 per cent of the government's own determined cost to provide facilities for the new high school programme. Thirdly, having done that survey, having identified the needs in every school board district, they did not give them the money they needed, what school boards thought they were going to get. If it was determined, for example, in one school board they needed \$2 million, they did not get that because the government applied the formula on the per capita basis, they gave the money out on a per capita basis. And one of the divisions of the DEC, the IEC, had a shortfall of \$2 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what the minister has indicated is that that survey was useless anyway because, according to the minister, the survey was done, it was decided that it was going to cost X number of dollars of which

MR. LUSII:

they provided \$20.3 million, which was ninety per cent of the determined cost, they were going to give \$20.3 million. But the survey was no good, obviously, because she just gave the money over to the DECs, that is what the minister is saying, for them to give out. But no relationship now to the survey that was done, because the DECs were not told, 'Now, you give out this money according to the surveys; but school boards understood that, in this particular case, school boards understood in this particular case - that the DECs would just simply be the delivery agency, if you will. The survey was done and school boards knew - they all got a copy of what the costs were - so they were able to look at this and say, 'Well, we are going to get \$5 million out of which we are going to build three classrooms, a gymnasium or whatever, we are going to get that.' But the minister passed it over to the DECs and that was not the case; it was to be done according to tradition and according to the laws of this land. But for this one-shot deal a lot of school boards thought it was going to be different, otherwise why the survey? Now the DECs, as I have indicated, were placed between a rock and a hard place because one division got a short fall of \$2 million, so they would not be able to give the money anyway, they got a short fall of \$2 million because of the formula applied, the money given out on a per capita basis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will read a letter that has come my way. It was written to the Integrated Education Committee from one school board in this Province. The person writing the letter is not designated as an official of the school board. I think he writes it as a concerned citizen of that school board.

MR.LUSH: And, Mr. Speaker, this is what he says. He writes the letter to the Executive Secretary of the Integrated Education Committee and says, "Dear Sir."

AN HON.MEMBER: Table it.

MR.LUSH: Yes, it will be tabled.

"I am astonished to learn that the finance subcommittees of the Integrated Education Committee has decided to countermand the decision of the Department of Education given under the authority of the minister to provide funds to erect a gymnasium for St. Paul's High School , Harbour Grace. The matter of the funds allocated by the minister for St. Paul's High School and vetoed"- Mr. Speaker, this is very important.I will read that again -" The matter of the funds allocated by the minister for St. Paul's High School and vetoed by the Integrated Education Committee is the only question at issue. No further comment was made by the Department of Education and no commitment at all was made by the Integrated Education Committee." So, Mr. Speaker, here this gentleman is saying that the IEC vetoed the directive by the minister,or

MR. LUSH:   whichever way it goes, it did not necessarily have to be signed by the minister herself, but from her department saying that the monies were allocated for St. Paul's High School for a gymnasium. But the IEC vetoed that.

  Now it goes on to say "In preparation for the reorganized high school programme, the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) ordered a survey of all high schools in the Province to ascertain the need for additional facilities.                         The need for a gymnasium for St. Paul's High School was recognized and funds allocated for that purpose. Nothing could be more definite and final. We had not asked for this gymnasium. It was granted to provide St. Paul's High School with the minimum acceptable facilities for the new programme as stated in the minister's release." This is what the letter says. It says, "The monies were allocated for St. Paul's High School as stated in the minister's release." And I will just inform the minister of what the gentleman was talking about and she can say whether it is correct or not.

  Somewhere after the study was done and the government allocated the \$20.3 million based on its survey, I am told that a letter came out from the department to each of the school boards saying these are your needs, and they were all specified, these are your needs. And they were all specified school, free classrooms, a gymnasium and all this totals, for example, say, \$2 million. And the letter stated that this will be given to you over the next three years by the DECs -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:

- by the appropriate DEC

division, this is the way it was done. That the minister had said that this is our cost analysis -

MR. TULK:

Did you do that?



MR. LUSH: - this is the result of our survey, and this is what we found in your school board and your needs are these in dollars and cents and specified the item. So, as I have said, just to use a hypothetical figure, say for school board X it was \$2 million to put on three classrooms and a gym. And went on to say that this money will be passed over to the DECs and they will in turn give the money to you, deliver it to you over the next three years.

MR. TULK: Did she say that?

MR. LUSH: But in this case, this was the understanding-

MR. TULK: Seriously, did you write that letter?

MR. LUSH:

-if I can generalize, this is what a school board member is understanding. So, Mr. Speaker, the letter goes on to say, 'An untenable situation now exists in Newfoundland education. A committee deriving its authority from government has publicly defied a decision of the Minister of Education and usurped the prerogatives of government'. And it goes on to say that, 'Tradition offers few options'. It says, 'One, a reversal of the decision by the committee with an apology to the minister. Secondly, an overruling of the decision by the minister with reprimand. Third, resignation of the present members of the DEC committee. Fourth, a resignation of the Minister of Education.' But now, Mr. Speaker, the letter is not all that blatant. It goes on to say, 'The last option is least desirable and most unjust since the minister is quite innocent of involvement in the matter. The Integrated Education Committee has offended the dignity of the office of the Minister of Education and set at naught the authority of a minister of the Crown.'

Now let me explain to the minister the questions that have to be answered as a result of that, and I will table the letter, Mr. Speaker. The problem is the survey was done in consultation with school boards with their superintendents and the needs were identified and the cost of these needs. A second letter was sent back to verify with school boards whether or not each individual school board - to verify whether or not this was the cost, whether these were the needs, and whether the costing was right. And the superintendents verified that it was.

MR. LUSH:

Now obviously school boards would think, having gone through that procedure they would have thought that when the money was given to the DEC's it would be passed over to them since the study was done with each school board identifying specifically what the needs were. It was only natural that school boards would think that that is the way it was supposed to be. But what the minister has to clarify

MR. LUSH:

is whether or not the DECs were given any instructions to give out the money according to the cost analysis study that was done, or whether the money was given, the same as all capital works monies, for the DECs to divy out in the way that they always did it, meeting with their own particular school boards and identifying the needs. Because if that is the way it was done, if the money was given out in this way, in the way that all capital works monies are given out, then the survey was useless and just created misunderstanding with school boards because school boards are out there waiting to get the money that was identified by this cost analysis study, as happened with this particular school board.

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

MR. LUSH: This particular school board believes, Mr. Speaker, that they are entitled to monies from the minister and there needs to be some explanation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) is saying by inference that the denominational education system, and the principles which that embodies about distribution of public funds for school construction, should be done away with and that there should be some alternative arrangement. I am intrigued by the hon. member's remarks and I would be interested in hearing an expansion of his proposal for an alternative to the denominational education system. What the hon. member has said is that in the case of the reorganized high school programme that the \$20 million-plus of public funds dedicated for facilities should have been distributed directly by government, by the Department of

MR. VERGE: Education, to school boards, with the Denominational Education Committees, the arms of the churches in education, bypassed. The hon. member is suggesting that it was somehow wrong and improper and inefficient of government to have given the money in the traditional way, according to the principles of the denominational education system, to the Denominational Education Committees.

Further, the member is suggesting that there was something wrong in apportioning that money according to the denominational ratio in a non-discriminatory way, which is required by our Constitution. And what I would like the hon. member to do is to outline his proposal for changing the denominational education system and for distributing public funds for school construction in future. This is perhaps the first time in the history of this hon. House, or certainly in the three years that I have been privileged to be a member, that I have heard a member propose an alteration to, a change in the denominational education system. And I would very much like to hear the hon. member's suggestions for an alternative to this system of education which we have had for many years.

Now the hon. member quoted

MS. L. VERGE: from a letter, the copy he was reading, I have not seen but I gather that it is one that was recently published in a couple of the St. John's newspapers. The author of that letter evidences a misunderstanding of the denominational education system, deliberate or otherwise. He indicates that the Denominational Education Committees get their authority from government when in fact their authority is derived from the Constitution. One of the key features of our system of education is that there is a partnership between government and the churches, those denominations which earned rights in education because of early involvement, rights codified in the Terms of Union back in 1949. Under this partnership each of the partners has certain rights which compliment each other, and this partnership has worked well. In the case of the capital funding for the re-organized high school programme, tradition was honoured. The Denominational Education Committees and the Department of Education worked hand in hand as partners, jointly participated on the Steering Committee, which I outlined earlier, jointly carried out the survey of building requirements, which government fully approved by allocating the total amount of money identified, \$20.3 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind hon. members of the generous commitment of the Peckford administration to improving our high school education.

For school construction, specifically to cover those needs relating from the expansion, with the new curriculum and credit system and the extra grades, there is provided the \$20.3 million over three years. But in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, there has been a provision for the past two years of \$10.8 million, so that in the present fiscal year it is estimated that there will be \$22.8 million for new school construction in our Province. Now, in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, for operating requirements of school boards,

June 24, 1982

Tape No. 1679

MJ - 2

MS. L. VERGE: basically all the operating costs except for teachers salaries, which are paid directly by the provincial government, there is provided in the estimates currently being considered an across-the-board increase of twelve per cent, but in addition to the twelve per cent increase, Mr. Speaker, a \$2.5 million fund to be given to those school boards most in need. And with those operating funds, school boards will be able to come up with their minimum ten per cent share of the cost of new capital projects.

MS. VERGE: A major breakthrough in these estimates is a \$400,000 fund, Mr. Speaker, \$400,000 to be given by the Department of Education to subsidize the cost to school boards of equipment needed for the new courses being added in our high schools. These courses include, Mr. Speaker, science courses. Chemistry and physics are being introduced in many of our schools for the first time and are being offered to more and more students. Business Education, Mr. Speaker, typing and other Business Education courses are being offered not only through the pre-vocational programme but in all kinds of schools across the Province, in rural and urban centres.

Another course which will benefit from this \$400,000 subsidy fund, Mr. Speaker, is industrial art. There are a lot more shop courses in schools across the Province now than were possible formerly. And, of course, home economics, again an expansion in enrollment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the biggest outlay of public funds of all for the improvements in high school is the generous increase in the number of salaries for teachers in relation to the number of students.

Mr. Speaker, last year, in April of 1981, government announced a three year plan to increase the number of teachers which, when fully implemented in September of 1983, with the main component of the allocation formula being a ratio of twenty-three to one, will provide 760 more teaching positions across our Province, for kindergarten through Grade XII, than we would have had if we had not made those changes. And of that 760 total, Mr. Speaker, there will be new jobs created totalling about 470. That is a significant boost



MS. VERGE: to our education system  
and to the economy of the Province.

And, Mr. Speaker, when  
that commitment is fully implemented in little more  
than a year from now, in September of 1983, assuming  
none of the other provinces of Canada alter their  
pupil/teacher ratios, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland and  
Labrador will have the lowest pupil/teacher ration in  
the whole country, and that is according to Statistics  
Canada information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE: Comparing apples with  
apples, dividing all the teachers of every kind,  
specialist teachers, special education teachers, class-  
room teachers from kindergarten through high school  
by the total number of students, Newfoundland and  
Labrador will have the most generous provision of  
teachers when our commitment is fully implemented in  
the next school year, 1983 - '84, which coincides with  
the start of Grade XII.

MS. VERGE: Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite are talking about some kind of a letter. The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) read a letter which I have not seen yet, It sounds like the letter I read in the St. John's newspapers, in the Letters to the Editor column, by Mr. Roy Goodwin of Harbour Grace, to the Intergrated Education Committee. I have to reiterate that Mr. Goodwin, according to his letter as published, does not evidence a proper understanding of the principles of our denominational education system. Apparently he does not understand that there is a partnership between the provincial government and the churches, that each has certain rights which are complimentary, that in the area of school construction the Denominational Education Committees have the right to receive public funds on a non-discriminatory basis and that they have the sole right to distribute those funds.

The churches alone, under our Constitution, determine priorities for school construction. This determination has always been done in co-operation with the Department of Education, a co-operation which has been enriched over the past couple of years, and there was outstanding co-operation, Mr. Speaker, in the preparation for the reorganized high school programme.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to end by again calling on the hon. member for Terra Nova to outline to this hon. House his ideas for an alternative to our denominational education system. I would like for him to explain -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - under what arrangements our Constitution could be changed so that the Denominational Educational Committees would be cut out of decisions relating

MS. VERGE: to school construction -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER( Aylward): Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - so that funds could be allocated on a discriminatory basis. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief -

MR. NEARY: Recover the funds or resign.

MR. WARREN: - because my hon. colleagues from Terra Nova ( Mr. Lush ) and Fogo ( Mr. Tulk ) want to ask more questions of the minister. But I want to lay on the Table, Mr. Speaker, two photographs that I had the privilege of taking. These are of the interior of the Nain school about which the minister said I was exaggerating in the Committees there a while ago.

MR. DAWE: Oh, no, the hon. member is exaggerating.

MR. WARREN: So I had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of going to Nain last week and I took two photographs of a room in that school where there is usually a blanket or a piece of plywood or something like that used for a door. So I want to lay these on the Table, Mr. Speaker, to show the hon. Minister of Education ( Ms. Verge ) that this is a fact -

MS. VERGE: What does pupil/teacher ratio mean?

MR. WARREN: - that this is really happening in Nain, where teachers are obliged to teach in little cubby-holes with no doors to them whatsoever. And the minister is so preoccupied with Grade Xll, yet she does not even have facilities and infrastructure in place for grades

June 24, 1982

Tape No. 1681

SD-3

MR. WARREN:

that we already have

in the Province.

MR. WARREN:

I just want to lay these on the table, Mr. Speaker, and the minister can see for herself that I was not exaggerating when I told her that the teachers are obliged to teach in the schools in Nain with blankets up in place of doors.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

Before I recognize the next speaker, it being five o'clock on Thursday I have to advise hon. members that we have two items for debate on the Late Show, the first item being an item from the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) who says he is not satisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Health (Mr. House) with respect to the salmonella poisoning. And the second question is also from the hon. member for Torngat Mountains who is not satisfied with the answers given by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) re the discontinuance of EPA's Tuesday flight to and from Labrador.

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about this point that the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) brought before this House. I think the minister, a minute ago, looked across the House at the member for Terra Nova and asked him if he wanted to change the system of allocation of funds for school construction in this Province.

I would suggest to the minister that she, herself, in setting up the Grade XII programme, has gone a long way toward doing exactly that, changing that system. Even some of the things that are being said in this House today -

MR. SIMMS: That is progress.

MR. TULK: That is progress. It probably might be, Mr. Speaker, but if they want to change it, then let them do it in the legal fashion in this House.

The minister says she set up a steering committee of which there was a sub-committee to do a survey in this Province. The fact of the matter is, as we understand it, that that sub-committee was aborted, and in a hurry the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) appointed a gentleman to go around this Province and establish priorities for the Department of Education. At that point, after hurriedly establishing those priorities and the survey was done, the minister allocated \$20.3 million to the DECs. Now let me ask the minister a few questions. If indeed the DECs are the people in this Province who are going to put the school construction in place for Grade XII, why did this minister, herself, have to carry out that survey? The DECs had done their survey, were doing their survey, and they indicated that there was twice the amount needed that the minister had allocated,

MR. TULK: so why did she, in the beginning, interfere in that process? Why did she not go to the DECs?

MR. MORGAN: The hon. Rompkey is the man to send to for help.

MR. TULK: Well, I can call him a he. Would the he from Bonavista (Mr. Morgan) please be quite. Why did the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) go to the DECs with her list rather than saying to them, would you go out - we need this much for Grade XII, would you go out and do a survey and come back to this government and say how much is needed to bring Grade XII into this Province? Because that is their job. Regardless of whether the minister realizes it or not, the DECs are the people in this Province who set the priorities for school construction.

MS. VERGE: Tell that to your friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush).

MR. NEARY: No, he is telling you.

MR. TULK: He is trying to tell you.

MR. NEARY: You overruled them.

MR. TULK: He is trying to tell you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister has set up her priorities, she set up her priorities for the DECs and for the school boards in this Province.

MR. NEARY: And they would not buy it.

MR. TULK: Well, Mr. Speaker, what irony! What irony! If you ask that minister a question in this House about school construction in the Province and the allocation of funds for a specific school, she stands in her place and says, quite rightly, the DECs are the people to allocate funds for school construction in the Province and who decide on the priorities. But here we have her own

MR. TULK: flipping in her enthusiasm for Grade XII, she flipped and said, "No, I am going to establish the priorities". And would not boards think - if you are going around this Province doing that survey, the boards would naturally think that whatever the minister says is going to be allocated for Grade XII, a special project, is what is going to be allocated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, then she goes and allocates, which again is right, which she has to do to show the fallacy of the whole situation, she goes and allocates the funds on a per capita basis for a special project. Grade XII to be considered special. The extensions that are needed, the classrooms that are needed to be added on, the gymnasiums and so on, that has to be considered special.

MR. NEARY: She made a gigantic blunder.

MR. TULK: The minister was saying - by doing that - the minister was saying that the needs of every school board in this Province are the same for that extension.



MR. TULK: In other words, they are all equal at this point in time and we are just going to allocate on a per capita basis to keep them equal. But she should have recognized that one of the real problems in this Province is that there are certain school boards in the Province which have good facilities already for Grade XII and there are other school boards which do not. She should have recognized that, and she should have perhaps encouraged the DECs and the school boards to come to some sort of an agreement on that but she did not. She did not do that, she allocated on a per capita basis without playing a leadership role in that regard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I have basically said is that I believe that the minister has somehow, and I do not believe knowingly, I think it was overenthusiasm to do her job for the Premier who says you have to have Grade XII in Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Or ignorance of the system and procedures.

MR. TULK: And I think somewhat - yes, there must have been some ignorance of the system itself. But the member for Terra Nova introduced a very important question a few minutes ago. And this is where the minister can say - never mind getting up and talking about the beautiful courses we are putting in Grade XII, never mind about the number of teachers we are putting in Grade XII.

MR. HOUSE: All you can talk about is facilities.

MR. TULK: The former minister who got flicked out of it should be quiet. He got flicked out of the Department of Education. Mr. Speaker, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) has said that

MR. TULK: as far as he knows the minister wrote a letter to the school boards saying that as a result of our survey here are your needs.

MS VERGE: I did not write anything.

MR. TULK: Well, if you did not get up and say so. Never mind getting on with all this nonsense. In a minute you will have a chance to get up and say so.

MR. LUSH: That is what this gentleman says in his letter.

MS. VERGE: That is not what I said.

MR. TULK: Then she went on to say that those needs would be met in the next three years. And then she went on to point out that the DECs would be the delivery agent. Now, Mr. Speaker, that minister has no more right to tell the DECs, and the DECs know this, she has no more right to tell the DECs -

MS. VERGE: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): A point of order. The hon. the Minister of Education .

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I wrote no such letter as the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) alleges I did. If the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) thought I wrote such a letter, I would like to know his grounds for making such a statement. There was no such letter. So there is really no point to waste the time of the hon. House in discussing some miserable letter which does not exist.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, are you going to rule on that point of order?

MR. SPEAKER(McNicholas)            There is a difference of opinion between two hon. members in this matter.

MR. TULK:                            Mr. Speaker, if the minister - she will, in a few minutes, get her chance to stand up - did not write that letter we will accept that and that is fair enough, no problem. No problem.

MR. BAIRD:                            You are guilty until you are proven innocent, are you? Proven innocent.

MR. TULK:                            No, we are asking her a question, did she indeed write that letter.

MR. BAIRD:                            She just said no.

MR. TULK:                            In any case, whether she did or not, by carrying out her survey -

MR. BAIRD:                            Come on, now make up your mind.

MR. TULK:                            There are two ways that it is being said that the minister interferred with the DECs, first of all by conducting that survey and leading everybody down the garden path to believe that indeed what she said would - the survey would be the case.

MR. STAGG:                            Look her straight in the eye now. Look her straight in the eye.

MR. TULK:                            Yes, and look the member for Stephenville(Mr. Stagg) straight in the face too. But he is not as good looking as the Minister of Education. So why should I not look her in the face?

    The survey itself led boards in this Province to believe, and the DECs to believe that what the minister said she was going to do she was going to do, namely, establish her own priorities. And that she did by appointing that survey. Now whether she wrote the letter or not the minister knows and, I guess, the member for Terra Nova(Mr. Lush) will find out. But in any case, the minister has now, by using that thing in Grade XII, by establishing her own priorities,

MR. TULK: by making it known  
throughout this Province - this letter shows that  
school board members believe -

MR. BAIRD: Table it. Table it.

MR. TULK: Oh, he is going to table  
it, are you not?

MR. LUSH: Oh, yes. I have it here.

MR. TULK: - that school board members  
believe that what the minister said was going to be the  
case was going to be the case. Now, who led them to  
believe that? It was obviously the survey put out by  
the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and done by the  
Minister of Education.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at least  
the ministers owes to that board, and many others in  
the Province, I understand, owes to that man and many  
other people in this Province an explanation of why  
she led them to believe that - and an explanation to  
the DECs. She owes an apology to the DECs for, in  
the first place, carrying out the survey instead of  
asking them to do it.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE: I think it is shocking  
that the hon. members opposite are ranting and raving  
about matters of principle in the denominational  
education system without the apparent benefit of any  
consultation with the Denominational Education Committees  
themselves or any school boards.

They seem to be pointing  
to their one and only source for some discontent, to one  
individual school board member writing on his own behalf  
to the Integrated Education Committee and having

MS. VERGE: published his correspondence  
in the St. John's newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, there is  
latent inconsistency in the remarks of the two members  
opposite. First the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush)  
complained about the capital funding for the high  
school programme having been

MS. L. VERGE: channelled through the DECs in the traditional way and not being given directly to school boards, suggesting that it would have been preferable to ignore the DECs, and then the member for Pogo ( Mr. Tulk ), sitting to his left, suggests that there was some interference with the traditional rights of the DECs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the DECs were full participants in the process of determining the capital needs for high schools, of conducting that survey that we heard so much about, of approving the survey as partners in and joint participants on the steering committee charged with the responsibility for planning the programme and a recommendation endorsed by them as well as the Federation of schools Boards, as well as the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and the Faculty of Education of the University, and the Federation of Home and School Associations, which government fully honoured by providing the exact total amount of money requested. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the one man author of the letter quoted by the member for Terra Nova ( Mr. T. Lush ) is confused, then it must be a result of poor communications between him and his school board, between him and the Federation of School Boards, between him and the Intergrated Education Committee. And it is some misunderstanding which is not worthy of taking up any more time of this hon. House, it is a problem which perhaps the members opposite can resolve by sitting down with Mr. Goodwin in Harbour Grace and thrashing it out with the agencies responsible, the Avalon North Intergrated School Board, the Federation of School Boards, and the Intergrated Education Committee.

June 24, 1982

Tape No. 1686

MLeP-2

MS.VERGE:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to say again that the survey of capital requirements for the high school programme is a joint product of the Denominational Education Committees, the Federation of School Boards, all those other agencies and the department.

MS. VERGE: A lot of the leg work was done by officials of the Department of Education, civil servants, but the final product was shared by all of those agencies co-operatively. And as far as I know, Mr. Speaker, the Denominational Education Committees and the Federation of School Boards were quite pleased with the response of government in approving the same amount of funds as those requested by that co-operative effort.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer for a moment to the remarks of the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). He complains about the condition of the school in Nain. It is the James Haven Memorial School in Nain, which is an all grade school serving from kindergarten through high school, a school which I was privileged to visit in October of 1980 when I spent some time in Nain. Mr. Speaker, for those who have not had the opportunity of being in Nain, it is perhaps easy to have a misconception of a deprived school when, in fact, the opposite is the truth. That school is an outstanding one in our chain of 660 schools. It has a varied and rich programme of excellent quality, particularly in the arts. The Labrador East Integrated School Board which operates that building, enjoys the lowest pupil/teacher ratio in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE: That school board benefits not only from provincial programmes but it also gets some help from the Federal Native Peoples' Funding Arrangement. While the James Haven Memorial School may not be as excellent a structure as some of the DREE schools, as some of the more modern schools in the Province, it is still a sound structure. Now, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains tries to make a big deal about the allegation that there are blankets serving as dividers for rooms in that building.



MS. VERGE:

Now, the pictures which he tabled, Mr. Speaker, do not reveal any blankets. They do show a sound structure attractively decorated with a good quality orange divider, in much better shape than the dividers in the general office of the Department of Education downstairs in this building, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one reason why it may be necessary to make subdivisions of space in that building, the James Haven Memorial School, is that there is such a generous pupil/teacher ratio making possible a great number and variety of programmes. So, Mr. Speaker, from what I know of the James Haven Memorial School in Nain, it is one of the best in our Province, doing a good service to the students, with fine instruction by competent teachers who are innovative and dynamic and who are conducting some of the best programmes, especially in the arts, Mr. Speaker, of any of the 660 schools in our Province. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the  
minister is deliberately misunderstanding or deliberately  
misinterpreting what I have said or whether she misunder-  
stands what I have said, and that is possible. But, Mr.  
Speaker, the minister mentions that I am talking about  
a new system of allocating funds. No. I am simply raising  
concerns that have been expressed to me by school boards  
throughout the Province. That is what I was doing,  
Mr. Speaker, and pointing out to the minister that there  
is some misunderstanding with the way the money was divvied  
out for this new high school programme. That is the  
point I have been trying to make. And I am just not  
basing my remarks on this one letter, I can assure you.  
I have checked into this.

MR. BAIRD: Table the letters.

MR. LUSH: I will table the letter when  
I am finished with it, I have to use it again.  
And, Mr. Speaker, the point of the matter is this, that  
school boards throughout the Province, because of the  
procedure used by the minister in determining the needs,  
in determining the needs for facilities, because of the  
procedure used by the minister and because of subsequent  
correspondence after that, school boards thought that  
the specific needs identified for them and the cost attached  
to these needs, that they would get this money accord-  
ingly. Whatever was identified for a school board in  
terms of its needs, its facilities, and the costing of  
those needs, the school boards thought that they, individually,  
would get those specific amounts, as determined by this  
Cost Analysis Study. So they assumed for this one

MR. LUSH:

occasion, because of the pressing need to get the new high school on the tracks, that the DECs would be acting as delivery agents just to fit in with the legislation in this Province. Rather than the minister allocating the money herself, they assumed that for this one occasion it was going to be given to the DECs and given to the school boards in turn. In other words, that the DECs would be just acting as a delivery agent. And, Mr. Speaker, there are many school boards in the Province that assumed that was the way it was going to be. That it was not going to be given to the DECs to be divvied out in the way that they have done in the past. And this is not my view, and I do not want the minister to try and misconstrue or try to misinterpret that. I am saying what has come to me from school boards throughout the Province, not this one school board, not this one man, but several other authorities. Mr. Speaker, their understanding was and is that the monies identified in this Cost Analysis Study would come through each school board through the DECs. That is what they assumed. They did not think that it was not going to be given to the DECs and for them now, as they have done in the past, to determine where the money was going after the study was done, as the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) pointed out. What else could they think? When this survey was going on, when letters came back to them telling them, outlining their needs and the cost of these needs

MR. LUSH: what else were they to think? And then the minister talks about a covering letter. I do not have it. I have had the letter read to me which came from the Department of Education. It does not mean the minister's signature was attached to it, but everything that comes from the minister's office, naturally comes under the authority of the minister. The letter came from the Department of Education via the DEC's to the school boards saying - and this is where this gentleman here, says, 'Makes the point as stated in the minister's release'. And that was the release, the letter that came through - and I hope to have a copy of that letter tomorrow - the letter came through the department via the DEC's to the school boards outlining, in essence, that the needs have been identified for each school board and that the school boards would be given the money in turn through the DEC's. So obviously the people in Harbour Grace thought they were going to get the money for their gym. But the DEC's vetoed that money and this particular school board did not think that the DEC's had this power at this particular point in time. They would have realized that in the ways monies were distributed in the past, but not at this particular time. I was told by a superintendant today that there is not a school board in the Province that knew that that was the procedure, I was told by a superintendant today that not one school board-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: - in the Province knew that the money was going to be given out any other way than that determined by the survey, not a school board in the Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not recommending that the system be changed, I am just simply outlining what school boards throughout the Province believe to be the way that the monies-

MS. VERGE: How would you have allocated them?

MR. LUSH: - would be allocated.

MR. HISCOCK: We will show you when we get over there.

MR. LUSH: How would I have allocated it? I probably would have done it that way. I probably would have done it through my survey. I probably would have done it through my survey and said to the DEC's, 'You give this money to each of the school boards the way we have identified it. I probably would have, I do not know. One has to be in the circumstances. One has to be in the circumstances. I do not know what I would have done, but I certainly would not have confused school boards in the Province, I would not have had them all confused,

MR. LUSH: not knowing what the situation is. It is not for me to decide how it is to be done, it is for the minister. When I get there I will decide how it is going to be done, and everybody will know, Mr. Speaker. But the point of the matter is that the minister has been getting up here and trying to misrepresent and mis construe the remarks that we have been making. We are not advocating a change in the system. The school boards thought the minister had brought about a change. They thought she did but she did not, she just gave the monies to be allocated in the same way. And the point of the matter is, the point that has to be made clear, is that school boards did not understand that the money was going to be allocated in that way, hence, now, school board X, if it has been decided by the survey that their needs would cost \$2 million, now they are not going to get that \$2 million. They might now only get \$1 million, they might get \$800,000 they might not get any. They might not get any, But they did not understand that, they believed, because the department was carrying out a cost analysis, that whatever they determined the cost would be to meet their particular needs to bring in the reorganized high school programme that they would be getting that money. And that is why the people in the Avalon North School Board district, are so upset, because they assumed that this allocation of funds - they did not know that it was just an academic exercise, they did not know that it was an exercise in futility. When they came back and said the cost of your gym will be \$380,000, whatever it was, they assumed that was the commitment from the government to give them the money

MR. LUSH: to build that gym so they could offer a physical education programme to their high school. But it got vetoed, it got vetoed by the DECs.

MR. VERGE: You are not taking it out on the IECs?

MR. LUSH: No, no, I am just saying what the reality is, I am just saying what school boards - I do not know whether the minister can understand this. This particular school board thought they were going to get the money and they did not think, obviously, that the DEC's, or the IEC's in this particular case, had the power to veto that which was already approved, a sum of money that was already approved by the Provincial Department of Education. That is the way that they saw it, That is the way they saw it. And believe me, that is just not the view of this one man, so something went wrong. They are not saying that that is the way it should be or it should not be that way, they are simply saying that is the way we understood it to be.

MR. TULK: But under the law she should have known better.

MR. LUSH: That is right. That is the way we understood it to be. And they say, from the minister's release, whatever that release is - it will be forthcoming to me in the mail and we will see what it is then. I remember the gist of the release was to the effect that because now your needs have been costed, because the facilities you need in your area have been costed, you now will receive these through the DEC's or the IEC's, whatever the appropriate committee was. So, Mr. Speaker, there is nobody here attempting to say that we change the procedures

MR. LUSH: for allocating capital expenditures with respect to schools. Nobody is saying that. All we are saying is that minister and the Department of Education have confused school boards throughout the Province, they have confused them. That is what has happened. And, Mr. Speaker, it looks like, as I say, this survey was an exercise in futility, that school boards should not use that as any kind of guide as to what money they going to get, the monies have been given to the DECs, which is required. The monies have been given to the DECs to administer, to allocate in the way that they do, and the way that they have done ever since we have had the denominational system of education, or ever since we brought in this new structure. So, that is what is going on, Mr. Speaker. But, the minister must realize that school boards, many school boards throughout the Province are confused. After today hopefully they will not be, and I think that will help alleviate the problem tremendously. I know this one superintendent that I spoke to in Newfoundland, he certainly after today is going to understand the situation, because he thought the situation was that because the cost analysis was done with his school board, because of that he would be getting that money through the DECs, no questions asked, that he was going to get, well, not \$2 million, but certainly \$1,800,000, a reasonable figure from whatever the cost of analysis was, and certainly did not think that the DECs had the power or the IECs in this particular case, and that becomes difficult, the IECs in this particular case had the power to veto something that the minister already approved.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. LUSH: Now, I am not saying that, that is what this gentleman is saying, and, as I said, he is not alone. The man is not alone in this belief, this is something many school boards throughout the Province believe. And I just want



MR. LUSH: to make sure that that is straightened out, that we on this side of the House are not advocating a new system for financing education, we are just talking about the misunderstanding that has resulted as a result of the circumstances surrounding the establishment of this money for the new High School programme, and the way that it was divided out. School boards misunderstood that completely. I hope that the minister will let school boards know that that is not the way it was, the survey did not mean anything, the survey did not mean that you were going to get the numbers of dollars that were identified for this particular school board. It depended on the DECs to give out money the same way as they did in the past. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the problem, that is the problem. But, as I have said before, the minister must understand that these are views that have come from school boards and superintendents throughout the Province. It is not something that we are convoluting on this side, it is not something that we are fabricating over here, these are problems that have come to us through contact with school boards, school board members, and superintendents, Mr. Speaker, It is not something that I glean from the papers, not something that I glean from the papers at all,

MR. LUSH: I have done a lot of research on this, a lot of research, Mr. Speaker, and I know the way school boards, and school board members feel throughout the Province. And they are not objecting to the fact that the DFCs are giving out the money. That is not the point. They are not objecting to that, they are objecting to the fact that they thought they were going to get the monies that were identified as a result of the study.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. LUSH: They thought they were going to get the monies that were identified in this study. Hence, if I can make it crystal clear, Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. LUSH: If I could just finish with a half a sentence, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. HISCOCK: Go on, do it anyway.

MS. L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, just one sentence. \$20.3 million was asked for by the agencies in education, \$20.3 million was provided.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Is the House ready for the question? On motion, the report of the Social Services Estimates was concurred in. It now being 5:30, there are two questions for the Late Show, the first one raised by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains ( Mr. Warren) to the Minister of Transportation re the discontinuance of flights into Labrador.  
The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the Question Period I asked the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) - I figured at that time, Mr. Speaker, it was a very simple question, but apparently I could not get an answer from the very simple minister. The question, Mr. Speaker, was, 'Has the Minister been in contact with Eastern Provincial Airways concerning the withdrawal of the Tuesday flights in and out of Labrador? And to quote the minister - I am surprised, because in his rebuttle he did say that he intervened with EPA's intention of withdrawing from Deer Lake. I must admit that his department had done a good job in convincing EPA not to withdraw from Deer Lake. However, the answer that the minister gave me, I wish to quote again, he said, 'I am aware of the situation as it relates to the discontinuation of a flight from Labrador, but it was within the jurisdiction of the Canadian Transport Commission and their Air Services Division, or the Air Transport Division which approves or disapproves flight changes or scheduling as it relates to aircraft in Canada.

MR. WARREN: So he said yes, that I should contact the CTC. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador - I presume he must be the minister for Newfoundland and Labrador, but the way he answered this question he appeared to be more interested in Newfoundland than he is in Labrador.

So I am expecting that the minister will get up and say that today - he had twenty-four hours since yesterday, since I asked the question. I hope today that he can tell the House that he has contacted Harry Steele and his officials at Eastern Provincial Airways -

MR. BAIRD: Did you contact Harry Steele?

MR. WARREN: Yes, I have.

MR. BAIRD: When?

MR. WARREN: Today.

MR. BAIRD: Today, eh?

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. BAIRD: Yes.

MR. WARREN: I have done my homework. if the minister would do his and you do yours, probably EPA would not withdraw from Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering if the minister has any intention of intervening with Eastern Provincial Airways on their withdrawal of the Tuesday flights?

This was announced over two weeks ago by the President of Eastern Provincial Airways - it only took the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) one day to stop the topless waitress downtown -

MR. BAIRD: Yes, with your blessing.

MR. WARREN: That is right. That is right. He did it with my blessing, so why cannot the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) do the same thing with my blessing?

If I am so influential with the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) in getting a topless waitress removed from a bar downtown, I hope I can be as influential with the Minister of Transportation in getting EPA to continue their Tuesday flights into Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister can get up - and do not go gabbing off about what he is planning to do and all this kind of stuff, why does he not come up with some concrete information and tell us that he has been in contact with Eastern Provincial Airways and he does have answers to the problem.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) ceases to amaze me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: However, I will endeavour to pick through

MR. DAWE: the verbal shenanigans that he was trying to get on with. And I remind the hon. gentleman again of a few facts of life. The air services in this country, the air operations, the regulations regarding air services, the approval or disapproval of routes of travel, of where they can travel in Canada, airports that they can land at and cannot land at, their schedule of flights in and out of those particular communities, the rates that they charge, are all subject to federal regulations. The area to which the hon. gentleman is referring is represented, I believe, by one William Rumpkey-

MR. SIMMS: Rumpkey.

MR. DAWE: Oh, Rumpkey - the federal Cabinet Minister who is supposed to be representing the interests of not only his district, which is involved in this particular area, but also the interests of all Newfoundland and Labrador in his deliberations with his colleagues and other federal agencies. This particular matter falls squarely and solely in the area of federal responsibility. It is Mr. Rumpkey's obligation. It is his duty. It is the duty of the members representing the districts of Labrador, representing the districts of the Island, to make sure - and we have been attempting to do so with very little success, in trying to make sure that one Mr. William Rumpkey, the MP -

MR. SIMMS: Rumpkey.

MR. DAWE: Rumpkey, I am sorry - carries out his responsibilities to this Province. And unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that has not occurred. I would suggest again, as I did yesterday, that perhaps the hon. gentleman -

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

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has asked the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) if he would support the members for Labrador, the minister and the parliamentary secretary and the two members. But instead, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: - what we are getting is blatant patronage, supporting PC districts. Because Labrador is represented by Mr. William Rumpkey, MP, the government is not taking any action.

MR. MARSHALL: To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSAHLL: Number one, it is not a point of order. Number two, this is a five minute period of time in which the minister has to speak and the hon. gentleman should give him the courtesy of allowing him to speak.

MR. NEARY: Further to that point of order.

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

MR. NEARY: The last part of the hon.

gentleman's remarks, Mr. Speaker - a point of order is always in order in this House. It is a member's privilege

MR. NEARY: and his right to raise a point of order whenever he thinks a minister or a member is out of order. And my hon. colleague was just exercising his right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) did not raise a valid point of order.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated previously in answer to the question that was raised yesterday, the Province is aware of the situation and has been monitoring, officials from my department have been corresponding and in discussion, verbal and written, with representatives of Eastern Provincial Airways, getting information, gathering statistical information to see if their arguments - even though the Province has no real say into whether the CTC accept EPA's application to reduce its schedule or to change its schedule, whether they will authorize that, what we have asked for, as we have asked for in similar situations, is for the necessary information so that we can, if we so desire, make representation on behalf of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador where we see some discrepancies. But also, Mr. Speaker, as in the case of - people mentioned the area of Deer Lake where the people of the area took the necessary steps to make sure that their views were adequately brought forward and government assisted them in doing that. I think there is an onus.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, a year or so before that when some flights were supposedly to be discontinued into the Stephenville area the residents of Stephenville, through their transportation committee, did essentially the same thing, and government was supportive of them in that position. And we will continue to be supportive of any interest groups and any people who are affected by



MR. DAWE: scheduling changes and do whatever we can within the system where, even though we do not have the responsibility - and I suggest again to the hon. member that he direct his question to the people who do have some say into what happens to scheduling and flight changes in the air area. And we will continue, this government will continue, to support the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and try to make sure that the federal government lives up to its obligation of providing not only adequate transportation services but all other services in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

The second question to be debated is one raised by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) with regard to the outbreak of salmonella poisoning at the Glenbrook Lodge.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Today in Question Period - it has been brought to my attention by several people associated with the Glenbrook Lodge that they are concerned about the outbreak of alleged salmonella poisoning - I had the opportunity to ask the minister several questions but he was, as most ministers are, very, very vague in his answers.

MR. WARREN: I understand that there were some twenty-two cases reported as of the 17th of the month. Now, he also said that it was caused by the food, particularly chicken or poultry. It was only just last night, on the 23rd., that a lady, a member of the staff, was taken to the Health Science Complex in a very serious condition, and the symptoms were again of Salmonella Poisoning. So this is five days later than the 17th, surely goodness they have not been eating the same chicken everyday for the last five days so I am just wondering - the minister did leave the impression with the media today that they know the cause but they are not going to let the people know it.

MR. NEARY: Why not?

MR. WARREN: Now, that is my concern, it is the concern of the staff, it is the concern of the senior citizens in that home, that if they even suspect what the cause is, surely goodness the minister has an obligation to the staff and the residents of that home to let them know whether there is any danger to their health. And that is basically what the people want to know, if there is any danger to their health, can they go to work down there tomorrow morning comfortably, can the senior citizens tomorrow morning get up and have their three meals without any fear of getting in contact with this Salmonella Poisoning? So it is a very simple question to the minister and I think that the minister has been too evasive.

MR. NEARY: If he know the cause he should tell the people.

MR. WARREN: And if he knows the cause I believe he didinitely should tell the people, tell the staff and tell the general public, and even tell the Member from Humber West ( Mr. Baird), because he looks

MR. WARREN:

like he is a sick man already.

Mr. Speaker, you know, it is very simple to get up in the House and say that we are still checking into the cause. I am sure that the owners, the Salvation Army who operate this home, I am sure that they would not object, they would not object if there was something wrong in this home and an evacuation had to take place for one day, for two days, for three days. You know, it is the lives of the people that you are dealing with. It is not the dead chicken that you are eating, it is the lives of the people. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like for the minister if he know the causes, or if his department has ideas of what the causes are,

MR. WARREN:

for goodness sake, tomorrow, let the staff and the senior citizens in that home know - and let them be contented - if they do not have anything to worry about, because at the present time they are concerned. And in particular, the gentleman I met last night who took his wife to the Health Science Complex at 2 o'clock in the morning, he is most upset, he is most upset that his wife is working there and she does not know whether it is safe or healthy or not. When the staff and the senior citizens are advised that it is safe, there is no danger of deterioration in their health conditions, then, I think the people of the Province will be particularly pleased with the Minister of Health (Mr. House).

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond to that statement. First of all, the member is saying that I gave a vague answer. I always give vague answers when I get vague, asinine questions, and that is exactly what we got today. And for the member over there to be just saying that people are coming to him asking what the cause is, when Doctors have been there, the Public Health Department has been in there, their own Doctor on staff has been there, they have been talking to them and they know what the problem is. Now, the whole point about it is, Mr. Speaker, this happened between the period of the 10th and the 17th of this month, that is when the symptoms began to come out. This building is a new building, the cooking equipment is new, it is a very new building only opened a year, the cooking equipment is new, it is built to top standards and the staff, as far as the administration know, was kept in good

MR. HOUSE: order, clean, and so on. But sometimes the food - I did mention poultry as one of the main causes, poorly prepared or if it happens to get spoiled or left a little too long in one place or in the heat or something. the dressings and all this sort of thing, that could be the cause. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, the fact is it was after the fact, our inspectors were called in after the symptoms, after the Doctor identified that there were problems. And it is just crazy then to send everybody out, evacuate the place. They have isolated what they think the cause is and they know what the cause is, and it is just silly if they send all the guests around the country because the guests are possibly the ones who have the germ.

MR. WARREN: Are they alright?

MR. HOUSE: Are you going to wait for me to finish what I am saying? The reason they are not evacuating anybody is the fact that they are trying to isolate the people who may have the germ, the Salmonella germ.

MR. WARREN: Do you know how much there were?

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker -

MR. RIDEOUT: Do not play politics  
with the lives of people.

MR. HOUSE: - he just wants to play  
politics with the lives of people. That is about what  
he is trying to do. There have been nineteen cases  
isolated, there have been a number of deaths. But we  
do not know if they are related to this particular  
germ, and that is the thing that is being investigated.  
But I am saying, and I have said on behalf of the  
Department of Health, the Inspection Division, that  
there is no danger, they think they have the source,  
or are reasonably sure they have the source. You know,  
they are still working on the various people, particularly  
the cooking staff, who have been involved, and the  
dietary staff.

So there is no stone left  
unturned to try and resolve the problem. It is better,  
as I have said, to have the people kept in the institutions.  
We do not think there is any germ there now in any food  
or in any equipment, but there still may be carriers  
and that is what they are working on now, the people.

So, Mr. Speaker, basically  
what the hon. gentleman is trying to create is a bit  
alarming. Everything is being done to alleviate the  
situation. I want to give assurance that we do not  
think there is any danger there now, but we are still  
trying to isolate all the people who may have been in  
contact with the germ.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: A good answer. Good  
answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Russell):

Order, please!

It has been moved and  
seconded that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow,  
Friday, at 10:00 a.m. Those in favour 'aye', those  
against 'nay', carried.