

VOL. 2

NO. 22

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1983.

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR.DINN: Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Minister of Labour and Manpower met several times over the weekend in an attempt to find some 'common ground' whereby meaningful negotiations could proceed between the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, Treasury Board and the School Boards. towards affecting a successful collective agreement in the current dispute. The most recent meeting was with the NTA bargaining committee which concluded shortly after mid-day today. That committee is again examining their position with respect to the issues in dispute and it is expected that they will meet with the mediator later in the day. It is obvious that in any situation where negotiations have been protracted over many months that it is not an easy matter to find a quick solution. It would be giving false expectations to comment further and equally nonproductive for either side to be commenting in the press at this stage in a very sensitive situation.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR.LUSH: Mr. Speaker, as I have said for many days now, it is not our policy on this side of the House to try and make political points out of any labour dispute. It is simply, Mr. Speaker, to see that any bargaining unit, that the workers of any bargaining unit are treated fairly and justly under the laws of the land, under the laws related to their particular Collective Bargaining Act, and we are in this case very concerned about our students and

MR. LUSH: hope that they soon will be able to get back to their schools which they have been denied access to for a week now, a week tomorrow I think, denied their right to an education. We are concerned about these two matters so we just hope that this mediation process will be successful and there is nothing we are going to say or do to muddy the waters. We just certainly hope that the process is successful and that the whole matter is resolved as quickly as possible.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell) The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report on the success of the recently established Ocean Industries Capital Assistance Programme. This programme is designed to stimulate further development of the ocean industries sector by encouraging the expansion of Newfoundland companies and by helping to attract new ocean related industry to our Province.

MR. WINDSOR: Originally intended to be short term incentive measure, available in the 1982-83 fiscal year, the Ocean Industries Capital Assistance program has been extended into the present 1983-84 fiscal year. Total budget for this program was \$1.5 million and in order to obtain maximum effectiveness was made complementary to existing federal programs.

The Ocean Industries Capital Assistance program is directed towards those firms which manufacture products, equipment or provide technical services in support of commercial and scientific activities for use in the ocean. It is available to any local, national, or international entity whose business is considered an eligible manufacturing or service industry. Eligibility for assistance is based on the benefits of the proposal to the overall Newfoundland economy, particularly with respect with respect to the maximization of "value added". Preference is given to firms owned or controlled by persons normally resident in Newfoundland and to other Canadian or foreign entities who enter into joint ventures with Newfoundland firms.

Financial assistance available under the Ocean Industries Capital Assistance Program is in the form of a conditional grant forgiven over a four year period at the rate of 25 per cent per annum. These grants amount to 50 per cent of the approved capital cost less the amount available from the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion under the Regional Development Incentives Act if any, to a maximum grant of \$500,000. Minimum project size for assistance under the Ocean Industries Capital Assistance program is \$25,000.

MR. WINDSOR: Interest in the Ocean Industries Capital Assistance Program has been enthusiastic, receiving a positive response from the business community. To date, five applications for financial assistance totalling \$389,250 have been authorized and ten other proposals valued at approximately \$1.7 million are currently being evaluated. It is expected that another \$400,000 worth of applications will be forthcoming within the present fiscal year.

Offers of assistance have already been given to the following: (1) Woosley Marine Diving Ltd. of Mount Pearl - \$19,500 (2) G. Pelley Ltd. of Springdale \$24,000 (3) Terra Nova Laboratories Ltd., St. John's \$34,500 (4) Brown Offshore Ltd. of St. John's \$94,500 and (4) Aerial Mapping & Photography Ltd. of St. John's \$216,750.

Woosley Marine Diving Limited purchased additional diving equipment primarily in support of offshore oil and gas activity.

G. Pelley Limited will purchase equipment to establish a Hot Dip Galvanizing facility for marine-related products.

MR. WINDSOR: Terra Nova Laboratories Limited are to purchase scientific equipment to provide specialized services related to offshore oil and gas exploration activities. Brown Offshore Limited propose to purchase sophisticated machinery and equipment to establish a machine shop specializing in products and services in support of offshore exploration activity, while Aerial Mapping and Photography Limited plan to purchase equipment for use in iceberg reconnaissance and survey services to offshore oil and gas activity.

Mr. Speaker, as stated on many previous occasions, this government is determined to encourage the expansion of Newfoundland and Labrador companies and to attract new ocean related industry to the Province, to ensure that maximum benefits from the development of offshore resources and other marine industries accrue to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. This assistance, offered through the Ocean Industries Capital Assistance Programme, is evidence of government's commitment to development of a diversified ocean industry sector to compliment and enhance the traditional relationships of our economy with the sea.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to say that we on this side of the House, of course, are pleased and happy to hear of any projects or government incentives to maximize employment opportunities for our people in our Province and even though the amounts here are small and the total figure of \$389,000 is small we note with interest that four of the five grants made available by the provincial government are directly

MR. CALLAN: associated with offshore oil and gas activity and the other one, marine related products.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing that we see wrong here is that with the lack of an offshore oil agreement then, of course, any plans and projections that these firms have for offshore oil and gas activity obviously will have to be stalled, as most activity in this Province related to the offshore oil and gas activity is stalled, awaiting a successful conclusion to an offshore oil and gas agreement with the federal government. And until that comes, and we hope it is in the very near future that this Province will sit down again with Ottawa and work out some sort of either short-term or long-term agreement regarding our potential offshore,

MR. W. CALLAN: these industries like others will be just sitting idly by with very few employment opportunities. But anything, Mr. Speaker, that will create even a small number of jobs we are glad to hear about on this side of the House.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have now been sitting in this House about three weeks, a little over three weeks, but we have not seen any plans or heard of any plans yet to deal with the horrible state of the Newfoundland economy other than the statement that was made by the Premier recently that has made Newfoundlanders and Labradorians heartsick, his comments the other day through the broadcast media -

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is getting up and asking an initial question to the Premier. It is certainly within the rules to have a preamble but it is not within the rules to make a speech. The hon. gentleman is obviously making a speech, and there is a time and a place for that, but not during the Question Period.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. In every jurisdiction, in every Legislature, in Westminster, the Mother of Parliament, and in the Parliament of Canada, every member asking a question initially is allowed a preamble. All the hon. gentleman is trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is to continue to muzzle the Opposition. I cannot help it if I am embarrassing the hon. gentleman and embarrassing the Premier and the administration, Mr. Speaker,

MR. S. NEARY: but we are trying to deal with a very serious, a very heavy item here and I think I am entitled to a fair preamble.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The Question Period only consists of thirty minutes and perhaps as many questions should be asked and as many answers given as possible. It is correct that the Chair is permitted to give some leeway with regard to a preamble, but certainly hon. members in asking questions are not permitted to make a speech and I would ask the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to keep his preamble as short as possible.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the words that I referred to, used the other day by the Premier, is that he categorically stated that there was nothing could be done for the unemployed in this Province. Now these are not the words of a man who last year went around this Province promoting himself as a fighter, Mr. Speaker, for the people. Fighters do not say publically that they have given up and there is no fight left in them. Fighters fight, Mr. Speaker. So I am going to ask the hon. gentleman now a straight question. Has he given up on providing employment for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians this year? You know, I could say the hon. gentleman was misquoted but I heard his actual voice. I heard him being interviewed, it was the hon. member's actual voice I heard on the tape. So would the hon. gentleman tell the House if indeed he has given up? If not, could he tell the House and the people, especially the unemployed throughout this Province and as hon. members know we have record unemployment, it is worse now than the Depression years, more

MR. NEARY: people unemployed now than during the Great Depression - can the hon. gentleman tell the House what he intends to do about this?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, for an Opposition which now pretends in Questions Period to be interested in the unemployment of this Province and for not one Opposition member to turn up when the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) was doing his estimates in Committee this morning, I find it to be staggeringly inconsistent.

MR. DAWE: That is not right.

MR. PECKFORD: It is the Minister of Development's Department which has the mandate to develop programmes and policies to try to stimulate economic growth in this Province. There was a Ministerial Statement by the minister a few minutes ago which demonstrated one area of economic activity in which the Department of Development is very, very ambitiously involved in trying to create long-term employment opportunity for the people of this Province.

So I find the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) question inconsistent indeed. For no member of the Opposition could find time this morning to attend hearing and debating the estimates of the Department of Development, and then this afternoon for the lead off question by the Leader of the Opposition to try to somehow demonstrate that he is concerned about the unemployment of this Province, I find it an extremely inconsistent position for the Opposition to take.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I hope hon.

members and the Parliamentary press gallery were listening to that answer. The hon. gentleman did not deal with the question at all, he chastised the Opposition. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that we were ready three days in a row to attend that Committee but the minister was down South soaking up the sun. And, Mr. Speaker, it is his own colleague that he should chastise as well as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) who is out of the Province, the President of Treasury Board, right in the middle of the biggest crisis that we have ever had in education in this Province. Now we cannot arrange our agenda to suit the ministers if they want to go South, Mr. Speaker. Our members were on some very important business this morning. If the hon. gentleman wanted to accommodate the reduced numbers Opposition -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is getting into the realm of debate. I would ask him if he has a question if he would ask it to one of the ministers or the Premier.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. gentleman got his answer to that. He should keep the ministers in their place in this House. And the Chairman of the Committee knows that three days in a row they were ready, willing -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question! Question!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I will have to rule the hon. Leader of the Opposition out of order if he persists in debating.

MR. NEARY:

Mr Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman a few specific questions, then, in connection with development in this Province. The other day the hon. gentleman told us that the Lower Churchill was on hold -

MR. WARREN:

For at least ten years.

MR. NEARY:

- for at least the next ten years. Let me ask the hon. gentleman if it is possible to create some badly needed employment by clearing away the property, the basin, for the development of the Lower Churchill? Is it possible to create a make-work project? And is it possible to create a make-work project at Cat Arm, where 50,000 cords of timber will be covered over with water when the basin is flooded down there? Would the hon. gentleman tell the House if it is possible to do some initial work on these projects in order to take care of some of the unemployed in the Province this year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, first of all

I think that if somebody is out of the Province they cannot very well attend a meeting on a given hour or a given day. But I would like to know what excuse the members of the Opposition have for not attending this morning who are in the Province? I mean, that is the question. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) can complain all he likes whether the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) or the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) is not in the Province. But what reasons do the members of the Opposition have, who were in the Province this morning, who were in the capital city this morning, for not attending a Committee meeting for which they are elected to serve? I mean, that is the question. The question is not who is outside the Province, but who was in St. John's this morning, and a member of this Legislature representing the Opposition, and who did not attend the Committee meeting which was dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Development. Now the Leader of the Opposition can throw as many red herrings as he likes about ministers being here, there or anywhere else outside the Province. That is irrelevant. The relevant question is how many members of the Opposition were in St. John's this morning and how come they did not attend the Estimates meeting dealing with the Department of Development? That is the question, Mr. Speaker. No red herrings by the Leader of the Opposition can change that, to nor can he answer it, of course.

Now to deal with the question of the Lower Churchill and with the Cat Arm development, Mr. Speaker, I made a statement last week

PREMIER PECKFORD:

and I stand by it. I say to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), one of the big things which separates the group of individuals who sit on the right of the Speaker, from the group of individuals who sit on the left of the Speaker is that we are trying to make significant structural changes to the economy of Newfoundland which will bring about permanent employment. The Leader of the Opposition, of course, talks about make-work projects, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: A second fence around the cemetery is the psychology which dominates economics theory and philosophy on the opposite side of the House, Mr. Speaker. Well, this government is not interested in that. We are interested in permanent change. That is why we have argued with the federal government for sharing management in the fisheries, so we can make structural change, so that we can create permanent jobs. That is why we want the foreign allocation of fisheries eliminated, because we are not getting a fair deal out of it and, secondly and more importantly, Newfoundlanders are not seeing their raw resource being processed here but processed in Germany. That is why we have argued that we want the same transmission principle on hydro-electric power to apply in the same way as it is applied on oil and gas over the years. We want to make permanent structural changes for the economic well being of this Province so that we are able to create permanent jobs and long-term jobs. That is why we ask that we be treated in the same way with offshore oil and gas as onshore oil and gas is being treated in other parts of the country.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is what this government stands for, that is what the party that we represent stands for, to make significant changes to the economic well-being of this Province, and not going on handing out bits of money which are make-work and are orientated towards people getting unemployment insurance and not being permanently employed for ten or eleven months each year, Mr. Speaker. I mean, that is the substantive, significant answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question.

On the whole question of the Lower Churchill itself, Mr. Speaker, there is some clearing at the site, if it is Gull Island or if it is Muskrat Falls, that could be done. We made proposals two or three years ago to the federal government to try to get involved in that kind of programme which is permanent, which therefore will be doing something towards a permanent development.

Five or six or seven months ago the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), in consultation with the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), and all other ministries involved in job creation, put together a very long list of significant resource development projects that could go ahead under the NEFD Programme. We were told by the federal government, not consulted, we were told by the federal government that there would be \$27 million available for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and we said to them, and I went to Ottawa myself and sat down with the ministers up there and pleaded with them, 'Let us use that \$27 million for resource development projects. Outside of politics, of what district it was going to be in provincially or what district it was going to be in federally, if you are really serious about

PREMIER PECKFORD: trying to do at least a little
bit, because that is all it can be, any make-work project can
only be a little bit, but if you are satisfied in doing
that let us look at resource development opportunities.

 In the mining industry we
identified with them, in the agricultural industry

PREMIER PECKFORD: industry we identified them, in the forest industry we identified them, in the fishing industry we identified them, in the tourism industry we identified them, and we put them forward. The federal government was not prepared to co-operate and jointly fund with us - and we would put together our few dollars that we had - to use all of that money, \$27 million plus \$3 million, \$30 million to go towards some permanent "make-work" projects which were based on resources and which could lead to some permanent change in a given project or activity in this Province associated with resource based industries. They turned it down; \$10 million out of \$27 million was all they were willing to participate in.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), that in a meeting between the Premiers and the Prime Minister I put forward again what I considered to be a way around some of the problems we had. And I said to the Prime Minister at that time two things - and I walked out of the meeting afterwards when it started to drag into the early hours of the morning - two things, and there was only one other person around that table of eleven who agreed with me at that time. I am pleased to report from the media reports I get from Ottawa lately that apparently the federal government has gone along with the two people who suggested something: Trim your departmental estimates. Do not increase your deficit, trim your departmental estimates, because there is a lot of fat up there in those departments, and use that money for job creation in resources. And apparently the budget tomorrow is going to do what I suggested to the Prime Minister four or five weeks ago.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, even though the hon. gentleman has forty-three members in addition to himself, there is no way that he is going to bully the Opposition. Forty-four against eight, Mr. Speaker! The hon. gentleman can display all the arrogance he wants and he can try to be as smart as he wants but he is not going to bully the Opposition.

My colleague, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) and I, during the time the Committee was meeting this morning had a commitment to meet with the Federation of Labour and we certainly got more from our meeting with the Federation of Labour than we would have gotten from the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor). My two other colleagues who were in St. John's were on some very, very important business. Besides that, the hon. gentleman should be trying to accommodate us. There were only four of us available today and two of us were tied up with a meeting with the Federation of Labour and, Mr. Speaker, we consider that to be very important as the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn) will find out in due course.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us get back to some more specific questions.

What about the development of the five rivers with their headwaters in Newfoundland flowing into the Quebec part of Labrador? And what about the markets for the surplus power? What about the development of these rivers? What about the market of power from the Lower Churchill and Muskrat Falls?

MR. NEARY: What step has the administration taken to look for markets for the surplus power? Have they done anything or is the Premier just down in his office making little paper airplanes and tossing them into his empty wastepaper basket?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, to deal with the hon. Leader of the Opposition's preamble first, the members of this legislature, on this side or the Opposite side, were elected first of all to serve the people of Newfoundland and Labrador through the legislature and, therefore, the two people who met with the Federation of Labour this morning should have arranged that meeting for another time because their first obligation is to committees of this legislature. Mr. Speaker, that is what they are elected for and paid to do, to attend meetings of the legislature and meetings of committees of the legislature, not of the Federation of Labour or any other federation. That is their first priority, that is their first role and that is what the taxpayers of Newfoundland are paying them for. So excuses of meeting with some federation or other bears no resemblance to what the primary obligations of a legislative member are anyway. So the Leader of the Opposition cannot make excuses along those lines. Their first priorities and their first duties are supposed to be this House .

MR. CALLAN: You are not lecturing to a group of students now, you know.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, obviously I have to, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. members do not know what their duties and obligations are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I know I have hit a touchy point with the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. They will not allow me to answer the question without being interrupted because I have hit a very sensitive point with them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, number two, to show that I have to explain to the members of the Opposition what their role is as legislative members, which must be first to the legislature and the committees that are set up by the legislature, let me go on to answer the Leader of the Opposition's question by indicating to him that obviously not only does he not know his duty and role as a member of this House, that it must be to the House and to the committees first and everybody else second, but he does not know very much about energy, because the Leader of the Opposition just asked me what was I doing about the five rivers. Now, Mr. Speaker, do I have to, again, do I have to again tell the Leader of the Opposition and the members opposite, who obviously have done absolutely no research on this, that the cost of electricity on those five rivers would be extremely high, much higher than alternate forms of electric generation known to man on the Eastern Seaboard and in Canada, that the five rivers when developed, the cost per kilowatt hour, mills per kilowatt hour of that power would be far, far more than competitive costs of electricity generated by coal, oil and nuclear in this here continent? I do not know where the Leader of the Opposition is

PREMIER PECKFORD:

coming from. He is out in left field. Does the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) recognize, forgetting the five rivers which are extremely costly, that Gull Island and Muskrat, which form the two projects on the Lower Churchill River which are cheaper than the five rivers, are right now in a 60 mil, 70 mil, 80 mil per kilowatt hour range when the average cost of electricity across Canada right now is somewhere between 25 mils and 35 mils per kilowatt hour? I mean, does the Leader of the Opposition know what he is talking about? He is talking about five rivers which have their headwaters in Labrador and flow through Quebec into the Gulf of St. Lawrence. They are not economic entities at the present moment for the generation of electricity for this nation nor for export to the United States. They are extremely expensive sources of electricity and much cheaper forms of electricity can be sold to the United States based on other generation. So the Leader of the Opposition does not know what he is talking about.

Now if he can show me, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition is very serious about his question- I mean, he is scraping the bottom of the barrel - let the Leader of the Opposition table a report from some reputable organization in Canada or the United States which has done a study on these five rivers and can demonstrate that the cost of kilowatt hours of generating the electricity on those five rivers is competitive with other forms of electrical generation- I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to do that-then he would be able to pose his question based upon some facts. But simply to get up in this House and talk about this mythical five rivers that are down there on the border between Newfoundland and Quebec, and somehow we are not doing our job for employment generation because we

PREMIER PECKFORD: have not activated those five rivers, is completely terrible for the Leader of the Opposition to do because there is no economic justification for activating those five rivers in any kind of deal with Quebec, or even if they were all in Labrador they will not form a viable economic activity on which to base jobs now.

Secondly, insofar as it goes with the Lower Churchill situation, we have markets for the Lower Churchill power. Our problem is that the federal government, in cahoots with the Province of Quebec, will not allow us to smoothly move through the Province of Quebec so that we can sell some of that power, and, in addition, that once we get the Upper Churchill power back in the next little while, we will have additional surplus power which is even cheaper and which we can make even additional funds if we can get through the Province of Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the hon.

gentleman gave us another lecture. First of all, he says that our duty is to serve the people who elected us to this Legislature. Well, certainly now that is some statement for an hon. gentleman to make when his two key ministers are down in Florida soaking up the sun. The teachers are sitting in these galleries day in and day out locked out of the classrooms, and the hon. gentleman they should be negotiating with is off soaking up the sun. Now that is some statement for the hon. gentleman

MR. S. NEARY:

to make. The taxpayers are paying for that, too, in case the hon. the gentleman is not aware of it. So, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman a final supplementary question and I will lump all the projects, megaprojects and otherwise, in one question. Does he hold out any hope this year for the start of a Trans-Labrador Highway, the start of a transmission line in Labrador, an offshore agreement, and assistance for Buchans on which the task force made certain recommendations? What about the tunnel that they spent \$200 million or \$300 million on in 1975, the two explosions on either side of the Strait of Belle Isle? What about that tunnel? Will that be going ahead this year? What about cutting this pulpwood on the Cat Arm Development that I asked the hon. gentleman about? Do we have to compensate Bowaters for this wood that they are losing, because part of it is on their concession? What about Corner Brook? Will there be any help any assistance for Corner Brook? What about Baie Verte, where over half the people are unemployed and they want to share the work down there? What about further processing of the fish in this Province that the hon. gentlemen used to talk about a few years ago? Have they completely abandoned all these plans altogether? Is there anything this year that is going to happen or is the outlook for the unemployed in this Province as bleak as the hon. gentleman said the other day when he stated categorically that there is nothing he can do to help the unemployed in this Province?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is going to ask what is a very, very detailed question, for an answer he has got to expect me to have the time to answer it. I will take them one by one. Number one, I want to inform this hon. House, so there is no

PREMIER PECKFORD: misunderstanding, that the schedule for the Resource Committee was set three weeks ago with the agreement of the Opposition. They knew for three weeks when the Department of Development would be on. Three weeks ago this committee meeting this morning, which no members of the Opposition attended, was set. They had three weeks notice, Mr. Speaker. The only change, Mr. Speaker, made to the committee schedule was to delay the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to accommodate the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) who was on vacation in Florida.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, what is the point of answering the rest of the questions because obviously the question that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) asked is couched in the same vein in which his accusation was about the Estimates Committee this morning, Mr. Speaker, the same kind of thing? That is the kind of stuff we have got to deal with, this old foolishness that the Leader of the Opposition gets on with.

MR. NEARY: At least he did not go at the taxpayers' expense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Minister of Development went on holiday on his own.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: They all went on their own. Let us not lower the decorum of the House. I mean, to have respect -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, out of respect for the people in the galleries who would like to see, I am sure, this House conduct its business in a rational, businesslike way, would the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) please, please, stop from digging the trench a bit deeper and fill in the hole and let us get on with some dignity in this hon. House so that we can deal with the issues? Ask your questions, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to answer. Ask the question and I am willing to answer it, but I am not willing to have the Leader of the Opposition lower the decorum of this House and hon. members because now he does not like the kind of answer he is getting to questions that are being asked, Mr. Speaker. I am prepared to answer all the questions on unemployment. Let us talk about unemployment. Let us talk about Baie Verte. The Leader of the Opposition brought up Baie Verte. We are very proud of what we have done in Baie Verte, Mr. Speaker, very, very proud that we brought a mining operation that was bankrupt back into existence. We expropriated the assets there, we brought a new company in, we pushed the federal government into dealing with us on it and we have a deal with the federal government on it, and now this mine is hiring back a lot of the people who were laid off. And their predictions for the rest of the year are they are going to hire on more people - sad news for the Leader of the Opposition! - so that Baie Verte has a real chance in its asbestos operation to succeed this year and next year. That is what we are doing in Baie Verte, Mr. Speaker, that is pretty big stuff.

PREMIER PECKFORD: As it relates to the fishing industry, which is the most labour intensive sector of our economy, we have put forward a proposal which would significantly change the way the offshore fishing industry is handled in this Province. To what end, Mr. Speaker? To the end to creating hundreds and thousands of jobs in this Province over the next ten years. To go the route that the federal government and the companies want to go will reduce the amount of processing activity here and will put it out in factory trawlers in the North Atlantic, and that is not acceptable to us as a government, Mr. Speaker. So we are not only trying to protect the processing sector as it now exists in Newfoundland and Labrador, but if our proposal is pursued with a lot of vigor and with a lot of sense, then we have the opportunity to create hundreds and thousands of more jobs in this Province based upon the fishing industry. Those are the kind of things we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker. We have asked the federal government to get involved in the programme that was started a number of years ago, the FESP programme, where we put people to work, permanently employed, in cutting down overmature timber and bug infested timber. It created hundreds and hundreds of jobs last year in Bay d'Espoire and other parts of the Province. Through the

PREMIER PECKFORD: NEED Programme we can do it again. In Roddickton we are just involved in opening a crab plant down there and giving a processing licence, and we want the same thing done in Fleur de Lys, in the hon. member for Baie Verte- White Bay's (Mr. Rideout) district, Mr. Speaker.

At Cat Arm we are going to up to about 1,000 jobs this year. We are going to be into municipal servicing \$25 million or \$30 million. We are going to be into roads \$20 millions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I had the time to tell the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) what is going on in this Province, perhaps he would have a far different outlook on our future than it evident from the questions he has asked to day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) a few questions about this most innovative concept for breaking teacher lockouts or strike breaking, the ding-a-ling service. It has been in effect now for about an hour and a half, a little over an hour and a half, so I wonder if the minister can tell us some details about this very innovative programme in terms of who the tutors are, what their training and background are, and what the tutor-student telephone ratio is? I understand that there is one telephone line, so I wonder if she can tell us just what the tutor-student, or the tutor-telephone-student ratio might be, and what technological equipment, teaching aids, that these tutors will have at their disposal for this very unique audio instructional system?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I assume the Opposition Education critic is referring to the Dial-A-Tutor service which the Department of Education instituted this afternoon -

MR. LUSH: So that is what it is.

MR. VERGE: - to provide a small measure of help to those senior high school students who are doing the best they can to help themselves in their studies at home while their schools are closed. The service began offically at two o'clock this afternoon, about twenty telephone lines have been installed by the telephone company and are staffed by qualified teachers having expertise in the important subjects taught in senior high school.

As of a few minutes ago when I got a report from my Deputy Minister, the system had been working well with several calls coming from students, most of whom requested help in mathematics. I will continue to get reports as the day progresses.

Mr. Speaker, this service was instituted by members of my department after the strike began last week in a jam session in our department. It was thought up on very short notice, in a crisis situation. It was implemented very quickly. It has only ever been described as a stop-gap measure.

MS VERGE: certainly is not intended, never was intended and, in fact, would be impossible to amount to anything like a replacement for schools. It is at best, as I say again, a stopgap measure which may provide a small measure of help to those senior high school students who are trying to help themselves so that they do not fall too far behind with their school work while their schools are closed.

Mr. Speaker, in the same way as this service was thought of and implemented very quickly, it can be discontinued and dropped very quickly if we achieve our ultimate aim of reaching a settlement in this labour/management dispute and have the schools reopened.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The time for Question Period has expired.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, the Government Resource Estimate Committee have met and have passed Heads VI, Development, VII, Mines and Energy, VIII, Fisheries, IX, Forest Resources and Lands and X, Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, all without amendment.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Opposition's performance this morning, I am not sure that I should be bothering to give them information. But I think it is important information and I am going to give them information in spite of themselves, Mr. Speaker, not because they asked for it in questions but in spite of their performance this morning, I am going to make sure that this House is given certain important information.

SOME HON. MEMERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: This particular answer is in response to a question from the member from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) and I think the question is indicative of the attitude we saw this morning, Mr. Speaker. Here is what is important to them. It asked for a list of loans by Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation for the fiscal year 1982 - 1983 to date to industries which failed and assets of companies sold by public auction or some other means to recover part of the funding of such companies. This sort of negative thing, Mr. Speaker, is the thing that is important to them. The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, in short, is that there was one company financed by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation which failed, the assets of which were offered for sale by the Corporation. The assets that were mortgaged to the Corporation were offered for sale by tender. To date no sale has yet been finalized so I cannot report exactly what percentage came back.

The question that should have been answered and which is very important too, Mr. Speaker, is exactly how is the Corporation performing? And if hon. gentlemen had been here this morning, I would have been able to tell them if they had asked the question, that the NLDC, the Development Corporation, since it was

MR. WINDSOR: formed has approved 227 applications for loans to a total value of over \$51 million approved for loans. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, there have been fifty-six applications approved where the Corporation actually took shared equity and \$2.8 million has been given out by way of share equity and two further shareholder loans have been approved for a total of \$191,500.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR: The impact of that, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is that there has been 2,844 full-time jobs created and a further 700 part-time jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I regret to have to interrupt the hon. gentleman but do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman was not answering a question that was put on the Order Paper? The answer he gave initially, and then he proceeded to make a little bit of political hay for himself. That was not on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WINDSOR: To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order. The Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I was answering the questions from the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) who asked the failures, and I assume that the failures of a company are very much tied in with the success of the company. I am sure the hon. gentleman would like to know how many loans have been approved and how many jobs have been created in this Province.

MR. NEARY: An abuse of the rules of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair has no way of knowing whether the hon. Minister of Development was answering the question or not. I have to believe that the hon. minister was.

MR. NEARY: Well, he said he was not. This information was not asked for.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I want to offer some answers to questions asked by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), on March 18, 1983. The questions were, (a) How many instances of moose poaching have been

MR. SIMMS: reported to his department for the years 1980, 1981 and 1982?, (b) How many fines were levied against moose poachers for the above years?, and (c) Give a break down of which areas of the Province the poaching infractions occurred?

Answer to question (a). Our records do not distinguish between offences that are reported relative to moose, caribou or small game or others, particulars as to the number of instances of moose poaching that have been reported, therefore, are not available. (b) There were a total of 264 fines imposed against persons charged with offences relative to moose: In 1980 there were 64, and in 1981 there were 99, and in 1982 there were 101. And I will table (c) which gives a breakdown of the offences by areas.

MR. DINN: No, go on. I would like for you to read it.

MR. SIMMS: Well, there are four regions and there are three years so I am afraid we would be here all afternoon.

MR. DINN: Oh, pity.

MR. RIDEOUT: It must have cost a lot to put these together.

MR. SIMMS: Well, that is true. Well, if you insist I will read it. The following is a breakdown of the offences by areas. The Eastern area would be that part of the Province East of Terra Nova National Park and a line to Bay du Nord River. The Western region would include all the area West of Springdale, Hinds Lake, Star Lake, Lloyds Lake and White Bear River. And Central would, of course, then be the area in between East and West.

AN HON. MEMBER: I thought that would be the idea.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes. Right on.

The year 1980 in the Eastern regions, 25 moose offences, the same year in the Central region 17, the same year in the Western region 19, the same year in the Labrador region which I know the hon. member is really interested in, 3. In 1981 in the Eastern region there were 29 offences, in the Central region 22 offences, in the Western region 48 offences and in Labrador none. And in 1982 in the Eastern region there were 28, in the Central region there were 31, in the Western region there were 42 and in the Labrador region there were none.

MR. SIMMS: If hon. members insist, I can run back over that once more if they like.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS: The answer to question A -

MR. NEARY It just shows how arrogant you are.

MR. SIMMS: I would rather be arrogant than silly like the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I have answers to four questions put on the Order Paper by the hon. gentleman for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). The answers are rather lengthy. I will not get into those, but I will point out the questions, at least, wanting to know the details of why the number of farmers insured under the Canada/Newfoundland Crop Insurance Programme had decreased since 1978. The answer to that is there. A list of persons and businesses who received loans from the Farm Development Loan Board in 1981/82 - the answer is there. What is the status of the Province's proposed Ventura Capital Corporation that was to be established to provide incentive programmes to assist in the start of new businesses or the expansion of an already established enterprise. I can read the answer to that. The response to the hon. member's question is that the proposed Ventura Capital Corporation does not come under the jurisdiction of my department.

And the other question - a list of individuals and/or companies who received loans from the Rural Development Authority and the purpose for which the loans were granted for the year 1982. The answer to that question is there as well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
and Manpower.

The hon. Minister of Labour

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, an answer to a question by the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) - the number of trips taken by the minister during the fiscal years 1979, '80, '81 and '82, reason for trip, places visited, date of departure, date of return, cost of travel, other costs, class of travel, airline used, individuals not directly related to government business who accompanied the minister at government expense.

MR. SIMMS: How much did it cost to do all that?

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much it cost the department to get this, but it is probably interesting information for hon. members. All trips, basically, taken by me were on economy. There was one time when an individual not directly related to government went on a trip with the minister and that was my wife, and we went out to meet his Royal Highness, Prince Philip, in Gander at a cost of twenty-five dollars -

MR. SIMMS: What year was that? How far back?

MR. DINN: - plus the travel to get there and back - \$138 to get there and back, plus \$25.

MR. SIMMS: What is the \$25 for?

MR. DINN: The rest were basically Cabinet meetings that we held around the Province, or meetings that we held of Atlantic Ministers of Labour and Manpower in Halifax, a meeting with Abitibi Price, tour of mills and meetings, tour of Bowaters and so on, all of the information the hon. gentleman may need. I am sure hon. gentlemen do not want me to go through each individual item, but, you know, it will be there for their perusal at any time. A silly question but a very good answer.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 3, Concurrence Motion.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Concurrence Debate, Order No. 3.
I think the debate, last day, was adjourned by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate the other day I was asking the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) a few questions. I hope the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) is not leaving the House, because I have a few for him a little later on. But I was asking the Minister of Education about the vocational schools. We hear rumours that vocational schools, some of them, some of the eighteen will either be merged into the expanded high school system in some way or other, or some, we hear, may be closed altogether. And I gave the Minister of Education notice of these questions. I think it is time now to put something on the public record in connection with the vocational schools. Will there be any closing? Will there be any layoffs? If

MR. NEARY: they do tie in some way or other with Grade XII, will all the instructors be kept on? Is there any move to consolidate the schools in any way, shape or form?

I was in Baie Verte the other night , a tremendous banquet and dance down there, several hundred people came out, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: we have not seen the likes of it since the good old days. I had a number of people approach me, when I was in Baie Verte, to find out, because they hear that something is going to happen.

MR. CALLAN: Asking about the Premier's security, whether it has been removed or not.

MR. NEARY: That is right. And I will be in Springdale shortly, at another one of these banquets, but we will deal with that one in due course. But a couple of people approached me to find out, because they hear reports about their school in the area. And I believe the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) owes it to the employees of the vocational schools, the instructors and so forth, and the support staff, to tell them where they stand. They are living in daily fear, Mr. Speaker, that the axe may fall at any minute.

Now I know this administration has a reputation for sitting on information and covering up things, that has been established. They sat on the closing of the Burin Fish Plant, they sat on the closing of Bowaters, they covered up a \$60 million deficit. They are continuously withholding information. God only knows, Mr. Speaker, how much more information they are sitting on. They like to sit on the bad news until they are forced to make announcements. They like to keep things secret. But I do not think it is fair, Mr. Speaker, to the people who work in these eighteen vocational schools, to go to work every day not knowing what the future holds in store for them. And I think the minister owes it to these people to make a statement now, while the minister has an opportunity, in this House. So I will gladly take my seat, Mr. Speaker, and wait for the minister's response.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have an opportunity to tell all hon. members of this House of Assembly about the good work being done in the Province's chain of vocational schools. In fact, there are sixteen vocational schools across our Province and one craft training school, all of which are administered directly by the Department of Education's Division of Technical and Vocational Education.

MS. VERGE: Of the sixteen vocational schools, twelve of them offer programmes to high school students. In these twelve vocational schools approximately sixty instructors, who are on the payroll of the Department's Vocational division, spend all their time giving instruction to high school students who come to the vocational schools for, on average, I believe, a half day a week to receive instruction in pre-vocational programmes which gives those high school students a big advantage. Those programmes have been immensely successful.

The twelve schools offering pre-vocational programmes to high school students are as follows: The schools on Bell Island -

MR. NEARY: What was that?

MS. VERGE: I am talking about the twelve of our Province's vocational schools which give instruction and programmes to high school students. These are called pre-vocational programmes and in these twelve schools approximately sixty instructors are employed directly by the Department of Education's division of Technical and Vocational Education and are on the payroll of the Department, itself, solely to give instruction to high school students.

Mr. Speaker, I was about to name the twelve vocational schools which give these pre-vocational programmes to high school students when the Opposition Leader (Mr. Neary) asked me to repeat what I had said previous to that point in my remarks.

The twelve schools are Mr. Speaker, the schools on Bell Island, the school at Conception Bay South, in Seal Cove, Conception Bay South,

MS. VERGE: the school at Placentia, those are schools on the Avalon Peninsula. Then, Mr. Speaker, the school at Burin, Salt Pond, Burin, I believe gives pre-vocational instructions. The school at Bonavista, the one at Gander, the school at Lewisporte, the schools at Springdale and Baie Verte and then on the West coast, Mr. Speaker, in the Opposition Leader's (Mr. Neary) own district, the school at Port aux Basques and then, of course, on the tip of the Northern Peninsula, the school at St. Anthony and, finally, the district vocational school at Happy Valley.

Mr. Speaker, I have listed those schools from memory and they should total twelve. Forgive me if I have left one out.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that most of the vocational schools scattered around the Province, twelve out of sixteen to be precise, do offer pre-vocational programmes to high school students. These are students in Grades 1X through XI.

Mr. Speaker, everything is set in motion for the pre-vocational programmes in those same twelve schools to continue -

MS. L. VERGE: for the students who are going to participate, who are now participating, and who will in the future take part in the reorganized high school programme, which, of course, will span that extra grade called Grade XII.

Mr. Speaker, quite apart from this subsidiary function of vocational schools, that of providing valuable programming to high school students, I would like now to focus my remarks on the primary function of vocational schools which is giving what are called trades training or pre-employment programmes to people who have completed their secondary education, most of whom have graduated from high school, and also people who have the benefit of years of experience in the paid labour force, having entered vocational schools sometime after leaving secondary school or high school. Mr. Speaker, the sixteen vocational schools around the Province offer a wide variety of programming for this clientele and, Mr. Speaker, it is the policy of government and the Department of Education to adapt the offering of programmes, to change the mix of programmes in response to the changing labour market and in response to different interests and demands of students, of the clientele being served by the schools. Mr. Speaker, that policy was developed and articulated, well communicated, within the vocational division of my department, to principals and instructors at each of the sixteen vocational schools a couple of years ago and the policy was, in fact, implemented last year resulting in programme changes which meant discontinuing a couple of programmes in a couple of schools, scaling down the number of seats available to students in certain courses, in certain schools, and, most importantly, adding some new programmes in some schools. I would like to give hon. members some examples of courses that were added in the present school year. In the district vocational school at Gander, in September past, we saw the start of electronics technology

MS. L. VERGE: which is a two or three year programme leading to a diploma of technology. The first year of that programme has been operated successfully at the Gander school. Students in the programme have the option of completing their programme at one of the colleges in St. John's, or at the district vocational school in Corner Brook. Also, Mr. Speaker, there was added to the Grand Falls district vocational school new courses in accounting, that is a two year diploma course in accounting and a one year, I believe eleven month programme, in computers. At the Corner Brook district vocational school there was added courses in electronic technology, in accounting and also, thirdly, computers, all those courses having attracted full slates of students, and having given obvious benefits to them in preparing them for the job market of the future.

Mr. Speaker, that same policy, leading to those improvements in the programme offerings of all our vocational schools, is still in force and will be applied as government finalizes decisions for programme offerings in the next school year. Of course, as we look ahead to the next school year, Mr. Speaker, we have to recognize the changes that will result in applications with the transition in our high schools, when very few people will be going to vocational school straight out of high school, since there will be virtually no graduates from our high schools this Spring and Summer. Mr. Speaker, this policy, which recognizes all the factors I have listed, the changes in the labour market, the changes in the interest of students, the changes in the demands of applicants to vocational schools, all of these factors will be recognized as government makes final decisions for programme offerings in our sixteen vocational schools for the next school year starting September.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the minister successfully again skirted around the issue as she is doing now in the case of the lockout of teachers. We can never get a straight answer from the minister, and I did not get any straight answers from the minister with the questions that I put about the closing of any of these schools,

MR. NEARY: the phasing down or the layoff of instructors or support staff.

In all the words that the minister just used, and I followed what she said very closely, that is why I asked the minister to repeat, because I happened to be speaking to one of my colleagues there, now is the minister saying there will be no layoffs in the vocational schools, that none of these schools will be closed in the foreseeable future, that all we have is just a change in the mix, as the hon. minister indicated, to tie in with the new technology and so forth? Is that what the hon. minister is saying? Can the minister guarantee the instructors and support staff in these schools that the schools will not close or be phased out and there will be no layoffs in these schools in the foreseeable future? I wonder if the minister could give me a straight answer? These people have a right to know. Mr. Speaker, if I could only get the hon. minister's attention. I am sure if the teachers could only get the hon. minister's attention for a while we might get some answers.

Could the hon. minister tell us point blank? Do not beat around the bush just tell us, will there be layoffs? Will the schools be phased out? Will any of them close in the foreseeable future?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to repeat what I said in my earlier remarks. All sixteen of the Province's vocational schools, and also our craft training school are providing excellent services to the people of the Province. All these institutions are providing educational services as well as fulfilling social and economic roles for the people of our Province. And all of these institutions, all sixteen vocational schools, and the craft

MS. VERGE: training school, will be operating on into the future, in the next school year and will continue to provide valuable services and programmes to our people. And as I said before, Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the changing nature of our labour market, in recognition of the changing interests of our people, and the changing demands of applicants to those institutions, there will continue to be changes in the programming at the institutions and, naturally, programming changes will also necessitate some personnel changes.

MS. VERGE: The details of changes to be implemented for the next school year are now being worked out by officials of my department. I will be bringing a recommendation to Cabinet, and the full government will deliberate on these matters, and I should be in a position to tell all the people involved very shortly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in carrying out this exercise with the officials of my department I have consulted with, I have personally met with and have gotten the benefit of the advice of a representative Committee of Principals of our sixteen vocational schools and I am confident that the decisions which are reached by this government, in changing the mix of programmes offered by our sixteen vocational schools in the next school year, will lead to significant improvements for the people of our Province, recognizing the present economic circumstances of the Province and of our people, and better preparing them for developments of the future.

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

MR. NEARY: That is a pretty slick answer Mr. Speaker. Now the hon. minister is admitting that a number of instructors and other people in these schools will be displaced because of the changes that will be made and the bringing in of Grade XII in this Province. The frightening part of the answer given by the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) is that plans for Grade XII, according to the answer just given to my questions, are not yet finalized. They do not seem to know where we are going,

MS. VERGE: We are not talking about Grade XII.

MR. NEARY: Well, we are, because the minister is talking about enrollment, talking about these vocational schools being linked in various and sundry ways with the expanded high school system. The hon. minister mentioned that there a few moments ago.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that these instructors and other people in these vocational schools will leave work today, will go to bed tonight not knowing what the future holds in store for them. And here it is the middle of May and the minister does not know yet -

MR. SIMMS: The middle of April.

MR. NEARY: The middle of April rather, and the plans are not finalized yet, Mr. Speaker. It is just like everything else this government does. They are operating now almost on an hourly basis, from day to day, they have no long-term plans. The minister should be able to give us the details for these changes now. These people have a right to know, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

And that was a pretty slick answer. The minister is good at smooth talking; you cannot get any straight, honest answers from the minister. That is one of the reasons why education is passing through such a crisis in this Province at the present time. It is in an incredible mess, the worst mess, I suppose, in our whole history. That now and the fishery - the administration have managed to do a job on both the fishery and on our education. We are well aware that the vocational schools are providing a good service for the people of this Province. We should know, we built them all. It was a Liberal reign, a Liberal administration which built them.

MR. BAIRD: There he goes again, there he goes.

MR. NEARY: It was a Liberal government in this Province which made the decision to build these vocational schools - the College of Trades, the College of Fisheries and the university. Mr. Speaker, we should know all about it. But what I am afraid of, and it is frightening when you just listen to what the hon. minister said in that little slick answer that she gave, trying to be smart alecky and slick. That is not going over too well with the people of this Province today, Mr. Speaker, that kind of an arrogant attitude on the part of the minister. I am surprised that the NTA have not, a long time ago, moved a vote of non-confidence in that Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) for her ineptness and her incompetence. I remember one occasion before when the NTA moved a vote of non-confidence in a Minister of Education for doing far less, I might add, for far less reason than the reasons they have today for reprimanding the present Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. I am getting a little bit off the subject here now of the vocational schools. I regret very much that maybe I am not

MR. NEARY: making myself clear, but I believe I am. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. minister understands the questions that I am raising, my concern for the future of these people who work in these schools. We do not need to be told about the value of the schools because we built them. I happened to be part of an administration that built these schools. And they would not be there but for a Liberal government.

MR. MORGAN: And John Diefenbaker.

MR. NEARY: Oh, and John Diefenbaker. The cost sharing for the vocational schools, vocational training at the time, was 50/50. Mr. Diefenbaker brought it up to 75/25. So we can give Mr. Diefenbaker credit for providing 25 per cent of the cost. The Liberals brought in a 50/50 policy, the late Mr. Diefenbaker upped it to 75 per cent, so we will give

MR. NEARY:

him all the credit he is due, the poor man. He is dead and gone now. He managed to provide 25 per cent of the cost and the Liberals provided 50 per cent of the cost. So when the programme was brought up to the 75/25 level, then we built sixteen, the hon. the minister says sixteen - I always thought it was eighteen - vocational schools. The initiative for building these schools had to be taken by the provincial government which happened to be Liberal at the time. The initiative for the College of Trades, the university, the College of Fisheries, had to be taken by the provincial government.

So we over here do not need a lecture about the value of these schools. But what we are concerned about is that this administration has managed to shut down everything in Newfoundland now except the churches. They have had a go at everything. They have the people in the pulp and paper industry turned against them, the residents of mining communities are against them, one-half or two-thirds of the public servants are against them, the teachers are against them, the fishermen are against them, the fish plant workers are against them, the construction workers are against them. I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, that people have not taken to the streets in this Province. They are awfully, awfully civilized people. I suppose if they wanted to they could be more aggressive. I am not the kind to advocate civil disobedience, but I guarantee you that the people on the opposite side, members there opposite, as my friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) would say, members there opposite should thank their lucky stars that we have a civilized people in this Province. Because I guarantee you there is no other part

MR. NEARY: of the world where people would allow their government to get away with the things they are getting away with in this Province. And they can lie back all they want and they can say, 'Well, this is happening in other parts of Canada and other parts of the world.' Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is this, that the situation in Newfoundland could be much better than it is at the present time. The image that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have of the Premier of this Province is not that of a gentleman who is bent over his desk night and day burning the midnight oil trying to find ways of getting them jobs. But they do have an image

MR. NEARY:

of a Premier who sits in his office tossing paper aeroplanes into an empty wastepaper basket. That is the kind of an image they have of the Premier of this Province, who always seems relieved when a decision goes against him. They always seem relieved about it, like they did about the offshore, that now they do not have to do anything themselves, they can just lay the blame on somebody else. That is what they are up to all the time, Mr. Speaker, and we see it daily in this House; something happens, a problem arises, they seem greatly relieved that somebody else has to make the decision, somebody else has to do something about it, and they just lie back and wait, so that they can complain and criticize when the decisions are made.

That is no way to govern a Province. They should give up politicking. In between elections is when you govern, when you deliver on your promises. Mr. Speaker, is that what this administration is doing? Certainly not. And the teachers are finding that out today. They had great hope in the administration. They had great hope in the gentleman who heads up the administration in this Province. But he has given them every reason, Mr. Speaker, to feel that they have been let down, tremendously let down. They were accused of being dishonest, they were accused of bargaining in bad faith, they were accused of not having a mandate to negotiate. Their integrity and their professional honesty was questioned by the gentleman who is now soaking up the sun down South, who should be here to deal with this situation. We were told today by the Premier the first obligation is to the House of Assembly, being paid for by the taxpayers.

MR. BAIRD:

You should go soak your head.

MR. NEARY:

There is the kind of arrogance you get, Mr. Speaker. Those are the kinds of answers, and the kind of comments, and the kind of arrogance that you get from the members there opposite. The next thing now somebody will get up on the other side and make a speech and they will all start pounding their desks again. And that is supposed to do something for the various groups and people and individuals who are faced with very serious problems in this Province.

So it looks to me like the people who work in the vocational schools are going to be treated in the same shabby way as the minister has treated the teachers, as the minister is treating everything and everybody else who comes under her jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. minister will want to comment on what I am saying, but when the hon. minister gets on her feet perhaps she can tell us about Grade XII. What about Grade XII? I have been told on a number of occasions by representatives of the various school boards, especially here in the city of St. John's, that they do not have the space, they do not have the accommodations, they do not have the classroom space to start up Grade XII.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: Well, I would like for the hon. minister to give a few comments on that, too, Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to go on to speak about successes in Education in our Province. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) indicated that he was not sure about the number of vocational schools in the Province and for his information, and perhaps in the interest of other people in this Chamber and people in the galleries, I will go through the list of vocational schools in the Province. There are indeed sixteen, most of which were built through the initiative of and with the benefit of most funding from the federal government, headed by the late Right Honourable John George Diefenbaker. Mr. Speaker, we have sixteen vocational schools going from West to East. The school at Happy Valley which serves all of Labrador, particularly the Lake Melville area and the coastal area, and on the island, Mr. Speaker, there are schools at St. Anthony, Corner Brook, Port aux Basques, Baie Verte, Springdale, Grand Falls, Gander, Lewisporte, Bonavista, Clarenville, Salt Pond - Burin, Placentia, Carbonear, Seal Cove, in Conception Bay South, and then Bell Island. That is a chain of sixteen district vocational schools. As well, as I said before, we have a craft training school at St. John's and all of those seventeen institutions, the sixteen vocational schools and the craft training school, are administered directly by the Department of Education, through our division of Technical and Vocational Education. Mr. Speaker, also providing valuable programmes and services in our network of post secondary educational institutions are

MS. L. VERGE: three colleges in the Stephenville-
Stephenville Crossing area, the Bay St. George Community
College, and in St. John's, the College of Fisheries, Navigation,
Marine Engineering and Electronics, soon to be renamed the
Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology, and the
College of Trades and Technology and, finally, of course,
Memorial University of Newfoundland with its main campus
at St. John's, and a campus called the Sir Wilfred Grenfell
College at Corner Brook. Now, all of these institutions
provide valuable programmes of a post secondary

MS. VERGE:

nature to people of the Province. The vocational schools have a secondary function, Twelve of our vocational schools provide what are called pre-vocational programmes to high school students. These programmes had been given to students from Grade IX through XI before the re-organized high school programme was implemented, and with the phase in of the changes in high school, the pre-vocational programme will be given to students in Grade XII, or Level 3, as well. Some sixty people are employed by the department's Division of Vocational and Technical Education at vocational schools, spending full time at giving the pre-vocational programmes to high school students.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) asked about the re-organized high school programme. That programme which was conceived several years ago and which was shaped through a committee of planners comprising leaders in education of our Province, representatives of the Department of Education at the helm, representative of the Federation of School Boards, the Denominational Education Committees, representative of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and the faculty of Education at Memorial University, all of those people worked together on a steering committee for implementation of the re-organized high school programme which was struck early in 1979. That committee also had the benefit of a representative of parents. At the time the committee was started there was no formal provincial association of parents, since then the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Home and School and Parent-Teachers' Associations was formed, and the parent originally on the steering committee

MS. VERGE:

teachers, principals, parents, anyone who took an interest in the design of the reorganized high school programme, had a chance to review the tentative programme design, make comments, make constructive suggestions. Many, indeed, were received and were considered in leading to the final design which incorporated many of those recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, people may recall that somewhere in that process government decided to postpone by one year the actual implementation of the reorganized high school programme, scheduling the start of the programme at the Grade X level for September 1981. That actually happened and we are now completing the end of the second year of the three year programme. The students now in Grade X1, or level 2, as most of the people in our high schools now refer to it, are destined to become the first graduates from the new programme. They will be the first people to take Grade X11, or level 3, and will graduate with the benefit of the greater variety of programmes in June of 1984.

Mr. Speaker, there were many reasons which led to the basic policy decision to expand high school. I think these can be grouped under three headings. First, a desire to increase and improve the variety and selection of courses and subjects available to our students. Formerly our students constricted into X11 years of school, from Kindergarten to Grade X1 inclusive, were attaining the same level in some subjects, such as mathematics and the sciences and English, as their counterparts in other parts of North America who had the benefit of an extra year of schooling. With greater expectations and demands that happened over the years, this necessitated an increasingly greater percentage of scheduled instructional time being devoted to those subjects with the result that

MS.VERGE: other important subjects were virtually squeezed out of the time table of many of our high school students, even those in large urban schools where, on paper, there was a reasonably good selection of courses. It was quite common, for instance, Mr. Speaker, for students going through school not to do History after Grade VII or VIII, and this was an obvious shortcoming in the education of many of our young people since History is considered one of the basic subjects for a reasonably well-rounded education.

MS VERGE: So, Mr. Speaker, designing the senior high school programme by first of all expanding the time frame by providing an extra year, by lengthening it from a two year programme for Grades X and XI to a three year programme for Grades X, XI and XII, obviously made it possible for many more courses and subjects to be offered in schools and actually taken and studied and absorbed and appreciated by students.

A second feature of the plan, which enhanced the chances of a greater variety of subject matter to be appreciated by students, was one key element in the design and that is the credit system whereby, for graduation, a certain minimum number of credits are required with courses having one or two credits, depending on the number of hours of classroom instruction devoted to those courses.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. minister's time has elapsed.

MS VERGE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With leave, I could continue to tell people the benefits of the reorganized high school programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

Order, please!

Before I introduce the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) it gives me great pleasure to welcome to the galleries of the House of Assembly, a delegation from Point Leamington, in the district of Exploits, Mayor Stuckless, Councillors Andrews, Elliott and Woodward.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the minister
wants to take an extra minute to elaborate, she may by all
means go ahead.

MS VERGE: Thank you very much.
Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. the member for
Torngat Mountains.

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

MS VERGE: I was just explaining,
Mr. Speaker, that one of the benefits of the reorganized
high school programme, namely, that of a provision of a
greater selection of courses and subjects to students,
results from the credit system whereby, for graduation,
a minimum number of credits are required - the number
happens to be thirty-six - with the courses offered giving
one or two credits, depending on the number of hours of
classroom instruction for each of the courses. And,
Mr. Speaker, no longer is a course tied to or locked into
a grade. There is flexibility, such that a student in
Grade X, or Level 1, may study a 2000 level course side
by side with a student in the higher levels, Level 2,
or Grade XI. And, Mr. Speaker, if a student should fail
a certain course, should fail to get the credits
accompanying that course, then, Mr. Speaker, the student
will no longer have to repeat the whole grade, the
student will no longer have to repeat any other course,
the student has the option

MS. VERGE:

of repeating that one single course to get the credits accompanying the course, or the student may turn to yet a different course. Now, Mr. Speaker, the programme design is such that half of the required credits for graduation have to be derived from a core component which guarantees that every student has a minimum exposure to all the important courses and subjects, so that we can be assured that all the people leaving our high school programme with a high school graduation certificate, have a reasonably well-rounded education.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the first and most important reason why this administration moved to add Grade XII and, at the same time, do more than that, to enrich all of senior high school, beginning at the level of Grade X. There are two other reasons which, I will state very succinctly, have to deal with allowing young people, on average, one more year in high school when they can live home with their parents before they have to take that big step of going on to post-secondary study, or trying to get a job. And, of course, because of our world society, that also means leaving home. By having people remain at home that extra year for Grade XII it is felt that on average, when young people do have to take that big step of going on to university, or college, or vocational school, or getting a job, they will be better equipped for the transition because they will be more mature and better able to handle the social change as well as all the other adjustments.

And the third reason, Mr. Speaker, has to do with bringing more in line the high school system in our Province of Newfoundland and Labrador with the rest of North America. Formerly, we were out of step and there were many practical problems for people and families moving back and forth from our jurisdiction to Mainland, Canada,

MS. VERGE: and the United States.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Before I introduce the hon. member, I would like to welcome to our galleries the Mayor of Biscay Bay, Mr. Wilson Ryan from the district of St. Mary's-the Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am forced to get into this debate. In particular, I was just listening to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) trying to give all the Brownie points, all the good parts of her department.

I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that the minister did not have the gall to mention that the teachers are locked out and the government is saving roughly \$1 million a day. And what is this doing to our educational system? We are worried about Grade XII, but we have children in this Province, from Nain right down to Cape St. Mary's, who cannot go to school today because of this minister's incompetence. That is why they cannot go to school, it is because of the incompetence of this minister.

MR. SIMMS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. WARREN:

Sure it is a shame. I agree it is a shame. It is a shame that this minister would allow the teachers to be locked out of their classrooms, forced out of their classrooms, and have the parents all concerned and have the students, maybe - and if the minister does not get off her rear end a little more and do something about it, then we are going to have students in this Province, this year, maybe having to repeat their grades all over again. This lockout could continue and with the incompetence of the minister, I am sure she is not doing too much in trying to get the students back in the classrooms. And the reason she is not trying is because she knows that everyday the students are out, everyday the teachers are out, this government is saving \$1 million a day and this \$1 million a day is going to help

MR. WARREN: to pay for the institution.
of our Grade XII programme. So this is what the minister
has in her mind, to try to pay for the Grade XII programme —

MR. BAIRD: Imputing motives. Imputing motives.

MR. WARREN: — pay for the Grade XII
programme, and the one way to do it is to
keep the teachers out as long as they can. And that is
the intelligence of the minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the
Department of Health, we also have in the Department of
Health — teachers are going to have to
suffer, the students are going to have to suffer and
then this government through the Department of Health,
and through another incompetent minister, the Minister
of Health (Mr. House), is saying, 'Look, to hell with
the sick people, let the sick people die'. This is
the attitude, we are going to close down the hospitals.
And the minister said in this House in response to a
question I posed to him about two weeks ago,
just after the budget came out, about
the North West River Hospital the minister said, 'The
government opens up hospitals and government closes
down hospitals'.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. the minister and his colleagues of what the Premier said in Labrador in August of 1979. Let us remember a very strong and forceful promise made by Premier Brian Peckford to the people of Labrador, August 1979. Here is what he said, 'The people of Labrador would be consulted on the affairs that affect them.' That is what the Premier said. In fact, in The Evening Telegram on August 11, 1979 the Premier went on to say, 'It is important that a consultative process be in place, and people in Labrador would be consulted before government takes any action.' Now, what people in Labrador were consulted when the Minister of Health (Mr. House) decided that the hospital at North West River would close down? No one was consulted.

MR. S. NEARY: Not even the member.

MR. WARREN: No one. And what I find so ironic about the whole thing, and the hon. member from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) said it in North West River and he said it in this House, that he did not know the North West River Hospital was going to phase out until fifteen minutes before the budget was brought down. Now, I think that is a bit much and it shows one thing, that the rest of the Cabinet do not worry at all whether the hon. the member from Labrador knows about what is happening in his constituency, because the hon. member has said so. And here is the Minister of Health, in fact he was on the radio, on the Labrador Report one morning, and he was sort of contradicting himself. One minute he was saying, 'We are all going to make these decisions, make them unilaterally', and the next minute he was saying he would make whatever decision was necessary.' Now, the minister thinks he can close down a hospital that is going to affect 500 miles of coastline from Nain down to Black Tickle, across to North West River, while at the same

April 18, 1983

Tape No. 1131

MJ - 2

MR. G. WARREN: time knowing that the Lake Melville
Hospital cannot accommodate those patients at the present

MR. WARREN:

time unless there is a major restructuring programme carried out on that hospital. In fact, an inspector's report on the two hospitals - and the minister has this report - says that structure-wise, the better of the two hospitals is the one in North West River.

And another thing the minister is not thinking about either is how many people - How many people, I wonder, from Happy Valley - Goose Bay will lose jobs when the transition takes place from North West River into Lake Melville? The minister has not answered that. And there are people in Happy Valley/Goose Bay who are concerned that there could be some jobs lost in Happy Valley/Goose Bay because of the move from North West River.

The minister has made a move without even consulting with his colleague in Cabinet, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), that has drastically affected his whole district. And what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, is that this government - this government have another thing in the back of their minds. I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) mentioned it the other day. It is the key election item being discussed today between the two parties in B.C., that of user pay fees, and I would not be at all surprised to see this minister, through the Premier, bringing in the policy of user pay fees in the hospitals, having the patients paying. In fact, it is only just this year that they have increased the cost of private rooms.

So everything that this government have done - you know, I am amazed. I had a call from a teacher in Nain a few days ago and, you know, he was quite honest. He said, 'Could you tell me one thing that this government have done?'

MR. WARREN: I said to him, 'Surely goodness, you know this government have done a lot of things.' And this teacher could not name one thing that this government have done. 'Yes,' I said, 'they have closed down hospitals, you know, there are many things they are doing.' But they are doing it to hurt the people. They have locked the teachers out, that is another thing they have done. You know, this government have done a lot of good things as far as the government are concerned, because they are trying to save money: 'We are closing down hospitals to save money, we will lock the teachers out and save money.' And that is all that this government are concerned about.

MR. NEARY: They are punishing people who cannot defend themselves.

MR. WARREN: They are just trying to punish the average, ordinary Newfoundlander and Labradorian. This is the aim of this government. And this government was elected by the people last April 6th., and I will guarantee you now that if the people today had the opportunity, I would venture to say you may see one or two members on that side returned. You may if you were lucky. If the people today had the opportunity to go to the polls -

MR. TOBIN: Do not be so foolish.

MR. WARREN: Probably the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) may get back, because I think he is one of the harder working members over on that side and I am sure that he has done a good job for his constituents and probably he may get returned. But the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), he may as well forget about it. In fact, Lew Bailey will take care of him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: So he has been so affected by the closedown of the Burin Fish Plant, that I would not doubt but he would lose his nomination fee the next time. He would lose his nomination fee the next time around.

MR. CALLAN: He would have to shave off his mustache so that they would not recognize him down in his district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get distracted. I am not going to get distracted, because I think there is more concern about the Department of Health and what the Department of Education is doing to get sidetracked by the - what do you call him? - the global -

MR. TOBIN: I had six more letters from his district today.

MR. WARREN: So, Mr. Speaker, we here have a government that instead of -

MR. BAIRD: (Inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Yes, the word does begin with 'c', the word does begin with 'c' that this government is using, but not consultation. It is not consultation, it is confrontation. It is confrontation. This is a confrontation government, not a consultation government. That is the difference, Mr. Speaker. The people were blindfolded. The Premier was saying he would consult, but actually, Mr. Speaker, the people of the Province mistook the Premier, what the Premier was saying was, "We will confront". "We will confront." And that has been the attitude of this government and its ministers since they were elected not in April 1982, but way back in June 1979. And they have just one aim and that is to do what they can to hurt the people.

You know, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), I have not seen him. Is he down South?

MR. NEARY: He is a fellow who has a pretty good attendance in the House.

MR. WARREN: Yes, I have not seen him since the House opened.

MR. NEARY: He has not been here in two weeks.

MR. WARREN: However, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), when the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) - where is the Minister of Finance now I wonder? Where is the Minister of Finance?

MR. NEARY: Soaking up the sun.

MR. WARREN: When the hon. Minister of Finance read his budget in May - was it? - I think it was.

AN HON. MEMBER: March.

MR. WARREN: In March, when the hon. minister read his budget, the hon. Minister of Social Services started pounding his desk, pounding his desk because there was a six per cent increase.

MR. CALLAN: To the fuel allowance.

MR. WARREN: Well, a six per cent increase to the fuel allowance for the Labrador recipients. Now I just did a calculation -

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

MR. WARREN: By leave for one minute.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. NEARY: By leave. By leave.

MR. WARREN: Just for one minute, Mr. Speaker, to finish up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No leave!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): No leave!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, there is the difference. I had the decency to give leave to the hon. minister just now. This is the kind of government we have, Mr. Speaker, confrontation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to respond to some of the remarks made by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). I notice he is not staying around to listen. First of all, I just want to say that, you know, the remarks made, the inflammatory remarks made that government just got teachers out to save money, that is a thing that is totally inflammatory, imputing motives, it is totally wrong. And the hon. gentlemen should know that they are playing politics when they are saying that kind of thing.

The other thing, of course, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains just mentioned the incompetent Minister of Health. And I just want to say that the Minister of Health, you know, is not taken back by these kinds of statements, he knows where his competences are. That is one of the things he knows. Now, if the people on the opposite side of the House had wanted to have some debate, some engaging debate with the Department of Health estimates, they should have come here in the House of Assembly when they were done. Now there was a member here - there were a number of members, but one from the Opposition, and that member, I must say, asked some very incisive questions, but he was not even the critic for health,

So we went through \$456 million of estimates with one person from the Opposition, and two or three from the government side when I had a whole bevy of

MR. HOUSE: expertise here to answer any questions that were posed. So I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: I told you it was silly.
Scrap the procedure.

MR. HOUSE: That was not silly. A good way to get debate, and to get information and answers was, of course, to come and join in that particular kind of debate.

I just want to make a little response now not necessarily to what the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was talking about, but just

MR. HOUSE: a little response to the Leader of the Opposition. A couple of days ago when I announced the Royal Commission on Health Care Costs he got up and talked about how incompetent the minister was and he was too big a spender, he spent too much money. I acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a lot of money spent and I acknowledge that, perhaps, just by virtue of that fact we have to look at procedures and look at ways of curbing costs and ways of financing Health. But I want to say, also, that all the questions and all the debate and everything coming from that side is, 'You are not giving enough to Health' while on the other hand, they are saying, 'It is too much'. Now, I know it was not challenged by the press, it was not challenged by any of the media because they take the Leader of the Opposition to be a bit of a paradox, he can say one thing one day and contradict it the next, and that is the way he is accepted across the Province.

MR. NEARY: That is not what they told me in Deer Lake yesterday and the day before.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was out in my district the Saturday before last, I believe, for a social function. Now, ordinarily at a social function you would get a good turnout, you know, they give them a free dance pretty well, come and drink her up and so on. Now, one of my ardent supporters was there at my behest. He went in and when he got up to leave they said, 'Where are you going?', and he said, 'I am going out to get a postage stamp to write down the names of the people who are attending this function here tonight.' Those were the very words he told me. You had a very, very, poor turnout and if I were you, I would never mention the kind of a turnout you get to social functions in my district.

MR. SIMMS: If the Minister of Health (Mr. House) were out there it would be crowded.

MR. HOUSE: Very much so. Very popular.

MR. NEARY: He protested so much he (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS: I have been there and they were crowded.

MR. NEARY: All his staunch supporters
are now over in the Liberal camp.

MR. HOUSE: All my staunch supporters
in the Liberal camp. Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with that
camp very effectively in the last three elections, very
decisively and effectively.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me
get back to the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). The
member for Torngat Mountains, of course, is carrying on about
the closure of the hospital in North West River. As I have
said on a number of occasions and I will say it again, we
have to try and spend the dollars we have for health care
in the best possible way for the purposes of health care.
And no matter how much I want to see people retain employment,
we cannot keep facilities open for the sake of employment.
The first priority has to be giving health service,

MR. HOUSE: and I think if you look at the Budget and the Health-care this year, anybody can see that there is \$400 million of the \$456 million going to the curative aspects of health-care - \$306 million to our hospital boards, about \$22 million to government operated hospitals, \$57 million to medicare and then about another \$10 to \$12 million to hospital services, or medical health offices around the Province.

The member also talked about the people not being consulted. Now, Mr. Speaker, the member already said this repeatedly, repeatedly, time after time, everytime he has been interviewed the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) has said that he knew that the North West River Hospital was under review. It has been under review for three or four years and everybody knew it was under review. The Board, itself, had done a study on it, and a doctor who is not there now, Dr. Sarsfield, was involved in that, it was not being done by the Department, the Board was looking at the future of the North West River hospital. And when you see a hospital in North West River, sixteen miles away from the one in Goose Bay, the one in North West River with less than a 40 per cent occupancy, the one in Goose Bay with less than 50 per cent, when you see the occupancy rates in that hospital in North West River drop by 50 per cent over the last five years, when you see no surgery going there, and that being used for very little more than a dormitory, you just cannot maintain that as a hospital. I read a letter in the Northern Pen the other day which said 'my question is not - why are you closing it, my question is why was it not closed before?'

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, we have got to continue to look at efficiencies in the health-care system and while -

MR. NEARY: Why were the people not consulted?

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says that the people were not consulted, The people knew that this particular hospital was under study and its utilization being questioned. And what we have done now, Mr. Speaker, and what we are going to continue to do, is look at the most efficient uses and the most efficient way that we can deliver health-care, and I challenge anybody to be able to do a better job than we are doing now, at this particular day, even though we are not able to give the hospital boards all the funding they want.

I have no compunctions about closing a hospital when I know, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to be able to deliver adequate service. Now, the hospital at Melville was taken over from the American base years ago and it is deemed quite capable of handling all the services that is required, that can be given, as a matter of fact, in that part of Labrador. It is no good for anybody to say that we can get all the specialists we want in that particular area, It still has to be associated with St. Anthony, it still has to be because it does make up a viable unit And it is no good for us to say that we will have the same kind of specialties

MR. HOUSE: in Goose Bay as you could have combined with Goose Bay and Labrador. So the service is going to be offered, Mr. Speaker, I think, much better than has been offered heretofore, because when you centralize twounits into one you are going to be able to offer better services. Now, the member also asked a question about the people in Happy Valley/Goose Bay losing jobs. Nothing of that nature has come to my attention. What we are doing, and I am going up there next week or the end of this week to discuss it with the people, what we are doing -

MR. NEARY: You are going up?

MR. HOUSE: Yes, I am going up this week

MR. NEARY: A public meeting?

MR. HOUSE: I am going up this week to meet with the Public Health Board there. We are discussing the future of the hospital, we are discussing matters pertaining to dormitory requirements, we are discussing what is going to happen to the people who are being displaced. And, of course, we have programmes in place under the collective agreement to deal with it in part, but we will be placing as many people as possible in the existing situation at Melville, because we are going to have to add beds to that particular situation.

So, Mr. Speaker, we can say all we like, you know, that people were not notified. The people were not notified specifically it was going to close but they knew it was under study, and when we made the announcement of closure, we gave a six month period for that particular phasedown. So these were the questions that the hon. member raised, and I want to reiterate for about the third time that I am certain that there is going to be no setback, or cut back, or no deterioration in services to the people of

MR. HOUSE: Northern Labrador by virtue of what we are doing now in closing down the North West River hospital. Now, we are going to be adding rooms and beds to the Melville hospital. That has been decided. And the chronic care people certainly who have problems, who deem they have problems, will be taken care of right in their own communities, in Happy Valley and in Melville.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I notice in today's debate that many hon. members opposite try to take great delight in talking about the attendance at the Estimate Committees. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that is about the lowest thing any hon. member could engage in, to talk about an hon. member's attendance either at the House or in the Committees, I am sure hon. members have many legitimate reasons for not being in the House or not being in committees. And, Mr. Speaker, as I say, I think it is the lowest thing that people can get engaged in.

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible)

MR. LUSH: No, I did not hear it that way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. LUSH: No.

MR. NEARY: It was the Premier who started it.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, in my own case when I am not at a committee and when I am not in the House I have good reasons not to be. And the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) mentioned that he and I had a meeting this morning. And that meeting was planned many, many weeks ago, that meeting that we had this morning. That was a meeting planned many, many weeks ago. But, Mr. Speaker, just to substantiate what we have been saying all along, that with such a reduced Opposition the hon.

MR. T. LUSH:

members opposite know that this is not the right procedure with the numbers that we have. They know it. Mr. Speaker, we hardly have time to go to the washroom. All hon. members have engagements that you cannot predict and we knew it was going to come to this, but hon. members in their arrogance try to suggest that members on this side of the House are derelict somehow in carrying out their duties. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not going to wash. My constituents know that I am in this House every chance I get, that I am here working for them. They know that and these are the people that I will answer to as will all hon. members.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. House) again referred to the fact that there was only one member here. I well remember the hon. member, how he squirmed at the questions that I asked when he was trying to suggest that because of the cutbacks in health care the quality of health care was not going to be negatively affected. Now, how ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, when all of the major associations of this Province connected with health, the Medical Association, the Hospital Association, all of them are very concerned at what is going to happen to health in this Province. Then, Mr. Speaker, to look at our high levels of unemployment in this Province, and the great needs in education and then to see the provincial government turning down projects from the federal government in education. Mr. Speaker, it is something unreal how hon. members could sit back and watch that situation going on with school boards making applications to get minor repairs done to their schools, minor renovations, to upgrade their playgrounds, little things that they wanted to do and that needed to be done and could not get the money from the provincial government, and they applied to the federal government to qualify under these make work programmes, the Canada Community

MR. LUSH: Development Projects and the NEED programme. They were doing, Mr. Speaker, what every other committee in their communities were doing. And what justifiable reasons are there for this provincial government to veto these applications? Mr. Speaker, it is nothing but petty political nonsense to turn down these applications and to try and blame it on our denominational system of education, and to blame it on our structure of financing education. How stupid, Mr. Speaker. The people of this Province must, by now, see how political this crowd are becoming, Mr. Speaker; to try and make politics on the backs of school boards, people that need money so desperately. For what good reason? Forget the good reason, what reasons are there to turn down these monies when this Province needs money so badly to create jobs and to improve our educational facilities? Mr. Speaker, what nonsense! It is incredible, it is unbelievable that any government would do it. Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH: it is incredible, it is unbelievable, it needs to be said more and more so that the people of this Province will recognize this government for what they are, Mr. Speaker. It needs to be said over and over again. It needs to be said over and over again that this provincial government would stoop so low as to turn down federal make work programmes in education, an area where we need them so badly. There is not one hon. member on the other side who can justify that move, not one. Not one one, Mr. Speaker, not one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN: What time was your meeting over this morning?

MR. LUSH: Our meeting ended, I think, about one o'clock, did it not?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. LUSH: It ended about one o'clock. That is when our meeting ended. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the point. This debate is not going to end, the people of this Province have to know how small, how petty, this government are. They have to know how political they are. They have to know what they will do, and they have to know how low they will stoop, Mr. Speaker, to try and pick an argument with the federal government. That is what the people have to know, to know how low this government will go to try and create a fight, to try and get into a confrontation with Ottawa to turn down money, to every little community in this Province for upgrading their educational facilities, and to blame it on the DECs, to blame it on the denominational system of education, to blame it on our system of financing education. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier had gone to the DECs and said, 'Look we have all of these school boards throughout the Province applying for these grants, can we accommodate them somehow?'

MR. LUSH: I am sure that the DECs would have been delighted to make these accommodations. They would have been delighted. To bring our DECs into this political trash is an insult. It is an insult to the DECs, it is an insult to our educational system that the Premier and the government would use them in such a way. These federal government projects, Mr. Speaker, cannot be geared to the peculiarities of our system of financing education. You would not know but the federal government was trying to take over our educational system. What nonsense! What nonsense! What suggestions to try and put in people's minds, that the federal government somehow wants to get in and take over our educational system. They are not doing it anywhere else in Canada. Is our system so great they want it? What nonsense! What pure unadulterated nonsense. Again they are just carrying on these devious procedures, Mr. Speaker, to try and divide this nation, to try and further divide this nation. This is what they have been doing, and the people of this Province have to see them for what they are worth. It is absolutely ridiculous. And these projects, Mr. Speaker, are set up to create jobs in all of Canada, and committees apply for them. The federal government has nothing devious or insidious in mind other than to create jobs, and to do things in communities that people want done. They are local initiative programmes. It is the people in the area who have the initiative, they go to the federal government and say, We want the money spent here, and school boards innocently did what other groups were doing, did what municipalities were doing, did what Rural Development Associations were doing. Nobody said the federal government were trying to take over our municipalities, nobody said they were trying to take over the Rural Development Associations.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a lot of nonsense! And the school boards throughout this Province applied for moneys, badly needed moneys, desperately needed moneys to bring about improvements in buildings, buildings that were falling down, buildings that were dilapidated. We have some of the worst school facilities in all of Canada and these school boards had applied.

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

MR. LUSH: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No! No!

MR. SPEAKER: Leave has not been granted.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the truth hurts.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Baie Verte
- White Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, we have to try to keep some semblance of balance here, back and forth, so I would like to have a few words to say before this debate winds up on this Concurrence motion.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard three or four times today a lot of political rhetoric coming back and forth across the House but I never saw anybody in recent times work himself into such a frenzy, knowing he was wrong, work himself into such a frenzy as the hon. gentleman who just took his seat. Because there is more to it than what the hon. gentleman is trying to say, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not say a word to anybody in this House this afternoon while

MR. RIDEOUT: he was speaking. I can do that, I can shout as well as anybody but let the record show that I did not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who just took his seat knows full well that there is a lot more to what he tried to create than what he said. It is very easy, very easy indeed, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. gentleman to get up and accuse this government of not allowing the federal government through some department or other to spend money on education in this Province. That is very easy, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. gentleman to do. It is very easy for it to be reported that way. It is very easy for people to feel frustrated that way. But there is a lot more to it than meets the eye.

I had the occasion in my own constituency last year where two different school boards, Mr. Speaker, had a number of capital projects that they wanted to get involved in. Now, we all know how those decisions are made. Up until now the Province has given a block of funding to the appropriate DEC and they decided, based on their own priorities, whether it was Tom Rideout's district got a few dollars for the capital project or whether it was somebody else's district. I did not decide, no other politician decided. And in order for the board to be able to do those capital projects they have to have, I believe, 10 per cent of their own funding. And what did we find, Mr. Speaker, last year, with two different boards? We found federal politicians going to them and saying, 'I will find the 10 per cent if you will do the job here.' Well, maybe

MR. RIDEOUT: the job in Black Neck Tickle is not the priority that the school board wants to do. Maybe it is not. But the federal politician will go to them and say, 'You do the job here in place A and I will find you the 10 per cent. I will find you your 10 per cent if you do that job there.' The school board's priority might be in community B; that might be the community that needs the extra classroom so that that can take care of the expanded high school programme, community B might be the community that needs the science laboratory, but community B does not have the political clout that community A has so the federal politician goes to the board and says, 'I will give you money out of section 38, that section or some other section to help you meet your 10 per cent providing you do the project there.'

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what happened. This Province, this government would take advantage of every federal dollars, whether through make-work projects or whether they be through various other funding mechanisms from the federal government, Mr. Speaker, if things were done properly to ensure that the priority of the board, that the priority of the appropriate Denominational Education Committee was met. It is not that this government does not want to take advantage of every federal dollar there is, or that this government wants to stifle funding that might come in from a federal source to help out a board or help out a municipality or to help out anybody else, but rather it is to ensure that the funding went to the appropriate source so that when the decision was made it was made based on the priority of that particular board and that particular denominational education system. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the long and short of it. I can cite four examples to this House where school board representatives were told - and they told me, Mr. Speaker, they have told others and I would expect that they would continue to tell any member of this House who asked them - that if they agreed to do a certain project in a certain community under the authority of their boards, then that board would be assured that the 10 per cent they needed would come from a federal programme in order to be able to qualify with the DEC. So what does that do to the priorities of the various denominational education systems? What does it do, Mr. Speaker? I mean, you cannot allow that kind of thing to happen. If I have the right to make a political decision about what capital funding is going to be spent on school construction

MR. RIDEOUT:

in my area, that is one thing; but if we have a system that is set up whereby the priority and the decision is taken by the appropriate DEC and I try to influence it by saying, 'I will give you money from some programme providing you do Project A' and the board's top priority might be Project B, what does it do to the system? That is the real question, Mr. Speaker, that had to be addressed. And the government of the Province never said we would not take any federal money. The Province never, ever said that, Mr. Speaker. The policy that was developed by this Province was that we have a mechanism in place for capital funding in this Province for educational purposes; any dollars that you got to put into that put it in appropriately where it is supposed to go so that the appropriate DEC can then make the decision, based on their priorities, based on their own process they have in place, and in that way it will be done right, it will be done proper, and there will not be any influence by anybody whether it be political or anybody else in the system. So that was why that policy had to be adopted, because of the examples I just cited to this House. I can name four occasions where two different boards were told that 'if you carry out this project I can assure that you will get the money that you need in order to qualify for your 10 per cent.' Now, that, Mr. Speaker, cannot be allowed to happen. Either that or we do away - I suppose we can do away with it. I do not know how you would go about constitutionally doing away with what is enshrined now, and has been for the thirty-odd years we have been in Confederation, in our terms

MR. RIDEOUT: finance education. You can do that. You can change the whole system. But while that system is in place, you cannot have federal funds guaranteed for a project here that might not be necessarily the priority of the board or the appropriate Denominational Education Committee. So that is why the policy had to be developed. And, Mr. Speaker, if I have another minute or two I would like to make a couple of more comments on another issue. I have noticed that the official Education critic (Mr. Lush) for the Opposition over the last four or five days has been repeatedly saying in preambles to questions that he has asked the minister in the House about the dispute between the NTA and the Province and the school boards that he did not want to be provocative, that he did not want to appear to be taking sides, that he wanted to be neutral, that he did not want to appear to be political - and I give the gentleman full marks for that. We all realize that this is a very tense situation. Any dispute is tense, but this one has its own different characteristics that make it a tense situation. And I give the gentleman full marks for that and I hope he continues to take that approach, Mr. Speaker, because that is a very responsible approach. That, Mr. Speaker, is a very responsible approach and I hope he continues to do that. But what did we hear from the hon. gentleman for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) this afternoon? Again we saw the Opposition speaking out of both sides of its mouth. Its official position as enunciated by the official critic for Education has been responsible, been reasonable, attempting not to rock the boat one way or another, attempting to be neutral. But

MR. RIDEOUT: what did we see from another side of the Opposition's mouth as illustrated by the hon. gentleman opposite there this afternoon? We saw a very provocative political speech, Mr. Speaker. We saw a very vicious personal attack on the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge). We saw wild political accusations that have no foundation in fact about trying to balance the deficit of this Province on the backs of teachers and on the backs of students and on the backs of the school system in this Province. All so vastly different than the very responsible, very gentlemanly, reasonable approach taken by the official critic for the Opposition in Education. We saw another member of the Opposition irresponsibly, negligently try to infuriate and try to make worse, try to blow up a situation that is very, very delicate in this Province. And Mr. Speaker, I would say shame on that member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. RIDEOUT: It would be better, Mr. Speaker, if that member acted responsibly like his colleague from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). It would be better, Mr. Speaker, if that member would cease making wild, irresponsible statements that he cannot back up. This government, Mr. Speaker, budgeted this year money to pay teachers' salaries. You do not budget money to pay teachers' salaries if you want to force them out on strike. This government never locked the school doors, Mr. Speaker. This government never took the vote that was taken. It was taken by other people in other situations. So for the irresponsible, negligent, vicious political venom that came from the hon. gentleman this afternoon, it is almost not worthy of comment, but unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that kind of comment cannot be allowed to stay on the public record and not be answered.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

It would be much better for the students of this Province, much better for the teachers of this Province, much better for the employers of the teachers of this Province if the very reasonable, responsible approach that the gentleman from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) has taken continues to be the official line of the Opposition. But what are you going to see now, Mr. Speaker, and that is the strategy -

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I might have a go at it a little later on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the hon. member has said nothing to convince me about why it is necessary for this Province to reject monies to be spent under make-work programmes by the federal government. Now I do not know what the hon. gentleman is talking about when he is talking about these large capital projects; they are not what I am talking about. I am talking about the ordinary make-work projects that school boards apply for. I am not talking about building of schools or extension to schools, capital expenditures of that type, I am not talking about that. I am talking about applications under the \$100,000 range where they are doing minor renovations and minor repairs to their schools. And I never heard of any 10 per cent commitment or anything like that. What I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of application that was submitted by the Terra Nova Integrated School Board for minor repairs to the primary school at Charlottetown among which was to remove the urea formaldehyde insulation that was in the school. That is the kind of thing that I am talking about. I am not talking about major capital construction. And in any event we have made those accommodations, we have had those arrangements when the federal government built DREE schools. And all I am saying

MR. LUSH: is that the Premier could have made certain accommodations through the DECs so that these school boards could have received monies to do these minor jobs. As I said, I am not talking about building schools, But certainly goodness we changed our regulations before, we made accommodations for that somehow rather than cut off these desperately needed monies that school boards wanted to do the minor repairs and the minor renovations to their schools, to remove, for example, in Terra Nova district in the town of Charlottetown, urea formaldehyde insulation, certainly that kind of accommodation could have been made. And, as I said, we once made accommodations for the building of schools in this Province but now we could not make the accommodation for these little, small Canada Works projects. We could not make these accommodations.

So, Mr. Speaker, one is forced to ask the question why did this Province turn down those monies? Why were there fifteen applications rejected and scores of others not looked at because the personnel, the selection committees at the regional Manpower offices just figured it was just a lot of work for nothing, just an exercise in utter futility to be screening these projects when they knew the Province was going to turn them down. And I say again, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason for it. There is no reason for it. It is just petty nonsense, petty political nonsense that we cannot accept money under these federal works projects.

Mr. Speaker, not any great expenditures - \$40,000, \$50,000, \$60,000-and I am sure that the DECs would have been delighted to have made some accommodation, And to talk about changing the constitution, Mr. Speaker, what nonsense! And, Mr. Speaker, if we have to change, if we have regulations which prevent us from receiving money under these programmes, then I say they have

April 18, 1983

Tape No. 1143

NM - 3

MR. LUSH: to be changed. They have
to be changed. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary

MR. LUSH:

to do it at all because I am sure, as I say, that certain understandings, certain accommodations, could have been made in the same way they were made for DREE schools. We are just talking about little petty amounts of money, but Mr. Speaker, in their total they mean a lot. These fifteen applications that were rejected, I do not know what they would have amounted to but I expect they would have resulted in a lot of jobs in the fifteen communities concerned throughout this Province and they would have done a lot, Mr. Speaker, to improve the educational facilities in the areas where these applications were made out.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, there is no justification for it. There is no justification for not accepting these monies, that certainly we can make some accommodations, that our regulations can be modified or changed, something can be done so that school boards can apply for these monies to get the little work done that they need, work that they have been wanting to do over the years with their schools falling down and schools dilapidated in many of our communities, little repairs that they could have made to repair those schools. So, Mr. Speaker, some accommodation could have been made in an area where we need money desperately and where we need the jobs. And it is ridiculous, it is absolutely ridiculous, it is atrocious that this provincial government saw another way to create confrontation with the federal government. That is all it was, Mr. Speaker. The school boards innocently applied for these projects. Everybody else was applying for them. Municipalities were getting them. Every group in the community were applying for these projects. Why should not the school boards think that they should apply if they had a school that was falling down that needed some

MR. LUSH: repair to the roof, needed some repairs to the floors and the walls? The obvious thing to do was to apply for these little, small federal government projects, make-work projects and would be doing the Province a great favour, would not be coming to the Department of Education to bother them. They would be getting this money to carry out the work that they needed so badly to improve and enhance the educational facilities in the Province. But, no, this Province says, 'No, we cannot do it because that is not the way we fund education'.

Mr. Speaker, that is nothing sacrilegious, is it? Is there something sacrilegious about taking a Canada Works project or taking federal government monies from these make-work programmes to improve schools? There is nothing sacrilegious about it. Mr. Speaker, as I said, it is an embarrassment to our denominational educational system, it is an embarrassment and an insult that the Province saw fit to make this unprecedented move to deprive school boards throughout the Province that are broke and busted and need the money so badly, of these funds. Here was an avenue to do things that they have wanted to do for years, and yet the provincial government saw a way to reject those monies. Mr. Speaker, as I say, I see no justification for it. There can be no justification for turning down these projects, these fifteen applications and scores of others that did not get looked at because of this narrow, parochial policy by this government, and trying to blame it on our denominational system of education and the way that our funding is structured. It is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, nothing short of being atrocious. And I hope that the Premier and his government, his Cabinet, can get together and work with the DECs and work out some plan whereby school

April 18, 1973

Tape No. 1144

IB-3

MR. LUSH: boards can apply for these make-work programmes, whereby they can take advantage of these make work programmes. As I say, I am not talking about huge capital expenditures, building schools,

MR. LUSH: although if the moneys are there we will take them. Let hon. members answer this, How can the federal government do it? How can they do it to give us money out of these make-work programmes? We say they can give block funding. They are doing that. These make-work programmes are in place for all of Canada. How can they tailor that so that our school boards can qualify for them? How can they tailor it? And I take very well what the hon. member is saying. I am not asking that priorities be changed and this sort of thing. If the Terra Nova Integrated School Board makes an application to do improvements to the school in Charlottetown, then that is taken in and evaluated and appraised with all of the other projects. There is no need for the situation of this money being spent in Gander; they have applied for it for Charlottetown and that one gets recognized and gets appraised in the same way all the others do. And when it is approved, I see no reason why the Terra Nova Integrated School Board - I just use that in the universal sense - could not be given that money to do the repairs that they wanted to do with the school in Charlottetown.

I would not buy the nonsense either that the hon. member mentioned previously, I would not go for that nonsense. But that is not the kind of thing I am talking about. I am talking about school boards making applications under these Canada Works programmes in the same way that municipalities do, in the same way that rural development associations do, and they are there waiting for their approval, and if they meet the requirements we get them, but not to find that after we have granted one that they are turned down. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the situation as I understand it, that because they turned down fifteen all the others now

MR. LUSH: are not getting looked at.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that we need to look at this, to review our policy and see if we cannot make some accommodations. And again, I am sure that the DECs welcome the money. They are not that small, Mr. Speaker, that they do not want to see \$40,000 going into Wesleyville or \$40,000 going into Nain or \$40,000 going into Deer Lake to make some minor repairs, to make some minor renovations to the school. They are not that small! It is too petty to talk about, Mr. Speaker. It is too petty to talk about when we realize that the provincial government have been given -

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

MR. LUSH: By leave?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: No, leave is not granted.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I yield to the hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: I thank the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

I just have another point or two that I want to make relative to a point or two made by the hon. gentleman. I do not expect that I will take all the time at my disposal to do it, but I do thank the

MR. RIDEOUT: hon. gentleman who just took his seat. Also, of course, in this House it is normal that we go one for one and while some of us might be engaged in other things and be a little slow getting to our feet, I believe it is quite normal that we alternate back and forth, so it is not any special privilege that the hon. gentleman is allotting to me but I thank him just the same.

I want to talk another moment or two, Mr. Speaker, about, again, some of the allegations made by the hon. gentleman from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), who sometimes can be very sensible and reasonable and reliable and intelligent and can make his points very well, but there are other times, Mr. Speaker, when he really builds himself into a frenzy for no reason at all. And there are none so blind, Mr. Speaker, as those who refuse to see. The hon. gentleman knows very well what we are talking about when we are talking about Capital Works for education purposes in this Province.

Now, it makes no difference, Mr. Speaker, whether the capital project is \$1, \$100,000 or \$1 million, a capital project is a capital project no matter how much is attached to it.

MR. RIDEOUT: You know, you cannot be talking about apples and oranges. You are either going to be talking about capital projects for education purposes in this Province or you are not going to be talking about them. You cannot say because a project is \$15,000 it should be done under CCDP, you cannot say because it is \$150,000 it has to be done through the DEC and the federal government have no input into it. You cannot say that. If it is a capital project for education purposes, then it has to be handled by the appropriate constitutional mechanism that was set up and approved by this Legislature in conjunction with the churches in this Province for delivery of capital works.

Now you cannot have it any other way. You cannot have your cake and eat it too. Not because the project is \$5,000 we can do it one way now, and when it gets up to \$150,000 or \$1 million we can do it another way. You cannot do that. And this is what the hon. gentleman is not understanding.

There is another thing he is not understanding, Mr. Speaker. Let me take a hypothetical example of, say, a school in my own district, which might be able to apply and get \$50,000 or \$75,000 from a Canada Works project maybe to put down a foundation for a gymnasium. Now a local school committee or a committee of the board, a local school committee most likely in the particular community would have made application for that particular project. The board most likely would say, 'That is fine. If you get that, that is fine with us.' But the Denominational Education Committee, the particular Denominational Education Committee might have a priority, Mr. Speaker, that says before you can build a gymnasium on that school it is of a greater need to put two classrooms on the school in the community next-door, or it is of greater need to take the urea formaldehyde, that the hon.

MR. RIDEOUT: gentleman is talking about, out of a school somewhere else.

The appropriate DEC might have a list of priorities on which that particular gymnasium is number four or number five. But, Mr. Speaker, because the federal government through a make-work programme gives the local school committee \$50,000 or \$75,000 to put down the footings and start that project, what does that do to the DEC's priority list? What happens then? What happens to number one, the two classrooms in the community next-door? Or a lab facility in the community next-door to ensure that we can do the appropriate work that we want to do under the expanded high school programme? What happens then? Where does the hon. gentleman's logic carry through then? It does not, Mr. Speaker. Obviously it falls down.

And, Mr. Speaker, added to that federal politicians are involved. I do not care what the political stripe is, because most of this money we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, they dish out themselves, let us face it. Most of this money, whether they are government members federally or whether they are Opposition members federally, the final decision on where that money is going to go is theirs.

So what happens knowing that when the federal politician goes down to a regetta in some community in the Province and meets his buddy on the school board and says, 'I understand you want to build a classroom or put a lab in the school in this community or build a gym, but you cannot meet your 10 per cent requirement. I will find your 10 per cent for you provided you put it in this community. I will find it through Section 38, or through NEED or through some other slush fund that might be available in Ottawa. I will find it for you.' Now what does that do, again, Mr. Speaker, to the priority list that the Denominational

April 18, 1983

Tape 1146

PK - 3

MR. RIDEOUT:

Education Committee has in this Province and to the people who have the responsibility constitutionally for delivering that service? What does that do?

MR. RIDEOUT: I would submit to Your Honour that that argument holds valid and holds true no matter whether the project is \$10,000, whether it is taking UFFI out of a school in Nain, or whether it is building a gymnasium on a school on the Baie Verte Peninsula, or whether it is building a new school, the same logic holds true, that if federal politicians or by using federal grants they are going to be able to come in and disrupt the priority that the school board has and the appropriate Denominational Education Committee has, then the system breaks down, it cannot work. And that is what we are talking about. And the Province did not say, Mr. Speaker, "We do not want your money". This Province participated in direct federal involvement in spending for education capital purposes in this Province before - the DREE schools are a prime example of that, that can be done - but do not go behind the appropriate DEC's back and slide up after dark and say to your favourite member on the school board, "I will find you \$10,000 or \$20,000 providing you do this." That is not the way it is supposed to be done in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: He knows that.

MR. RIDEOUT: And the hon. gentleman knows that. Go to the DEC, come to the provincial government and say, "We have \$500,000 that we can spring out of the NEED Programme, or 'We have \$200,000 that we do not need to put into CCDP,' or 'We have \$500,000 under section 38, or we have \$5 under section 39.'"

PREMIER PECKFORD: Or we have \$500,000 under j-o-k-e.

MR. RIDEOUT: Or whatever, and come to the Province, and to the DEC and say, "Here, you can have it."

MR. RIDEOUT: And then if the school board in Terra Nova has Glovertown number one on their list, the IEC can say, "Go ahead." Or Charlottetown. Or if the school board on the Baie Verte Peninsula has LaScie number one on their list, they can go ahead. But do not go up to them and say, "Number five becomes number one," or "Number ten becomes number one." That is the point; it makes a joke, Mr. Speaker, out of what has worked very well in this Province up until now. It makes a joke out of it. And it has only been done, Mr. Speaker, this last year or so, the last few months really.

MR. WALSH: By the Liberal MPs.

MR. RIDEOUT: It has only been done by Liberal MPs sliding up to various people on the school boards and saying, "I will get this for you if you will put the money here." We cannot allow that to happen.

MR. LUSH: You do not want them involved.

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not mind their involvement, it is their money, they can do what they like, but if they are going to do it they have to do it right and they have to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that the priority of the appropriate IEC, and the priority of the appropriate school board becomes the number one priority, not the political vote getting of the federal MP.

Now that is the bottom line on it, Mr. Speaker. This Province cannot allow that kind of thing to take place. It has taken place. They have tried to make it take place, but if they have money under NEED, or under anything else, let them go to the Province and let them go to the appropriate DEC and let it be handled, like it was always handled, by the DEC and the school board. And, Mr. Speaker, the nerve then of the hon. gentleman opposite - I know he knows the difference, and I know that he knows that I know the difference. I did have some connection

MR. RIDEOUT: with education in this Province for a number of years - but the nerve then to say that we are trying to lay the blame on the DEC. The only time I have ever known that to be used, Mr. Speaker, is when I used to use it in the Opposition myself, and accuse the government of wanting the DEC to do their dirty work for them, like handing out the money. I knew intellectually it was wrong because that is the way it was set up, but that is the same kind of argument that the hon. gentleman is making. The hon. gentleman knows full well how we fund capital education projects in this Province and it makes no difference, whether they are \$1 or whether they are \$ 1 million, they have to be funded the same way, if not the whole system breaks down. And the foolishness and the ranting and the roaring that the hon. gentleman gets on about then is

MR. RIDEOUT: nothing to do about nothing - it is not even much ado about nothing, Mr. Speaker, just for the sake of a headline. Because the people out there understand. I had this problem in my own constituency and I believe the Premier had it in his as well. This is not the first time this has surfaced. But when you sit down and explain the appropriate procedure for doing this - and the question is not returning or refusing federal assistance, that is not the question, the question is doing it properly so that the priority work remains the priority work and it remains the priority of those responsible for delivering education to the Province, not the responsibility of the MP.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The time for the hon. member has expired and I have to say that I have been advised by the Table that the time for the debate in this Social Services Committee has also expired. So I have to put the motion, the motion being that the report of the Social Services Committee be concurred in. Those in favour 'Aye'. Those against 'Nay'. The motion is carried.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I intended to call the next concurrence debate, which is the Resources Committee, but I would suggest to the hon. gentlemen; if they like, perhaps we begin afresh with it tomorrow rather than now. There are only fifteen minutes left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sure, sure!

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

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

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

April 18, 1983

*Tabled by Hon. Min. of Rural,
Agricultural & Northern Devt.
18 Apr '83*

Mr. Warren (Torngat Mountains) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

A list of persons and businesses who have received loans from the Farm Development Loan Board in 1981 and 1982.

ANSWER:

My response to the Honourable Member's questions is directed by the policy presently in place respecting the disclosure of names of persons, organizations or firms receiving loans from Government or its agencies. The policy presently in place is as follows:

A person requesting such information must:

- (i) the person requesting such information be required to approach the staff of the Department or agency concerned;
- (ii) the Department or agency guarantee that such disclosure be mailed to the person requesting such information within 72 hours. Such mailing to place on record the request received; and
- (iii) the name of the person requesting and receiving such information to be subject to disclosure to the client or clients, the information on whom is disclosed.

*Tabled by Hon. Min. of Rural,
Agric. & Northern Develop.
18 Apr. '83*

Mr. Warren (Torngat Mountains) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

A list of individuals and/or companies who received loans from the Rural Development Authority and the purpose for which the loans were granted for the year 1982?

ANSWER:

My response to the Honourable Member's questions is directed by the policy presently in place respecting the disclosure of names of persons, organizations or firms receiving loans from Government or its agencies. The policy presently in place is as follows:

A person requesting such information must:

- (i) the person requesting such information be required to approach the staff of the Department or agency concerned;
- (ii) the Department or agency guarantee that such disclosure be mailed to the person requesting such information within 72 hours. Such mailing to place on record the request received; and
- (iii) the name of the person requesting and receiving such information to be subject to disclosure to the client or clients, the information on whom is disclosed.

Tabled by Hon. Mem. of Rural
Agri. - Northern Develop.
18 Apr. '83

Mr. Warren (Torngat Mountains) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to pay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What is the status of the Province's proposed Ventura Capital Corporation that was to be established to provide incentive programs to assist in the start of new businesses or the expansion of an already established enterprise?

ANSWER:

My response to the Honourable Member's question is that the proposed Ventura Capital Corporation does not come under the jurisdiction of my Department.

*Tabled by Hon. Minis
of Rural, Agric. & Northern
Development 18 Apr. 83*

Mr. Warren (Torngat Mountains) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

The details of why the number of farmers insured under the Canada/Newfoundland Crop Insurance Program have decreased since 1978.

ANSWER:

The number of farmers participating has decreased from a high of 29 in 1978 to a low of 15 in both 1981 and 1982.

The first crop insurance program, available since 1973, was not sufficiently flexible to keep abreast of changing production technology, production costs and market prices and therefore, it has become less effective.

The present program gives all-risk coverage for turnips and potatoes and coverage for cabbage only for losses resulting from wildlife (moose) damage. Insurance coverage is for a guaranteed level of production intended to reimburse the owner for out-of-pocket financial costs if the crop is a failure. The costs of production and guaranteed yields apply equally for all insured farmers. This has resulted in an inadequate program for farmers who are top managers and obtain high yields.

Therefore, in 1982 a new more flexible program involving provincial cost of production data and provincial yields and market prices was prepared. It has been agreed to and will be cost-shared by Agriculture Canada. The new program will be implemented in 1983 and hopefully more farmers will participate.

The main changes incorporated in the new program and summarized as follows:

- (1) All-risk insurance will be introduced for cabbage.
- (2) Farmers will be able to select from four different levels of coverage. The higher levels will require higher premiums by the farmers.
- (3) The guaranteed level of coverage for each group will be calculated using annually updated cost of production figures and yields based on the previous five year provincial averages. This will keep the information current. The provincial average yields will be replaced by individual farm yields as they become available. This will mean that higher indemnities can be offered to low-risk applicants.
- (4) Premium payments will be established and shared as follows - Farmer 40%; Province 35%; Federal Government 25%.
- (5) The Federal Government will pay 50% of all administration costs including travelling, salaries and equipment of crop insurance staff.

Dick Williams

18 Apr. '83

MAR 18 1983

Mr. Lush (Terra Nova) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Labour & Manpower to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

The number of trips taken by the Minister during the fiscal years 1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982

- (a) reason for trip;
- (b) places visited;
- (c) date of departure;
- (d) date of return;
- (e) cost of travel;
- (f) other costs;
- (g) class of air travel;
- (h) airlines used;
- (i) individuals not directly related to Government business who accompanied the Premier at Government expense.

Received
MAR 30 1983
in the
Minister's Office

1979-80

Labour / Manpower, 18 Apr. '83

<u>REASON FOR TRIP</u>	<u>PLACES VISITED</u>	<u>DATE OF DEPARTURE</u>	<u>DATE OF RETURN</u>	<u>COST OF TRAVEL</u>	<u>OTHER COSTS</u>	<u>CLASS OF TRAVEL</u>	<u>AIRLINE USED</u>	<u>INDIVIDUALS NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO GOVERNMENT</u>
Meeting with I.O.C. & Wabush Mines	Montreal	Apr. 17/79	Apr. 20/79	333.18	245.00	Economy	EPA	None
Press Conference on <u>Easton Report</u>	Labrador City	May 28/79	May 29/79	51.00				
Annual Convention - Industrial Accident Prevention Association	Wabush	June 21/79	June 22/79	112.83			Government Aircraft	
Nfld. Federation of Labour - Workshop on Safety	Gander	Aug. 26/79	Aug. 26/79	48.00				
Ministers of Manpower Conference	Moncton	Aug. 27/79	Aug. 28/79	101.00	220.00	Economy	EPA	None
Nfld. Federation of Labour Convention	Gander	Nov. 18/79	Nov. 18/79	48.00				
Canada Paperworkers Union Convention	Corner Brk.	Nov. 16/79	Nov. 17/79	93.00	62.65	Economy	EPA	None
Meeting with United Steelworkers of America	Labrador City	June 11/80	Jan.	25.00				
Attending Cabinet Meetings	Stephenville	Jan. 15/80	Jan. 17/80	128.42	125.30	Economy	EPA	None
Attending Cabinet Meetings	Corner Brk.	Feb. 20/80	Feb. 22/80	156.00	125.30	Economy	EPA	None

1980 - 81

<u>REASON FOR TRIP</u>	<u>PLACES VISITED</u>	<u>DATE OF DEPARTURE</u>	<u>DATE OF RETURN</u>	<u>COST OF TRAVEL</u>	<u>OTHER COSTS</u>	<u>CLASS OF TRAVEL</u>	<u>AIRLINE USED</u>	<u>INDIVIDUALS NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO GOVERNMENT</u>
Meeting with Citizens Committee - Baie Verte	Baie Verte	Apr. 19/80	Apr. 20/80	73.80				
Meeting with United Steelworkers & Department Regional Offices	Wabush	May 2/80	May 3/80	176.85				
Cabinet Meeting	Goose Bay	June 15/80	June 17/80	96.00	239.00	Economy	EPA	None
Attending Graduations Exercises District Vocational School	Burin	June 17/80	June 18/80	51.00				
Cabinet Committee Meeting	Gander	July 4/80	July 4/80	51.00	97.20	Economy	EPA	None
To meet His Royal Highness - Prince Philip	Gander	Oct. 11/80	Oct. 12/80	138.58				Wife - \$25
Cabinet Meeting	Grand Falls	Nov. 4/80	Nov. 7/80	233.38				
Representing Premier - Conception Bay North Bonspiel		Jan. 24/81	Jan. 24/80	30.00				
Cabinet Meeting - Corner Brook Winter Carnival - Baie Verte	Corner Brook Baie Verte	Feb. 17/81	Feb. 21/81	337.59				
Atlantic Provinces Ministers of Labour	Halifax	Mar. 22/81	Mar. 24/81	237.20	229.00	Economy	Air Canada	None

TRAVEL BY MINISTER - 1981 - 82

<u>VR. #/DATE</u>	<u>REASON FOR TRIP</u>	<u>PLACES VISITED</u>	<u>DATE OF DEPARTURE</u>	<u>DATE OF RETURN</u>	<u>COST OF TRAVEL</u>	<u>OTHER COSTS</u>	<u>CLASS OF TRAVEL</u>	<u>AIRLINE USED</u>	<u>INDIVIDUALS NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO GOVERNMENT</u>
419 June 21	Abitibi Price	Stephenville	June 21/81	June 22/81	88.55	55.00	Economy	EPA	None
570 Aug. 7	Tour Mill and Meetings	Stephenville	July 26/81		298.29 (car) 202.98		Govt. Aircraft		
571 Aug. 7	Tour Bowaters N.S. Cement Meetings	Corner Brk.		July 31/81	Govt. Aircraft	255.00	Govt. Aircraft		
876 Sept. 28	Cabinet Meeting	Deer Lake	Sept. 22/81	Sept. 24/81	92.90	171.92	Economy		
877 Sept. 22	Manpower Ministers Meeting	Quebec City	Sept. 11/81	Sept. 15/81	95.85	512.00	Economy	Air Canada	
1331 Nov. 25	Meetings of Social Policy Committee	Corner Brk.	Nov. 20/81	Nov. 22/81		113.13(car) 205.24			
1562 Jan.14	Manpower Ministers Meeting	Vancouver	Jan. 10/82	Jan. 12/82	954.50	378.50	Economy	Air Canada	
1938 Mar 25	Meetings with Town Council	Wabush	Mar. 21/82	Mar. 22/82		156.48			

1982-83

<u>REASON FOR TRIP</u>	<u>PLACES VISITED</u>	<u>DATE OF DEPARTURE</u>	<u>DATE OF RETURN</u>	<u>COST OF TRAVEL</u>	<u>OTHER COSTS</u>	<u>CLASS OF TRAVEL</u>	<u>AIRLINE USED</u>	<u>INDIVIDUALS NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO GOVERNMENT</u>
Attend Conference on Productivity through Improved Labour Relations	Halifax	Oct. 5/82	Oct. 7/82	300.25	210.00	Economy	EPA	None
Attend opening of Baie Verte Mine and Cabinet meetings in Springdale	Baie Verte Springdale	Oct. 20/82	Oct. 22/82		175.00			
Meeting with Honourable Lloyd Axworthy	Ottawa	Dec. 22/82	Dec. 22/82	441.00	85.00	Economy	Air Canada	None
Manpower Ministers Conference	Edmonton	Jan. 12/83	Jan. 14/83	963.00	384.81	Economy	Air Canada	None

Len Simms 1983 04 18
Rec. & Youth

Answers to questions asked by the Hon. Member for Torngat Mountains on March 18, 1983 to Hon. Len Simms, Minister of Culture, Rec. & Youth.

Questions:

- (a) How many instances of moose poaching have been reported to his Department for the years 1980, 1981 and 1982?
- (b) How many fines were levied against moose poachers for the above years?
- (c) Give a breakdown of which areas of the province the poaching infractions occurred.

Answers:

- (a) Our records do not distinguish between offences that are reported relative to moose, caribou, small game or others. Particulars as to how many instances of moose poaching have been reported are, therefore, not available.

- (b) There were a total of 264 fines imposed against persons charged with offences relative to moose:

1980 - 64
1981 - 99
1982 - 101

- (c) The following is a breakdown of the offences by areas. Eastern area would be that part of the Province east of Terra Nova National Park and a line to Bay Du Nord River. Western would include all the area west of Springdale, Hind's Lake, Star Lake, Lloyd's Lake and White Bear River. Central would, of course, be the area between east and west.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Region</u>	<u>Moose</u>
1980	Eastern	25
1980	Central	17
1980	Western	19
1980	Labrador	3
1981	Eastern	29
1981	Central	22
1981	Western	48
1981	Labrador	Nil
1982	Eastern	28
1982	Central	31
1982	Western	42
1982	Labrador	Nil

ANSWER TO QUESTION #8

Appearing on Order Paper #4/83, Thursday, March 10, 1983.

Asked by The Honourable Member for Bellevue, Mr. Callan.

Question: Mr. Callan [Bellevue] - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Development to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

A list of loans by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation for the fiscal year 1982-83 to date to industries which failed and assets of companies sold by public auction or some other means to recover part of the funding of such companies.

The list should provide:

- [a] amount of original loans;
- [b] subsequent loans or operating capital;
- [c] location of industry receiving loan;
- [d] jobs created and then lost due to failure of the industry;
- [e] revenue received by the Corporation as a result of companies' assets through public auction or other means.

Answer:

During the fiscal year 1982-83 to date, one company financed by loans from the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation failed and its assets were offered for sale by the Corporation. The company Tic-Tock Bakery Limited of St. John's, received loans of \$95,000. [ninety-five thousand dollars] approved in March 1981, and \$12,000. [twelve thousand dollars] in September 1981. Assets mortgaged to the Corporation were offered for sale by tender and to date no sale has been finalized. Consequently information pertaining to revenue received and jobs lost is not available at this time.

Hon. Member for Torngat Mountains
Responsible for Youth 1983 04 18

Answers to questions asked by the Hon. Member for Torngat Mountains on March 18, 1983 to Hon. Len Simms, Minister of Culture, Rec. & Youth.

Questions:

- (a) How many instances of moose poaching have been reported to his Department for the years 1980, 1981 and 1982?
- (b) How many fines were levied against moose poachers for the above years?
- (c) Give a breakdown of which areas of the province the poaching infractions occurred.

Answers:

- (a) Our records do not distinguish between offences that are reported relative to moose, caribou, small game or others. Particulars as to how many instances of moose poaching have been reported are, therefore, not available.

- (b) There were a total of 264 fines imposed against persons charged with offences relative to moose:

1980 - 64
1981 - 99
1982 - 101

- (c) The following is a breakdown of the offences by areas. Eastern area would be that part of the Province east of Terra Nova National Park and a line to Bay Du Nord River. Western would include all the area west of Springdale, Hind's Lake, Star Lake, Lloyd's Lake and White Bear River. Central would, of course, be the area between east and west.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Region</u>	<u>Moose</u>
1980	Eastern	25
1980	Central	17
1980	Western	19
1980	Labrador	3
1981	Eastern	29
1981	Central	22
1981	Western	48
1981	Labrador	Nil
1982	Eastern	28
1982	Central	31
1982	Western	42
1982	Labrador	Nil