



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 35

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas

Thursday

12 May 1988

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, as members will recall on April 18, 1988, I made a statement to this House on the lobster fishery. This statement made reference to the fact that under the Fish Inspection Act, all lobsters buyers, as a condition of their licence, are required to pay fishermen 70 per cent of the price received for Newfoundland lobster in the Boston market. Today I wish to confirm to the House that this condition is presently in effect.

Although this pricing system has been utilized by the lobster industry since 1984, the market situation this year is not as strong as previous years and consequently, buyers, in order to conduct a viable operation under this criteria, are required to "fine tune" operations to meet the 70 per cent requirement and realize profitable returns. Accordingly, I have decided to schedule the weekly price announcements to more adequately coincide with the selling date in the U.S. marketplace. For example, Mr. Speaker, my previous schedule indicated that the price announced each Friday would apply retroactively to the previous weeks purchases. However, these announced prices more adequately

apply to the period two weeks previous, since it frequently takes anywhere from 10 to 14 days from the time of purchase from the fishermen for the lobster to reach the actual market in the United States.

I have attached a revised schedule for the release of lobster prices for the remainder of the season - it is here in the statement. Beginning on 20 May, which is next Friday, there will be another price announcement applying to the week of May 1 to May 7, and so on down through to the end of the season.

The price I announced last week, on May 6, 1988 (\$2.65/lb) applies for the period April 20 to April 30. Further prices to fishermen will depend on the market and will be announced as per the schedule that I have just referred to. Buyers will be required, of course, to meet the announced prices retroactively for the period the announcement covers.

In order to revert to this price schedule, my next price announcement will be next Friday, May 20, applicable for the period May 1 to 7. Furthermore, to ensure that all parties are aware of the weekly prices, I will be telexing the buyers and Fishermen's Union, in addition to media announcements. In order to ensure that buyers are included on this telex list they can contact our licencing division or any field office of the Department of Fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, this adjustment is in accordance with the principle that the fishermen receive 70 per cent of the market value. This timing schedule will more adequately reflect this principle to

accommodate the industry (fishermen and buyers) in general.

Although this condition of licencing has provided pricing guidelines for lobster fishermen over the past few years, I look forward to 1989, when such a condition, under the Fish Inspection Act, is not required and is replaced with the regular industry pricing mechanism through collective bargaining between the union and buyers. I have every indication that this action will take place for the 1989 season.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I realize the importance of clarifying the situation with respect to the Boston blue sheet price and the 70 per cent amounts that have been stated by the minister, because a number of lobster buyers have indicated some confusion as to what period, for example, applies and all that sort of thing. My colleague for Stephenville has brought to my attention the fact that a number of buyers in his area have expressed concern that they are not sure as to what period is covered and as to what price is being paid.

I think one of the important things that the minister touched on was the fact that the lobster market this year is not as good as it was last year. In fact, I believe last year the price being paid for lobster was around \$3.15

a pound, and this year it is \$2.65. That is a pretty sizeable reduction and, of course, the fishermen are the real losers.

Mr. Speaker, I am not blaming the minister for this. I know that this is all contingent on the Boston market and the American market, and so on, for lobster, but certainly it points out the need for maybe taking a second look at the industry itself, in that, as is always the case, when the lobster season starts, there is a great deal of interest in the fishery and a lot of lobster are exported into the marketplace, and, consequently, of course, like any other product, when there is an oversupply, the price drops. That is what is happening in the lobster fishery, and it is not going to be a simple matter to overcome.

But certainly it seems to me the idea of holding lobsters in holding pounds for a certain period - I realize too there is a limit as to how long you can hold them - and then fed into the market as the demand requires, we might be in a much better position to get a better price and have a more sustained price.

It is very tedious. The market is up and down, and, as I said, the fishermen are usually the losers.

I am not surprised that the minister in his closing paragraph said he looked forward to next year when this condition will no longer exist and what is now the practice will be replaced by a regular industry pricing mechanism through collective bargaining between the union and the buyers. I think that is what has to come. It is not a healthy situation now, for the government to be so highly

involved. I think the matter of pricing can be better dealt with by the union and the buyers through the regular collecting bargaining process.

Mr. Speaker, these are a few thoughts that I would like to pass on to the minister. Maybe sometime he can address them and investigate the possibility of providing some mechanism whereby lobsters can be held over until the market can absorb them without a drop in price. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, the marketing of lobsters, like the marketing of all the rest of the fish in our Province, suffers, I think, from too much of an attitude that the Americans are the only market in terms of development for the future. I think the Minister of Fisheries and everybody else would agree that there are a lot of other markets that have been developed in the past in Europe and in Japan, which, quite frankly, are a lot more lucrative. So it is, I think, with lobsters as well. We are talking about a price pegged at 70 per cent of the Boston market, yet I understand from Clearwater, the fish company that does a lot of the lobster marketing, a lot of it is sold in Europe now, sold in Japan and sold in other countries. Let us hope that in the future we can develop these markets to the extent that we do not have to rely on the Americans.

Because, as one person told me, if each American eats fifteen pounds of fish and there are 250 million of them, that creates a certain size fish market. But when the Japanese eat one hundred pounds of fish and there is 100 million of them, that is a market that is almost twice or three times as big as the American market even though it looks smaller. And in places where they spend \$50 for a pound of steak, they are not going to be too surprised to get a lobster shipped over by air freight, which may still be able to give us a higher yield.

So we support the attempt to localize it, to stabilize the price. We also realize it is a collective bargaining function, although a very difficult one given the vagaries of the market. But we hope that in the future, and we intend to make a submission to the Senate Committee on fish marketing which is coming to the Province next week or the week after, we will see a development on a world-wide basis, because I think that is the best protection we have against getting good prices for our fish products and keeping the price there over the long term.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion in the media and otherwise in recent days about the situation with respect to hospital bed closures in the Province during the Summer months.

I would like to point out to hon. members that bed closures during the Summer months is a common phenomenon in Newfoundland's health care system and, indeed, throughout Canada and North America. What we are witnessing this year is not dramatically different from the situation in previous years.

There are many reasons why hospitals close beds in summertime. In general, it is the normal practice for hospitals to do this as a cost-containment measure because summertime is generally considered to be a more appropriate time of the year to reduce hospital activities. This is due to a number of factors. For example, there is usually a shortage of relief staff available in summer. There is often a decreased demand from the public to have elective surgery during the Summer months because children are out of school and people are often on vacation. Also, hospital staff and physicians, like other people, try to take vacation during the Summer months. In general terms, the summertime is a more opportune time to reduce operations in hospitals and Newfoundland hospitals, like hospitals elsewhere, take this into consideration.

In previous years, in the summertime Newfoundland hospitals have closed in the range of 350 to 375 beds of a total bed complement of approximately 2,750 acute care beds. That represents approximately 13 percent of acute care beds.

In the current year, there will be approximately 430 acute care beds of a total bed complement of 2,768 closed during the Summer. This increase in closures amounts to

about 50 beds more than last year but 20 of that 50 bed closure relates to the \$20 million redevelopment of the Central Newfoundland Hospital at Grand Falls, where there has to be, for construction purposes, a certain amount of closedown of activities. In essence, the true percentage of acute care bed closure this Summer will be 14.8 percent, which, as I say, relates to approximately 13 percent in other years. So there is not a great percentage increase.

In the health care system there is no such thing as a cutback in funding. Each year the amounts granted to the Province's hospitals increase. In our current estimates of revenue and expenditure, we have provided for Grants to Hospitals this year a total of \$400,711,700. This compares with \$377,174,100 last year, representing a 7.6 percent increase in the general allocation over last year.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate the point that the situation with respect to hospital bed closures and hospital funding this year must be put into a proper historic perspective. If that is done and the situation in Newfoundland is fairly assessed, it will become clear to objective observers that the decisions taken by the Newfoundland hospital care system are really comparable to those taken in other years and to those taken by other responsible health authorities in other provinces of our Country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, what we face here is the reality of the need. It is clear that we are not providing and responding to the need for hospital services in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order! Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Indeed there has been a lot said in the media in the last two or three days about the problems arising out of the closure of health care beds, and not all of it has been totally accurate. I am inclined to agree with the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins) that it may well have been exaggerated to say that the lady died because she could not be admitted to hospital. I do not quarrel with that, and I do not believe Mrs. Rowsell quarrels with it either, but the simple fact is, Mr. Speaker, she ought to have been admitted to hospital and she was not because there were not adequate beds available unless she were an emergency. And what the government's action has done for the most part is reduce our hospital care services to the point where, for a significant portion of the year, at least in some services not all, you can only be admitted, Mr. Speaker, if you are an emergency. And that is a sad commentary on the delivery of our health care services.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) trying to play God.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

The statement made today by the hon. the Minister of Health that everything is normal is, with great respect I submit, not totally accurate. Because this procedure has only started in recent years, the last five or six or so, when government cut back on funding to hospitals, and more and more hospital beds are having to be closed because there is a reduction in the funding available to hospitals or, at the very least, there is not adequate funding available to hospitals.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is dealing in inaccuracies. We have not cut back on funding to hospitals, we have increased it. The Leader of the Opposition knows that, and he is really misrepresenting the situation when he knows the difference.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, this is not a point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There has not been a reduction in funding to hospitals, there has been an increase every single year.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

That is up to the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Of course there is no point of order, it is an attempt to interfere.

Mr. Speaker, adequate funding is not made available to hospitals to provide the health care services our people need and, as a result, during the Summer months, which now seems to get extended from March to October, a very long Summer, a longer Summer than we have ever had in this Province, access to hospital beds is not available to people who need it unless they are in an emergency situation, and the government might as well recognize it. In fact, in this year the restraint of funding is such that there is going to be a more serious cutback than there has ever been before. So it is quite improper to castigate the hon. the member for Port de Grave in the circumstances, which has been done by the hon. minister and the news media in the last couple of days.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, in looking at the statement prepared by the Minister of Health he says there is no such thing as a cutback in funding which, of course, leaves the general public with the impression that there is no cutback in services. But, in fact, we all

know that the hospitals, especially in St. John's over about a three or four year period, went through a freeze in the total budget that they had. Of course, costs continued to escalate, the cost of nurses' salaries, doctors' salaries, medical supplies and so on, so the only way they could accommodate it was to cut back on services so that the budget could then meet it. So I think it is somewhat less than totally honest for the Minister of Health to say that there has not been a cutback, even though, strictly speaking, the words may be true. The fact is, we have less service.

The other thing I should point out to him is that the nurses are telling us that the reason part of the cutback in the Summer is occurring is because of the desperate situation to get nurses during that time period to do the relief work, and that is because so many nurses have become disgusted by the overwork that they have to do that they are leaving the profession.

For example, one of the hospitals in St. John's advertised for thirty relief nurses and only got ten applicants. That makes it very, very difficult to operate the number of beds that are needed, and that is a result, I would suggest, of the continuing freeze over a number of years, which means that we have a health care system that is in crisis. I regret that we ended up with the argument centering on the unfortunate death of a woman from St. Lawrence. The fact of the matter is, the shortage is there and there are health threatening situations, Mr. Speaker. The example may have been an inappropriate one to use, but the fact is the crisis is there and

the people who are waiting to get into the hospitals know it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

At this stage, I would like to welcome to the galleries students from St. Theresa's Elementary School in Buchans, with their teachers, Mr. and Mrs. Ted Whelan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, on May 9 the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) asked the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) a question, and I quote to him from Hansard: 'Will the minister advise the House why he would approve renting space at \$14.85 per square foot when similar and maybe better space was available at \$11.00 a square foot?' The minister I think promised that he would report to the House. I ask the minister when can we expect to get that report?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I informed the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle when he asked the question that we would ascertain all of the facts relating to that question

and I would table them. But I also told him, Mr. Speaker, at the time, and I still am certain, that it had to do with the suitability of the space. But in due course, Mr. Speaker, I will table the information.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary question.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand what is taking the minister so long. Surely he had the information available before he made the decision, so it must just now be a matter of pulling that together and bringing it into this House. So I ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, what is taking so long? Are there such extenuating circumstances that it is taking him so long to table this information, or are we going to wait until the House closes in July or August, and then he will publish it?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

No, Mr. Speaker, no extenuating circumstances. And I am not aware if there is any specific time limit placed on something like that. In the next day or so I will provide an answer.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Matthews). We learned today that the only teacher at Her Majesty's Penitentiary is going to be laid off as part of a larger layoff of fifty teachers in the Community College System. When this teacher leaves in June the educational courses at the Penitentiary will be shut down completely, leaving the inmates with no way to upgrade themselves for when they leave the system. Can the minister confirm that this layoff will happen in June? And if it will happen, what does his department plan to do about this educational void which will happen within the Penitentiary system?

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question and I would just like to say at the outset that what we see happening with the institutes and the community colleges in the Province is all tied in to the re-organization of our post-secondary education system. We said a couple of years ago that we were going to reorganize the system; now we are not only saying we are going to do it, we are going to do it. That means there has to be change.

With reference to the hon. gentleman's specific point about the literacy programme, particularly at Her Majesty's Penitentiary, I am very please to inform him that that programme will be taken over by the Avalon

Community College, as was the intent right from day one of reorganizing the post-secondary education system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
We are glad to hear, Mr. Speaker, that that will happen. I would like to ask the minister now, specifically, about the other fifty layoffs of teachers throughout the Province from community colleges. Can the minister confirm whether or not these people will be laid off? If they will be laid off, will government be providing them with retraining dollars or some way to retrain themselves to get back into the job market?

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

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker, for the second time in a row the hon. gentleman is wrong again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:
The total number of staff that will be displaced is 41.5. Of the total number displaced, 18 are permanent employees, and 23.5 are temporary employees who are on contract, who knew they were temporary when they were hired and knew they were going to be terminated. Of the total number

displaced, 14 are displaced as a result of declining enrollment, while 27.5 are displaced as a result of ongoing reorganization of our post-secondary education system.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, we did not just talk about reorganizing our post-secondary education system. We knew there had to be changes to implement a good post-secondary education system in this Province and that there would be some fallout and, as concerned as we are about layoffs in any situation, whether temporary or permanent, there has to be change if we are going to effect the end product, namely the students, the young people of this Province, whom we want to prepare for future job markets in this Province, Mr. Speaker. So while a total of 41.5 are being displaced, as well approximately 16.5 new positions will be introduced to meet other programme requirements and the net reduction will be twenty-five positions.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a further question for the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, re the layoffs in the community college system and the Cabot Institute. Would the minister tell us if any money in the accounts of the community colleges in capital funding is being transferred to operational funding so that they can at least keep on the staff that they have at the present time?

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

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker, such situations of transferring capital monies to current expenditure is evaluated on an individual basis.

The case the hon. gentleman, of course, is referring to is the Western Community College, which I discussed with him last week sometime when he suggested to me that there were some difficulties. The situation is that they are evaluated on an individual basis. It is not an uncommon occurrence. In discussions with the president of Western Community College, the member for St. George's (Mr. Dawe) and the member for Port au Port, (Mr. Hodder) who was aware of the situation and wanted to address it, I indicated, since I had to authorize the budget for Western Community College, that to overcome some difficulties that were apparently going to be encountered I would consider, upon request, transferring some of their capital money to operating funds. So that is where that is, Mr. Speaker. I think, again, we will see the layoffs being minimized in that particular college.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Would the minister tell us if the one-year business education programme is being dropped by the Cabot Institute? Could he tell us, also, if that programme was

supposed to be transferred to the Avalon Community College? If it was supposed to be transferred and is not, could he tell us why it was not?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, before answering that particular question, I would like to inform the hon. gentleman that there would be nine or ten people affected at the Western Community College. Of course, the hon. gentleman is being a tiny bit unfair in his questioning, because he knows why the difficulties are being experienced at Western Community College, in that there was an unauthorized over-expenditure last year in excess of \$300,000 that I, as minister, could not tolerate and wanted to address. There was no way, as Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, that I was going to allow that to go unnoticed and let people overspend again. So he knows full well what the situation is, because he has had conversations with the president himself.

Now, with regard to business education, Mr. Speaker, all over this Province programmes will not be affected. Students will be able access the programmes they require within a reasonable distance from where they live, and that is the whole basis of our community college system.

Another very interesting point that the hon. gentleman should know, with the Cabot Institute particularly, is that with most of the layoffs that are taking place we have done a graduate survey of employment and we found that most

of the positions that are now being eliminated, here programmes are going to be offered in the community colleges, the employment rate is anywhere between 50 and 60 per cent for those graduates. So what we have been doing, and why we set up the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies and reorganized the post-secondary system, is that we were preparing students for jobs that are not there and we wanted to change that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, would the minister tell us, with relation to the retraining to instructors, if any of the instructors who are being laid off have been offered any other employment within the system, or retraining for future employment within the system. Would he also tell us if the reason business courses are not being transferred to the Avalon Community College is because they want to see business education course done by the private schools here in this city?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, let me say again that 16.9 new instructors are being hired in our post-secondary education system, mostly in the community college system. With regards to instructor retraining, it should be recognized that

provision is made within the instructor collective agreement for establishing a committee to address retraining.

It is a function of a management-union committee, and, of course, another very important consideration here, when you are talking about retraining is that you are talking collective agreements, and, anyone with seniority can bump someone with lesser seniority, so until all that takes place within the system, then you really cannot get a handle on who is available for retraining.

So there is a management-union committee in place to deal with that, but it is going to take a few weeks before we really know what instructors can be retrained and for what. With regards to private schools, no such thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, and on the same issues but from a slightly different angle.

Mr. Speaker, we have checked with all the community colleges across the Province, and the only institution that has actually lost courses that were not due to lack of students, or due to the fact that these courses were temporary to start with, is the Cabot Institute, and only the Cabot Institute, and these are first-year courses in business education and computer terminals. My question to the minister is

this: Since the Avalon Community College, the only other local one, is not picking up these courses, and since the only other institutions that can then teach these subjects are Keyin Technical Institute, Compu-College or the other private ones, would not the minister agree that what we are seeing now is a very substantial privatization of the training of the people in this Province, especially in the St. John's area, from a public institution at low cost to a very high cost private institution?

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

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker, as I said in reference to a previous question, such is not the case; it is not a deliberate attempt to put such training over to private schools. I guess what we have to remember is that private schools are a reality in this Province. As well, as minister with responsibility for private schools, we will be introducing a new bill in a few weeks to strengthen The Private Schools Act. They are for real, and as the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies I am going to do whatever I can to assure quality in private schools. But it in no way reflects that there is a move away from the public post-secondary education system towards the private schools.

I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that students who want to access courses can do so within a reachable distance from where they live. As I said, that is the purpose for the community college system, the reason why we have the provincial institutes, and the

reason why we have the university. So it is not going to have a negative effect on programmes or students, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, it is well known, with the failure of the Harbinger School of Business last year, that some of these private schools are in trouble, that they are running out of students and so on. Would the minister not admit, given, for example, that the vice-president of Keyin Technical College is Ralph Tucker, a former candidate for the PC Party, that all we are seeing here is a massive privatization of the educational system at that level, a gift by the Tories over there to their buddies to make sure that they can continue on with what have been very variable, by the minister's own comments, educational programmes away from the high quality programmes that are being offered at the Cabot Institute?

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

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is again being very unfair now, trying to tie in a candidate who ran in a by-election a few months ago with what is happening with post-secondary education in the Province and in private schools, one of which that particular candidate happens to be part owner. I think that is very low on behalf of the hon. member.

Really, he should take the high road, because there is no connection, no link whatsoever in what is happening.

And I think it is very unfair, Mr. Speaker, and I think that is all I am going to say about that.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, we understand that tuition fees at the Cabot Institute are about \$240 to \$250 per semester. Would not the minister agree that comparable tuition fees at the private institutions range anywhere from \$1,800 to \$3,000 a year, and that these actions on the part of this government means that maybe fifty or 100 students who wish to take these business education courses that have been cancelled at the Cabot Institute will now have to bear the entire cost on their backs and make profits for their buddies?

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

MR. MATTHEWS:
No, certainly not, Mr. Speaker. That certainly is not a fact. Any student who wishes to access a programme that was being offered by the Cabot Institute can do so at a community college in the Province at a campus within reasonable distance from where they reside.

Perhaps the hon. member wants to be retrained for a job with Western Community College at Bay

St. George so that he can run against the member for Port au Port, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps that is what this is all about, if he wants to get personal about it and start throwing slurs across the House about people who run for different parties.

MR. SIMMS:

He has had about six years off running in elections.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, he has about six years off in time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

But, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman is saying, there is no truth to it whatsoever. There is no connection. And students who want to access programmes in this Province can do so because of the initiatives of this administration in reorganizing our post-secondary education system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question goes to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). Last Friday in the House, during the special debate on the Canada - France fishery dispute, the Premier tabled a copy of a letter he sent to the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, in which he denounced the federal government's lack of action to exert pressure on France to bring about a

satisfactory settlement of the fishery and boundary dispute. Now the Minister of Fisheries as well made some pretty strong statements, in fact, threatened to cancel certain bilateral agreements that exist between our two countries.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is this: Last night on Q Radio the Minister of Fisheries appears to have taken a more reasonable and a more conciliatory position.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am getting to my question.

Will the minister tell the House what has happened in the meantime to bring about this change of attitude? Is he aware of any action being taken or contemplated by Ottawa that will bring about this conversion?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, no doubt, the hon. gentleman, if he were to review the whole record last Friday, would know and I am sure he knows; it is just for other reasons that he is framing the question the way he is - that the Premier and myself, and I guess basically everybody who spoke from this side of the House, were unequivocally calling on the Government of Canada to use all of the diplomatic and economic levers available to it to try to bring about a change of heart and a

change of mind and a more reasonable stance at the bargaining table by the French.

That was our position last week, that is our position this week. The only comment that I recall making late yesterday was something to the effect that we had been trying to get or Canada had been trying to get clarification out of Paris as to whether or not the French intended to impose the permits that were being talked about over the last several days. There was some indication that there may have been some delay because of the resignation of one government and the swearing in of a new one, that kind of thing, and Canada had made some comments in that regard that that might be the case.

So if there is any other question I will try to deal with it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder has the minister, then, made representation to Mr. Clark and to the federal government to maybe bring about a situation where the historic relationship that has existed between the fishermen of St. Pierre - Miquelon and Newfoundland, that kind of an arrangement, can continue? Or if the French authorities insist that Newfoundland vessels be licensed, then will Canada follow suit? Will it, too, insist that vessels from St. Pierre and Miquelon be licensed to operate in Canadian waters? Or better still, Mr.

Speaker, what action has he taken to maybe bring restore the status quo, where the old historic situation will continue to exist between our two people?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman again knows that that has consistently been our position throughout this whole dispute, that over the last number of decades, and in accordance with several articles of the 1972 Treaty, inshore fishermen from both the Canada, i.e. Newfoundland, South Coast and the residents of St. Pierre and Miquelon have been able to fish freely back and forth on either side of the line. It has consistently been our position that the status quo ought to remain.

And we have communicated that both verbally and in writing to the government of Canada on a number of occasions over the last few days. However, we have gone on to say that if France intends to change the rules in the middle of the game, and institute a licencing system or a permit system for Newfoundland vessels, then, while we would prefer the status quo, if the rules are changed then obviously, there will have to be a quid pro quo and we will have to demand that Canada institute the same regime. That is not our preferred position, Mr. Speaker. Our preferred position is that the historic status quo that has existed between our two countries remain.

But if one party changes that unilaterally, then obviously we have to follow suit as much as we

would prefer not to.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I too have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. The immediate issue here, I would suggest to him and he might agree, is that a number of trawler skippers, including Willoughby Bolt and George LaVallee in my district, and Cec Rideout down in the member for Grand Bank's district, among others, have had their fishing activity interrupted, and their over-riding pre-occupation is to get back fishing, at the earliest possible opportunity.?

May I ask the minister, very specifically what has the minister done in the past few days, since this issues blew last Thursday, to get those men back fishing at the earliest possible opportunity?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. gentleman that while the whole question is most pressing, obviously the most pressing part of the question are those vessels who ought to be fishing now on the other side of the line and have not been able to fish because they do not know whether or not they would be arrested, as was the Maritimer on Thursday, I believe, of last week.

Every single day since last Friday, with the exception of Saturday and Sunday, we have been

in contact on several occasions with the Department of External Affairs, through my department, through Intergovernmental Affairs, through the Premier's office, and with the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans, trying to get out of Ottawa whether or not they have a response from their diplomatic note to Paris asking France to clarify whether or not they were going to cease and desist from this foolishness of instituting a permit system.

We have been in Cabinet from 8 o'clock this morning until 2:50 this afternoon, but up until this moment - or the last time I checked, around 2:30 or 2:40 today - we are still informed by Ottawa that there has not been a response from the French. Now, we have them bugged to death; we have the phones rung off the hook; all of us have been talking to them; our officials are onto them several times a day over the last two or three days, so we are trying to get an answer and Ottawa insists that it is trying to get an answer. Possibly, as the spokesman for the Fishermen's Union is quoted as saying today, the change in government may have something to do with it, but I do not know. All I do know is that as of the time I came to the House, Ottawa says they still do not have an answer from Paris.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
The minister, in responding to my friend for Twillingate made reference to what he thought was the most pertinent quote from him

yesterday. I submit to him there was one other when he said -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Would the hon. member please pose his question immediately?

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

- when he said yesterday evening, "We, the government of Canada."

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I have asked the hon. member to pose his supplementary and he continued on with exactly the same sentence as he was before. I ask him now to pose his supplementary or I will recognize somebody else.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, will he get away for a moment from the weighty responsibility of being a player on the international stage, being the Government of Canada?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Questions! Questions!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Will he return to the mundane task of being provincial Fisheries Minister for just a few minutes? These people are still not fishing. Will he do something very specific, and ask the Government of Canada to advocate that a blind eye be turned here for the interim, something that

will allow these people to get back fishing in the next few days? I realize there are larger issues, but the immediate one is that those people still are not fishing. Would he focus on that one for the next few hours?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
I am not going to allow any quotes from the hon. gentleman to stand on the public record without their being corrected. He attempted to refer to a quote yesterday, when I said "we", and went on to say "when I say 'we' I mean the Government of Canada," of which we happen to be a part. Rightly or wrongly, knowingly or otherwise, we are a part of Canada, and Canada deals with those matters with our input, hopefully, on the international stage.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. gentleman that I have been talking to at least two of those fishermen involved. I am on top of the situation daily, hourly. I need not take any instructions from the hon. gentleman about whether my role is in Newfoundland and Labrador, or whether it is participating through the National Government on an international stage, or whether it is on Mars or the Moon. I happen to know, Mr. Speaker, what I can do. I know what we have been trying to do, as a government, through Intergovernmental Affairs, through the Premier's office, and through my office. No stone has been left unturned and no stone will be left unturned, Mr. Speaker. If we had some political co-operation in this Province, Mr. Speaker, whereby we would be able to at least speak with a common front and unity on some shared

jurisdiction, unlike the
Opposition, Mr. Speaker --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

-- then we might have some constitutional rights in this regard, Mr. Speaker, to protect the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador. That is what we have been trying to do over here, but in the interim we are dealing with the reality of the here and now and nobody can point a finger and say we have not been trying to do, with tools that are available to us, the best we can do for those fishermen, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Political co-operation, yes.
Political duplicity, no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

That is what we are asking the minister: Will he stop being politically duplicitous about this, Mr. Speaker?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the member is on a supplementary, he should ask his question with no preamble.

MR. PECKFORD:

He just asked it.

MR. PECKFORD::

No, he did not.

MR. SIMMONS:

For the benefit of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, the question started, 'Will' --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The point of order is well taken --

MR. SIMMONS:

No, it is not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

I beg your pardon?

MR. BAIRD:

He said, 'No, it is not.'

MR. SPEAKER:

I ask the hon. member to withdraw that comment.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I started my question with, 'Will he stop being.' That is a question, Sir!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have asked the hon. member --

MR. SIMMONS:

I withdraw, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, the question is, as it was a moment ago, will the minister stop being politically

duplicitous long enough to give those trawlermen at least the time of day, which he would not give them yesterday when they called him? Now, let us not stand in this House and talk about what you have done. You have done sweet nothing on this one and it is time you started.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
I ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, will he -

PREMIER PECKFORD:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Now, the hon. member can very well say that he started off his supplementary question with 'Will,' and if that means that there are no full stops or periods in between, the question can go on until twelve o'clock tonight.

I ask the protection of the Chair for the minister and for this side of the House, and for the hon. member to get on with his question in brevity.

MR. SIMMS:
And do not be argumentative.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. member did start with a legitimate question, but he did not stop at that. He carried on making a speech.

The hon. the member for Fortune Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I shall try again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Fisheries confirm that yesterday he scarcely had the time of day for those trawlermen, which is to his shame? But, more to the point, will he now undertake, Mr. Speaker, to do something specific? I ask him to just forget the political rhetoric for a minute. The fishermen have had enough of it. Will he do something specific, Mr. Speaker, to help get those fishermen back fishing at the earliest possible opportunity?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, let me, first of all, say to the hon. gentleman that he can mouth political co-operation all he wishes, but political co-operation is no substitute for political stupidity -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
- and the transfer, some say, Mr. Speaker, over the most important resource of this Province. When a political party in this Province stands and opposes that, that is political stupidity of the highest order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Now, let me deal with the operative part of the question, Mr. Speaker. Was I called by one of those gentlemen yesterday? If my book is correct, yesterday was

Tuesday, and the answer is no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yesterday was Wednesday.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yesterday was Wednesday. The answer is no. I was called on Monday, Mr. Speaker - I think it was after a Cabinet meeting Monday or Tuesday - and I told them, 'I am going down to get a bite to eat. We just got out of a P&P meeting, I have another meeting with somebody at two or two-fifteen or something, and if you want to give my office a call around two or two-fifteen I will see if I can fit you in before I go to the House.' I have not heard a word since, Mr. Speaker. Now, take that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. SPEAKER:

At this stage, I would like to welcome to the House seven students from Badger Pentecostal School, with their Principal Mr. Danny Ayre and their chaperons, Shirley Stacey and Karen Eveleigh.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I want to table

essentially the material that the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies provided in the Oral Question Period. The question had been asked of me a couple of days ago on the whole issue as it related to layoffs in the Community College System. I have a written answer for hon. members opposite, because I promised them that I would get all the details for them. And this goes through it in the same way as the minister did, that it was not the numbers that the members opposite had been saying it was, and that we would be hiring on new people and going through the question of retraining and so on.

So I have the answer, and copies for all members of the hon. House so that they will have the answer in writing.

Petitions

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, I am still here in St. John's East the Premier will be glad to know.

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition that I would like to present to the House of Assembly with just a small number of names on it, but the Speaker will see that the petition is in order. It says:

'To the Honourable House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador:

We, the undersigned, urgently

petition this House of Assembly to enact changes to The Landlord and Tenant Residential Tenancies Act, 1973, so that we may receive protection from illegal eviction from our rented premises by The Landlord Tenancies Board. Since 1981, the Supreme Court of Canada's decision has denied jurisdiction to The Landlord Tenancies Board over evictions and, as a result, several of us petitioners are fighting eviction without the benefit of this consumer protection body.'

Mr. Speaker, I will give a copy of the petition to the page, and I am sure you will that it is in order though it is signed by a small number of petitioners, including the member for Menihek and myself.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:
I am having some difficulty wondering where this massive support for this petition is coming from, and how many, because members are supposed to comment on the numbers contained.

MR. LONG:
I just did.

MR. SIMMS:
I could not hear him, so perhaps he could repeat -- the total numbers of the names on the petition are?

MR. LONG:
Four.

MR. SIMMS:

Four?

MR. LONG:
Right.

MR. SIMMS:
I see.

MR. LONG:
Obviously no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
This is a point of clarification, for the hon. member.

MR. LONG:
I was just about to say for the benefit of the House Leader, the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications, the Minister of Housing, and others, that although there is only a small number of names on the petition it reflects what is obviously a very serious issue, especially for those people whose signatures are there, representing the situation of people who find themselves without any protection in this Province by The Landlord Tenancies Board.

MR. BAIRD:
There are more people than that up on the roof.

MR. LONG:
The issue of people, in the case of the couple who are signatories to the petition and who are also here in the gallery today, is one that I raised in the House yesterday during Question Period. It was by sheer coincidence that I put a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications, because I had been aware of this issue for some time, that the Landlord Tenancies Board is essentially without any jurisdiction, any authority, any regulatory capability in dealing with issues that might be brought

to it by tenants with respect to maintenance and upkeep or, indeed, with the issue of evictions.

In order for tenants in this Province who may be served with an eviction notice by a landlord, which may or may not be in compliance with the Landlord and Tenant Act, to determine their rights, they must go before a court of law. It, of course, might be a difficult question to resolve. If the landlord wants to initiate court action, then they will have to do that.

But the issue, Mr. Speaker, is that tenants are not able to turn to the Landlord and Tenancies Board as a court of resort to determine their rights and to determine whether they may have some protection in the face of questionable practices that might be initiated by a landlord. Those questionable practices might include: Issues of maintenance and upkeep. Or, in the case that has been brought to my attention this morning, less than twenty-four hours after I raised the question during Question Period yesterday, an eviction order that, to my own mind, seems quite patently unfair and in violation of the Landlord and Tenant Act.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am not able to pass judgement on this. The Landlord and Tenancies Board is not able to pass judgement on this. These people, who are now in the position of being forced, quite literally, out onto the street, have been told that the Landlord and Tenancies Board might like to be able to defend them and take action on their behalf, but they have no ultimate authority to do so.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with the seriousness of the issue in mind that myself and the member for Menihek, after having met with this couple who came to our office this morning, decided that instead of coming into Question Period today asking another question of the minister and receiving another vague promise that legislation is being worked on with no indication of any interim mechanism that the Department of Consumers Affairs might have to protect tenants, we would bring the issue forward again to the House today in the form of a petition.

So, Mr. Speaker, without having a whole lot further say, because we only have a short time in which to present the petition, I would simply submit to the House and to the government that a very serious situation exists in which the government has taken since 1981, so much time to review its own capacity to act with an arm's length agency and to review the position of the Landlord Tenancies Board. With respect to this issue, continuously for the last number of years government has promised legislation, indeed to the staff of the Tenancies Board -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker, by way of conclusion we, on this side, have been waiting long enough, and certainly tenants in this Province who are without protection are not in a position to wait any longer. In particular I would, with regret, draw the attention of the House to the particular situation that I have mentioned in the petition, and that is the situation that has been brought forward by the people who have joined us in signing the

petition. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Waterford
- Kenmount.

MR. GULLAGE:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to speak to the petition in support of the plight of these two individuals. Even though we have a petition with only four names, two of which are members of the House, I do think the individuals involved, who have signed the petition, their plight at this time has to be spoken to. I would like to support, in fact, the thrust of this petition. Because not only do we have one couple involved, as we do with the petition today, but this situation has been going on for sometime and indeed is only the tip of the iceberg as far as the problem is concerned.

We have evictions taking place with no recourse except through the courts, a situation where people cannot afford to take that route. This petition, of course, speaks to only two people at this time, but I would certainly say that we have had similar situations in the past and we do not have a Landlord Tenancies Board that these people can appeal to.

It really shows, Mr. Speaker, the whole area as far as the problems people occupying housing are having, and not only with evictions. We have seen recently people who are having their lights cut by Newfoundland Light and Power having no recourse to the Public Utilities Board. This speaks to the plight of people who

are occupying housing of all types, whether it be city housing or government housing. That whole area of landlord tenant relationships has to be looked at, and certainly a better avenue of appeal than is currently in place has to be put in place by the government, to not only address the plight people who are evicted without a fair trial and without a just hearing, but also address the matter of lights and services being cut without the right to appeal, as well.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to this petition.

On first blush, at any rate, I have a lot of sympathy for what the hon. member is saying in the petition. I was not aware of it, and it struck me as soon as the hon. member got up and got into what it was he was presenting there, that it seems to be a good point. I understand, in just speaking across here to the minister, that the act is being redrafted now to accommodate what the petition is asking for, and I guess people would say, 'Well, get on with it and get it into the House.' I support what the petition calls for.

Also, I noticed the news release from the NDP Opposition office. I do not think there was any necessity for some of the language there. I think the point is well taken, but the language leaves a little bit to be desired; it is somewhat discourteous and so on. But I guess that is part of the

political game.

I am seriously struck by what the hon. member had to say. The minister indicates that we are now redrafting it so that it will not be struck down as, I take it, it has been before.

The way the news release from the NDP Opposition office reads is that the Landlord and Tenancies Board do not have the right. I guess they would have the right - would they not? - if you draft the legislation properly?

MR. FENWICK:

They would if you did that.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes. It is not a question that the Tenancies Board has been struck down, it is that certain provisions in the legislation which established the Tenancies Board have been proven to be not strong enough to handle this without it being overthrown by the court. Therefore, some other language can be used which would permit the Tenancies Board to do what the petition asks for. Am I right?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Okay. So I just say, Mr. Speaker, it seems to be something that needs to be corrected, and the minister and myself will get on the ball about it in the next day or so and see that it is corrected. If we can get it into this session of the House and get co-operation for speedy passage, then I see no problem with us doing it before we close.

Orders of the Day

MR. SIMMS:

Order 3, Mr. Speaker, continuing debate on the Concurrence Motion of the Social Services Committee.

Debate was adjourned by the member for the Straits, but he is gone now, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER:

The debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

I will recognize an hon. member on my left.

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the Estimates Committee I thought we had a good exchange of views from both sides, the Opposition and government. I will not say it was totally without some controversy, but I thought it was a fair give and take and I think useful information was exchanged. I do not want to go into that in great detail now. I just want to speak generally on the health scene for a few moments.

I do not think there is any gainsaying the fact that there have been complaints voiced about our health system in recent weeks. The complaints have come from workers in the field, hospital workers, nurses, but not only nurses. There have been some concerns and complaints brought forward by the Opposition, not too unexpected I suppose, but nevertheless they have done it a number of times, perhaps more so than previously, and these points have been brought up in the media and so on.

Now, I am not too surprised at that, Mr. Speaker. I think one can reasonably expect at this time, in the course of matters, that there would be concerns expressed, there would be fears voiced, and there would be complaints made. The reasons for it are several: One of them is that this is a time of great change in the health care system activity. I will go into that a little bit later, but I will just list off a few now. This is a time of considerable change.

Secondly, and I think this is a realistic point, that is because of the nature of the budget that was brought down. Again, I will go into that in a moment or two.

Thirdly, I think we do have to recognize that the collective bargaining arrangements call for certain years to be quite, relatively speaking, by those in the health care system and in other government systems, because many of our workers are in the collective bargaining units, and also calls for certain years relatively active, and relatively, even, acromonious, if you want to use that term.

Now, just working backwards on those reasons, last year most agreements were in place or they were in the last year of the contract, and in actual fact there was not much going on in the collective bargaining field.

This year is different. Many contracts have either expired some time during last year and now collective bargaining is getting going again - there often is a little bit of a delay in these things gearing up or they are about to expire.

So, I think we can expect 1988 to be a much more active year in collective bargaining and, therefore, there will be cases made to the public and positions stated to, obviously, give one a bit of an edge at the bargaining table.

Now, that is not being cynical. That could be regarded as a cynical remark, but I do not think it is cynical. I think it is just looking at the reality of events. So that is one reason why there has been a certain amount of concern and a certain amount of publicity given to concerns in the health care field.

Now, on the deficit side of things, and again one has to be realistic in this, last year we projected a very large deficit. We did not want to present a large deficit, because we were afraid it could be hurtful to us in our borrowing programme, amongst other reasons.

But we were so concerned not to decrease essential public services that, the financial situation being what it was, we had to make that choice, either cutbacks in services or face a large deficit. We elected to face a large deficit, and I think it was the correct thing to do.

Now, as events unfolded themselves, we came out better than we had any reason to expect. The economy picked up right across Canada and, therefore, we got better equalization and other transfer payments. The economy was slow in affecting us beneficially, but it finally did and retail trade, and so on and so forth, picked up very markedly, especially in the large items, and our revenues from retail sales

increased quite smartly.

And, of course, we did, ourselves, have in place a very active programme of restraint so that our expenditures did not get out of hand. Anyway, at the end of the last fiscal year we were not facing \$170 million plus deficit, we were facing a deficit of about \$50 million.

Now, I think, and again this is not being cynical, a lot of people said, Look, if they felt they could get by with a large deficit and now they are only facing a small deficit, they must have some ready cash around the place, why do we not go after it? - and, therefore, there was this push to say we are suffering badly, we need a bit of extra funding and, therefore, we are going to make our case known to the public in every way we can.

Now, of course, as a government we do have to point out that no matter what improvement occurred in our budgetary situation, we are still left with a very serious deficit - \$50 million deficit on current account is not to be sneezed at. And that is one of the dangers of deficits; they are the proverbial slippery slope and once you get on them, they are very hard to get off. And once you get on them and you see a bit of improvement, people tend to think they are all over in a very premature fashion. Our deficit situation has not dissipated, we still have years ahead of us to bring our current account completely into balance.

We will do it but, nevertheless, we have to work at it. We cannot relax. It would be unrealistic for us to say now that our deficit is a bit smaller than we expected,

or even significantly smaller than we expected, we can afford to expend money without any regard or without sufficient regard to what our accounts are.

Now, the final reason why there is this dissatisfaction out there is because there is a lot of change going on in the health care field. We brought in, in Canada, government payments for health services about twenty-five years ago, give or take five years, and we brought it in in a certain fashion. Undoubtedly, it did fit in reasonably well with circumstances that pertained at that time, but now, twenty-five years later, a lot of things have changed. The very nature of government programmes is that they do not change smoothly: You tend to put in place a programme and, if things change around you, the programme tends not to change until somewhere down the road the programme gets so out of line, so out of kilter or so divorced, shall we say, with the circumstances that it is supposed to take care of that finally you have to change.

Now, that is what has happened to our health care system. We put in place a reasonably good system from a public funding point of view twenty-five years ago, there were gradual changes in the disease entities presenting the type of population that one was dealing with, the particular concerns that came to light, and the system essentially did not change in a very substantial way until pressures have built up and that is where we are now. We are now at a stage where we have to undergo, or undertake, a fairly radical review of our health care system and, for the reason I just mentioned, that it is not fitting

in nicely now with the problems we have to face. Therefore, that is a fertile area for complaint, concern and agitation, and that is another reason why we are being faced with it at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am not making a theoretical case of this, because I have had to respond to a number of issues and, hopefully, put them in some sort of perspective that people could be reasonably happy with. For instance, a number of weeks ago there were reports that we were in great difficulties because of a lack of specialists. Now, Mr. Speaker, I had to respond and say if one looked at the figures, we are better off in terms of specialists than we ever were. We are better off in terms of specialists than we were a number of years ago when there were no complaints about specialists, or if there were complaints, they were quite muted complaints or only very sporadic complaints. But here there were great concerns that we did not have enough obstetricians; we did not have enough internists; we did not have enough radiologists and so on and so forth, so I had to bring it to people's attention that that was not the case. Sure, we do not have enough, probably, but we are improving, and I think the issue was put to rest after a period of time.

Similarly, in the area of funding generally, the word 'cutbacks' began to be bandied around and it is still being bandied around. And if one just left it at that, people ultimately would get the impression, my heavens! there is not as much money going into the health care system as there was previously, which is patently false.

As the Premier mentioned today, if you look at the figures the monies going into the health care system are increasing all the time, year by year, progressively. They are increasing at a greater rate than the CPI; they are increasing at a greater rate than in almost any other part of the public expenditure programme. Now, I would be the first one to admit that they are not increasing at the rate that many people would like them to increase, this government included, but when you consider there was talk of cutbacks and you look at the facts and the figures, the two thoughts, the two words, 'cutbacks' and 'increases' are clearly at total variance with one another. So, one tries to put that at rest.

Then the other day, as hon. members will remember, there was the unfortunate situation at the Health Sciences Complex where, no doubt about it, surgery of a relatively urgent nature had to be delayed because of difficulties in the intensive care unit up there. Again, that was pounced upon as something very radically new and very dangerous. One had to put that into perspective and indicate that quite often, by the very nature of the health care system itself and by hospital activities, a hospital will be faced with more needs than it can normally handle and, therefore, it has to practice what is normally called triage; they have to take the most urgent cases and perhaps delay somewhat the cases that they ordinarily would not delay, but now, in this particular circumstance, they do have to delay for a bit. But after a while the extra pressure is taken care of or is otherwise not apparent, and then they can go back and practice the usual pattern of events, that is take

the cases they had to delay for a temporary period of time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I only have another minute or two. Let me just say this, that we are not unique in facing these concerns, and I hope I have explained the rational basis for those concerns. I am not saying that they are without basis, but I am just saying that they have to be viewed in their true meaning. We are not unique in this. Ontario set up a task force, and out of that task force there is now a Premier's study group, or whatever it is, and that is looking at the health care system in Ontario in great detail. They have published some reports, and those reports are ultimately going to result in quite a different health care system in Ontario than what has been in place in the last decades.

In Quebec they have completed a similar study. They have come forward with proposals which are quite radical in terms of putting physicians and other health care workers in rural areas and in controlling costs in their institutional and programmes areas of health care.

In Alberta, Nova Scotia, and so on and so forth, and in the United Kingdom, they had to do exactly the same thing, as did the United States.

MR. SIMMONS:

Would the minister permit a question?

DR. COLLINS:

I only have a minute, but if it is a short question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I have been listening with great interest to the minister and I was wondering - he is a doctor by profession, a doctor of great reputation - does he reflect the views of his colleagues as he speaks here? I find it incredible that as person who took the Hippocratic oath could sound so hypocritical.

MR. BAIRD:

He is just trying to be smart.

MR. SIMMONS:

It sounds hypocritical from here, but that was not the point of my question. The real point of my question is, is he reflecting the views of the medical profession in his statement here today.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am not in this House to reflect the views of any group, I am here to reflect, in my position as a minister, the attitudes of government, but I am also here, like every member elected to this House is here, to reflect the views of public issues as I see them. Now, I am not going to say I am speaking for doctors. I might add that I have been invited to address, as my predecessor was before me, the Newfoundland Medical Association's annual meeting coming up the weekend after next. The Minister of Health is usually given the privilege of speaking last at the luncheon at the end of the convention, and the minister usually takes this opportunity to discuss certain broad issues as he sees them. I certainly intend to get into similar issues at that time. Whether I will be hit with buns or applauded and carried out on the doctors' shoulders, I will not foretell. But if the hon. member would like to know, I will

report to him after the meeting.

In any case, if the hon. member is using the word, 'hypocritical' in a pejorative sense, in what I have said I was trying to lay out as I see it the large movements that are going on and that ultimately we have to deal with, perhaps in a day-by-day way or an item-by-item way, but we have to try to understand the large changes that are going on. What I was trying to say is that we are at a critical stage in our health care system. When you are at a critical stage, you often do get dissatisfactions, sometimes not clearly thought out, but dissatisfactions coming to the fore and we have to respond to them. But we must make sure as they do come to us that we define them, we do not run off and make irresponsible statements about concerns that are expressed; we have to look at their true nature and deal with them as best we can.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that in this House as we go through the rest of this session, and undoubtedly there will be further debate on points in the health care system, that we will try to deal with these things rationally, and try to deal with them in a way that will ultimately give rise to helpful solutions. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a pleasure to rise and speak in the debate on the Estimates pertaining to Social Services. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that in Opposition we have a serious role to play to keep government accountable when it comes to expenditures of monies. And when it comes to health care, when it comes to education and related services that are essential, especially health care, then we have a serious role to play in bringing those concerns to the forefront for the people so that they can understand what exactly a situation is.

We present those concerns, I feel, in a responsible manner, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, the health critic for the Opposition, in the first few weeks he was appointed, went down and met with, just as an example, a number of people from a variety of health care institutions in the Province, and he discussed the concerns of nurses with the President of the Nurses' Union. In a very responsible way he has done those things, getting the information and putting it together and coming into this House and presenting that information. That is the role of the Opposition. We have been doing it very well, Mr. Speaker, and we are going to keep on doing it.

We have to compromise, there is no doubt about it. Everybody has to compromise. There is only one pie. There is only so much funding to go around. But the questions that have to be asked are, How is that funding spent? Where is it spent? How are you supposed to do it? How effectively is the money spent? Those are the questions, Mr. Speaker.

When I hear the Minister of Health getting up and talking about irresponsible statements and wondering whether or not we should be careful in how we put our concerns and so on, I want to let him know that we are very concerned on this side, and things are more than at a critical stage out there in the health care field, they are getting very dangerous.

I get many phone calls as do other members, about elective surgery. Mr. Speaker, it is called elective surgery, and many people in this Province have been waiting months and months, and this elective surgery turns out to be emergency surgery because they get not get into the hospital; they are put on long waiting lists. As a matter of fact, in one particular case I called the doctor myself to ask when they would be able to put forward surgery for a certain person, and the secretary who answered the phone said, Well, we are not going to be able to do that this Summer, Mr. Aylward, because we are closing beds at the Health Sciences. I said, But you understand that this person has to have surgery very soon. They call it elective surgery, yet the person is getting worse all the time, she has been waiting nine months.

That is the critical situation we have to deal with. Now, how do we deal with that? That is the solution that this government has to come up with. It is a situation that exists all around the Province, Mr. Speaker, and it is something that is not going to go away. As a matter of fact, it is going to get worse if beds are closed and emergency surgery, let alone elective surgery, is not allowed to be performed. This has

to be addressed. That is a major concern of people out there that we have to do something about.

So we bring that to the House or Assembly and we say to government, address these concerns. If the beds, Mr. Speaker, are going to be closed down due to lack of funding, or vacations or whatever, we have people waiting on elective surgery and we should keep as many beds open as possible so that that elective surgery can get done and people can get the services they so rightfully deserve.

This situation is becoming critical all over the Province, especially in rural Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. People there are wondering if they are ever going to get their health problems solved. They do not live in the city, so they have to make phone calls, which means running up a lot of long distance charges. I think everybody shares that concern, Mr. Speaker, and government over there have to deal with that concern, they have to address it.

Speaking of health care, this is National Nurses' Week, I believe, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to commend the nurses who are working within the system who have done a tremendous job under great pressure, and without the proper resources.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, our critic for health care in this Province, the member for Port de Grave, soon to be minister, has met with people in the health system. That is a responsible action, Mr. Speaker. When a problem occurs and it is an emergency situation, we have to bring it up. That is the role of the Opposition, and I think we are doing a very good

job. And we are not going to stop, Mr. Speaker, bringing those concerns to the hon. Minister of Health, and whomever else on the other side, when it comes to concerns of people of this Province. We are elected to do so, and we are going to continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker, looking at education in the Social Services Estimates Committee, I was very surprised to hear the hon. Minister of Education talk about rural Newfoundland teachers and how academic results in rural Newfoundland correspond to the education level of teachers, or the competence of teachers. I do not know if that was a comment made out of whack, or if he really did not mean it, but I know, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of people in rural Newfoundland are awfully riled up, and the teachers out there are very concerned when they hear a minister of the government talk like that, especially the minister responsible for education.

It is hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, that you would hear that. When you look at the realism of the funding they get and the unfair system we have for funding education in rural Newfoundland and you blame it on the teachers, Mr. Speaker, that is not right. It is wrong, and it is something the minister should make sure he clarifies. Or maybe that is what he believes, I do not know, or what this administration believes. But we will present another alternative. Our education critic is doing a very good job of providing proof, Mr. Speaker, that funding levels for education in rural Newfoundland are down, and in urban areas they are up.

Mr. Speaker, we have to address that problem. When you see the results academically, it is shameful what it is doing to our young people in rural Newfoundland. It is shameful, it is shocking, and it is not giving our young people in rural Newfoundland the opportunity to get out and improve themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we have only one pie, but we had better share it equally. Because if we do not, then the result will be what we are seeing now. It is happening now with our young people, and that is a situation that has to be dealt with. And it is not going to be dealt with by the Minister of Education getting up and saying, Well, it is the inexperienced teachers in rural Newfoundland. That is not the way to address the problem. It is with government action and government policies that you address that problem.

Also in the Social Services Committee there was talk about The Young Offenders Review Board and the minister said, We are going to get the Board to do the hearings, yet, there is very much confusion within legal circles as to what they can do.

Mr. Speaker, we are having trouble over here understanding if the Minister understands whether or not he can dismantle this board, or if he wants to. But I hope, Mr. Speaker, that he will understand what his Cabinet has done, what the provincial government has done and that he will address that problem. It is something they put there, and they can take it away.

There are young offenders in the Province who are in need of

rehabilitation, who are in need of having their reviews done, Mr. Speaker, and that has to be dealt with. It is not being dealt with now. There is great confusion because of government policy that is being presented, and that has to be dealt with.

We have brought those concerns to the House of Assembly, to the people here in this House to be dealt with - a job well done - and I would only hope that the Minister of Social Services, who just took over the job a few months ago, when he gets up will give responsible answers to responsible questions. If that happens, we might get something done around here.

But I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if that is ever going to happen the way he is going. It is unfortunate, because we want to see something done with that young offenders board for young offenders in the Province. We suggested a solution, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope it will be addressed.

MR. EFFORD:

Tell them to watch **View From The Hill**, on Sunday.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The member for Port de Grave tells me to tell all hon. colleagues to watch **View From The Hill** on Sunday, Mr. Speaker. You will see a new and rising star, the member for Port de Grave. I look forward to seeing that, and seeing his exposition of his views on a variety of topics.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Services Estimates Committee also considered the estimates of the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies. The

minister of that department came in here today and he talked about layoffs as if they were nothing, as if there was nothing to worry about, no problem, yet it took him two days to put together the answers to address the problem.

In the statement given by the Premier today in response to our question he included instructor retraining. He says that it should be recognized that provision is made within the instructor collective agreement for establishment of a committee to address the retraining issue. It is the function of this Management Union Committee to identify candidates who have potential for retraining. It is kind of surprising, Mr. Speaker, that he would put that there. Because some of the people I have talked to within the system were asked last year to submit resumes so that they could be evaluated for transfers or retraining, and so far all almost every one of them have gotten are pink slips, Mr. Speaker, with no consultation, with no, Well, you are doing a business course or you are doing this type of course, we will retrain you, or we will put you here or we will put you there. That has not been done. So the mechanism is set up, Mr. Speaker, but it is not being followed. I know that for a fact, and it is about time the Minister of Career Development took the situation a little more seriously.

If you want to blame administrators of community colleges in the Province, Mr. Speaker, because of funding, that is a hard way to go. The Western Community College came out of the Bay St. George Community College, and was a flagship of community colleges in Canada, Mr. Speaker,

and over there now, because of lack of funding, people are being laid off who are teaching courses which are important and which are in demand. So the answers brought in today by the hon. minister and the Premier are certainly not good enough and we are not going to accept them, I will tell you that.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, they came in with this new, revamped community college system that was going to create a new wave, and new system with lots of money to make sure the mandate was well done. We will hire new teachers, new instructors, and we will put in courses that are valuable. Mr. Speaker, all we see now are cutbacks in all different areas and courses being affected that are still good, that are important, and people getting laid off with no instructor retraining put forward to them. That is not the way it was supposed to be done, and we express those concerns to the hon. the Minister of Career Development so that he can deal with them.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that they chose to come in as if there is not a problem, as if there is nothing to it, as if everything is going hunky dory, we are going to be fine in career development and education, no problem getting people into the system, and no worrying about whether or not they will be teaching, or if there is going to be a class for them to go to when it comes to students.

So we have a lot of concerns, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the Social Services Estimates. Some of them were addressed and some of them were not addressed. I would hope that the ministers who are responsible for each of those

departments, and others I have not touched on, will address the concerns we have mentioned.

The overlying and overriding one, which has been in the air in the last few days, is health care. The hon. the Minister of Health cast aspersions on our hon. Health critic by saying that we are trying to sensationalize it. Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, you are there and you are saying, 'Look, this is a problem. Will you see it?' But if they do not want to see the problem, Mr. Speaker, there is not much we can do about it. And they are not going to do anything about it if they do not see it. Now, that is nice, good, simple logic. You have got to see a problem in order to do something about it.

Now, I do not think the Minister of Health or the administration -

MR. SIMMONS:

None is so blind as he who will not see.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

That is right. None is so blind as he who will not see. Mr. Speaker, if you do not see it, you are not going to be able to solve it.

So we bring these concerns, especially in the health care system and education system, to the forefront in this House. They need to be addressed by the hon. ministers responsible. The Minister of Health, it seems, is just going to ride it out, let her go, and let these people who need elective surgery, not to mention emergency surgery, stay out there in the wilderness; he is not going to bother to have their cases dealt with.

I think that is a shameful way to deal with it, and I think we should look at other ways of solving the problem. Covering up is not good enough, Mr. Speaker, and one of these days this government will have to accept responsibility for some of its actions over the last seventeen years. I am wondering when that day will occur. I have not seen it in my three years here. Of course, they only have a little more time to take that responsibility, Mr. Speaker. Pretty soon they will not have to worry about it a whole lot. But the thing is, I am sick and tired of hearing, Well, this has been going on for years. These bed closures have been going on for years. They have been going in Tory years. That is when they have been going on, and it is about time government recognized it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYIWARD:

It is about time they said, It is a phenomenon that has come about since we have been in power, not the bad old Liberals of twenty years ago. We are the Opposition. We are not the government yet. So you can blame us for so much, but we are not there yet. Give us a chance and we will do it. That is not a problem. But the thing is you are accountable. You have got to be held accountable. You have been shameless in not taking proper responsibility, especially in health care. It is time you did something about it; dealt with it instead of giving us words. I hope to see some changes soon. If not, Mr. Speaker, we will make the changes. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Housing.

MR. PEACH:

I would like to make some brief comments as it relates to the debate. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for my cracking voice today, however, I will try to use up my time as meaningfully as I can, with that in mind.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if we look at our budget and at our Estimates, as we have over the past number of weeks in the various Committees, we have discussed expenditures for the various departments.

If we just went back for a minute, Mr. Speaker, to budget day in this hon. House, I think it was a very important and a very healthy climate that was delivered in the Speech by our Minister of Finance on that particular day, because there has been very little criticism since the delivery of that budget. I think, by and large, many people in the Province were shocked to see that we were responsible enough, Mr. Speaker, to reduce the very frightening deficit we had in our current account. I do not think anyone would be fearful of saying that it was really a frightening deficit.

When we go back to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that in April 1987 we projected that we would have a deficit in current account of \$173 million, I think it was extremely important that the government of the day would address that particular problem. And we did, Mr. Speaker, in style, because we found that our deficit was reduced to some \$58 million, which was an

overall saving or reduction of \$115 million. Added to that, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that we projected that the current account deficit for this year would be only in the range of \$41 million. I think that, Mr. Speaker, as somewhat of an overview of what is really happening here in the Province.

I think there were quite a number of positive factors that contributed to the great reduction in our deficit. The fact that we had a very large increase in retail sales tax revenue, I think, Mr. Speaker, spoke well of the fact that people do have confidence in our economy and they are spending money. And the fact that there was some \$26 million in retail sales tax in the automobile industry does not indicate that people are scared or afraid to spend money in our Province.

Mr. Speaker, our fish products during the past year yielded a very high price and, of course, some very high prices were paid to our fishermen. Employment in the construction sector in our Province rose by some 2,000 jobs. I think that, Mr. Speaker, is very, very positive.

Our inflation rate of some 2.9 per cent was the second lowest of any Canadian province, and, of course, the lowest we had recorded in this Province since 1971.

Our unemployment was down, and when that is down our employment increases, and we had, in 1987, an employment increase of some 5,000 jobs. This, of course, meant that our unemployment rate had decreased for two years in a row. In fact, we dropped some 1.4 per cent from 1986, which I think is the lowest decline of any province

in Canada, except New Brunswick, which had a very high unemployment rate as well. I think that in itself, Mr. Speaker, is very positive.

But if I could just, for a few minutes, look at a couple of areas we dealt with in the Social Services Committee estimates debate. I just want to zero in for a minute or two on Education and Career Development. I do not think any of us would disagree that the greatest resource we have in our Province today, and where our future lies, is with our youth. I think it is upon us to ensure that our youth in the Province are given the greatest opportunities for education, not only the in high school system and the elementary system, but in the post-secondary system.

Mr. Speaker, in 1979 the budget of the Department of Education was some \$322.9 million. That was increased to \$447 million in 1987. If we add on the other education factor of a new Department of Career Development, which had some \$177 million in 1987, we are looking at, Mr. Speaker, a total expenditure in education in this Province in 1987 of \$624.9 million, which is 106 per cent increase.

For the member opposite, the member for Stephenville, to get up in this House and say we are not funding education properly, we are decreasing the funds that we put into education in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is completely incorrect, it is misleading the people of this Province. I say quite often, unfortunately when something is said, it is very difficult to unsay it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

But the facts, Mr. Speaker, speak for themselves. We have, with the dedication and the hard work of the Minister of Education, seen tax equalization grants increased by some 80 per cent, to \$4.5 million in the 1988 - 1989 fiscal year. We have put some \$20 million of new money into new school construction.

Of course, as was announced a short while ago, the Minister of Education indicated that we were going to become involved in distance education, training and technology, I suppose, which, when we look at it first, we are probably not aware of the great benefits that it can have. But I am sure that there are many students in this Province, in some remote communities, who will surely benefit from the science, in particular, and the mathematics that they can get from this programme.

MR. EFFORD:

Would the minister permit a question?

MR. PEACH:

No, Mr. Speaker. When my time is up, the member for Port de Grave, I am sure, can have his say.

Distance education, Mr. Speaker, we will see almost \$250,000, almost a quarter of a million dollars, put into this programme so that people in remote parts of the Province can benefit from it this coming September. If we look at the post-secondary system, which I am sure the member for Port de Grave would be quite interested in, the college system, his district is served very well by the Avalon Community College,

Carbonear Campus, and I guess we are pleased to have it.

MR. EFFORD:

That is what I want to ask you a question about.

MR. PEACH:

Well, if he has a question on that, I will be only too glad to listen for a minute.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a very short question and it is important to the people of Carbonear and, as you said, the people of my district. They recently asked to have a petition presented about the first year university courses being offered in Carbonear. Probably the minister can tell us if that is being looked at and if it is going to be implemented in Carbonear.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing.

MR. PEACH:

Thank you.

I appreciate and thank the member for his comment. I did not realize that is what he was going to ask. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I indicated, I think, some two and a half years ago when I was parliamentary secretary at the time to the Minister of Career Development, I guess that was the beginning, or the initial stages, of a great change that we made in our post-secondary system. I guess being a teacher myself, one of the things I was quite strong on was the fact that we should

have first year university courses offered in our college system around the Province.

To that end, I have worked very hard, Mr. Speaker, with the minister at the time and now with the New Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Matthews) and I have received that petition. I received it from a spokesperson, Mr. Al Stacey, who happens to be a counsellor in Carbonear, and an employee of the R.C. School Board of Conception Bay North. He presented that petition which took in the four districts, I guess, out in Conception and Trinity Bays. He presented that directly to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies. We met with him and heard where he explained where the things were coming from; the concerns that the people had out in the bay.

I am not convinced, Mr. Speaker, although some people put up an argument, and I am sure the member for Port de Grave will agree with me, that, 'Well, you are too close to St. John's.' I do not buy that argument at all and I can assure the hon. member that I will be putting my case forth, as a member of government, and as a member of Cabinet, I guess to stop any argument like that because the people out in Conception Bay and out in Trinity Bay, in particular, are just as far away and it costs them just as much to come to St. John's. They pay the same board in St. John's and they have the same expenses to come to St. John's. I guess we realize it is sometimes quicker to get home, and cheaper, but their parents do incur the same expenses.

I think, Mr. Speaker, with the proximity of the Avalon campus,

the Carbonear campus, to St. John's, I think it would be a very unique and a very good area to start because we have personnel and staff from the university who could easily commute to Carbonear and therefore the cost of implementing that into the Carbonear system and into the Conception and Trinity Bay systems, I should say, would be much cheaper. I think that probably should be one of the first places - one of the first places, I said, that university courses should be offered. I will, over the next number of months, be continuing on to make sure that we promote that.

Just to look at a page of our budget there, Mr. Speaker, along the same lines, it is very interesting to note that the Avalon Community College, Carbonear campus is to receive some \$820,000 this year as part of the major capital construction. As a matter of fact, tenders were awarded and construction has started. I do not know if the member for Port de Grave is aware of that, but construction has already begun. As a matter of fact, it is a contractor, I think, from his district that is doing the main portion of the work and most of the people, if not all, of the people working on that particular project, of the renovation and demolition, are from the Shearstown, Port de Grave area. I have no objection at all to that, Mr. Speaker, and I do not mind saying it publicly because the Carbonear campus is a regional one and it serves Port de Grave, Harbour Grace, Carbonear, and Trinity - Bay de Verde. As a matter of fact, it also serves some of the Bellevue district so I am sure when we look at it we have five people there that are served

by that.

As well, Mr. Speaker, in the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies, one of the bold initiatives that that department and this government has taken over the past two years is probably, in my opinion, one of the better programmes that we have embarked upon. That is the Private Sector Employment Programme.

We have, Mr. Speaker, I think, been very, very successful in providing a 50/50 sharing of funding with the private sector. I do not know how other members feel and how they have found this programme to work, but, Mr. Speaker, I can say that in the Carbonear district last year it was just unbelievable the response that the private sector gave to that programme.

I think the responses that came in were all positive, despite the questionnaire that the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) circulated throughout the Province to the business community hoping to receive all kinds of negative responses, despite that. He never once, Mr. Speaker, commented on his circulation of those questionnaires since, because when he got the questionnaires back, he found very quickly that they were positive.

MR. YOUNG:
Who?

MR. PEACH:
The member for Menihek circulated a number of questionnaires hoping to find out all of the negative things you could have happen in the Province.

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

A point of order, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, you cannot allow the member to deliberately mislead the House here. The fact of the matter is we did survey that programme, we got results back, and we published the results on it. We did say the business community accepted it. So, the member should stand corrected.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I did not hear you. Repeat that again, please.

MR. TULK:

The member had a mike.

MR. LONG:

It is a good point of order.

MR. FENWICK:

The member was saying -

MR. SPEAKER:

I will rule if it is a point of order after I can hear it, if you would mind, please.

The hon. the member for Menihek, would you repeat that?

MR. FENWICK:

The member is misleading the House, Mr. Speaker. He is quite correct in saying that we did ask the business community whether or not the programme was acceptable. We did get replies back and we found that for the business community it was a very well received programme, which we said publicly in press releases and elsewhere. So the minister is not being correct in saying that we

did not admit that that part of it was acceptable.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the hon. gentleman has even spoken in this debate. I think the hon. gentleman is out of order, and I would point this out to him, to rise to answer a statement being made by the member for Carbonear, the Minister for Housing (Mr. Peach).

If he wants to speak and make a speech in this debate, I would say he should do it at the appropriate time and not when somebody else is speaking. The gentleman, who is supposed to be so good in this House and so pure, should learn to keep his seat until the appropriate time.

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am really more concerned with the language of the hon. member for Menihek. I do not believe it is unparliamentary to imply that an hon. member misleads or is misleading the House, but certainly not to imply that he deliberately was misleading the House. From what I caught from what the hon. member was saying, it seemed to me that he might have been implying that he was

deliberately misleading the House. Perhaps Your Honour might like to ask the hon. member if he would withdraw any kind of imputation along those lines, and that might settle the matter. But certainly it is not very good language for the hon. member to be using.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there was no point of order. I did not hear the hon. the member for Menihek saying that the hon. minister did mislead the House. There was no point of order, and the hon. minister's time is up.

MR. PEACH:

I will take half a minute to just clue up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Housing.

MR. PEACH:

I just want to say that the particular programme I referred to, the one which disappointed the member for Menihek because of the positive response we had, was well received in the Carbonear district. As a matter of fact, Carbonear district was the third highest community in this Province to take advantage of the private sector programme.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before I recognize the hon. the member for St. John's East, I would like to read the three questions for the Late Show.

The first question is from the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. He is not satisfied with the

answer given by the Minister of Transportation in today's Question Period.

The second question is from the member for Port de Grave. He is not satisfied with the answer given to the question on Tuesday by the Minister of Health.

The third question is from the hon. the member for Twillingate. He questions the Minister of Fisheries concerning the licences for Newfoundland inshore fishing vessels.

And now, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. LONG:

No, I will not be too long. I will have a few minutes though to say what I feel is necessary about the Estimates Committee meetings which I participated in on Social Services. We had seven different departments that we were meeting with, ministers and their senior officials. I was able to attend all but one of the meetings. Because of another engagement, the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) filled in while I was not there when the Justice Minister came before the Social Services Estimates Committee.

Before addressing some of the specific issues in some of the particular departments and some of the discussion that was held with those ministers, I might just have a few words in general on the committee system as other speakers have addressed certain issues with respect to the functioning of the

committee system, in particular, this committee, the Social Services Committee.

The House Leader, when he introduced the concurrence debate on the Social Services Estimates Committee on behalf of the member for St. John's North, who is not in his place to begin the debate, went to some length to talk about how well the committee system was functioning. He talked in particular about the Social Services Committee being the most hard working of all three Committees, and gave an historical perspective on how the committee system has come to be where it is today and how it has reached a point of such effectiveness.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, to the House Leader that the committee system is not yet without its failings. In particular, my own experience on the Social Services Committee was one which I found quite interesting at times, but I also have to say, Mr. Speaker, that the experience was at times very frustrating.

MR. SIMMONS:

I agree with the hon. member on that.

MR. LONG:

I cannot speak for the other two committees which were meeting, Resources and Government Services, since we, in this party, were not given a seat on them, and so we had a different experience and a different degree of frustration. The member for Menihek tried to attend other -

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) I think Peter is used to it.

MR. LONG:

Right, the House Leader is not in his seat but he is taking every opportunity as he will to poke in from various corridors and have a few words to say.

MR. BUTT:

I thought you were asking good and sensible questions at my Estimates, whereas the Liberals were not asking any sensible ones at all.

MR. LONG:

Right, the Minister for Culture, Recreation and Youth says that the real opposition in his committee meeting was coming from the NDP. I have had similar feedback from other ministers, not to overstate the issue, but other ministers. The Minister for Social Services had similar feedback. Not to focus too directly on the role played by the official Opposition members, the members of the Liberal Party who are sitting on this committee, both the members of the committee and other members of the caucus who were responsible for certain critic areas and were coming in to take their time -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible.)

MR. LONG:

I have not said anything yet. I am not going to take a lot of time to talk about the role played by the Liberal members.

What I did want to say, Mr. Speaker, was to the issue as to how the committees function. The degree of frustration that I felt at times was not simply to do with the contributions or lack thereof being made by members of the Liberal Party, which the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth has just referred to - and I

believe the Minister of Social Services has also put some of his own comments on the record in that regard - but I would have to say, and it is unfortunate that the member for St. John's North has not been in his seat to observe and participate in the concurrence debate for his Committee because I am sure he would agree as Chair that there were problems at times in developing a fair system in which we could conduct the business of the committee in an equitable way so that all Opposition members would have fair and equal time to bring their questions forward to the committee.

The Chair of our committee, from what I understand from other comments made in previous concurrence debates with the Resources Committee, was conducting the business of our Committee in perhaps a different way. He was insisting on what he called a flexible method which was to try and encourage members to intervene and have a free flow of debate so that we did not regulate the time allotted to any members.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in future, when the House breaks into Estimates Committees and begins to do the important business of bringing ministers and their officials forward to talk about their budgets, that we need a better system to allot time on an equal and fair basis because, as I mentioned, we in this party did not have a membership representation on the other two committees, and so the only committee in which we had full membership to speak from was the Social Services committee.

I, at times, had great difficulty in feeling like I was being given an opportunity to do my work as an

Opposition critic for the seven departments that we were dealing with in this Estimates Committee. Sometimes that was a function of the Liberal Opposition raising questions which I thought were not particularly relevant in terms of addressing major policy questions that would need to be debated in an estimates committee.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I ask the member for St. John's East to clarify that statement. My concerns are just as good as his concerns, and he can downgrade ours as much as he wants to, but we have a right too, even though there is only fifteen of us, and two of them, to ask questions in committee.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

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

MR. LONG:

There is obviously, Mr. Speaker, no point of order, and at times, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, when I was sitting in estimates committees and questions were being asked, there were no real questions being asked either.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, no matter the performance and the contribution or lack of, the point is I think what we need is a clear set of rules and guidelines to

establish speaking time and speaking order in our committees to enable all members of both Opposition parties to be able to, as the Leader of the Opposition likes to say, discharge their duties. So, that is just simply, by way of saying to the House Leader, that the committee system yet, is far from perfect.

We seem to have different sets of rules being applied, depending on who the Chair of the committee is. In my own experience with the Social Services committee in which we had the largest departments of government coming in with very large budgets to be reviewed, it was quite frustrating, in a matter of three hours, to feel like we were adequately doing the business that the estimates committee is charged with doing, and that is doing a full and proper review of the estimates in front of us, and being given enough time and enough space to ask the questions and make points that we want to make in a committee.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to some of the specific issues that were brought before the committee. I guess we could say that of the seven departments, the three largest departments of government were perhaps the three most busy committee meetings we had, and that would be Health, Education, and Social Services. Each of these committees and altogether were perhaps the committees where, I personally felt the most frustration in the time limits and the inability for Opposition members to properly carry out their duties in asking questions and raising debate.

The day we began our meetings of the Social Services Committee, we began with the estimates of the

Health Department and at the beginning of our first meeting, the Minister of Health came in with a very lengthy ministerial statement, and at the end of his statement, he tabled a report on staffing levels at the Hoyles - Escasconi Complex, which we in this party had been, for the last four months, prior to the opening of the House, been trying to receive a copy of, to the point of going through freedom of information and having our request denied, and then having to appeal to the Ombudsman's Office to make an intervention. Much to my surprise, the agenda for the review of the Health Department's Estimates began with what was a very urgent political issue that the minister laid before us, and that was the release of the report.

Mr. Speaker, at the time we welcomed the opportunity to respond immediately and directly to that report, but unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the presentation by the minister at the beginning of his committee meeting of a very significant document meant that there was so much time taken up the first hour-and-a-half of the committee, at least in discussing that issue, that it seemed to be perhaps, a strategic move by the minister. To wait four months for the release of a report, which obviously should have been made public much earlier, may have been designed so that other time in the Estimates Committee would not be taken up with more pressing concerns.

The Minister of Health did his best through the rest of the time taken in the Estimates Committee. I believe we went over on the Department of Health and met again a second time for half the time allotted and split it up with

another department. But the Minister of Health did his best to engage a debate in which Opposition members were trying to address the very critical issues facing the delivery of health in this Province by beginning what would become a chorus through the Social Services Estimates Committee, beginning by saying that there are no cutbacks in this department. The cry from the Minister of Health was, 'How can you say that there are any cutbacks in place when we are spending millions more than we spent last year and last year we spent millions more than we did the year before?'

Mr. Speaker, that established a pattern in which ministers of this government responsible for human services, we might say, for the delivery of social programmes health, education and social services, are clearly coming into the Estimates Committee with a very political agenda, one which denies the seriousness of the issues which Opposition members are bringing forward and one which, in fact, shows great disregard, and in some case outright contempt, for the many people out there in the public who are either working in certain fields, in social services or health or education, and certainly the general public, the people who have to deal with the delivery of services and the problems and the gaps and the shortfalls and the lack of adequate services.

The concerns that we bring forward into the House and then, in particular, try to get into details on in the Estimates Committee are totally ignored by the ministers. The chorus is that members have no right to suggest that there has been any programme

of restraint or that there are any cutbacks or that there are any problems with services. The government is spending more year to year and so the problems are imaginary.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased today to hear the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins), in his short intervention in this debate, acknowledge in a different way than the discussion proceeded during the Estimates Committee that indeed there are very serious problems with respect to the delivery of health care services in this Province and that, as we look to the future with an aging population, the problems are only going to become more serious.

The minister acknowledged that he and his officials are trying to grapple with the need for what he called 'a radical review' of how the government delivers health services in this Province. I was pleased to hear the Minister of Health today in, perhaps, a more quiet fashion, and almost in passing, because during Question Period and when he is in front of the TV cameras, he seems to take a strike a different disposition and in a very political way deny that such problems exist, but today he acknowledged, and I give him full credit for that, that the department is doing its best to deal with the need for what he called 'a radical review' of the delivery of health services.

So I would applaud the minister for what he said in this debate on Concurrence and hope that perhaps it might be a sign that not only this minister, but the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) as well, and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin), in particular, those other ministers who are

responsible for the largest departments in the government and who among them and together are responsible for the delivery of human service programmes, that they will admit that they are indeed very serious problems in all these areas and that indeed, as Opposition members have been saying, there is a need for a full review of how the government is conducting its affairs in these departments.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many unresolved issues. The next department, I believe, that we had an opportunity to talk about was the Department of Education and the Minister of Education. I would just like to say on a specific issue there, again, there is an overall need for a review of the education system in the Province.

I said at the time during the Estimates Committee hearing and I would like to say again that I acknowledge, to some extent, the position that the Minister of Education is in. The irony of dealing with a situation in which the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, as one important representative group coming from the education field in this Province -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LONG:

Just by way of conclusion then, Mr. Speaker - I was not sure how much time I had left - the NTA is calling for putting more money into education, but acknowledges, and has, in fact, produced some of the best research which shows the problems of the duplication of services inherent in the denominational education system.

I think the minister would agree that there is a need for a full review of the whole structure of education in this Province.

Just by way of concluding --

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LONG:
Unfortunately, there are many other things which we will continue to address day in and day out.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Question! Question!

MR. SPEAKER:
Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:
The question is, shall the report be concurred in?

On motion, the report of the Social Services Committee was concurred in.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, we will carry on with Order 3 and now proceed to debate the report of the Government Services Committee, the final report.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Humber

Valley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to start off, Mr. Speaker, as I did a couple of weeks ago when I reported that we had considered the estimates of the seven departments we are responsible for, about the Government Services Committee itself, the members that were on it, and the type of meetings that we did have.

The meetings were very informative. There was a level of, I thought, very pertinent questions with upfront answers, and what was not answered in Committee, was brought back by ministers after. I think some of it is still outstanding, but that will come in over the next couple of weeks.

In any case, I want to again congratulate the Committee on, I thought, a job well done. We had seven heads to discuss and to consider: Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation; the Departments of Labour; Finance; Consumer Affairs and Communications; Transportation; Municipal Affairs; and Public Works.

The first one we discussed, Mr. Speaker, was the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. I said that night, and I will say it here publicly, I thought the minister did an excellent job for his first appearance in the Estimates. I thought he did an excellent and very competent job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:

Some of the things discussed under the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation - I will just touch on a few because we had seven heads. If you want to touch on them all, it will not be long taking up the fifteen minutes. In any case, we touched on public housing whereby the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation tenants pay approximately 25 per cent of their income towards the rental.

That is substantial, Mr. Speaker, because I have a project in the Humber Valley district. To give you some idea of the importance of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation's 25 per cent towards the rent, Humber Valley Homes in Deer Lake came in under the CMHC system some years ago whereby they put up \$25,000 towards the initiation of the building and the first establishment of the complex. That was supposed to be paid off over the next five years and it was not done because they just did not have the income from the source. We have tenants there paying as high as 64 to 65 per cent of their income in rental fees. Now, that will give you an idea of what the impact is on the tenants themselves. It is unreal!

When you look just down the road at the Pincent Memorial Homes or something like that, they are paying 25 per cent, or the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing homes where they are paying 25 per cent of their income. So I know full well the benefits that that could have on the district and on an individual, mainly on an individual who is on a guaranteed income, we will say, a fixed

income. So it is substantial. We are in the process now of trying to do something about that in conjunction with the NLHC.

Other things discussed were the industrial parks in the Province. A prime example of that is in the district itself, the industrial park in Deer Lake which was worked on by NLHC some eight or nine years ago. Nothing was done whatsoever for eight or nine years, no business activity, and, due primarily to the efforts of this government and this administration, something has been happening, especially over the past couple of years, because now we have had so many requests for the industrial park in Deer Lake that it is almost filled. We have a couple of pieces left, and over the next couple of months that should be filled. So the activity in the last year or year and a half has been substantial. We have all kinds of businesses moving to the industrial park.

Now, we have gotten to the point where we have got to make a request for an expansion of that industrial park. The whole Humber Valley region is moving, and the Province as a whole. This says something for the administration itself because this just does not happen in one area. This is a thing that is spreading right across the Province, and we can it with regard to the unemployment rate as well over there.

The RAPP Programme was another thing that was discussed under NLHC, an excellent programme, administered in my district by the town of Deer Lake itself and in other places by the office in Corner Brook and around the district. I just touch on that.

We went on to the Department of Labour. The minister did an excellent job. We covered the subjects like pay equity. The main one there, I think, was the Compensation Board. Some of the things covered there was where they did away with - if a person is on compensation, instead of keeping him on long-term, they give him a total payout of \$25,000 or \$35,000, something like that, and they start a business of their own, and then they are off compensation. They are self-employed.

So there was some discussion with regard to that, and people going to their own doctor and he is saying one thing. Then they go to the Compensation Board's doctor and he says something else. But, anyway, that department was covered quite well. There were a few questions asked of which the minister took notice and I would say he will come in with the answers within a few weeks.

Finance, Mr. Speaker, is another one that went over fairly well. Some of the things discussed there was the borrowing by the Department of Finance, how it was done on world markets, and the reasons for it. The questions were very pertinent questions, and I think the answers by the minister were well taken, especially by the member for Gander, who asked a lot of pertinent questions.

The deficit was discussed. As you know, the projected deficit for 1987 was approximately \$173 million, and when the budget did come out and was introduced, that was down to approximately \$58 million. So that was a substantial decrease in the projection and the reality was

that we had a \$58 million deficit in this year's budget.

One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, for that, that came out in the discussions - I guess all members could read it in the Estimates and in the budget - was because of the increase in the RST, the Retail Sales Tax, in the personal income tax, in the corporate income tax, and in the equalization plans. Mr. Speaker, respectively the amounts were approximately \$26 million, RST increase; personal income tax up some \$18 million; the corporate income tax, some \$5 million; and the equalization, approximately \$11 million.

Mr. Speaker, in order for those taxes to increase, RST does not increase unless someone is spending money. You have to buy something in order to pay taxes. In order to buy something, you have to have money. So there is an indication, no doubt about it, that the unemployment rate in the Province is decreasing.

That was made factual just last week by Stats Canada when they said that it was 17.5 per cent, down from 20.5 per cent, at the same time a year ago. So that is indicative of what has been happening. Granted the unemployment rate is still high, but we are working on that, and there are things happening every day in the Province, with some incentive by government and the private sector. The private sector is really kicking in, Mr. Speaker, and putting their money where their mouths are. They are starting to spend and that is obvious in the district of Humber Valley as well.

The other thing is the first quarter report from the Statistics

Canada with regard to the industrial base in the Province and the economic outlook for the Province, just a short while ago showed it was a 30.5 percent increase in the sale of cars in the Province, just for one example. That alone, I do not have to tell you what the taxes are on just one vehicle. So it does not take long when you are getting into that kind of spending to bring your RST income up.

Another one was Consumer Affairs and Communications. The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications talked about gas prices in the Province, whether they were fair or not, whether there should be a reduction, as compared with Nova Scotia. One of the things discussed there was that the Nova Scotia gas price was under the Public Utilities Board. In discussions back and forth, we discovered that was not always the right way to go either because of the fact there are so many restrictions. In one case, I think a local consumer appealed a decision of the Public Utilities Board in Nova Scotia and they won their appeal. So that did not look too good for the Public Utilities Board in Nova Scotia. There are pros and cons and maybe they are debatable and arguable, I do not know.

Cable Television and things like that were discussed. The Landlord and Tenants Act was discussed at the same meeting.

We came on down to Public Works and the hon. Minister of Public Works was questioned on such things as renting space because of the new office building, why rent space and why we had so much let out outside the building. The cost of portfolio changes of

ministers, Newfoundland Information Services, expenditure on Opposition offices, purchase of the Newfoundland Savings Bank building, and so on. There was quite a bit discussed here and quite a bit of information gained in the discussions back and forth.

Municipal Affairs and Transportation were two so-called heavier portfolios that we were discussing and one of the things that came out Municipal Affairs was the need for regional government across the Province. I think all members agreed with that.

It is something that I have been involved in for years because of my affiliation with Council, although with a small council, such as the one in Cormack. I was affiliated with the Federation of Municipalities provincially for four years and with the Canadian Federation of Municipalities for two, whereby this was always a subject. Where I was a small town representative on the Federation of Municipalities, I was always cognizant of the need for a regional government.

We have examples of that around the Province. Conception Bay South is a prime example. South Brook over my way in the Humber Valley area is another prime example of people sharing and cutting down on the cost, especially when it comes to the infrastructural part or things like fire brigades, recreation facilities, water and sewer and what have you.

I am not trying primarily in the district of Humber Valley to try to get some kind of amalgamation in place there whereby we can take in the outlining areas of

Nicholsville, Goose Arm, Spillway, St. Jude's, and Reidville and have them come under the direction of the Deer Lake Council with regard to a regional water supply thereby again cutting down on the amount of monies that would be needed in the Municipal Affairs Department.

We have examples of that in the district. It was brought up by the member for Burgeo (Mr. Gilbert) about the incinerator problem up in his district, a prime example. We had that, as all members know, when you used to come into the airport in Deer Lake, the first thing meeting you was the dump on the left hand side and you could hardly see it for gulls. In any case, that is eliminated now. All the towns agreed to put in one incinerator and now, although there is no regional government, everybody do pay a fee on a per capita basis, and putting their garbage into the one place. It is working very well. It is working well for the ambulance service, another prime example, that is based on a per capita basis in each community. The fire brigade is there as well. Deer Lake has got one, Reidville, and Cormack and that covers pretty well the whole Spillway, St. Jude's, Nicholsville, Goose Arm area.

So it is an economic thing, but all municipal -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. WOODFORD:
I would just like to thank the members of the Committee, Mr. Speaker, for a job well done. We had seven meetings in a row, without exception everything

passed at the end of each meeting. So that augers well for the members of the Committee, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:
MR. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I have to agree with some of the things that the Chairman said. This week I am sort of in an agreeable mood because I had the occasion to become a grandfather twice yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:
I would like to say that I welcome Deborah Susan Gilbert and David Scott Gilbert to Newfoundland. They will be good Liberals in about twenty years time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
Your son worked for me the last time.

MR. GILBERT:
Because he recognized a good man.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

He knew you used to work for me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to agree with the Chairman for a while that it was the best Committee that I had worked on since I have been a member. There were some good questions asked.

I am not as positive about the answers as the Chairman is. However, there were many questions answered and some of them are still unanswered. But, in general the seven departments covered I thought were covered well. We got through the questions very well and, as I said, there were really some interesting questions asked. The answers were not as interesting. There were some political answers given.

The concerns we expressed as we went down through were mostly in an effort to question the ministers offices. With the expenses in the ministers office, the two points that were always brought up was that the spending in Transportation and Communications and Purchased Services in the minister's office are continually, year after year, overspent. In other words, we questioned the point of why we were going through this exercise if the ministers were not going to live within the budgets that were voted to them. We are not satisfied with the answers we received to that question.

What is the point? If you are going to spend money on travel and entertainment, we should put it into the estimates as travel and

entertainment so that we all know at the time what we are going to spend our money on. That was the major concern in all of the departments.

As the Chairman said, we went through the various departments and I am going to leave it to the various critics on this side to cover the individual departments as they go through the debate. All the departments were important. I think the ones I am going to talk about mostly in this are going to be the ones that I am the shadow for, which is Public Works and Services and Transportation.

However, I would point out that the Chairman ended up on Municipal Affairs and that there was a general agreement that there had to be more regional government. That was agreed. But as for having the political will to put it into force, there was some question about how that was going to be done.

We, the Opposition Liberal Party, still feel that there are some serious problems in the way that the funding is delivered. The Tory districts seem to be getting a better share of the funding than the Liberal districts. I am sure when the critic talks he will be elaborating a little further on that.

It is now 5:30, Mr. Speaker, and I will adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The debate is adjourned by the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

Debate on the Adjournment
[Late Show]

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

I now call on the hon. the member again.

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir is not satisfied with the answer he got from the hon. the Minister of Transportation and he wishes to debate it on the adjournment.

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had occasion to ask the Minister of Transportation a question that we, on this side of the House, have asked many times in the last three years since I have been here. It concerns the funding for road paving and upgrading in this Province, the money that the minister is going to spend in his department, the \$40 million that every year he has at his discretion to spend in the Province.

Two weeks ago the minister stood in this House and made a Ministerial Statement which listed about a third of this \$40 million that he had spent. To my knowledge, there was very little of this money being spent in Liberal districts. They seemed to me that the old pork barrelling arrangement was still there. So, that prompted my question to the minister on Monday afternoon.

I asked him when we could expect the list for the remaining two-thirds of this \$40 million to be spent. Would there be any of the Liberal requests that the former minister asked us to provide in December, a list of road priorities in our districts. We did provide those lists.

There was an interesting thing after that. Shortly after that, there was an article in the paper where the former Deputy Minister of Transportation, at the time, said as far as he was concerned that government members were given a chance to provide this list. It was published in one of the papers in January. Government members did have an opportunity to make recommendations to the minister as to how this roads money was going to be spent, in other words, how the pork barrel was going to be divided this year.

My question to the minister is why did the former minister come out and ask the members of the Opposition to provide this list if there was no attention going to be paid to it? In the first third, as far as I am concerned, none of the priorities that were addressed by members here were answered, and now, we have the remaining \$25 million to be spent.

What is going to happen to the list that was presented by the members opposite? How come the Liberal districts are not on the priority list? The minister is going to get up and say that he gets a request for \$500 million, or \$600 million, and he has only got \$40 million to spend. How come it is always and forever that the liberal districts are not considered in the pork barreling of the funds?

Yes, the tokenism is there to say, 'Yes, okay, you did get something.' The thing we asked and we have continually asked the minister is would he not heed the Auditor-General's report where the Auditor-General said that there was no procedure or guidelines for the distribution of this funding?

We asked the minister if he would make public the priority list that was set up by the civil servants in his department, the recommendations that were made by the civil servants in his department, and then pick out the ones that he is going to fund out of his \$40 million. If he has this horrendous list of \$400 million, or \$500 million, we realize that it cannot be done on a this-year basis. But if he would take the top priorities that were listed and say, 'Okay, here are the first twenty,' and we feel that they should be funded, but there is also a number ninety-nine that should be funded, bring into the House of Assembly the list that the government wants to pick from the priority list put forward by the by the civil service, rather than take the list that is given by the civil service, hide away up in the Cabinet room, make the list and come down and announce it. It destroys democracy.

The minister is going to say that it is done on a fair basis, but another perception is what is out there. When it is done in veiled secrecy, it is hard to convince people out there that it is done on a fair basis.

So I ask the minister to make the list public, let us debate it, and let the minister say why they picked the places they picked before it is made fait accompli.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DOYLE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to respond to the hon. gentleman but I really do not know

how to respond to him at all. I do not know how to keep him satisfied.

He complains about the fact that the former Minister of Transportation has asked for a priority list from members opposite as to what projects they would like to see undertaken in their district. He complains about that, but when we did not ask him for priorities in their own areas, he complains about not having a chance to make representation to government on what projects he would like to have undertaken in his district. I really do not know how we can satisfy the hon. member at all, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to indicate to the member that the procedure right now is no different in approving projects in the Department of Transportation than it is in any other part of the country. Every province in Canada uses the system that we have right now and the procedure is to submit a listing of X millions of dollars worth of projects to Treasury Board. That is done mainly for the record and to officially say that this is how much we need in any one given year.

The budgetary process will probably allocate \$40 million. What the Auditor General - and this is what the member keeps referring to, what the Auditor General was saying - and it is fair and a legitimate comment that we do not have any problem with whatsoever, is that the Department does not have anything in writing as to what policies and procedures, or guidelines, are used in identifying and prioritizing projects in the Province.

There are guidelines, Mr. Speaker, that are not written down as firm policy. However, in our response to the hon. member sometime ago, it was indicated that the department is planning the development of a long-term and a long-range plan which will identify all its requirements. That document will be used in the department's planning as to what projects should be undertaken. That will include the maintenance cost on roads, the traffic volume, the industrial development in the area, the school busing, and what have you.

A couple of weeks ago we released an early tendering of capital projects which included a number of projects in areas represented by hon. members opposite like the grading of the Mose Ambrose road toward Coomb's Cove, which is costing the department \$400,000. The Black Tickle to Domino project is another one that we are undertaking this year which is going to cost about \$100,000 to \$150,000. The upgrading of the Goose Cove road \$200,000, and the upgrading of the Englee road \$200,000. These are just in the early tendering of capital projects.

It is virtually impossible, Your Honour, for me as the minister to take two, three, or four hundred roads and to bring them to the House and say, 'This is the priority which we attach to any given project and this is the reason why we are approving a particular road for paving, upgrading' and what have you. That is just not practical, it is not feasible, it is not efficient, and on top of that, Mr. Speaker, it would be chaotic if we had to go through that type of a system in order to get projects

approved.

When projects are dealt with by cabinet a lot of things are taken into consideration and when projects are approved, tenders are called and announced. That is the way it is done in every other jurisdiction in Canada and that is the way it is done in every department that has a capital programme.

The procedure is not different in any way, shape or form and I would like to point out to the hon. members opposite that since the PC administration took office back in 1972, \$27 million has been spent in the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir; in Eagle River \$40 million has been spent; in Fogo \$30 million has been spent; Fortune - Hermitage had \$38 million; Menihek \$27 million spent; Windsor - Buchans \$10 million; Naskaupi \$17 million, all by a PC administration, Mr. Speaker, and they keep making the case that there is no money being spent in districts that are represented by members opposite.

That is shameful, Mr. Speaker, for members to be making that type of case when it is absolutely untrue.

MR. DINN:

Make no wonder I cannot get anything done in St. John's.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I think it has been agreed we take the third question next. It is from the hon. member for Twillingate. He is not satisfied with the reply he got from the Minister of Fisheries concerning the licensing of inshore fishing vessels by St. Pierre.

The hon. the member for
Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that fishermen of St. Pierre and Miquelon and the South Coast of Newfoundland, who have enjoyed living together, as it were, for centuries, I suppose, co-existing, fishing in the same waters, and all of the sudden, for what we suspect to be political reasons on the part of the Government of France or the former Premier of France, that that relationship, an historic relationship that we have enjoyed for so long, has all but been severed.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is becoming very serious in that today on the South Coast of our Province we have a large number of small boat inshore fishermen who have traditionally fished in those waters and who are now left in a state of almost suspended animation in that they do not know where they stand. That, of course, prompted my question to the minister on Tuesday.

We have heard reports, for example, that the Government of France is now demanding that Newfoundland vessels fishing within their so-called territorial waters be licensed. We have heard of cases where Newfoundland inshore vessel owners have applied for a license but have been told that they are too late this year and that they will have to wait until next year in order to get a license to fish in those waters.

That, of course, is playing havoc with a large number of people because we all know that there are at least twenty longliners from

the South Coast of Newfoundland who frequent, again, the so-called territorial waters of St. Pierre and Miquelon, and fish. Of course, conversely there are an equal number, in fact, I believe, an even greater number, in terms of numbers, maybe smaller boats but certainly there are in excess of, I believe, thirty-five or forty people from St. Pierre who fish in what we claim to be Canadian territory, the waters this side of the middle distance line.

So there seems to be a standoff, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I think something has got to be done. We all know that last Friday we had a heated debate in the House when maybe we were quite angry at what had happened the previous day when a Newfoundland vessel was intercepted and detained and, subsequently, taken to St. Pierre by French authorities.

We heard the Premier, of course, make a very impassioned plea to Ottawa, followed by a letter that was sent to the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, asking that economic sanctions be imposed against that country.

We all know, of course, that Mr. Clark replied that no such sanctions would be imposed, and, of course, the reason he gave is certainly, in my view, and I think in the view of a lot of Newfoundlanders, especially my colleagues here, not a very satisfactory one. I believe his reason was, if we start imposing economic sanctions, it is a two-edged sword. Where is it going to end? I believe he expressed the concern that any such sanctions could very well have an affect on jobs on the

mainland. I believe, he specifically mentioned the Michelin tire plant in Nova Scotia where he said 2,000 jobs were being jeopardized.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that that is not a good enough reason for not following through on the prayer of the resolution that we passed in this House last Friday, whereby we called upon Canada to use whatever levers it had diplomatically and economically to bring some sanity to the Government of France and, hopefully, to resolve this boundary question. But the matter still remains up in the air, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Fisheries today, in reply to my question and that of my colleague for Fortune - Hermitage, could not add much to what has already been said. He is saying that he is in constant touch with External Affairs authorities but that nothing concrete has happened. Well, I would suggest to you, that is not good enough. It is not providing much consolation or comfort to the fishermen who were, in the first instance, harrassed and intercepted last week, and who are trying now to get back to that area to pursue their vocation, and, of course, it is of little consolation to the many dozens of other Newfoundland fishermen, indeed, I suppose, hundreds, who want to fish in that area.

Mr. Speaker, my time is obviously up, but I would ask the minister to enlighten the House as to what is happening. Will he impress upon his counterparts and the federal authorities the need to forget this nonsense and to allow the status quo, to obtain for Newfoundlanders and the people of St. Pierre - the people of St.

Pierre are not the enemy - to allow them to carry on as we have been doing now for centuries, fishing side by side and enjoying that kind of good relationship.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that the hon. gentleman is absolutely correct. I do not think any of us here in this House, or in the Province, really, feel that the people of St. Pierre and Miquelon are the enemy. Neither are the people of Newfoundland and Labrador conversely the enemy of the people of St. Pierre and Miquelon. It is very unfortunate that the people in both this Province and on the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon have been caught up in a situation which is not of their making. The reality is that both of us, the people of this Province and the people of those islands, are caught in a very difficult international situation and the people of both areas are suffering the consequences of the lack of diligence, lack of perspective, lack of co-operation, lack of anything you want to call it, of the respective national governments of both sides.

The hon. gentleman's assessment, Mr. Speaker, of the situation is nothing to disagree with. It is a very unfortunate historic situation. It is very unfortunate that the national Government of France, not the people of St. Pierre and Miquelon, have seen fit, without any warning at all to Canada, without any warning at all to the fishermen of the South Coast of Newfoundland, at a very

late stage of the game, a very late stage of the fishing season, to take it upon themselves unilaterally to change rules. Because, historically, as the hon. gentleman said in his remarks, both of us, the fishermen from this Province and the fishermen from St. Pierre and Miquelon, have been free, the small boat fishermen and the inshore fishermen, to wander back and forth across any imaginary lines and pursue their livelihood as they have done for decades passed. So it is very unacceptable. It is very provocative. It is very unfortunate that the Government of France have done that.

Mr. Speaker, we have been in constant surveillance of this particular matter for months, really, but more particularly since last Thursday when the **Maritimer** was arrested. The French authorities in St. Pierre and Miquelon have provided some of the Newfoundland skippers, at least, with applications for licences. Those applications, Mr. Speaker, are very dangerous documents. Not only do they request the Newfoundlanders concerned to apply for licences to fish within the so-called territorial waters around St. Pierre and Miquelon, but the application itself also refers to the economic zone. Hon. gentlemen in this House are no doubt aware that France, on behalf of St. Pierre and Miquelon, is claiming a very vast economic zone that is over and above the twelve mile territorial waters that most people would probably agree with, and that on the application form itself, Mr. Speaker, there is reference to licences in such disputed areas as 3Ps and 4VXW, zones that are totally outside of,

in any stretch of the imagination, the territorial waters of St. Pierre and Miquelon.

So we are doing what we can. We are not taking a back seat to anybody. We are trying to get the Government of Canada to get out of France, an appropriate answer, so we can deal with all the people involved, but particularly the owners of those twenty vessels that the hon. gentleman referred to, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday in Question Period I asked the Minister of Health a question on what he was going to do about the closure of hospital beds. At that time I tabled in this House of Assembly a copy of a letter I had received from a family in St. Lawrence concerning problems they had in trying to getting their mother admitted to the Health Sciences Complex. The minister is just not listening to questions being put forward by the Opposition when it comes to the closure of beds in hospitals. Every time he is asked a question in relation to that, he will try to play politics and try to play down the seriousness of the situation.

In pointing out the seriousness of the question I have often asked, How would the minister like it, or

any member of the government, if it was a relative of their family who was trying to get admitted to hospital? What would they do about the situation?

After I pointed that out the other day, a member of the public said to me, if it was a relative of one of the ministers families they might not have the same trouble, because they might be able to use their political influence to try to get that family member admitted to hospital. Now, I would not like to think that that is a fact.

MR. SIMMONS:
That is a fact.

MR. EFFORD:
That is not a fact, because it would be very serious if that was the situation. But something has to jolt this government into realizing what is happening is not only happening at the Health Sciences Complex, not only at St. Clare's, not only in the Grace, but it is happening in every hospital around this Province. What did we see after the question was put to the minister the other day? We saw the minister come into the House of Assembly today with a statement saying that they are going to close 430 beds in this Province this Summer. He very clearly pointed out this Summer. And I am wondering if that is not 430 beds plus the beds that are already closed in the hospitals around the Province?

Let me refer to what is taking place at the Health Sciences Complex. In the months of March and April, and this month, there were forty-four beds closed on the fifth floor of that hospital. He comes in with a statement today saying there are going to be 430 beds closed this Summer. Is that

430 beds plus the beds that are already closed at the hospital? If it is not, the minister is confused in the seasons in this Province, because I have never seen Summer start in April month in Newfoundland and end in October month. So the minister is certainly confused.

The Evening Telegram quotes the minister as saying, "Not true deaths caused by neglect, says health critic, 'irresponsible'." Now the minister can make all those statements he wishes, the point is the last paragraph of this letter points out that the concern now is with this family, as it is with every person in this Province, not with what happened in the past. It is to prevent anything like it happening in the future. That is the concern.

MR. TULK:
(Inaudible) Open Line Show this morning.

MR. EFFORD:
Well, the minister knows full well, and I am sure the government knows full well now that the people of this Province are quite open and quite clear about their concerns about it and they, no doubt, will do what is necessary in the next election to ensure that it will not happen after the next election. But the problem we have with it and the problem every citizen of this Province has with it, is that it is happening now. And nobody - the Minister of Health is a very capable individual, a doctor by profession, and a former Minister of Finance - no minister or no member of this House can stand in this House and say that when you close hospital beds it is not going to have an affect on the health care needs of the people of

this Province. You can cover it up by saying that it was not an emergency situation at the time, but who is to say that if that woman had been admitted to hospital when she wanted to be, when her family wanted her to be, when the doctors wanted her to be, that she would not still be alive today. Whether it was an emergency situation at the time is not the question. That fact is she needed to be admitted to hospital, she needed care, and she could not be admitted.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
Already, Mr. Speaker?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would beg again, as we did last week, the Minister of Health to look at the seriousness of the situation and to stop closing beds, and to give the people of this Province the decent health care they need.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I am trying to give the hon. member the benefit of the doubt, that is that he has a particular view and he thinks that view is the totally correct view and no one else has a right to any other view, and if they do have another view, they are totally wrong. I am trying to give him the benefit of that doubt. However, I do have difficulty doing it when he comes up with remarks like, Well, if it were your relative, because you are in the government, or your relative because you are a doctor, you could probably get them in, suggesting by innuendo that that

is the case. It causes me difficulty in giving him the benefit of the doubt. I tend to think, when he gets on with that kind of commentary, that he is getting extremely political.

Now, I am not, quite honestly, getting political here, I am just going to state a few facts. Firstly, we have always closed, for years and years, something of the order of 350 beds. This year we are going to close slightly over 400 beds, partly because there is a particular situation out at the Central Newfoundland Hospital that requires that; they have a construction job out there and it requires it. That is one point.

The second point is we have more beds than we ever did in the past in this Province. So percentage wise there is not that a great change in the percentage of beds closing.

The third point is that the provincial bed study done in 1985 said that we have too many beds in this Province; they said we have 370 acute beds too many in this Province. If you believe those figures, the beds that are being closed in the summertime now are not putting us much below where the bed study said that we should be in the first place.

The fourth point to be made, is that we are putting-

MR. EFFORD:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:
We are putting in place increasing services of an ambulatory nature,

of a community nature, of a home-care nature to take pressure of the number of beds in the Province.

The fifth point is the hon. member is saying that this problem relates to everyone. I have to point out to the hon. member, that the Sir Thomas Roddickton, the Old Perlican, the Harbour Breton, the William Jackman, the Curtis Memorial, the Churchill Falls, the Lake Melville, the Waterford, the M.J. Boylen, the Springdale, and four cottage hospitals have no closures, no closures whatever. There are about a dozen hospitals that have no closures this year, or, indeed, last year.

So, to sum up, bed closures in the summertime is not unusual, it is not unique to this Province. It is something that the doctors and the hospitals themselves feel they have to do because there are not as many patients who want to go into hospital. People do want to go on vacation during those times of the year. And we are increasing our budgets to hospitals all the time. We put in this year \$2.5 million purely for expanded and increased services. This is not the ordinary, shall we say, increase related to CPI or whatever, we put in, for expanded and improved services of a high tech nature, \$2.5 million throughout the system, the bulk of it being to the tertiary, to the core hospitals.

Doctors like to work. They are an ill-advised bunch of people, they like to work when they are around. Now, they also like to go on holiday, and I do not blame them for that. But when they are around, they like to work. They like to be at it all day long. Their wives cannot get them home

half the time. They leave at eight in the morning and come home at eight in the night. They just like to work. So they will always complain if they have patients they cannot operate on or take care of and they are not allowed to do it right away, depending on whether the needs are there in an in a very acute way or not. I have never seen a surgeon yet who did not say I want to do twenty operations a day. If you tell him, Look, all you need to do are ten operations a day, to take care of the work presented to him, he will say, Not on your life. I want to do my twenty operations a day. And if you do not let him, he will complain about it.

Be assured that we have the hospital services under control in this Province, as we had in previous years and as we will have in years to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

On motion, the House at its rising, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 13, 1988 at 10:00 a.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

May 12, 1988

*Tabled by Hon. the
Premier 12 May '88*

**RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS
REGARDING COLLEGE/INSTITUTES
STAFF DISPLACEMENTS**

STAFF DISPLACEMENTS

The attached table provides a detailed analysis of staff displacements which have taken place recently in the post-secondary education system. The following points are highlighted:

- A total of 41.5 staff were displaced
- Of the total number displaced 18 were permanent employees and 23.5 were temporary employees.
- Of the total number displaced 14 were displaced as a result of declining enrollment, while 27.5 were displaced as a result of the ongoing reorganization.
- While a total of 41.5 staff were displaced, approximately 16.5 new positions will be introduced to meet other programming requirements. The net reduction in the instructor staff compliment is, therefore, 25 positions.

None of staff reductions have any adverse impact on students.

CAPITAL/CURRENT ACCOUNT TRANSFERS

With respect to transfer of funds between Capital and Current Account allocation, it should be recognized that the University, the Institutes, as well as the Colleges, have annual budgets comprised of projected current and capital funding requirements. If an organization determines for any number of reasons that it would prefer to reallocate some of its capital funding for current operating purposes, it must request the approval of the

Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies. The Department considers each request on its individual merits and makes an appropriate recommendation. It is important to emphasize that the reallocation of funding between current and capital activities does not change the bottom line of the organization budget. The reallocation is a mechanism for providing some flexibility within the budget.

INSTRUCTOR RETRAINING

On the issue of instructor retraining, it should be recognized that provision is made within the Instructor Collective Agreement for establishment of a committee to address the retraining issue. It is the function of this management-union committee to identify candidates who have potential for retraining and forward recommendations to the respective college boards. It is noted, however, that the identification of candidates for retraining may also be complicated somewhat by bumping provisions in the Collective Agreement. An instructor who is displaced has the option to bump other less senior employees. As a result, it may be necessary to let the bump procedure run its course before the instructors who will actually be displaced can be identified.

PROVINCIAL INSTITUTES/COMMUNITY COLLEGES
ACTUAL AND PROPOSED LAYOFFS
EFFECTIVE FALL, 1988

	Cabot Institute	Marine Institute	Fisher Institute	Avalon	Central	Eastern	Labrador	Western	Total
Permanent Layoffs	10.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	1.0	18.0
Temporary Layoffs	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	9.0	23.5
Total	22.5	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	4.0	0.0	10.0	41.5
New Positions	(9.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(1.5)	(1.0)	(5.0)	(0.0)	(16.5)
Net Impact (Number of Layoffs)	13.5	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.5	3.0	(5.0)	10.0	25.0

CONTENTS

THURSDAY, 12 MAY, 1988.

Statements by Ministers

Revised Schedule for Lobster Prices:

Mr. Rideout.....	1828
Mr. W. Carter.....	1829
Mr. Fenwick.....	1830

Hospital Bed Closures During Summer:

Dr. Collins.....	1830
Mr. Wells.....	1832
Mr. Fenwick.....	1833

Oral Questions

Workers' Compensation Appeal Tribunal:

Seeks answer promised 9 May as to why lowest tender not accepted for office space.

Mr. Tulk, Mr. Blanchard.....	1834
------------------------------	------

Suggests delay caused by extenuating

circumstances. Mr. Tulk, Mr. Blanchard.....	1834
---------------------------------------------	------

Teacher at Penitentiary:

Seeks confirmation teacher will be laid off.
If so, action of the department, Mr. Furey,

Mr. Matthews.....	1834
-------------------	------

Community Colleges:

If teachers laid off, will retraining be provided. Mr. Furey, Mr. Matthews.....

.....	1835
-------	------

Is money being transferred from capital to operational funding. Mr. K. Aylward,

Mr. Matthews.....	1836
-------------------	------

One-year business administration course to be transferred from Cabot Institute to Avalon Community College; if not transferred, why not.

Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Matthews.....	1836
-----------------------------------	------

Community Colleges (continued):

Have teachers being laid off been offered retraining or further employment. Does government want private schools teaching business education. Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Matthews.....1837

Suggests privatization of these courses. Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Matthews.....1838

Suggests privatization benefits Tories' buddy. Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Matthews.....1839

Higher tuition in private institutions will bar some people from courses, and will benefit the owners' financially. Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Matthews.....1839

Canada-France Boundary Dispute:

Suggests Minister taking a more conciliatory approach. Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Rideout.....1840

If France insists on a licensing system, will Canada follow; actions of the Minister to restore the status quo ante. Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Rideout.....1841

What action to get the men back fishing. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Rideout.....1842

Suggests the Minister ask Ottawa to turn a blind eye to the situation so fishing can resume in disputed zone. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Rideout.....1842

Suggests the Minister do something specific to get these fishermen back fishing. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Rideout.....1844

**Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given**

Layoffs in the Community College System:
Premier Peckford.....1846

Petitions

<u>Landlord Tenancies Board Powers Need Restoration:</u>	
Mr. Long.....	1846
Mr. Gullage.....	1849
Premier Peckford.....	1849

Orders of the Day

<u>Order 3, Concurrence Motion (Social Services Committee):</u>	
Dr. Collins.....	1850
Mr. K. Aylward.....	1855
Mr. Peach.....	1860
Mr. Long.....	1866

On motion, Social Services Committee concurred in.....1871

<u>Order 3, Concurrence Motion (Government Services):</u>	
Mr. Woodford.....	1871
Mr. Gilbert, adjourns debate.....	1875

Debate on the Adjournment [Late Show]

<u>Transportation Policy:</u>	
Mr. Gilbert.....	1877
Mr. Doyle.....	1878

<u>Canada-France Boundary Dispute:</u>	
Mr. W. Carter.....	1880
Mr. Rideout.....	1881

<u>Health System:</u>	
Mr. Efford.....	1882
Dr. Collins.....	1884

Adjournment Motion.....	1885
-------------------------	------