



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 81

PRELIMINARY REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Wednesday

21 November 1990

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

Before beginning our routine business, on behalf of hon. members, I would like to extend a warm welcome to the hon. Vince MacLean, the Leader of the Opposition and Leader of the Liberal Party of the Province of Nova Scotia.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Education.

Dr. Warren: Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, November 22, the Newfoundland Teachers' Association will be one hundred years old. I think it is fitting that I rise and pay tribute to the Association.

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, the N.T.A. and the Department of Education have worked together for the overall improvement of education in the Province. This partnership has been in evidence in every new development in the education system - in curriculum development, in teacher education, in teacher certification, and in many other activities. I am confident that the mutual trust and respect that has been built up over the years will stand us in good stead for the future.

With respect to the future, Mr. Speaker, Government shares the N.T.A.'s views concerning the vital importance of education and

the need for educational change. As we approach the 21st century, excellence in education is essential to our success as an economic unit and as a society. Future economic, cultural, and social development will be in the hands of those who have an excellent education. With this in mind we must, for example, develop new curriculum programs, improve student achievement and retention, and provide support for students with special needs. Mr. Speaker, despite recent financial difficulties, Government is convinced that, working with teachers and others in the educational community, we will achieve these goals.

Earlier this year, Government announced the appointment of a Royal Commission to examine the delivery of educational services in the Province. I have every confidence that the final report will contain recommendations which will lead to a more efficient and a more effective education system. The N.T.A. was very active in recommending such a study. I know that the Association and its members throughout the Province will become fully involved in helping the Commission formulate its recommendations.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Government, I offer my sincerest congratulations to the N.T.A. on the outstanding service that the Association has provided over the years for teachers and for the Province generally. I extend best wishes to the Association for continued success in the future.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member

for St. Mary's - The Capes.

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hearn: Although I am sorely tempted, I will say that we are extremely pleased to join with the Minister in expressing congratulations to the N.T.A. on their centenary celebrations. The Newfoundland Teachers' Association, Mr. Speaker, was founded back in Spaniard's Bay, in fact, back one hundred years ago, November 22, 1890 when a small group of teachers met and from there sprung the great organization we have today.

From that organization, originally started one hundred years ago, we now see one that has grown to be a powerful collective voice of teachers in the Province. The N.T.A. has a proven record of achievement. It has been uniquely responsible for steady improvements we have witnessed in education throughout the century, and most especially since Confederation. It has set high standards for teacher training and insist that these standards be maintained and appropriately recognized. Today teachers in this Province are as qualified as their peers anywhere in the world. The N.T.A. developed and for many years provided the sole financial support for continuing professional development programs to make sure that the teachers were abreast of the latest developments in curriculum and teaching methods.

The Newfoundland Teachers' Association has always been on the cutting edge of change in education. It has worked hard to keep educational issues in the forefront of public debate. The

N.T.A. is vital to the welfare of the Province and to every individual Newfoundlander and Labradorian. So we would like to express our congratulations on the hundred years of outstanding leadership to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Further Statements by Ministers?

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Ms Cowan: Mr. Speaker, today I would like to announce to this hon. House changes with respect to the Labour Relations Board.

Since I became the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations I have had extensive discussions with unions, employers, employees and members of the legal community with a view to addressing problems identified in the operation of the Labour Relations Board. I have to date taken some measures to meet these concerns. For example, last year a new permanent position of Labour Relations Board Officer was approved. As part of that review process the Board has been actively reviewing the rules of procedure and has recently submitted for Cabinet approval for changes in the rules. Many of these changes, I think, address the concerns that have been brought to my attention. These rule changes have now been approved and will be published in the Newfoundland Gazette and will have an effective date of January 1 1991. All of these have been approved by the Board whose

composition is made up of equal representatives of employers and workers. These are the first changes to be effected in a decade. That is ten years, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: Hear hear!

Ms Cowan: Some of the changes proposed will provide for participation in pre-hearing conferences, for the consolidation of matters or proceedings before the Board and for interested parties to appear before the Board on any matter. They will provide for discretion in the Board to reverse the order of presentation of evidence in some applications requiring the respondent to proceed first, as opposed to the more usual order of having the applicant present first. In addition the changes will specify in further detail the requirements of references or applications to the Board under various sections.

Additionally I have reviewed the structure of the Board. The increasing demand and complexity of issues today necessitates that the position of Chairperson of the Board become a full time one. Mr. Denis Browne, currently Chairperson, serving on a part time basis, has been involved in helping to effect many of the recent and proposed changes to the operation of the Board and I look forward to his continued involvement.

This full time position will enable the Board to continue its important role and will facilitate the expeditious but considered decision making process so important to good labour relations in this Province.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: You are going to have to do a lot more than that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

Mr. Doyle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all let me thank the Minister for an advance copy of her statement. And let me say that we are pleased on this side of the House and we support any move that is made by the Minister and the Department of Labour to make the Labour Relations Board a little bit more efficient than it is right now. And as the Minister indicated a moment ago these problems were identified in a review process a number of months ago and what the Minister is outlining in her statement today are the changes in the rules of procedure of the Labour Relations Board. And these changes hopefully will lead to a greater efficiency and a greater fairness in the procedures that the Labour Relations Board employs right now. We see as well that the changes provide for the consolidation of matters that have a common theme to be dealt with by the Board instead of the longer process of dealing with these matters on an individual basis, and that can only be positive. A change in the order of presentation before the Board from the applicant and the respondent will be positive I feel, and have the effect of being fairer.

The most noteworthy change that the Minister outlines is the position of the Chairman of the Board which previously had been a part time position and is now going to become a full time position. And I believe that is a positive and wise move as well because the Labour Relations Board very often has cases backed up

quite a great deal and sometimes we have these cases solved between the employer and the employee before it even gets to the Labour Relations Board.

So these changes will undoubtedly have the effect of making the process a little bit more efficient and a little bit more expeditious.

Mr. Simms: Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday when the Minister of Education referred to a two or three year lull in funding education he revealed a long-term plan to extend the freeze on funding for education for two or three years beyond 1991-92. The major target in the Minister's cost reduction plan is teachers salaries, and his plan is much further advanced than he indicated yesterday. Let me ask the Minister about his centennial gift to the Newfoundland Teachers Association. Will the Minister confirm that he sent school boards two proposals for teachers allocations entitled scenario A and scenario B, both of which call for major reduction in classroom teacher allocations beginning in 1991-92 and continuing in 1992-93 and 1993-94?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Education.

Dr. Warren: It is only a lull. Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, I think this is accurate, during the

discussions with school boards there were some discussions held about the possible impact on individual boards if the numbers of teachers were reduced by a certain number. I do not recall precisely whether there were two or three options. There may have been two options looked at. The purpose of this exercise was to examine the impact on individual boards of such a reduction, if the reduction paralleled the declining student enrollments.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that over the last decade the number of students in this Province has gone down and they average 3,000 a year. So, I think in the discussions of the possible options for savings next year - the possible reduction of teachers paralleling the reduction in students - I think that was examined, Mr. Speaker, yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister will confirm that scenario A, and there are two scenarios not three, scenario A will result in the lay off of 122 teachers in 1991 and target another 191 teachers for lay off in the following two years? And will he also confirm that scenario B will result in the lay off of 160 teachers in 1991 and target 326 more for lay off the following two years?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Education.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, last year, I think the number of

teachers in the Province was reduced by sixty. We retained fifty others. So last year the number of teachers in this province would have been reduced by approximately 110, if the numbers had paralleled the decline in student population. It is my understanding that this option was looked at as one of the options. The hon. Member continues to talk about a reduction plan. There is no reduction plan. What we did in these deliberations - by the way, my department and I are very pleased with the whole consultation process - these are very difficult times, and we went out to talk with the people who are going to be concerned and we laid all of the options out. No decisions have been made. Mr. Speaker, if they would listen, let me just make one point. Let me repeat, no decisions have been made. May I repeat again? May I have silence, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Minister has asked for silence, and it is a long tradition of Parliament that when an hon. Member asks for silence that that be given.

The hon. the Minister of Education.

Dr. Warren: In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, no decisions have been made about any reductions. What we did was discuss with the people who were going to be affected all of the various options.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Minister that the only person happy with what the Minister is doing is the Premier.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hearn: In scenario (a) of the Minister's suggestions to boards, it will lay off 313 teachers over three years, and scenario (b) will lay off 486 teachers over three years. What factors will influence the Minister's final selection of either scenario (a) or scenario (b)?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Education.

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, there may be scenario (c), scenario (d), and scenario (e), etc. Let me answer the question directly. The Government's decision with respect to any scenario will be determined by the financial situation that this Government finds itself in for the year 1991-92, and whether or not the Province can borrow the additional money that is needed, whether it can increase taxes, or whether it has to face up to a possible reduction in programs and services in all Government activities, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to table, Mr. Speaker, the proposed scenarios.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I want to remind the hon. member that private members are not suppose to table any documents. He is not permitted to table any documents.

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have available the scenarios proposed by the Minister that will

certainly be made available. I ask the Minister if he will admit that the three year lull he talks about is in fact a deepening coma which will severely impair education in this Province for many years to come?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Education.

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Member was the Minister, and his predecessor, I kept up pretty much with what was happening in this Province, and you talk about comas. You talk about comas we experienced in education in this Province. Our first year in Government, Mr. Speaker, we increased the funding for education dramatically, and we did it again last year. I think the word 'lull' was a pretty good word really. After this lull over the next year or so we are going to surge forward into the 21st century.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: One final point, Mr. Speaker. I am enjoying this, Mr. Speaker. One of these days I am going to dig up the number of teachers that were reduced when the Opposition was in power, year by year. I am going to get this data one of these days.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had a question for the Minister of Finance today, who is not here unfortunately, so I will direct my question to the real Minister responsible for slashing and cutting in the Province, the

President of Treasury Board.

On November 7th, in Hansard, while responding to a question from the Member for St. John's East Extern, the Minister of Finance said, 'all revenues from provincial sources were down by about \$30 million or a bit less than that', that was his quote and on the 18th November, he told The Evening Telegram, 'the retail tax revenues were down by \$29 million', those are his quotes.

I want to ask the President of Treasury Board, is the lower than expected revenues which the Minister talks about from retail sales tax, the total or only short fall in revenues from provincial sources, or are there other decreases in the Budget projections, for example, of revenues from personal or corporate income taxes?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the exact figure is \$29.7 million in terms of the amount that RST is projected to be down. That is a projection that is done on the basis of information available at any given time. That projection was done I guess about a month ago - a little over a month ago maybe.

The latest information is that that projection seems to be accurate now, today, and that there will be a reduction in RST. There are some other areas of revenue where there is a slight increase. There are very few changes in any other areas of provincial revenue, so the majority of the change is occurring at the RST level.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for the answer. In fact, I think, after weeks and weeks of persisting, it is the first time we got the exact amount by anybody from the Government side, so I thank him for that direct answer.

Let me ask him a supplementary. On November 7th, the Minister of Finance also said, in responding to the Member for St. John's East Extern, that details on expenditures will be coming out over the next little while. Now since two weeks have passed since the Minister said that, because we have been asking the details on the expenditures -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes. The over-expenditures the Minister talked about. Could the President of Treasury Board now tell the House how much of that \$120 million expected deficit is due to higher than anticipated expenditures, how much is due to the expenditure part of it - he has told us \$29.7 is from retail sales - and also, could he give us precisely or exactly those major areas where increases in expenditures have occurred?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The major area, it seems to me, is where there has been an increase in Government expenditure, is related to the Hibernia project. As you recall, when the Budget was done, we were operating on a certain timetable for Hibernia and in the past,

timetables were not necessarily accurate and so on.

When we did the Budget up, we could not accurately predict at that point in time, exactly when the agreement was going to be signed and if in fact it would be signed, and we could not project the spending on Hibernia, so the major part of the over-expenditures is related to the Hibernia project, and I have not seen figures in a long time. It seems to me it is somewhere in the \$10 or \$15 million -

An Hon. Member: Cow Head.

Mr. Baker: - Cow Head. But this is all related to Hibernia, so the major over-expenditure is related to things associated with Hibernia.

Now, as the member knows, at this point in time we have a look at all expenditures and we estimate whether in some areas there is going to be an overrun, in some areas there is going to be some money left at the end of the year.

Premier Wells: The Employment Generation Program.

Mr. Baker: So any other variances would be normal variances, with the exception of the programs we have announced in this House.

Premier Wells: Employment Generation and Social Assistance.

Mr. Baker: The Employment Generation Program was one in addition, but there were no really significant ones other than the ones that have been announced in this House, and the Hibernia expenditures that have to be made because we kept to our timetable and managed to get the Hibernia agreement signed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Yes, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Premier can now understand why we have been having so much difficulty in getting answers precisely to questions. Even though we have been accused of not asking questions, we have asked this question time and time again and we cannot get the precise details. You have told us on the revenue side retail sales tax is down. You have told us and we have argued about the amount short in transfer funds from Ottawa. How much of the deficit is due to the higher expenditures? How much? - \$30 million? \$40 million? How much is it? And will he give us the exact areas where these increased expenditures have occurred? Now he just mentioned some across the House, which is the first time we have really heard some of it. And surely it would not take much time for people in Treasury Board or Finance to table that information. Will he do that?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, there is no difficulty in tabling it. It has all been detailed in the House before. Now if the member wants us to put it in a neat little package for him so he can see the neat little package, I am sure the Minister, the President of Treasury Board, or the Minister of Finance can put it in a neat little package so the hon. member can understand it. But every last bit of it has been described in this House.

I know the three significant areas are the additional expenditures on social services -

Ms Verge: How much?

Premier Wells: Well, maybe the President of Treasury Board has the detail and he can -

An Hon. Member: It was done (inaudible) surely now.

Premier Wells: Yes, but we will put it together in a neat little package.

Mr. Simms: Well, tell us.

Premier Wells: I do not have the detail right in front of me.

Mr. Simms: Nor do we.

Premier Wells: But we will get it for the hon. member in a neat little package and give it to him so he can understand it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, we would appreciate getting the information. The Premier says it is all available and it has been disclosed in the House. How come nobody knows the answer? That is the question.

An Hon. Member: That is your problem.

Mr. Simms: Now let me ask a final question then. Because of the expected increased expenditures, because of the larger increase in expenditures, can the President of Treasury Board tell us whether, in fact, the Government will be proposing to put forth another Supplementary Supply Bill?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, we have just gone through a process of Supplementary Supply, which is our estimate of what we will need for the rest of the year. In that process we explained to members opposite that in terms of the bond redemptions, three months down the road we have no idea as to how many of the saving bonds are going to be cashed in. If a lot of the bonds are going to be cashed in, if the rates in the markets are much higher than what we are paying and a lot of them are cashed in, then the possibility exists that we may have to come in for another Supplementary Supply Bill at that time. But in terms of ordinary Government expenditure, no. There has been no -

Premier Wells: We do not anticipate it.

Mr. Baker: There will be no need for Supplementary Supply that we can anticipate.

In terms of the rest of his question, I have since dug up some extra information that I had with me in terms of the expenditure areas. Essentially it is what I said: there is 3.5, 1.2, and .25, for the job creation, the \$6 million that the Premier mentioned. The total funds in terms of Hibernia development, including Cow Head, the total expenditure, but some of this is recoverable, is about \$60 million, and most of that is three-quarters recoverable. But understand that we have to put the money in and we get it back.

Ms Verge: Fifteen (inaudible).

Mr. Baker: I told the hon. member somewhere about ten or fifteen I believe, so it was around fifteen

on Cow Head.

Premier Wells: We will get the detail and table it tomorrow.

Mr. Simms: Tomorrow? Tomorrow?

Premier Wells: We should have it tomorrow, if the minister is available.

Mr. Baker: Yes. There are some minor items. There was a reclassification of nursing assistants that could not have been projected, and that cost in the vicinity of \$4.2 million, the reclassification of nursing assistants, remember, that went through the normal civil service process. These are the only big ones. There are some other tiny amounts, but I am sure the Minister will provide whatever other detailed information is available. Some of the things are \$50,000 here, \$10,000 there, and I am sure the member does not want to wade through all that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me ask the President of Treasury Board a question that he should have the answer to, because he is totally in control of it, which is the capital account of expenditure of the Province, both current and capital. Total expenditures of \$916 million in the general government sector were projected. Will the President tell us, is that projection still accurate now?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl, to repeat his question.

Mr. Windsor: The Minister of Finance projected in his Budget

gross current and capital account expenditures of \$916 million in the area of general government sector. Is that still an accurate projection of general government expenditure in this Province?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Offhand I would say that is still an accurate figure. However, the hon. member must understand with this clarification that a Budget estimate may be up or may be down at the end of the year. There are normal things that happen in the course of the year that would cause changes in figures. I believe under the general government expenditure, for instance, that is the heading under which salaries would come, therefore, that reclassification I mentioned of the nursing assistants would have an impact. But generally, with the exception of these types of circumstances, yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Speaker, that is the obvious answer but the President of Treasury Board should know now. He is the one who has been responsible for reclassifications and salary negotiations. Let me get into another area.

The Minister of Finance predicted revenues from vehicle and drivers' licences of \$31 million. Will the President of Treasury Board tell us now, as a result of the closedown of Clarenville and Wabush, and as a result of very slow sales due to the disastrous economy, has the President of Treasury Board now got a revision of the revenues expected from

vehicle and drivers' licences?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker these are the very same things that the Opposition House Leader asked, the same types of issues, and we said the Minister of Finance would provide him with a list, as soon as he gets it put together.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: If hon. Members want to spend the remaining ten minutes of Question Period asking the same question over and over again I suppose that is their concern.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: Well, revenues up or down mean changes in position, which is exactly what you asked for and which you will get.

Ms Verge: I asked that weeks ago and so did (inaudible).

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Speaker, it is clear the President of Treasury Board does not have the answers. But let me ask him this, Mr. Speaker. Fines and forfeitures were estimated at \$6.6 million in the Budget. In view of Bill 48, which is amendments to The Highway Traffic Act, the schedule to which we see increases of fines in the order of 400 and 500 per cent, perhaps even more, will the President of Treasury Board tell me, does he think that that will have an impact on the prediction

of \$6.6 million of revenue from fines and forfeitures?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Council.

Mr. Baker: In terms of that specific question, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very obvious to anybody who knows what the Member is talking about that if you increase fines, then you are going to have an effect on the revenue you take in. But the other variable there, Mr. Speaker, is how many people break the law. So I can not predict what effect that is going to have between now and the end of March. Obviously if fines are increased there is going to be increased revenue, assuming that there is the same number of infractions.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Speaker, if the President of Treasury Board can't predict any better than that, it is no wonder that the deficit has gone from a \$5.3 million surplus to a \$120 million deficit, (inaudible).

Now let me try one more question. Lottery revenues were estimated at \$16 million. In view of the fact that the Government has now authorized establishing computerized lottery machines in bars and other establishments in this Province, does the President of Treasury Board think that that might have an impact on the revenues of the Province this year, and, if so, how much?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I correct the hon.

Member. It was not a projected deficit of \$5.3 million. It was a \$10 million surplus we projected, not \$5.3 million. I do not know where the hon. Member is getting his figures, but I just want to tell him what the correct figures are.

In terms of lottery revenue, Mr. Speaker, that is a variable as well. As the year progresses we keep a check on that particular variable. As of this point in time, it looks as if lottery revenues will be up by \$3 million or \$4 million.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. In an interview broadcast on November 6, the Economic Recovery Commission Chairman, Dr. Doug House, said the Commission is presently investigating the means by which industries could be established in Newfoundland to manufacture items that people and business in this Province commonly purchase and use. Could the premier state whether, in his opinion, this approach to economic recovery is sound?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: It is sound. But it is not the only, it is part of the overall and the hon. member should take that into account.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has happened to our economy over recent decades, particularly the period of mismanagement by the former Government, was that the small manufacturing sector and our own self-producing sector disappeared virtually and they

made no effort to try and deal with that problem. The Economic Recovery Commission was set up with the specific mandate to try and broaden the base of our economy beyond the four traditional sectors on which we have relied and, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that the preliminary indications are extremely good.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: Hon. members can - they will see some, I do not know whether it is 1,000 or 1,300 to date, that will be made clear shortly, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) them working.

Premier Wells: Hon. members probably also would be interested in knowing the contribution the ERC has made to another very significant development, to respond to the question of the hon. member as to what is right. Mr. Speaker, between 1980 and 1987 the number of full-time jobs in this Province decreased by 4,000.

Some Hon. Members: Here we go.

Mr. Parsons: Mr. Speaker, that is not the question I asked.

Premier Wells: Well, I am explaining why it is a sound approach, and it is a sound approach to economic development because here is the result that is being produced. From 1980 to 1987 the number of full-time jobs reduced by 4,000 and part-time increased by 10,000. Mr. Speaker, in the first nine months of this year, as a result of the soundness of this Government's approach, the number of full-time jobs have increased by 4,000, and the number of part-time have gone down by

4,000. That is a demonstration of the soundness of the approach.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What the Premier left out was that there are 11,700 after leaving the Province in the last eighteen months.

Some Hon. Members: Got him! Got him!

Mr. Parsons: In the same interview, on November 6th, a particular example, Dr. House said that people in business in this Province commonly use large numbers of styrofoam cups, and that one idea of a good industry for Newfoundland would be to establish a facility to manufacture styrofoam containers. Could the Premier state whether, in his opinion, this particular approach to economic recovery is sound?

An Hon. Member: It is better than cucumbers.

Mr. Parsons: A specific question, now.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, paper cups are not going to solve our problems. Styrofoam cups are not going to solve our problems. But, Mr. Speaker, if we create two jobs producing styrofoam cups, thirteen more producing shoe laces, twenty-three more producing neck ties and so on and so on, in the end you produce hundreds and thousands of jobs. So the basic approach in principle is a sound contribution to the overall economy. Any one of them, any one by itself is obviously not going

to solve the problem and if that is an indication of the thinking of the hon. Members Opposite, it is no wonder they made such a mess of the economy of this Province in the seventeen years that they were there.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Listen, who is talking (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

Mr. Parsons: Another little bit of information before I go to my final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to remind the hon. the Premier, that in 1981 we had a 13.9 per cent unemployment rate and at this present date, we have an alarming 16 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Parsons: Mr. Speaker, a new question. A question to the Minister of Environment and Lands.

In light of the increasing pressure that environmentally conscious consumers are placing on businesses which overpackage, and specifically on those which package, using non-biodegradable materials like styrofoam and in light of the impact this consumer pressure is already having on the styrofoam industry, could the Minister of Environment and Lands, state whether, in his opinion, establishing a styrofoam manufacturing facility in this Province is a sound idea for economic development, and environmentally sound as well.

An Hon. Member: No, that was not to you, that was not to you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I just want to deal with the full -

Mr. Simms: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: On a point of order, the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, the question was directed specifically to the Minister of Environment, in his capacity as Minister of Environment and -

Mr. Warren: And he asked for a personal opinion.

Mr. Simms: - he tried to get up to respond to the Member's statement. Obviously, there is something wrong if the Premier is trying to force his way on to the turf of the Minister of Environment. Surely the Minister of Environment should be permitted to answer the question. It is an important environmental question that he is asking.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: The Premier wants to make some political point.

Mr. Speaker: To that point of order, I quote to hon. Members, Beausheue, 420, page 123. The Speaker has stated, "Of course, the Chair will allow a question to be put to a certain Minister; but it cannot insist that that Minister rather than another should answer it."

The hon. the Premier.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: If he is here long enough he will learn, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: On a point of order,
Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Opposition House
Leader, on a point of order.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, surely,
there has been enough practice and
tradition in our Legislature
though to indicate that if a
question is directed to a
particular Minister, I think if
you do the research you will find
that the answer is given by that
particular Minister, and in this
particular case, the Member's
question is specifically
environmentally centered,
environmentally centered, and you
know, unless the Minister wants to
defer to the Premier, that is a
little different situation, but I
surely think he should be given
the chance.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that it
would be a difficult thing for one
to check out precedent in that
respect. In my number of years
here, I found it working in many,
many ways, and Beauchesne's rule
stands firm in that respect.

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Thank you, Mr.
Speaker.

Mr. Simms: On a point of order, I
think the time for Question Period
has expired.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I
would like to answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House
Leader is right. Question Period
has expired.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An Hon. Member: They are afraid
of the answers.

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the
Minister of Health.

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker,
yesterday the hon. Member for
Torngat Mountains had some concern
about some protective masks that
were given out in Hopedale, and he
asked if the Minister of Health
would, today, immediately,
quarantine the Government owned
store in Hopedale so that its
officials can go into the
community and determine the cause
of this health hazard. Now, Mr.
Speaker, I had this matter checked
out, and as the Minister of
Development pointed out, the
government store in Hopedale has
had a problem with sewerage backup
for the past four to six weeks.
Local plumbers have not been able
to rectify the problem, and the
Department of Development, which
directly operates these stores,
has an engineer on his way into
Hopedale, and as the Minister of
Development pointed out the
weather was delaying him. On
Friday November 16 the sewerage
backed up again and required
cleaning up. The staff in the
nursing station had several
complaints of nausea from the
store staff who were cleaning up,
and the nurse gave the workers
surgical masks to use, as this
does filter out some of the odors,
and were indeed of great help to
the store staff in getting the
place cleaned up. There was no
contamination of foodstuffs and
there was no hazard to either

individuals or to the public's health. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition, under the direction of the Member for Torngat Mountains, were asking me as Minister of Health to quarantine the store in Hopedale. This would mean that nobody would be allowed in or out of that particular premises, and this is an indication of the alarmist, sensational panic which is over there on the other side. Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of this Province that these particular members never again take over the Government of this Province, because there would be nothing only an alarmist and a panic stricken bunch of members running the place. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to quarantine the Government facilities at Hopedale.

Petitions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Menihek.

Mr. A. Snow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to present a petition on behalf of residents of Western Labrador in the district of Menihek protesting the closure of a Motor Vehicle Registration office in the town of Wabush which services Labrador City and Wabush. The prayer of the petition is: we protest the decision of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to close the Motor Vehicle Registration office in Wabush. Your petitioners urge the Government to reconsider this decision which will have the effect of eliminating an essential Government service in our communities.

The 253 people who signed this petition are concerned about the level of service to the town of Wabush being downgraded. For ten years they had the opportunity of purchasing motor vehicle registration and renewing their licenses, that type of service, at a local office servicing Labrador city and Wabush. On October 30 the hon. Minister of Works, Services and Transportation announced the closure effective the end of November, and two people were flicked out the door, they were laid off, and this service is no longer available to the people. This is one of the things that this Government, this regime, is privatizing and now going to give over to the banks of this Province to allow them to generate revenue from it.

Mr. Speaker, one of the alarming things this does, of course, is remove another government service that used to be in Western Labrador, which has very few Government services. Maybe that is, by nature, how the towns were developed and the fact that they were practically completely built by two mining companies that went in and established a mining industry in Western Labrador. The removal of government services leaves a very poor image in the people's minds, because we live so far away from the capital. The Premier mentioned several times during his campaign about the importance of making the people of Labrador feel part of this Province, yet they feel more and more alienated towards the Island portion of this Province because they are left out of the main stream of this Province. This is one of the examples that develops this feeling of alienation, that this rift is appearing between the insular part of this Province and

the Mainland portion of Labrador. One of the people involved in organizing this petition and collecting names in this petition, attempted to contact the Minister by a telephone call, and placed a collect telephone call to the Minister and he wanted to discuss the conditions of the roads and the highways in Labrador. The Minister would not allow a collect call to be received from a resident in Labrador.

An Hon. Member: What?

Mr. A. Snow: Would not accept the charges on a telephone call from a resident living in Labrador. And they wonder why this rift is developing between the Island portion of the Province and Labrador.

At the same time this was being discussed, Mr. Speaker, there was a snowstorm in Western Labrador, and, of course, we live in a border community, and there was a lot of problems with snow removal on our side of the border in Newfoundland and the Labrador portion, and also in the Province of Quebec. A resident of Labrador City, which is in Newfoundland, phoned the Quebec Ministry of Transport collect and they accepted the charges.

Some Hon. Members: Shame! Shame!

Mr. A. Snow: Now what kind of a message is this regime sending out to the people of Labrador -

An Hon. Member: Shame on them!

Mr. A. Snow: - when they will not listen to the people of Labrador, because they will not accept the charges on a telephone call from the people of Western Labrador.

An Hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. A. Snow: Yes, it is true.
The Premier -

Mr. Woodford: It has not changed.

An Hon. Member: We will have it checked.

Mr. A. Snow: Why are you going to check? Everything that I ever said in this House is true, and I resent this attitude of you suggesting that the people of Labrador would lie about something like this.

An Hon. Member: It is terrible!
It is terrible!

Mr. A. Snow: It is a terrible attitude. And that is one of the problems, the arrogance of this regime to even suggest that residents in Labrador would be lying because they are upset about the elected representatives who are in Cabinet, who have an area of responsibility in this Province, and will not accept a telephone call from a resident living in Labrador, and when they want to call a person in another area, because we are in a border community, they do accept the charges in the Province of Quebec. That occurred. And I resent this attitude of the Premier suggesting that this resident of Labrador would lie, the resident who told me, and, of course, that I would relay this message as a lie. It is very improper for the Premier to suggest that.

Mr. Warren: (Inaudible).

Mr. A. Snow: Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Western Labrador are very upset about the fact of closing this office, and of the

arrogance of this regime in closing this office and other ways of insulating themselves here in their classy refurbished offices, in their ivory towers here in St. John's -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Warren: By leave.

Some Hon. Members: By leave.

Mr. A. Snow: They would ask this Government to reconsider and have this office continue to remain open.

Mr. Speaker: Further petitions?

Mr. Baker: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: On a point of order. The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, I waited until after Question Period and after Petitions and so on, because I did not want to interfere with the normal process of the House.

During Question Period today the Opposition House Leader used a tactic that is not proper during Question Period, using points of order to interfere with the answers to questions, and to kill the time of Question Period. This is quite plainly stated in Beauchesne where it indicates that unless it is of an absolutely emergency nature points of order are left until the end of Question Period rather than raised during Question Period.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition House Leader got a great kick out of doing this, I am sure, and it was obvious to everybody including the

press exactly what he was doing. But my point of order pertains to the precise events that happened, Mr. Speaker.

Now, my understanding is that there is a thirty minute allotment for Question Period, and that after that thirty minutes is up no member may rise to ask another question. However, Mr. Speaker, when the question is asked before the thirty minutes is up then obviously the answer must be given, and that there is never any suggestion or attempt to cut off the answer to a question, it is simply to limit the time of asking questions not of answering questions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in that context I believe that the Premier should have been allowed, after the Opposition House Leader had his little bit of fun, to answer the question. In light of the fact that he was not, Mr. Speaker, I would like a ruling from you sometime today as to whether we can accept that question as Notice of Question, and have the question answered in Answers To Questions For Which Notice Has Been Given tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what has happened to the President of Treasury Board, if he is getting sooky or what is wrong with him, or if the Premier is putting pressure on him. His preamble to his point of order talked about curtailing or cutting off time in Question Period so wasting time of the House and all the rest of it, and here he just spent about two or three minutes talking about a silly and foolish point of order to begin with.

Mr. Speaker, it is all because the Premier did not get his own way and did not get a chance to answer, that's all it is and nothing else.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: Now, Mr. Speaker, for your edification, for your consideration in ruling on this point of order, let me point out just two things to you which I know Your Honour does not need to be reminded of, but I will do so anyway. In the rules there is a thirty minute time allotment for Question Period, no ifs, ands or buts. No, but if he's asked a question at the last minute, and all that stuff. That is by leave and all the rest of it. But there is a thirty minute time limit for Question Period.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the President of the Council says the Premier should have been allowed to answer the question. Well, Mr. Speaker, I point out the question was not asked to the Premier. The question was asked to the Minister of Environment. So there clearly is no point of order, it is just a method for the Premier to vent his frustration because he did not get his own way today.

Mr. Speaker: To the point of order. In the past we have tried to discourage points of order and points of privilege during Question Period because, of course, the Question Period is only thirty minutes. But if an hon. Member stands on either a point of privilege or a point of order the Chair has no choice but to recognize the hon. Member. At the same time, in making the order again to try and discourage hon. Members from doing that, the Chair prefers leaving it to the end of

the Question Period and that is still my position.

But, again, when hon. Members rise to do so, of course the Chair has no choice but to recognize and the Chair sort of plays it by ear with respect to when the time is up. And when the Chair saw that we were into thirty-one minutes, and again in considering time we can not exclude points of order or points of privilege, we have to include that too, otherwise we would get into a real schlemozzle. So I would say there is no point of order.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Speaker: It being Wednesday, Private Member's Day, Motion No. 10, the Member for Bellevue introducing the motion by the Member for Stephenville.

The Member for Bellevue.

Mr. Barrett: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure for me to stand in the House today and to introduce the resolution placed on the Order Paper by my friend and colleague from Stephenville.

The hon. Member for Stephenville's resolution says:

WHEREAS the skills and knowledge of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians will be a critical factor in determining the future success of our Province as a vibrant society and a viable economy;

AND WHEREAS the post-secondary education system in today's challenging environment must provide the women and men in the

Province with high quality advanced education, delivered in an accessible and efficient manner;

AND WHEREAS the White Paper outlining a post-secondary educational agenda for the future has been announced by the Minister of Education and stresses equality, excellence and efficiency in the post-secondary system;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly express support for the White Paper Educational Initiative put forward by the Wells administration.

I completely endorse this particular resolution and also it is a pleasure to be able to take part in this particular debate. I would like to be able, probably for the benefit of Members present, to retrace some of the historical significance of vocational education in this Province, for the education of Members in the House and the public in general.

Prior to 1963 in this Province, vocational education was in a very limited form. It took place in very primitive premises on the Southside of St. John's and on Parade Street. But in 1963 there was a major Act passed in the House of Commons and it was called the Vocational Training Act, during the Diefenbaker years. At that particular time, the Federal Government recognized that the responsibility for training a work force in this country was the responsibility of the Federal Government. At that particular time there was a fair amount of money allocated to the provinces for vocational and technical education and training in the country.

During that time, there were eleven vocational schools built in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, in places like Bell Island, Carbonear, Seal Cove, Burin, Clarenville, Corner Brook, Gander, Grand Falls, Stephenville Crossing and St. John's. These particular schools, all eleven schools at that particular time, were built by the Province with Federal Government dollars on a 90/10 basis. During that particular time, vocational education in this Province was completely free: there were no tuition fees and the majority of the money that came to the Province came from the Federal Government.

The next major piece of legislation affecting vocational and adult education in this country came in 1967. From the period 1963 to 1967 it was found that a lot of people in this country could not take advantage of the provisions of the Vocational Training Act, that a lot of adults within this country called Canada, and particularly in Newfoundland and very many other provinces, did not have the basic academic qualifications to be able to take part in vocational education.

In 1967, an Act of Parliament, called the Occupational Training Act, was brought in. And it has great historical significance for Newfoundland, because at that particular time it saw the real expansion of a program called Basic Training for Skill Development, and those in the field would refer to it as BTSD. At the same time that this Act went through Parliament, a major event took place in Stephenville. I am trying to direct some of my statements, and I am sure the hon.

Member for Stephenville would have brought this up in the debate, that 1966 meant the closing of the base in Stephenville. This sort of coincided with the time the Occupational Health and Training Act was passed in the House of Commons, which meant that there was a lot of money provided for people to upgrade their academic qualifications.

At that particular time, the Government used facilities that were left behind by the Americans, in Stephenville, to set up the Stephenville Adult Education Centre, and at one time in our history we probably had 1800 to 2000 adults at the Stephenville Education Centre who were involved in academic upgrading programs which were completely, 100 per cent, financed by the Federal Government. And not only did they pay for the program costs, but they also paid support payments to people who wanted to enroll in the programs. That saw a great expansion of adult basic education, or basic training for skill development in this Province.

The next major historical significance in terms of vocational education in this Province was in 1970, when the Trade School in St. John's became the College of Trades and Technology, and the responsibility for the operation of this particular facility was transferred from the Department to a Board of Governors.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the hon. member would permit me to welcome some people to the House? I should have done so before but I forgot it. These are students and they may leave. It is not that they find the member boring, but they may have to get back to

classes or something, and I would like to do that. Probably some of them have already left. But my note says that we have thirty-five grade XII students from the E.J. Pratt Central High School in Brownsdale, Trinity Bay, accompanied by their teachers, Jessy Brown and Margaret Tucker, I believe it is.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Also in the gallery, or was in the gallery, is the Deputy Mayor of Marystown, Mary Hodder. We would like to extend a warm welcome to her, as well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Bellevue, thank you.

Mr. Barrett: I do not mind being interrupted by Your Honour to welcome students, particularly when the topic we are addressing right now is their future.

Mr. Hearn: (Inaudible) it was a relief.

Mr. Barrett: It is a relief. As I was saying, in 1970 the College of Trades and Technology was created. The next major event that took place was in 1972. There was still some money left from the previous 1963 agreement, The vocational Training Act. There was money left over in the pot, in Ottawa, for the further expansion of vocational education in this province, and in 1972 we saw six more vocational schools being built in the province, this time under a 75/25 arrangement. As we see, the amounts of money have been reduced by Ottawa. These schools were built in Baie Verte, Bonavista, Springdale, Placentia, Happy Valley and St.

Anthony, and these schools offered the same types of programs as the other ten vocational schools in the Province.

I think the point to remember is that all these schools, except for the College of Trades and Technology in St. John's, were operated by the Division of Vocational and Technical Education in the Department of Education. It was a very centralized system; it was very cumbersome to operate, in that even very limited decisions or very simple decisions had to be made by the Government bureaucracy, by Treasury Board, and all the things that encompasses programs that are operated directly by the Government. But it is interesting to note that at that particular time in our history, when we had some seventeen institutions in the Province, that a total of seventeen administrative staff operated the whole system.

Over a period of time these particular institutions did a great service to our Province. They turned out a very qualified, a very well-trained work force. And if you will look at our history you will notice that most of the trades people who were involved in the major industries and major developments in this Province were graduates from these vocational schools: Churchill Falls, the developments in Bay D'Espoir, major building expansion programs. What we have in this Province in terms of a trained work force actually came from these particular vocational schools.

In 1973, there was a person appointed Minister of Education in the administration of Premier Frank Moores: Gerald Ottenheimer,

a man who I had the great pleasure of working under within the Department of Education, a great planner, a man who had great foresight, at that particular time did a lot of planning in terms of vocational and adult education in this Province.

I think another significant thing happened in terms that it changed the history of vocational and technical education in this province. During an election campaign the former, former, former Premier, Premier Moores, promised a regional college for the west coast, based in Stephenville. At that particular time he got into some difficulty, because he promised a regional college to be placed in Stephenville and, as it so happened, this particular promised college turned out to be the Sir Wilfred Grenfell College, which was later put in Corner Brook. So there has always been a conflict going on between Corner Brook and Stephenville in terms of post-secondary education dates back, right back to 1973, but the Minister of the day, the hon. Gerald Ottenheimer, now Senator Ottenheimer, I think in 1974, appointed a person at the Department to - I think he was classified as a Regional Director of Adult Education - to look at and to investigate a model for community colleges in this Province, and out of that research was born what is known as the Bay St. George Community College.

The Bay St. George Community College was to have been the model for the rest of the Province and the Bay St. George Community College model was based on a model of a community college in Saskatchewan, and the idea of the Bay St. George Community College

was to bring together the various programmes; you had Stephenville Crossing which had a purely vocational oriented programme at the Stephenville Crossing Vocational School, you had the heavy-equipment school in Stephenville, you had five or six buildings in Stephenville that housed various programmes, particularly the Adult Basic Education Programme and other programmes.

The intent was to bring these programmes together under a Board of Governors. There was not supposed to be any more buildings built but really it was a tying together. I actually participated in the opening ceremonies of the Bay St. George Community College and the Minister of Education at that particular time, at the official opening in 1976 was T. Alex Hickman, who is now the Chief Justice of the Province.

Instead of actually cutting a ribbon to officially open the Bay St. George Community College, it included all the different segments of the college joining together, rather than cutting a ribbon, so that it indicated there was a coming together of the various programmes in the Bay St. George area.

The idea was not to build new buildings, but I think what happened was, eventually they ran out of space or in the desire to have a physical structure, a major programme of renovating the high-rise buildings in Stephenville became a part of the whole Bay St. George Community College and there was an expansion of programmes.

So what we had in Newfoundland, we had two - and of course we had

the Marine Institute which was the old College of Fisheries which was on Parade Street and we had The College of Trades and Technology and we had the Bay St. George Community College and then we had the poor cousins of the system which were the vocational schools.

I think that the College of Trades and Technology and the Bay St. George and The College of Fisheries made great strides within vocational and technical education in this Province mainly because they were under separate boards. They operated on their own and only received grants and aid from the Provincial Government but were not handicapped by the fact that every little request had to come through the Government channels, and I think we saw within this Province a sort of a down-grading of vocational education, because it is very difficult to respond to education and training needs when the thing has to go through the Government bureaucracy.

The next major initiative took place in vocational education in this Province in 1985 and was the releasing of the White Paper called the Re-organization of Vocational School Systems in the Province and in that particular White Paper it recommended transferring the responsibility for operating the vocational schools from the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies to the Board of Governors. I might add, that before that time there was the creation of the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies, which to me I think was a backward step in terms of vocational education in this Province and adult education in this Province. I think it was a

department that was not necessary to set up, because at the time in the history of Newfoundland when we were talking about decentralizing the system we were building up a very centralized bureaucracy. I think one of the problems we had in vocational education in this Province and post-secondary in this Province is that we build up a bureaucracy in St. John's that was unnecessary. I remind the hon. Member for St. Mary's - The Capes that he was one of the people responsible for the collective decision of setting it up, but it was ironic at the time. Back in the early 1970s, when the whole system was controlled by the department we could have used a department of post-secondary education because the system was being controlled completely by the department. But at the same time when we were making the transition of having decentralized control and putting the system under boards of governors, we brought in a big humongous department, and there was quite an expansion of staff at the Department of Career Development, when the hon. Member for Humber East was the Minister of Education that the whole vocational and adult education system in this Province was operated at the department level by seventeen people. And she knows that is accurate, because she was the Minister at the time. The whole system in the Province was operated by seventeen people and we built up this big, created a new department at a cost, I did an analysis at one time, and that department cost \$6 million or \$7 million to set up. Then when we brought back the two departments together, we had a lot of duplication taking place. And I do not think we can afford in this Province to be duplicating

services. So it was unfortunate that the department was set up at the same time that we were talking about decentralizing the system.

This particular White Paper which was circulated in 1985 really again received quite a reaction because it suggested putting certain vocational schools in this Province under the direct control of the College of Trades and Technology in St. John's. For example, the hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West would be interested to know that Placentia, Burin, Bonavista and St. Anthony were to go under the jurisdiction of the Marine Institute, which would have been four campuses dominated by a St. John's Board; place a vocational school at Bell Island, Conception Bay South, Carbonear and Clarenville, and the Craft School in St. John's under the jurisdiction of the Board of Governors of the College of Trades and Technology in St. John's; put the Port aux Basques Vocational School under Bay St. George, I saw no problem with that; designate the vocational school at Baie Verte as part of the Fisher Technical College in Corner Brook; and designate the school in Happy Valley as a community college. The only one that probably made a lot of sense was No. 8, designate the vocational schools at Grand Falls, Gander, Lewisporte and Springdale as a regional community college for Central Newfoundland. That is probably the only thing out of that particular report that was implemented, these particular schools eventually became the Central Newfoundland Community College.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Barrett: Yes, I have twenty minutes to further expand on this at the end.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, let me say the resolution seems to be ill-timed and ill-conceived. Ill-timed because it is not a very popular time for the Government to be talking about education. However one can easily see why it was introduced. In a mad scramble to come up with something whereby they could try to pick some positives in education, they discovered on the order paper the resolution as put forth by the Member. And undoubtedly what it is is a smoke screen to try to deflect the heat that is presently on Government for the decisions that they are making in education away from this to something that might be perceived as somewhat positive.

Why I say ill-conceived: the resolution was put on the order paper I presume much earlier in the year shortly after the Minister had come out with his White Paper. However since that time the Minister has come out with his response to the White Paper submissions, or at least as he said a response to the submissions that were made. And has told the public basically what Government is going to do, what action Government will take to address the positions taken in the White Paper and of course the reaction to the White Paper.

Unfortunately what is included in the White Paper in an overall addressing of some of the problems perhaps, or issues, in the

post-secondary field, and what is going to be done to address them, are two entirely different issues. And to listen to the Member for Bellevue who introduced the resolution speak - I presume he is just sort of preparing for his final twenty minutes, but he was basically giving us a history of the development of the post-secondary system, in which he played a part. Leading up to telling us how good it is to see certain decisions being made, and the White Paper offers a number of initiatives, but as I have said, unfortunately the Minister has already come out and said they are going to do very little about the suggested initiatives.

The centralization of the system, an issue that the Member addressed when he spoke. He talked about centralizing powers and about the history of the post-secondary system, where it was originally centred in St. John's, which was true. But over the years when the former administration was in power we saw a tremendous expansion in the decentralization of the educational system throughout the Province. And when the Member was speaking I suggested to him across the floor he should talk to the Minister. Because one of the aims of the Minister of Education, and all one has to do is to go through some of his selected readings over the years, the Minister of Education has always wanted to centralize certain authorities in the field of education. I would suggest that we watch in the near future and we will see the elimination of such individuals as programme coordinators, assistant superintendents, et cetera. We will see more and more of that power centralized either in Confederation Building or in selected areas in the Province.

The openness and the decentralization that is evident now in the educational field will no longer be there. And the Minister will be able to use the excuse that he has to cut funding and reduce positions in order to do it. But for years - all one has to do as I said is read some of the Minister's different issuances and they will see that he is always very keen on a more centralized approach to education. And in Newfoundland, I agree with the Member for Bellevue, that is not the way to solve our problems. The most advances we have had, the most involvement that we have had, is since we started decentralizing the authorities in the field of education.

In the original White Paper, which the resolution talks about, Mr. Speaker, put forth in February, one of the highlights, and the White Paper is entitled, by the way, Equality, Excellence, and Efficiency, a Post-secondary Educational Agenda for the Future. This is the Minister's great triple E reorganization paper. Perhaps we should call it a triple D paper, because really from the issuance of the White Paper, to the actual response, we have seen it is a deceptive downgrading and actually a dumb paper. As the Minister gets into the initiatives to be taken, after X number of pages of history and summary, the first page of the triple E policy framework, equality, dealing with equality, and initiatives, and as we get into initiatives: Initiative number one, the creation of a new campus of Memorial University in Central Newfoundland. Now, somewhere I heard that before, and methinks it was back during the election campaign. In fact I

heard it several times and I heard it from several different sources, the creation of a new campus of Memorial University in Central Newfoundland. We still have not heard the Minister of Education apologize to the people of Central Newfoundland for putting them through such a charade. Not only the fact that they decided to axe the university, but the fact that for months on end he put the different agencies out there, the councils, the educational institutions, the people on different school boards, and the different committees involved, put them through -

Mr. Simms: Treasury Board interfered there, by the way. He was the one who put the kibosh on that.

Mr. Hearn: The main reason, and I said that from the beginning, in fact I am on record when speaking to the Member for Lewisporte, in saying to him that Lewisporte was the driving force behind the Central Newfoundland University. The organizers in the Lewisporte area were the first, openly at least, on record, as going after, solidly going after, for different reasons, a university in Central Newfoundland. But once it became a popular topic, and of course the Premier realized that this was an important political issue, then the dream became a reality in the political arena, and the university was promised for Central Newfoundland, no holes barred. Then, due to lack of consultation between the Premier and his members, as always happens as we are being told daily by the members themselves, they really thought that the Premier was going to deliver a university in Central Newfoundland. All of a sudden they realized, this is big stuff,

a university is a very popular thing, and of course when we look at the jobs it will create, when we look at the educational benefits to the area, then there is no doubt about the fact it should be something that should be in my backyard. Then we saw the scurrying from the Member for Exploits, and we saw the scurrying from the Member for Gander. Even the Member for Grand Falls got in on the Act, but the Member for Lewisporte was the one who should have gotten the green light, because that is where the idea originated, that is where the basic work was done on the idea, on the concept. But, of course, the powerful member in Cabinet was the Member for Gander, and over the last three or four years he saw the Member for Grand Falls being looked upon as the driving force in Central Newfoundland and he wanted to be his counterpart. The Member for Gander, his hero, undoubtedly, the guy he imitates and emulates, is the Member for Grand Falls. I am surprised that when you go into the office of Treasury Board you do not find the picture of the former President of Treasury Board hanging on the wall, not because he is the former President of Treasury Board but because he is looked up to by the Member for Gander. So in following in the footsteps of the Member for Grand Falls the Member for Gander wanted to have the university in Gander, and then the war began, the internal frictions, you know, you could hear the vibrations from the Cabinet and caucus meetings about the Central Newfoundland University and then finally one day, the Premier said to them, 'boys', he said, really you know, in reality there is not going to be a university, there is no money for an university, we had no intentions of building the

university so stop your fooling around, go out and tell your people that we will build it some other time; maybe four or five years time -

Mr. Simms: The next election (inaudible).

Mr. Hearn: - and that is what they did, but the unfortunate thing about it -

Ms Verge: After the lull, after the lull (inaudible).

Mr. Hearn: - after the lull, after the lull -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible), we give them a lullaby.

Mr. Hearn: - we might see the hull of the university going up in Central Newfoundland. But the number one initiative, the creation of a new campus of Memorial University, and a couple of explanatory paragraphs actually on the (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) let us not forget that in the election campaign, the Premier went around talking about actually creating several university campuses. That was the initial (inaudible).

Ms Verge: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hearn: Yes, that is right. There is no doubt about it, in fact he said it openly - it is openly on the record that the Premier said that we should have several universities, several universities. But, unfortunately, what has happened, the Premier has been so long out of touch with reality that he was still living in the dream world of the fifties and the sixties, and of course in relation to education, he looked

to the two great historians in the field of education in the Province, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Education, who came out of the university to solve all the problems in the education field in the Province.

What the Premier did not know was, they were hoarded away in university as long as he was hoarded away in a law office, so consequently they knew less about what was actually happening in the Province than he did, so the result was a problem, but then after a while, and I am getting away from my topic, Mr. Speaker, after a while, after the triple E policy document had been assessed and feedback had come, the Minister issued a statement, his response, his response to public submissions on the White Paper.

A couple of interesting statements the Minister made: One: However, many submissions recommended the delaying of any action until the Province is in a more favourable economic situation. That is a statement in relation to the Central Newfoundland University.

Many submissions recommended delaying any action until the Province is in a more favourable economic situation. I wonder if the Minister would table such submissions so we would see from where they came. You know, did they come from Lewisporte, did they come from the Member for Gander, were they the ones who asked for a delay or is it just a figment of the Minister's imagination. So, scratch number one initiative.

Then me talk about the concept of first year common studies programme. He said work on this initiative will continue under the

interinstitutional committee for common studies. So if you cannot do it, that is not popular to tell the people, especially after you told them you could not do number one choice which was the university, so now if you cannot do it, well we will say we are going to study it because at least it is not dead, we are going to study it. Then he goes on and he talks about the many submissions supporting the principle of increasing access, by offering first year university programmes in more colleges and campuses throughout the Province and so on.

Following up on the suggestions, I tend to ask the recently appointed Royal Commission to investigate the feasibility of this, so we go on from concept to concept. Either scratch or study. Scratch it or study it. Maybe I could find another 'S'; what is the third 'S'? Triple it, or -

An Hon. Member: Shaft.

Mr. Hearn: - or shaft the people entirely, so you scratch it, study it and shaft the people along with it and shaft the students in particular. So, Mr. Speaker, here is what happened when the Minister responded to the White Paper, we find out that the ideas suggested by the triple E or the triple D policy document, there was very little done about them. The only changes that were made were for the political expedience of some of the Members, including the Member for Stephenville, who has this resolution on the order paper.

When the Minister goes through his response, he also deals with it in his triple E way, you know, about equality and excellence and efficiency. The Minister says there is one issue that remains

unresolved with respect to the White Paper, and that is the role - now one that remains unresolved, and I stress unresolved - the ones that are resolved, all except one he says, he resolved most of them by passing them on for further study and further investigation. But the one that was not resolved at all deals with the role of community colleges in the area of applied research and technology. And if there was ever one issue that should be resolved at this present day and time would be the one that deals with applied research and technology. So the Minister is going to see what he is going to do with that a little later down the road. So that one is not even addressed.

The Minister talks about the fact that the different community colleges will now have the opportunity to offer applied research and technology courses. So instead of highly concentrated technology courses being given in certain selected areas where you have the people who can teach the courses, the appropriate personnel, where you have the funding to supply the expensive equipment, he is now going to make them available in an assortment of colleges.

Then in the second breath, and the table is tapped and rightly so, the more areas in which we can make applied science and technology courses available the better, if you had the personnel and the funding to do so, but in the second breath the Minister says, despite the fact that we are decentralizing there will not be any duplication. There will be no expensive duplication. Which means that if a course is offered somewhere you are not going to offer it somewhere else. So in

one breath he says we will offer it in more places and in the second one - and it is right here in the response - in the second breath he says, but there will not be any duplication. So if there is not going to be any duplication, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be pretty tough to offer the courses in an assortment of areas.

And the Minister was probably right the first time because he neither has the personnel nor the money to offer a number of these courses and they become just slipshod offerings in slipshod institutions if you do not specialize in certain areas. And everyone is aware of that.

So, Mr. Speaker, basically what we are seeing is a complete sham. The resolution is a sham because it is dealing with the Paper which is no longer - it is a non-existent document. The Paper has already been addressed by the Minister. He is not going to do anything that was suggested except study, and refer for further study and research, and of course he has wiped out the Central Newfoundland University. So if the Member is asking that we support what the Minister has done we have no intention of supporting the decimation of the education system in the Province. That is the post-secondary system. And I suggest to the members opposite that the next time they have a resolution on the order paper they bring in one asking us to support the Minister in what he is doing in the primary, elementary and secondary field, because that is certainly one that we would like to have a few minutes on, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Exploits.

Mr. Simms: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader on a point of order.

Mr. Simms: I just wanted to give notice of a point of order that I would like to raise perhaps tomorrow when it is more convenient? Dealing with the question of tabling of documents which occurred earlier today. I gave Your Honour private notice but I wanted to give it formally.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Pardon?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, I am in my seat.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Exploits.

Mr. Grimes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to rise, Mr. Speaker, to address this Private Member's motion. And just looking at the resolution itself, without any of the "whereases", of course we are speaking today in support of the White Paper Educational Initiative put forward by the Wells administration. And as expounded and expanded upon by the Minister of Education on a number of occasions starting first of all in February of this year and then also in October, responding to submissions that had been made publicly in relation to the initiatives outlined in that Paper and the status of certain of those initiatives at the present time.

I would like to make a number of

comments if I may directly in relation to the White Paper, as well as a couple of comments, Mr. Speaker, in relation to education generally since we are on this particular topic.

The previous speaker, the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes, tried to suggest at the beginnings of his comments that there were some significant differences between the White Paper itself from February and the October 5 statement made by the Minister. That does not at all reflect the truth of what is happening. We have the White Paper which was a discussion paper. In October the Minister reported to the public of Newfoundland and to the House as to what the responses were. And which of the initiatives that were discussed in the Paper were going to be actioned, which are still in the process of being actioned, and which have to be delayed at the present time for various good reasons.

There has always been a fair bit of reference in this House, Mr. Speaker, to promises that the Liberals made during the last election and so on. And one of the areas where these are repeated from time to time is promises in the area of education, with the suggestion that maybe this Minister and this Government have not been able to produce on the promises themselves.

I just might refer to the document, the Liberal policy manual from the campaign of April of 1989, with particular reference to post-secondary education, so that rather than get little snippets that are purported by the Opposition as being the position of the Liberal Party, that we could read into the record what in

fact was published as the position of the Liberal Party prior to the last general election. And I will just take a couple of minutes to read into the record two or three items referencing post-secondary education.

University and technical training facilities must relate to the Province's socio-economic direction and services should be coordinated to avoid inefficient use of effort and resources. And this, Mr. Speaker, is from Campaign 89: A Policy Manual From The Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador. Post-secondary facilities, it states, will be expanded to allow more students in rural areas to participate in career development without being penalized by high costs of accommodation and transportation. Now that is a statement, that is the policy of the Liberal Party announced before the last election. That is the direction outlined in the White Paper. And it is a direction that has shown that there is some progress being made towards that in the response given by the Minister on October 5.

To achieve this, it says, we will expand the curriculum of Grenfell College in Corner Brook to include third and fourth year courses so that in time Bachelor level degrees in basic arts and science disciplines can be obtained at Corner Brook and Grenfell can become a degree granting institution in its own right.

That is a statement from the Liberal policy manual. A Liberal government will start immediately on the construction of a similar small university campus in Central Newfoundland -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Grimes: - to develop there as Grenfell has in Corner Brook. And I will get to that in a second. I will just read into the record and then we will comment on them as we go along. We will provide for the immediate reinstatement of first year university programme in Labrador West. As the Province grows and expands we will have to consider similar facilities in one or two other areas in the Province.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, from that same text of a Liberal policy manual: the curriculum on all levels of our education system will be changed to relate more effectively to future social and economic needs and special attention will be given by a Liberal Government to student counselling, literacy training, academic upgrading and early childhood education.

Those are the basic statements, Mr. Speaker, from the Liberal policy manual relating to post-secondary education, which is what the White Paper referenced. There are other references to developments in the primary-secondary dayschool system which I might even address later in my few remarks today, but these I would like to cover first because they have been described in different light by the Opposition on a number of occasions.

There is no doubt that if you look at those there is a definite reference that this Government, the Liberal Party, before the election, and this Government now through the White Papers, stated that it believes in decentralization and maximizing opportunities for students no matter where they live in the Province. That is reflected in

the White Paper for discussion. It is also reflected in the Minister's responses in October.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Grimes: Not that we are not delivering them all, it is not quite as fast as we would like to see it happen, but there is definite progress being made in that area. Let us look at the Grenfell College in Corner Brook. The Minister's responses indicate that indeed so, the progress will be continued in Corner Brook with the Grenfell College. That the expansion being planned will go ahead as indicated and in fact the \$8 million extension to the present facility, the Fisher Institute, will be completed by the fall of 1992. So there is some progress being made in certain specific areas.

The Central campus: The details of the White Paper some of my other colleagues will address as they make their comments later in the debate. Let us talk about the Central campus for a few minutes. You have heard what was said about the Central campus prior to the election. And there is no doubt that very shortly after the election an announcement was then made in this House that progress would begin and that submissions were in fact invited from communities in the Central area that were interested in hosting the Central Community College. There was, in fact, reference in the Budget to some preliminary monies that could be spent in this fiscal year to start initial planning and so on for that initiative. And after all the submissions were in, while they were still being carefully considered and before any final conclusion could be reached as to

where the central campus could best be located, we were faced with the sad news that we hear repeatedly day after day in the House, that there is now some fiscal difficulty in the Province that was not anticipated at the time of the Budget, and certainly not anticipated just before Christmas last year, at the time of the announcement in the House about the central campus.

I have every confidence, however, from all the meetings and discussions I have been involved in, that this decision in Central Newfoundland is only, unfortunately, delayed for a period of time, that the Liberal Government is still committed to a central campus and that when conditions improve, there will be an opportunity to decide where that central campus will be located.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that there was a tremendous interest shown in the whole issue of a central campus, and the interest is still there. It has not abated at all by the fact that there has been a little bit of an economic downturn and that there has been an announced delay, most definitely disappointing for everyone in the central area. And all the members who represent ridings in the central area, on both sides of the House, share in the disappointment that this thing had to be delayed. Because I have not heard anyone, other than the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes, the previous Minister of Education - he is the only one I have heard go on record in the House as saying that he thought it was a bad idea. I do not believe the Member for Grand Falls ever said he thought it was a bad idea. And no one on this side of the House

has ever said that it was a bad idea. But the hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes has risen on several occasions and said that he is not at all disappointed with the delay, because he does not even think it is a good idea. He thought the whole thing was a poor notion in the first place, but I guess he is a little bit alone in that regard.

The case has often been put regarding the central campus that, in fact, it could very well be one of the final linkages in putting together division of the new Exploits City that may come on the horizon in another three or four years. There is still a lot of interest in central following the recent amalgamation of Grand Falls - Windsor, and the elections that were held just over a week ago, a week and a day. In fact, the Mayor now of the largest community in my riding, in the District of Exploits, has been speaking openly about the fact that it may not be in the too distant future that Bishop's Falls would be interested in getting involved in that amalgamation on a larger scale and creating another city in the center of the Province. If that occurred, then I guess there would be some debate over name, and so on, and what have you.

Part of all that, one of the missing links in that, certainly in that part, in those three communities in particular, has been continued discussion about the possibility of a central campus. And I am sure that the interest has not abated at all. As a matter of fact, many people in the area still suggest that the site should probably be announced, even though we know there is going to be a delay for another year or so. And people in that area, just

like those in Botwood, in my District, and in Lewisporte and in Gander and so on, are still hopeful that their location will be chosen as the site for the central campus eventually, and they are continuing their lobby at a lower scale right now, but they certainly have not given up on it. But the recognition is that circumstances might change between now and when the Government is ready to make an announcement: there could be population shifts, there might be some economic considerations, some industries could close down in the area causing changes in the student availability for one community or the other. There might, indeed, be other economic considerations that cause people to move into the area, if there are some prosperous things that occur. So, in fact, everybody is still keeping their eyes and ears open and pursuing the opportunity to have that central campus established in their area.

The people in Grand Falls - Windsor and Bishop's Falls, in the riding of Exploits, certainly look at it as being one of the things that could be an integral component in putting together the next phase of amalgamation in that immediate area to an even larger centre to better serve the people of that whole central area.

I have been assured as well, however, regardless of economic considerations, that its educational criteria that are going to decide the eventual outcome of a central campus of the university. That is, in fact, one of the major initiatives of the Liberal campaign policy and also in the White Paper on post-secondary education.

Mr. Simms: They announced it. It is not an issue.

Mr. Grimes: So there is nobody giving up on the notion, and everybody is a little disappointed in the delay, but they will persevere and in the appropriate time, after the so-called lull, things can happen and everybody will turn up the lobby a little further and they will see what happens.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Grimes: One other thing, Mr. Speaker, I just might mention for the information of the House, in case some people have not heard, is that others in the Grand Falls - Windsor - Bishop's Falls area in particular have not been overly discouraged by the delay on the central campus, but have said, well, if the Province is having economic difficulties delivering a campus of Memorial University, maybe they should pursue the possibility of some outside Mainland university putting a campus in Central Newfoundland. Because they are interested in having the educational opportunity available for their students. They would like it to be Memorial University and they would like it to be directly related to the Province, but if it has to be some other university, with a main campus in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island, then so be it, as long as the educational opportunity is there. We have heard tell of that. They have been encouraged to explore that fully and see what the possibilities are. And there may be some further information on that in the near future from people who are still working on the campus, the Central University Campus Committees in those

communities in central Newfoundland.

Mr. Simms: St. F.X., Acadia (inaudible).

Mr. Grimes: Other things of note with reference to the White Paper on post-secondary education that I would just like to touch on for a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker, are very positive things which are still progressing, as announced in the White Paper and as referenced in the statement on October 5, the whole notion of a common first year. I am sure that everybody on both sides of this House again would be very encouraged if we could have the major post-secondary institutions in Newfoundland with a common first year program, with transferability of credits, so the person could do those general studies, first year courses, just about anywhere and then transfer them to any of the major post-secondary institutions when they want to specialize more specifically in one area or the other, as they move on through their educational advancement.

The other thing that has already been committed to and continuing is the opportunity for first year courses at centres outside St. John's and Corner Brook: the continuation in Grand Falls, the continuation of the courses in Lewisporte and so on, the possible expansion of courses for first year going into other places, such as Gander and what have you, and that these things will always be positive, and the possibility, as mentioned by the minister in answer to questions in the House recently, that even serious consideration will be given to second year courses of a general nature that, again, could fit into the transferability mode and could

be used for a number of courses and so on.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) by the way in Grand Falls, some (inaudible).

Mr. Grimes: As the Member for Grand Falls rightly points out, Grand Falls has been a leader in that area for a number of years, both with the first year offerings and now some second year offerings, and those course offerings are availed of by students from that whole central catchment basin. All the way from the Bay d'Espoir Peninsula to the Connaigre Peninsula, all down through the District of Exploits out as far as Springdale, and even the Baie Verte Peninsula and so on, they come into Grand Falls to avail of those opportunities.

In my last few minutes on this particular resolution, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of references to primary, elementary, and secondary education, as well. Because even with the positive initiatives that are here in the White Paper, which the Minister and this Government are to be commended on, on post-secondary education, they will, of course, be all for naught if we find ourselves in a situation where the regular day school system, as it is sometimes referred to as, is forced to restrain itself to the point that students are in some way disadvantaged or lose the opportunities they now have to progress through that system and go on to the post-secondary system.

I have taken the opportunity many times before, and for a couple of minutes again today, to say that that system has to be kept intact so that students are not in any way disadvantaged, or

disenfranchised, even in the most difficult of economic times, as we are facing this fiscal year, and it looks like for the next fiscal year. There is always need to lobby, to make sure that when restraint is the order of the day, when you are looking for increased efficiencies and so on, that the thing that is kept front and center is the interest of the students in the system, and that whatever reductions or restraint measures have to occur, that it always be done to make sure that if there is anybody going to be disadvantaged, it is not the student.

In education, when I was President of the Newfoundland Teachers Association, I would always remind the membership that as much as there was a role to try and do things that were to the advantage of teachers, because that is one of the mandates, we had to remember that the education system was not placed there for teachers; teachers were an integral component and were very, very necessary and important and vital to the success of the system, but the system itself is there for the benefit of students. And as long as we keep that in mind, any time we are dealing with restraint or anything else, keep the student front and foremost. With all the decisions that have to be made over the next period of time by this Minister, this Cabinet and this Government, and will be supported by this caucus, my message always is, make sure we keep the students first.

The other thing in that, to remind them again for the record, to remind the Ministers and others, is that one of the things we lobbied hard with with the previous Minister of Education,

now the hon. Member for St. Mary's - The Capes, and maybe even the previous, previous Minister, was that in a time of declining enrollment there is a natural tendency for people who just go to look at numbers only, without the impact on the system, to say that if there are less students, you should be able to deliver what you have to do with less teachers. It would seem there could probably be a natural reduction without any negative impact on the system, but I always argued very strongly, and I am still firmly convinced, that one of the silver linings to the cloud of declining enrollment in Newfoundland is the fact that if we just maintain the present teaching force, not that it has to grow, but if you maintain the current teaching force while the student population declines, you will, in fact, enhance the system by giving rise to smaller class sizes and better educational opportunities for the students in the classroom. That lobby has been put forward to the Government from representatives of the teachers for probably ten years or more, and I think there has been some progress made in that area.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

Mr. Grimes: Just to conclude, Mr. Speaker, if I may, the plea will be that there will always be a balance between greater efficiency and the needs of the students. Thank you, very much.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms. Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Exploits just reminded the House of some of the statements he made when he was

President of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, just a short three or four years ago. The teachers of Newfoundland and Labrador remember what he preached when he was President of their professional association and union, the teachers of the Province also realize what he and his regime, the Wells Administration, are doing, and every single teacher in the Province is now wearing a badge that says, 'Teachers betrayed. Never forget'.

Mr. Speaker, the motion we are debating this afternoon was made by the Member for Stephenville in early March, on the opening day of this session of the House of Assembly. That was just ten days or so after the Minister of Education published the White Paper on post-secondary education titled, Equality, Excellence and Efficiency.

Now, it is understandable that the Member for Stephenville was quick to support the White Paper, since it proposed amalgamating Fisher Institute in Corner Brook with Western Community College headquartered in Stephenville, enlarging the empire of the Western Community College run out of Stephenville. I understand the Member for Stephenville, as well as the federal representative for that area, Mr. Simmons, had lobbied for many months for the Government to implement this merger.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I am going to demonstrate why the Government should not support the White Paper, how the Government failed in the exercise of consulting people of the Province about the contents of the White Paper, and how the Government

ultimately, in announcing decisions on October 5, has miscalculated and made conclusions that are going to be detrimental for post-secondary and adult education in the Province.

Let me begin, Mr. Speaker, by saying that some of the ideas and concepts and goals in the White Paper are good. I can support the ideals of equality, excellence and efficiency, but these are empty, empty words by themselves. What we have to scrutinize are the specific proposals of the Government, the specific decisions announced by the Government on October 5 to reach the goals of equality, excellence and efficiency, and there is a disappointing lack of substance in the specific plans.

Other concepts in the White Paper, such as the merger of Fisher Institute with Western Community College, I reject. I strongly disagree with some of the ideas in the White Paper. Mr. Speaker, the White Paper is a slick, glib, superficial document, relying heavily on educational jargon and slogans. The Tripe E title was borrowed by the Minister of Education from the Premier who, at the time, was waging a campaign to oppose the Meech Lake Accord and to advance his notion of a Tripe E Senate.

Other commentators have suggested more appropriate slogans the Minister of Education might apply to his performance. I think my colleague for St. Mary's - The Capes has made some suggestions, including another Tripe E slogan, effusion, evasion and error. Then there was something said about Ss, scuttle, stall and study, which is the essence of what the Government is ending up doing.

The Minister of Education for many years was a Professor of Educational Administration at Memorial University. In that position, he was able to pontificate upon educational issues. He asked rhetorical questions, he conducted studies, he was in a position to really be all things to all people and he became something of an educational guru in the Province. When he was at the university, of course, he did not have to make decisions, he did not have that mandate, he had the luxury of posing questions, of analyzing and dissecting, asking questions. Now, however, as Minister of Education he is in a position requiring that he answer questions, that he make hard decisions. However, he has not modified his behaviour. He is continuing to try to appease everyone, he is continuing to try to be all things to all people. He has glib platitudes including equality, excellence and efficiency; more scholar for the dollar; progressive and effective strategic plan; consultation and dialogue with stake holders and the general public. He has all kinds of nice sounding phrases, but his specific ideas, his exact decisions, his actual record of conduct fall far short of the ideals expressed in his glib rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, the White Paper, which the Minister published in February, is a slick document, but it is seriously lacking in content. Many of the ideals, as I say, are good and I support them. Some of the concepts are bad and I oppose them. However, it was meant and held out to be simply a discussion paper. What ensued during the Spring and early Summer was a one way flow of information. Many groups and

individuals around the Province made written submissions to the Minister commenting on the White Paper.

In the case of the proposal for the amalgamation of Fisher Institute and Western Community College several agencies and groups in the Corner Brook area sent briefs to the Minister - the City of Corner Brook, the Humber joint council comprising about twenty-five municipalities, the town of Deer Lake, the Corner Brook Chamber of Commerce, the Deer Lake Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Humber Communities Futures Committee, as well as the Board of Governors of Fisher Institute, the faculty and staff of Fisher Institute and students at Fisher Institute. All these groups made submissions to the Minister of Education and all of them took particular exception to the concept of merging Fisher Institute and Western Community College. Some of the groups put considerable thought and care into their presentations and took a constructive approach. Some of them suggested that the Government explore the alternative of facilitating co-operation between Fisher Institute and Grenfell College of fostering linkages between those two post-secondary education institutions which are located in Corner Brook, headquartered in Corner Brook in close proximity to one another.

However, as I said, the information flow was one way. The Minister of Education failed to respond to these thoughtful submissions. Several of the groups I listed, in addition to sending briefs to the Minister, asked the Minister to meet with them to discuss the ideas in the White Paper as well as the

proposals and their responses. They wanted a dialogue. Disappointingly, that never happened. Now, the need for that kind of discussion was acute in the particular case of the proposal for combining Fisher and Western because the White Paper devoted exactly one sentence, a vague sentence at that, to the recommendation for merging Fisher and Western. That sentence is found on page twenty-one of the White Paper, and it says, 'The existence of both Western and Fisher within this city cannot be justified when their overall mandates are similar.' That is it. That hardly provided a rationale for such a major administrative change as combining the two institutions, stripping Fisher Institute of its autonomy, of its Board of Governors, of its President, and cancelling its high technology institute status. Naturally, groups in the Corner Brook area, municipal Governments and other organizations wanted a chance to hear from the Minister directly what was behind his proposal.

Now, two days after the White Paper was published in February this year, the Minister came to Corner Brook for a function at Fisher Institute, and while he was there he did have courtesy meetings with the Fisher Board, faculty and staff and student representatives as well as the city council. Later he cited those sessions as communication over the White Paper. What he failed to acknowledge is that at that time, two days after the White Paper had been released, the groups in Corner Brook had not even seen it much less had a chance to read it, scrutinize it, analyse it and offer constructive criticism.

The Humber joint council, as I mentioned, specifically asked the Minister to come and meet with them as a group. The joint council comprises about twenty-five municipalities from the outer Bay of Islands in the Premier's district to the western side of White Bay in the district of the Member for Humber Valley. The Humber joint council made several requests to the Minister for the meeting. In addition, the Fisher Board, which had done tremendous research to prepare its reactions, asked for the Minister to meet with them. Corner Brook City Council was another agency that asked for a meeting with the Minister, but there was no meeting forthcoming, Mr. Speaker. No meeting was granted by the Minister of education.

And on October 5th without having extended the courtesy of a meeting to the municipal governments and agencies in the Corner Brook - Humber Valley area to discuss the White Paper and the future of post-secondary education in that area, the Minister announced the Government's decisions. Shortly after that, following considerable political pressure being applied to the Member for Humber West, where Fisher Institute is located, the Minister of Education, as well as the Member for Humber West, the Minister of Justice, grudgingly agreed to come to Corner Brook and meet with certain groups at Corner Brook city hall.

That is the infamous meeting that I, as the elected representative of 11,000 people in Humber East, was prevented from attending, and people in the area are wondering why. They believe, as I believe, that I was excluded from that meeting, that the Minister of Education declined to go to Corner

Brook and meet with the municipal governments and agencies to discuss the White Paper before final decisions were made, because the Government could not defend an indefensible conclusion to merge Fisher Institute with Western Community College.

The Government has never first, nor last, given to the public a logical explanation, or indeed any explanation, for their decision to combine Fisher and Western. How does amalgamating those two institutions further the goals of equality, excellence, and efficiency? That basic question has never been answered. Are jobs going to be eliminated? Presumably, with the combination, there will be the elimination of one volunteer Board of Governors, and that is no cost savings. Board members serve without even getting remuneration or a per diem for meeting time. There will be one President at Stephenville instead of a President at both Stephenville and Corner Brook, but there will have to be, at least a Principal in Corner Brook. Since the Stephenville headquarters and the Corner Brook centre are sixty miles apart it will be impossible to combine student services. The Corner Brook centre has more students than all the other campuses of the Western Community College. Will administrative jobs be eliminated? We have never been told. Will jobs be eliminated at Corner Brook? There is reason to think so, although no answers have been forthcoming from the Minister of Education. Will jobs be reduced at Stephenville? Again, we do not know. What we do know is that the administration-student ratio at Stephenville is much higher than the ratio at Corner Brook, and both ratios fall short of the ratio at Ontario colleges,

certainly fall far below the recommended Ontario college standard. Perhaps there will be extra costs as a result of the combination, if the ratio at Corner Brook is to be brought up to the ratio at Stephenville. These are unanswered questions. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, some of the groups in the Corner Brook - Humber Valley area, including the Board of Governors of Fisher Institute and the Corner Brook City Council, in their submissions, asked the Government to examine the possibility of fostering linkages between Fisher Institute and Grenfell College. The Government never explained why they apparently rejected that option out of hand. They gave no indication of even pausing to consider it. In the case of the St. John's area, on the other hand, they did decide to maintain the autonomy of the Fisheries and Marine Institute, the Marine Institute, as it is known, and to facilitate sharing and linkage between the Marine Institute and Memorial University. That option, it seems to me, should have been actively considered for Corner Brook. If administrative efficiency and student service efficiency are goals, as they have been stated to be, surely they could be realized much better and realistically through a grouping of the two centres in Corner Brook, Fisher and Grenfell, rather than a grouping of Corner Brook with Stephenville, Stephenville-Crossing, Port aux Basques, and St. Anthony. Now, another aspect of the decision for the West Coast is the removal of the high technology institute status from Fisher in Corner Brook. The rationale behind distinguishing between institutes and community colleges is that high technology and diploma

programmes, programmes that take two, three, four years and lead to diplomas, are relatively expensive to provide, since most of them revolve around technology and equipment that are expensive and that are constantly changing with innovations.

A provincial Government such as ours, with scarce resources, can ill-afford to attempt to offer diploma programmes in all the community colleges in the Province, yet that is the conclusion the Government has reached.

In abolishing the institute designation, they are opening up to all the community college campuses in the Province, to St. Anthony, Stephenville Crossing, Stephenville and Port aux Basques as well as Corner Brook, the possibility of delivering high technology diploma programmes.

Now the Province will never be able to afford that and that-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, that change is going to water down our high technology education delivery. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this motion.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. George's.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Short: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased to stand today and support the resolution put forward sometime ago by the hon. Member for

Stephenville. I must say at the outset that I am also very pleased to have had the opportunity to serve the educational system of this Province for eighteen years.

I have always been a very strong advocate of improvements in post-secondary education in this Province and I suppose my community involvement over the years in things other than the educational system, has led me in that direction as well, so having said that, I was very pleased to see the introduction of the White Paper by the Minister of Education.

I want to talk about some of the things that are in the document and make some comments as well. Some of the things have been mentioned already, the upgrading of the Grenfell college to a four year programme, I think, is an excellent move for the West Coast. First year study at non-university programmes to be transferred to Memorial is another excellent idea, as well.

First year university programmes retain in community colleges at Burin and Labrador City to extend transferability of credits. Community colleges will have a mandate enabling them to offer diploma level programmes as well, and part-time programmes will be encouraged in all areas of the Province.

One, in which I am very keenly interested, Mr. Speaker, is that literacy and adult basic education will receive increased emphasis in the community colleges. I know in my district and on the West Coast in particular, there is a great need for literacy programmes and basic education. We have not, I believe in this Province, scratched the surface in terms of

literacy. The figures, I am sure everybody in the House is aware of it, the figures are astounding in terms of illiteracy in this Province. It is really frightening to think that we have a population where far too many people cannot read or write, so any improvements in that area would certainly be welcome by the public.

The second E, Excellence, and I just want to quote a couple of things from the White Paper: 'Low expectations are no longer acceptable. In this Province, low expectations are no longer acceptable,' and the second one, 'That we have to keep pace with the changing technology, innovative instructional techniques, and demands of the labour force.' If we are going to move forward into the 21st century, I believe we have to give excellence to our students who are going into those facilities. We have to demand excellence, and I am sure they are going to expect it.

There were also three dimensions of Excellence mentioned in the White Paper. Number (1), that learning and teaching should utilize the leading edge curriculum and delivery methods. Number (2), the question was asked, are graduates meeting the needs of employers? And (3), that quality of service must be provided to the learner. Those three dimensions of Excellence, I believe, are necessary if we are going to provide the best educational service.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Short: In terms of initiatives under Excellence, student services will be expanded

throughout the community. College system advisory and counselling services, remedial assistance and improved learning resources will be made available during a five year plan. Collaboration with community development groups and small businesses will be vigorously promoted. And in that area, I must say, I had the opportunity over the summer to speak to a group. A small business management program was being offered in my own community, it was co-sponsored by the Community Futures in Stephenville, and the Western Community College in Stephenville as well. Those are the kinds of initiatives that are necessary if we are going to get into the area of excellence.

Also, over the years I have been involved with the rural development movement in this Province, and I know that in my own area there has been a lot of work done with the local area development associations trying to promote programs with the community colleges and with other agencies, as well.

I want to mention, as well, that there is a special Hibernia Committee that was set up in this Province, and it is chaired by a person from the Department of Education. I remember going to see the Committee some time ago and I suggested to them that maybe they should certainly be looking at what it is Hibernia is going to require when it comes on stream, and probably gearing up the community colleges to offer different courses that are going to be necessary, rather than having people, perhaps, coming in from the Mainland. I believe the community college structure is there, and that we can use it to promote that sort of thing.

In terms of Efficiency in the White Paper 'organizational arrangements must make sense', the paper says. And I believe that to be the case. We must build on strengths of existing institutions and sharing of expertise and physical facilities. In a time of fiscal restraint, I believe we have to look at all our options in this Province. Anywhere where we can make improvements to the system without having to spend any more money, then that should be an option we should certainly look at and build on the strengths of those.

In the area of initiatives under Efficiency, the revision of institutional structures in St. John's such as Memorial University, Marine Institute, Cabot Institute and the Avalon Community College. I would just like to read a little bit on that particular topic, where it says: 'The duplication of administrative resources to support this structure is unnecessary.' They were talking about currently the St. John's area served by four separate institutions. 'Furthermore, a revision of institutional structures is consistent with the elimination of mandates noted in the first section on Equality. 'A community college will be created to serve the St. John's area, consisting of the present campuses of Cabot Institute as well as St. John's, Bell Island, Seal Cove campuses of Avalon Community College.

And it goes on to say as well, Mr. Speaker, 'The Marine Institute will retain its distinct identity but become affiliated with Memorial University, and the new arrangement will improve the co-ordination of research and development, while at the same

time retaining a support emphasis on industry, specific technical training and extension services.'

The revision of the institutional structure in Corner Brook. And I tried to listen attentively to what the Member for Humber East was saying, and I have to say that I totally agree with the statement, and I believe she referred to it, in the White Paper, that the existence of both Western and Fisher can not be justified. When you look at the way the Western Community College is structured, I believe we are doing the right thing to bring Fisher under that structure. I do not believe for one minute that we are going to downgrade Fisher in any manner in terms of the courses they are going to teach. And maybe I missed it, Mr. Speaker, but I did not hear the Member for Humber East mention anything about the \$8 million extension to the Fisher facility - \$8 million dollars. If that is in any way destroying what we are talking about here, then we have a funny way as a Liberal Government of taking away from Fisher.

An Hon. Member: And I can't get \$150,000 for a new classroom in Port (inaudible).

Mr. Short: The revision is also under the initiative for Efficiency, the revision of the community college boundaries, and also a review and a rationalization of extension services. I believe over time, Mr. Speaker, we always have to take a second look at what we are doing, we have to rationalize what it is we are doing in the educational field, post-secondary education as well as primary, elementary and high school. And I believe that that particular

initiative should go a long way, because we always have to be very conscious of what it is we are doing in the Province and where we are going.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to ramble on for twenty minutes. Perhaps somebody on the other side would like to make a few more comments before the person who introduced this motion will get up and speak for the last twenty minutes. I am very pleased to have had the opportunity to speak in support of this motion. Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: Don't be saucy.

Mr. Matthews: I am not going to be saucy, Mr. Speaker. I want to commend the Member for St. George's on a very fine speech, a very sensible speech. He spoke very well. It was a fine speech. He did very well.

Ms Verge: He was wrong.

Mr. Matthews: There were a number of points he was incorrect on, but I am sure that was not intentional. I just want to say that in the last few minutes there, when he bragged about the money for Fisher, the \$7 or \$8 million, that was our initiative, that was our money, it was our announcement. Well, it was the people's money but we announced it, and I was Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies at the time. I met with the board of Fisher a number of times and

discussed in what direction Fisher wanted to go, and consequently made the decision to fund it by some \$8 million.

I guess, being Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies for just about two years, I can relate to what has happened with post-secondary education in the Province very well, having set up the community college system, having set up the boards of the community colleges around the Province.

Everything has room for improvement, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about that. But I think what we have seen in this case is an attempt by the Minister of Education and the new administration, as they have done with a number of things, to try to put their own mark or whatever on a lot of things that have been working very well. And in some cases what they have done by trying to put their mark on things is they have worsened the programs, they have worsened the system. I refer, really, to the Employment Generation Program that was working so well in the Province and this administration tampered with, and consequently that program has not done as well in the last year and a half as it had done in the two years prior to that. I say to members opposite that part of the problem we are having with the economy now is related to their tampering with that program.

With the White Paper process referred to in the resolution, Mr. Speaker, I suppose you could call it a process, but I think before the Minister announced it it was a pretty determined process. That really was a charade and a sham by the Minister, to go out and

announce the White Paper on post-secondary education, and decisions had already been made prior to the process being allowed to take place. I see the Member for Bellevue looking at me under his eyes very curiously. I suppose he expects me now in this debate to take a flick or so at him on what we see transpire in some regions of the Province, particularly with community college systems, campuses and all that stuff.

Mr. Simms: And he your former employee.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, a former employee of Career Development.

Mr. Simms: Yours.

Mr. Matthews: Well, not really. I can remember what he said to me, though, the first day I met him, when I became Minister. He was on his way out of the Department and I was on my way in.

Mr. Simms: Yes, what was that?

Mr. Matthews: Well -

Some Hon. Members: Come on. Come on.

Mr. Simms: He wanted to run for the PCs (inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: No, no, no, that is not what he said. He said, thank God! They finally put somebody over here with a bit of sense. Now, that is exactly what he said to me, and I am sure he will verify that. Having said that, I know that the Member for Bellevue had a lot of influence over what has happened with post-secondary education over the last few months in this Province.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Pardon?

An Hon. Member: Why?

Mr. Matthews: Why? Because he is on the side of the Administration, he is in the Government, he has had experience in post-secondary education, certain aspects of that, and I would say that the Minister of Education listened to him a fair bit, before he made his decisions.

An Hon. Member: He should have been made Minister of Education.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, it would have been a good idea to make him Minister of Education, I think he would have been a better Minister of Education than the one we have now, but I must say that I had to express disappointment at the process that went through, particularly in our area of the Province.

Of course, the big concern for us on the Burin Peninsula, we were fortunate, we were happy to have first year university courses offered at the Burin Campus. We were very pleased and happy to have the headquarters of Eastern Community College located in Salt Pond, and at that time a system was put in place and there was a choice of Clarenville, Bonavista or Burin Peninsula and it went to the Burin Peninsula, but it is a little bit disappointing really because, I guess the most noticeable thing which has come out of the White Paper on post-secondary education with our region, has been the relocating of the headquarters of that particular college set up from Burin Peninsula to Clarenville.

I do not know what else really there is in the process that has happened really of any significance to the Burin Peninsula region. I do not see any educational value at all in the changes; there have been a couple of campuses added to our set up, I think it has gone to five, but from an educational benefit value point of view, really, nothing has come out of this White Paper process and the post-secondary initiatives.

Of course tied in to that, we have seen the college headquarters at Clarenville as well, I guess, is shut down or will be as I understand it, and those are the only things which have come out of it and I think it is a little bit disappointing. If, because of the White Paper process, we had seen a more effective delivery of post-secondary education in that area served by that community college set up, then I guess no one could say anything bad about it, and you would have to support it and commend the Government for it.

But as a result of what has happened, only one thing has happened in our region and that has been the move of the headquarters and I think that is really unfortunate. Nothing else has been touched, nothing else has been tampered with, nothing else has been improved upon -

An Hon. Member: What?

Mr. Matthews: No, that is correct, educational wise, value benefit. Nothing has come from this post-secondary initiative, the White Paper process, that is going to benefit the people of the Burin peninsula. I am sure that if people who are tied into their

respective regions and their community college systems, wherever they may represent in the Province, I am sure that for the most part they can echo the comments I am making today on that particular situation. So I have to express on behalf of the people of the Burin Peninsula, who lobbied so hard and lobbied the Minister so strongly to leave the headquarters in Salt Pond, that he did not see fit to do that, he is going to cost this financially strapped Government unnecessary dollars to relocate a headquarters and staff in Clarenville from where it is now set up, it is running effectively and efficiently, and if the Government is so strapped financially as it says it is, then why would they go and spend unnecessary dollars relocating a headquarters from Salt Pond to Clarenville. Why not leave it where it is and put those strapped dollars into better educational use somewhere else?

So those are my few comments which I want to make on this, Mr. Speaker, I realize that it is pretty well twenty to five, and I guess the mover of the resolution wants to clue up.

An Hon. Member: By leave?

Mr. Matthews: Sorry?

An Hon. Member: By leave.

Mr. Matthews: By leave? No, I am concluding my remarks because I have a commitment outside the building at about five o'clock and I know that the Member for Bellevue has got some very interesting remarks that he will make now in cluing up the debate on the resolution.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: That is the only thing I am disappointed about. That is the only thing we saw from the White Paper process, the move of our headquarters from one campus to the other, and that is not good enough. If you are sincere about the process that is going to be good for post-secondary education, then I have to say to the Member for Bellevue very sincerely and to the Minister of Education that we have not seen any benefit from the White Paper process.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Bellevue.

Mr. Barrett: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to make a comment. It was accurate in terms of the hon. Member for Grand Bank because when he was coming into the Department I was actually physically moving out, in that his Government had declared me redundant. And the comment I made to him: I said you arrived too late because I think you are an honourable man, and I think you are going to do a great job within the Department, but you are too late for me, in that you should have arrived earlier, and you would have probably saved my job.

But I am sure that the hon. Member, I have a great respect for him -

An Hon. Member: Who was the Minister before him?

Mr. Barrett: Who was the Minister before him? The hon. Member for Ferryland was the Minister before him. And I am sure that if he had stayed in the Department he would have made the revisions that we are talking about now. I am not saying that he would have moved the headquarters from Burin to

Clarenville but I think a lot of the things that are in this White Paper were probably started by him - initiatives that were started by him.

When I finished I was only up to 1985 in terms of the reorganization of post-secondary education in this Province. But when you talk about being negative in terms of educational programming in this Province, I think this paper here, the 1985 reorganization, was a very negative document, in that it talked about cutting out programmes, eliminating programmes. And if you go down through page five and page six of this particular document it was really an attack on rural Newfoundland. It talked about eliminating courses in Port aux Basques, Bonavista, Bell Island and St. Anthony.

Number two: Springdale, Port aux Basques, Bonavista and Happy Valley, eliminating courses in Springdale and Bonavista, Burin and Happy Valley, Port aux Basques, Bell Island, Conception Bay South and Happy Valley. The system would have been cleaned out. But I think something very very important is happening and it is too bad. Probably the White Paper that we put out, if we had some leadership in this Province in terms of post-secondary education, but I remember going around the Province and meeting community groups on this present White Paper -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Barrett: We could never find out who wrote this particular paper.

An Hon. Member: Which one?

Mr. Barrett: The 1985 White Paper. He was a mysterious author. We never ever found out who wrote it. But I will give you an example of what happened. Like in business education, for years in this system -

Mr. Simms: It certainly wasn't the Minister.

Mr. Barrett: - it wasn't the Minister, no, no. We determined it wasn't. As a matter of fact we had a -

An Hon. Member: He wrote so many he is not sure (inaudible).

Mr. Barrett: - game going at one time, trying to find out who the mysterious person was who wrote it but we never did find out. And we wouldn't issue any bets on it.

Some Hon. Members: Was it Phil? It wasn't Phil, was it?

Mr. Barrett: No it wasn't the present Minister of Education, I can assure you it was not him. But I want to point out something, for example, in one particular course alone, business education.

For years in this Province the system was not updated. When the business community in this Province was going with computers the vocational system had manual typewriters. And there was not an up-dating of the equipment within the vocational education system, and as a result in 1985 all of a sudden we realized that we were training people and they were out of date. Because there was not enough money pumped into the system to update the training capability of these institutions.

And I think it is very important for Members to know that at that

time there was a great expansion of private institutions in this Province, and the reductions that took place, like this particular report recommended that the reduction of business education go from 800 students to 400, eliminating programs in Gander, Lewisporte, Springdale, Baie Verte, Port aux Basques, Bonavista, Bell Island, and St. Anthony. And what happened is that the private schools filled the gap. They had all the up-dated equipment, all the computers, and could teach a very competent program. And what happened is that it threw back the program, a very expensive program on the backs of the students in this Province, in that the tuition fees in the private institutions were \$4,000 and \$5,000, but the provincial Government paid for it through the backdoor, and we subsidized the students through student aid, and we still used taxpayers dollars to subsidize the private schools in this Province. Instead of back ten years ago putting the money into capital equipment and up-dating the equipment in the schools, what we did was let it reach crisis proportion, public schools could no longer compete with the private schools and a lot of the students went to the private schools and it cost the parents in this Province a lot of money. But the Province also picked up a bigger student aid budget because the tuition fees were much higher. And this whole White Paper was nothing but negative.

I do not have very much time and I have about two hours to speak on this particular topic.

Some Hon. Members: By leave!

Mr. Barrett: The real problem

with the other system was the mandates of the particular institutions. It gave the mandates for diploma and technology programs to the urban centres like Corner Brook and St. John's. The College of Trades which became the Cabot Institution and the Fisher Technical in Corner Brook got the cream of the crop, as we would say in the industry. They got the technology programmes. And while it did eliminate with the mandate for the institutions, they were the only ones that were allowed to do the two and three year technology programs. Places like Burin, Grand Falls, and Springdale and all these other places were not permitted to get into the two and three year technology programs, that was an exclusive right of the Fisher Technical Institute and the Cabot Institute, and I think this discriminated against communities like Grand Falls. I expect the hon. Member for Grand Falls to support this particular resolution.

Mr. Winsor: But we mentioned (inaudible).

Mr. Barrett: Yes, secretarial science.

Mr. Simms: Yes, before you came.

Mr. Barrett: Yes, secretarial science.

Mr. Simms: They did do it.

Mr. Barrett: But that was against the mandate.

Mr. Simms: That was against the wishes of the (inaudible).

Mr. Barrett: It was against the mandate.

Mr. Simms: What mandate?

Mr. Barrett: In the news release by your former, former Premier which outlined the mandates. The regulations that were prepared were against the legislation.

Mr. Simms: It was not against the legislation.

Mr. Barrett: The legislation very distinctly spells out the mandate for the institutions and for the community colleges.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Barrett: I am trying to get his attention because this whole reorganization that took place in 1985 discriminated against rural Newfoundland, and what happened was we had disorganized confusion within the system. In St. John's, for example, at the Cabot Institute, they were suppose to only look after two and three year technology programs, but the powerful board of the Cabot Institute would not let go of the other courses that were suppose to have been transferred to the community college. The power base within St. John's would not permit the Government to do it, and they lobbied hard against the Government. In Corner Brook the same thing happened, in that the Fisher Technical Institute, was suppose to be responsible for two and three year programs but they would not give up the pre-employment courses, and the pre-employment courses were the nine month courses, courses in auto body repair, electrical linesmen, and all these other courses. That was suppose to be the way the system was going to work, but it did not work, it became disorganized confusion, and what you had, and I had it when I worked with Avalon Community College here in St. John's, where

I was responsible for continuing education and contract training, where we were going out trying to get money for the system from private industry and from the Federal Government departments. You would have the same person from Cabot Institute knocking on the same door. You had three public institutions in St. John's, the Marine Institute, the Cabot Institute, and Avalon Community College looking for the same dollars, out there competing against each other. The mandates were never enforced by the previous Government and it led to confusion. One thing that happens in this particular White Paper, and I praise the initiative of the Minister of Education, and probably the Member for Bellevue had some influence in it, but right now it makes them all community colleges. They are all community colleges and there is no downgrading of the programs in Corner Brook. As a matter of fact, the Fisher Technical Institute will gain.

An Hon. Member: Will what?

Mr. Barrett: Will gain.

An Hon. Member: Will gain?

Mr. Barrett: Yes, will gain programs. If the previous policy of the Government and the legislation had been implemented, there would have been massive layoffs at the Fisher Technical Institute in Corner Brook, because these courses were supposed to have been transferred to the Western Community College. There would have been massive layoffs. I know. I have talked to the staff of the Fisher Technical Institute in Corner Brook. They are completely in favour of this. There are two or three people at

the top layer who are against it, but the instructional staff is in complete agreement with this White Paper. So what we have done -

Ms. Verge: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Humber East on a point of order.

Ms. Verge: Mr. Speaker, I have in my file a copy of a letter that was sent to the Minister of Education last Spring, signed by the faculty and staff of Fisher Institute, opposing the recommendation of the White Paper.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Ms. Verge: There are two pages of signatures of faculty and staff of the Fisher Institute opposing the amalgamation, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

There is no point of order. The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for Bellevue.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Barrett: I would not disbelieve that the hon. Member does have a letter from the staff, but I think if the President of an institution went to the staff and asked them to sign a letter, I would sign it too. This is the whole problem with the system.

Mr. Simms: You are accusing them of not being supportive of (inaudible), are you?

Mr. Barrett: No, I am not accusing. I just said I do not doubt the members of the staff. As a matter of fact, the day after the announcement of the White Paper on post-secondary education I met with the management staff of the Avalon Community College I used to sit down at meetings with and I talked to them about re-organization. They all agreed with it, even though some of their jobs might be eliminated, including my previous job.

Ms. Verge: I will send them through the fax the copy of Hansard (inaudible).

Mr. Barrett: Yes, would you do that? And, as a matter of fact, have them all call me if they are in disagreement with it.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) you questioned their sincerity.

Mr. Barrett: No, I did not question -

Mr. Simms: Oh yes you did. You accused them of signing it only because (inaudible).

Mr. Barrett: I did not.

Mr. Barrett: I have great respect for the staff at the Fisher Technical Institute. As a matter of fact, a couple of Wednesdays ago I praised the staff of the Fisher Technical Institute, and I will send them a copy of Hansard from that day, before the hon. member sends this copy of Hansard, so they will know where I stand.

But the problem with the Fisher Technical Institute, and one of the problems with the Eastern Community College, was I do not think the amount of programming and the population base warranted a

separate institution. I think those of us who are entrusted with spending taxpayers' dollars have to get the most bang for the buck.

Ms Verge: How are (inaudible) that?

Mr. Barrett: There will be savings because we will not have to bring board members in from Ottawa, or we will not have to bring board members from all over the Province for the Fisher Technical Institute. The President's position will be eliminated. Right now the Fisher Technical Institute's budget is \$4 million.

Mr. Simms: No principal?

Mr. Barrett: Yes, there will be a principal. The budget for Fisher Technical Institute is \$4 million, and if the hon. member wants to check, a large part of that is not going into the delivery of programs. For one, I agree with providing more and more funding for the delivery of services to students. And you will find that the administration is very top-heavy at the Fisher Technical Institute.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Barrett: I will continue on. There has been a lot of talk about cutbacks. I have here a letter that was sent out by the Department of Career Development in September 1988, and you realize that on April 20, 1989 the Government changed.

An Hon. Member: How did you get that?

Mr. Barrett: The letter says, 'We have now received from Treasury Board and the Senior Expenditure

Review Committee' - you all remember that famous review Committee - 'a tentative schedule for the 1989-90 budgetary process. The budgetary process was initiated in July 1988 with the establishment of tentative current account reduction objectives by Cabinet. In net current account expenditures, Cabinet has approved a tentative allocation of 1 per cent of net current account expenditures for funding new initiatives. The tentative reduction objective reflects a 2.5 decrease in expenditures.' The previous administration was going to cut post-secondary education in this Province by 2.5 per cent, and the greatest thing that ever happened to post-secondary education happened on April 20, 1989. They did not get the chance to implement this. They were going to cut the budgets in post-secondary education, 2.5 per cent. That would have meant massive layoffs in the post-secondary education system. This is the Opposition that talks about cutbacks.

An Hon. Member: Who was the minister?

Mr. Barrett: The minister was the hon. the Member for Grand Bank. But he had no control over this, because the former, former Premier told him he had to reduce his budget, and he was going to reduce the budget in Career Development by -

An Hon. Member: How much did we increase it?

Mr. Barrett: By \$4,335,000.

Some Hon. Members: What?

Mr. Barrett: Four million two

hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars. But the greatest thing happened on April 20, and the second greatest thing happened on May 5, when the hon. the Member for St. John's North was made Minister of Education.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Barrett: Do you know what he did?

An Hon. Member: What happened?

Mr. Barrett: He increased the budget for the five community colleges from oh, \$31 million to \$33 million. The Memorial University budget he increased from \$89 million to \$98 million, an increase of 9.6 per cent. The Cabinet Institute. Just listen to this now. The Cabinet Institute budget instead of being reduced by 2.5 per cent was increased 6.9 per cent. The hon. the Member for Humber East was going to reduce the budget of the Fisher Technical Institute by 2.5 per cent. The hon. the Minister of Education in this Government increased the budget by 5.5 per cent. The hon. the Member for Humber East, I hope she sends the total Hansard, because they were going to reduce the budget at Fisher by 2.5 per cent, which would have meant layoffs.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible)
Hansard, too.

Mr. Barrett: The Marine Institute, an increase of 6.3 per cent - right?

An Hon. Member: Send that to the NTA for (inaudible).

Mr. Barrett: Overall there was a 6.5 per cent increase in the budget for post-secondary

education as opposed to a 2.5 per cent cut in the budget. This is a Government that is committed to post-secondary education in this Province.

The Minister of Education talked about the lull in educational funding. We prevented the lull in 1989, because that previous Government was going to reduce the budget for post-secondary education by 2.5 per cent and there would have been massive layoffs within the system, and a massive layoff at Fisher Technical Institute. I, on behalf of the hon. the Member for Stephenville, move that we have a vote on this particular resolution, and I suggest that all hon. members should vote for it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour of the motion, please say 'aye'.

Some Hon. Members: Aye!

Mr. Speaker: Those against the motion, please say 'nay'.

Some Hon. Members: Nay!

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the 'ayes' have it.

Some Hon. Members: Division.

Some Hon. Members: No division.

Mr. Speaker: No division.

It being 5:00 p.m., this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 2:00 p.m.