

Order Paper Questions

	Planned Funding 1985-86 (000's)											Total	
	Nfld.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta-NWT	BC-Yukon	Unallocated		
Job entry													
—Challenge '85 (1)	5,564	1,093	6,188	5,120	47,456	44,451	6,004	4,935	14,258	21,020	238	156,327	
Other dept's Challenge '85											23,525	23,525	
—other job entry	5,505	1,765	5,939	6,181	28,177	27,719	10,287	9,313	8,496	19,760	2,524	125,666	
Job Development	32,253	5,095	23,497	18,729	154,610	97,863	24,175	16,397	33,540	64,707	21,466	492,332	
—other departments (3)											60,000	60,000	
Skill investment	1,119	320	2,524	1,149	9,707	14,059	3,732	3,209	3,869	3,895	2	43,585	
Skill shortages	919	499	1,381	1,025	15,442	31,705	2,662	2,651	6,862	8,454	—	71,600	
Community futures & adjustment	5,476	2,178	5,471	5,512	34,567	16,027	4,127	3,394	4,663	13,869	—	95,284	
Innovations (2)	2,010	447	3,138	2,543	24,384	33,260	3,769	3,519	8,360	10,590	—	92,020	
Reserve											8,064	8,064	
CJS sub-total	52,846	11,397	48,138	40,259	314,343	265,084	54,756	43,418	80,048	142,295	149,568	1,202,152	
Institutional training	23,100	5,445	25,924	22,195	173,727	214,262	31,235	28,801	70,915	76,019	1,150	672,773	
Section 38	2,091	446	1,762	2,044	11,863	8,563	1,190	1,037	4,355	7,001	—	56,573	
Skills growth fund	3,108	—	6,420	23	26,000	9,907	603	978	9,355	179	—	40,352	
Emp. creation grants & contributions	—	—	653	3,050	25,251	7,012	730	675	92	1,237	1,000	39,700	
Related sub-total	28,299	5,891	34,759	27,312	236,841	239,744	33,758	31,491	84,717	84,436	2,150	809,398	
Operations and maintenance	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	163,837	163,837	
Other departments operations and maintenance	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4,300	4,300	
Grand total	81,145	17,288	82,897	67,571	551,184	504,828	88,514	74,909	164,765	226,731	319,855	2,179,687	
EIC total	81,145	17,288	82,897	67,571	551,184	504,828	88,514	74,909	164,765	226,731	232,030	2,091,862	

(1) Regional allocation includes SEED, WOW and Student Entrepreneurs only (2) Notional allocation (3) DND \$60

3. Is it an offence not to have a valid certificate of inspection for a boat or vessel and, if so, under what (a) article of which regulations (b) conditions, if any, is this requirement not in effect?

4. Did the Department refuse to explain for what reason it alleged the boat was illegal and therefore not eligible for a certificate and, if so, for what reason?

5. Did the boat have excessive tonnage and was Mr. Mallet provided with an opportunity to have the vessel cut down or reconstructed in order to bring it within the permissible ceiling of allowed tonnage and, if not, for what reason?

6. Has the Department permitted other fishing boats to be similarly reconstructed or cut down in order to bring them under the maximum permissible tonnage?

7. Is the maximum permissible tonnage considered to be gross or registered tonnage, and under what provision of which law or regulation is this specified?

8. Was insurance granted for the *Serge M* by the *Regime d'Assurance des Bateaux de pêcheurs* and was this an agency of the Department of Fisheries in 1979?

9. Did the federal Government believe that the *Serge M* did not have a valid certificate of inspection and was not eligible for such a certificate due to its tonnage and, if so, for what reason?

10. Did the Federal Business Development Bank advance a \$45,000 loan on the vessel and did the Department believe that the vessel could not qualify for certification and therefore could and should not be used for a fishing business and, if so, for what reason was the loan advanced?

11. Did the Government provide a \$42,000 subsidy for the construction of the vessel and was it alleged by the Department that the vessel could not meet its standards in order to be certified as a fishing boat and, if so, for what reason was the subsidy granted?

12. What were the circumstances surrounding the Federal Business Development Bank's sale of the vessel in the fall of 1981?

13. What was the FBDB's evaluation of the boat and was this less than the \$142,000 construction cost and, if so, what accounted for this drop in value when the vessel had only been used as a fishing vessel for one season?

14. Did the FBDB receive any offers to purchase the vessel and, if so, in what amounts?

15. Was an offer of \$55,000 received for the vessel and was it refused and, if so, for what reason?

16. Were other offers received and were they refused and, if so, for what reason?

17. Was the vessel insured for \$100,000 and did the FBDB sell the vessel for \$15,000 and, if so, for what reason?

18. Was the Department's decision to detain the *Serge M* provoked by complaints or information provided by the builders of the vessel and, if so, is it normal for the Department to act on such information when there has been a legal dispute resulting in court action between Lepage Craft and the owner of the vessel?

19. Was the detention order served in the Province of Quebec by the Department upon a fisherman whose mother tongue is French, filled out only in English and, if so (a) for what reason (b) is this normal practice (c) is this practice now being changed?

Return tabled.

HIRING OF OBSERVERS BY DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Question No. 465—Mr. Skelly:

1. Did the Department of Fisheries and Oceans contract with (a) Beothuk Data Resources to hire observers as guardians for streams (b) Sea Watch to hire observers for the offshore fleet and, if so, who are the principles involved in the signing of these contracts?

2. Will the Minister provide a list of all contracts made with these two companies and the Department, including the cost of such contracts since 1980?

3. Since 1980 (a) how many persons have been employed on these contracts (b) in what positions (c) how many weeks were they employed and what were they paid?

4. Will the Minister supply job descriptions for the jobs that were contracted with the above mentioned companies?

Return tabled.