



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 40

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Tuesday

27 May 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to inform honourable members of the results of a recent meeting of the Rural Development Authority.

The Board approved forty-one (41) applications, totalling \$662,169.00. The loans helped create fifty-four (54) full-time jobs and one hundred and thirty-one (131) part-time jobs while enhancing ninety (90) full-time and three hundred and thirty-seven (337) part-time positions. Mr. Speaker, a total of 612 jobs protected or created through this one meeting of the Rural Development Board.

The approved applications were for a variety of enterprises and included metal production fabrication; handcrafts, food processing, sawmilling, electrical equipment re-manufacturing, tourism, printing, woodworking and fish processing. Of particular interest were projects approved for the production of Labradorite - Mr. Speaker, I might add this is

through the Inuit Development Corporation of Labrador - and for the extraction and refining of local slate.

Mr. Speaker, with the provisions of these loans through my department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, I feel confident that the small business industry will continue to grow and flourish, providing good jobs and security for many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, we thank the minister for giving us a copy of his statement just before reading it. We are pleased to see these applications being approved. I am particularly pleased to see the reference to the approval of the project for the production of Labradorite. This is a project which initially we tried to commence back in 1973 or 1974, I guess, through the Department of Mines. We provided funds to have sources of Labradorite identified, and I visited the Coast of Labrador myself and saw a number of the sources of Labradorite. There is a lot of very fine quality gemstone available, and it is really a matter now of organization. The physical resource is there, the capital can be provided, and this is what the minister is announcing today.

We are very pleased to see that the Inuit Development Corporation

is taking on this project. We wish them every success and we look forward to that being a project which can see the people on the Coast of Labrador, the North Coast particularly, through an indigenous resource and through their own efforts, have a viable enterprise that will be of benefit to themselves but will also be a very distinctive product which all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians can be proud of.

MR. SPEAKER:

At this time I would like to welcome to the visitor's gallery sixty-eight Grade V students from Woodland Elementary School, Dildo, with their teachers, Richard Woodrow, Ronald Craniford and Harry Reid.

I would also like to welcome at this time forty-five Grade VIII students from Stella Maris School, Trepassey, with their teachers, Kevin Ryan and Wayne Holden.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. I am very interested in the Premier's remarks having to do with the need for greater protection, greater backup for the enforcement attempts of Canadian Fisheries officers. I wonder would the Premier indicate to us

whether he has been as forceful in his representation to get a share of the Canadian defence establishment located in this Province since the Tories were elected in Ottawa as he was when the Liberal Government was there?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact there have been innumerable meetings over the last six or eight months by the Minister of Ingovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), and the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) and the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) to realize the NATO Base opportunity that has presented itself for Happy Valley - Goose Bay, and they are pursuing the matter aggressively. Last week I had meetings with members of the Department of Defense, and these meetings are ongoing. There are a number of ministers and members attending another meeting in Halifax this week and in Happy Valley - Goose Bay on the weekend.

So we are, as a government, pushing very, very hard to get more of the defense dollars spent in Newfoundland. May I also indicate that as a result of representation made by myself and other members of the government we were successful in getting a lot of the engineering for the early warning system done in Newfoundland as opposed to Toronto or Montreal. That has been very beneficial in terms of defense dollars again. As I understand there has been quite a substantial contract let for one of the projects which involves a Newfoundland company.

So we are using every means at our disposal to access greater defense dollars here in the Province in pursuing and supporting the NATO Base in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. And at the same time, while supporting that very strongly - I have met with all of the NATO representatives here in Newfoundland, and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs has met them in Europe and there will be another trip to Europe on that matter later in this year - we have also pursued very aggressively the bilateral agreements between Canada and the United Kingdom, Canada and West Germany and Canada and some of the Benelux countries who intend to use Happy Valley - Goose Bay for training exercises. So the answer to the question is an unqualified yes, and we will leave no stone unturned to try to access more and more federal defense dollars to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is referring now to the presence of other NATO countries but there is no great provision for a Canadian defense establishment at Happy Valley - Goose Bay. The main thrust of that is for a NATO training center and what we are discussing, Mr. Speaker, is a defense establishment that could assist in the enforcement of Fisheries regulations and could provide a backup to those

Fisheries officers who are having great difficulty in seeing that the Canadian Fisheries regulations are enforced. So, would the Premier indicate what representation he has made to the Government of Canada to see a defense capability provided in this Province that will assist those Fisheries officers in the enforcement of Canadian Fisheries regulations?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, two points. First of all on the whole question of defense in the Province - and I forgot to mention this and obviously the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has forgotten about it - on defense generally the federal government last year committed \$93 million to Happy Valley - Goose Bay as part of their own Canadian effort to upgrade Happy Valley - Goose Bay - \$93 million. On the second point, as it relates to greater protection and support for offshore surveillance, perhaps the Leader of the Opposition is not aware, but as a result of representations from the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and so on, the federal government is now considering, and has before their Cabinet, additional measures to support federal Fisheries surveillance which will be announced very, very shortly.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what we are getting to now: Measures before the federal Cabinet for consideration are one thing, the Premier getting up and making a vague and general statement to the public are another. We have seen very little in terms of the Premier pushing for the necessary defense backup for Fisheries officers as he referred to yesterday. Now, would the Premier indicate what does he anticipate we will see in terms of backup for federal fisheries officers from these decisions that are presently being considered by the Government of Canada? Are we going to see this Province get its fair share of the defence dollar that is being spent across Canada? Is the Premier saying that that \$93 million to upgrade the Happy Valley-Goose Bay base is a sufficient allocation to this Province of the Canadian defence dollar?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have to laugh. Here is a member, the Leader of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, who with his party for the last ten or fifteen years sat by like lapdogs and supported a Liberal Federal Government-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- Mr. Speaker, that would not even go out and do what the federal government is now doing to capture the Spanish trawlers and bring them into court and put them through the court process, and to eliminate the Portuguese from coming in here to protect our

fishery resource. The same Liberal leader is now complaining about all of the initiatives that the PCs are taking in Ottawa versus the zero that the Federal Liberal administration did for the last two or three decades in Canada, Mr. Speaker. It never did a thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to release here today ongoing private consultations that are going on between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada that are now before the Federal Cabinet. Surely the Leader of the Opposition is not asking me to release here decisions that are under review in the Cabinet of Canada today. All I can say to the Leader of the Opposition is that the present Conservative Government in Ottawa has done more for Fisheries surveillance in the last two or three months than the Liberal Government did in twenty years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

As a final supplementary, I wonder if the Premier would indicate which party was in power when the fisheries economic zone was expanded from 3 miles to 12 miles and ultimately to 200 miles?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what party was in power which

allowed the foreigners to continue to come in here? Which party was in power when they would not sign the Atlantic Accord? Which party was in power when we tried but failed to get roads agreements? Which party was in power for all of these things, Mr. Speaker? We know which party was in power. They paid lip service to the Fishery. Now, for the first time, Mr. Speaker, both through free trade negotiations, through greater surveillance offshore we have a federal government that is beginning to look upon fish the same way that the Federal Liberals looked upon wheat.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if the Premier would indicate whether this now means that the Government of Canada has reversed it's decision on factory freezer trawlers?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we have just gotten in the last number of months additional fish for Harbour Grace. We have gotten additional fish because of the Portuguese. We have done better in getting more fish for Newfoundland in one year under the PCs than we did under twenty with the Liberals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). Mr. Speaker, will the minister confirm the Canadian Saltfish Corporation's involvements in the sale of approximately \$2 million worth of salt fish in 1983 through it's Newfoundland agent, a company known as Armaport Limited, to a Portuguese company, Armazans Limited, that subsequently defaulted on payment for the \$2 million purchase to it's Newfoundland agent who, in turn, defaulted on payment of the \$2 million account to the Canadian Saltfish Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, there is a fair amount of detail in that particular question. To make sure that I provide the proper details, I would like to take the question as notice.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder can the minister then comment on the fact that the allegation is that the fish supplied to the Newfoundland agent, who in turn supplied it to the customer in Portugal, was done without any kind of security, an open-ended account? Is this, in

the minister's view, a good way to conduct business, especially when the Salfish Corporation is conducting this business, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Newfoundland fishermen? I presume that the \$2 million lost will have to be made good from the earnings of the Newfoundland fishermen.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I indicated I would take the question as notice and provide an answer, hopefully, tomorrow.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

My question is for the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms). I want to ask, does the minister realize that the fire patrol rangers for Unit 18 - that is the Roddickton-Croque-Main Brook area - have not yet been hired for the season?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot respond to that question right now but I will take it as notice and check it out.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

I can tell the minister that as of six o'clock Saturday they were not hired. Does the minister not believe that in view of the severe forest fires we have had, and in view of the extremely early Spring that we are having, and in view of the fact that the forests are a virtual cinder bed, is it totally irresponsible not to have the fire patrol in place in Unit 18 for the prevention of fire and for the enforcement of the law and the regulations which he is bringing in about no fires for camping in the woods?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, you know, it is rather interesting to see how the Opposition will try to turn a very serious situation into a political battle. And that is what the hon. member is attempting to do right now. He knows full well, Mr. Speaker, as does everybody else, that the fire patrols for the various regions are hired on the instructions of the local regional offices and they will be hired at the appropriate time. The hon. member need not worry about that. But he should not attempt to make a political game out of something that is very serious. Where has he been for the last three weeks if he thinks we have been irresponsible and derelict in our duties? I suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, that he is speaking for himself, for the Liberal Party in a political way and no other.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon.

the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

In view of the fact that, political or otherwise, there is a high danger in Roddickton which is reason enough that the rangers should have been hired and the minister knows it, will he give an undertaking to immediately hire the fire patrol rangers in Unit 18 as well as in any other units in this Province where they have not yet been hired? I say that because of the fires.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, our department has been extremely responsible with respect to the situation that has existed for the last several weeks, and whatever decisions are required to ensure the safety of the communities involved, the public that is involved, we will undertake those steps. He need not worry about that one iota.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell), and it has to do with The Landlord and Tenant Residential Act. One of my constituents is in subsidized housing of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, and is being badgered by the Corporation. I advised her to go and seek refuge under The Landlord and Tenant Residential Act and

under your department's protection. My question for the minister is this: I have just now found out that the residents of NLHC subsidized housing, and residents whose rents are being paid by Social Services are not covered by that legislation and very little can be done by his department. My question is what is the rationale behind leaving these large number of people out of the protection of that essential legislation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take that question under advisement. The intent of The Landlord and Tenant Residential Act was dealing particularly and only with rental set, and if these people need subsidized rentals they are not covered under the legislation. I will get back to the hon. member tomorrow with an answer.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My supplementary is this: I realize a part of the legislation has to do with the setting of rates and, obviously, for people in subsidized housing that is covered by another mechanism, but my question is that there is also a mediation role that these boards are suppose to play in terms between landlords and tenants to try and alleviate problems.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!



MR. FENWICK:

Yes. My question is: These people, who are in subsidized housing and are also in a very weak position, who can only go through legal channels if they have a problem with their landlord, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, is there any rationale that you can think of for allowing these people not to be covered by this legislation which protects all the other renters in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, not other than the fact that they are subsidized by the taxpayers' dollars, on that basis. But if the hon. member would provide me with some of the details of the specific case, I will be pleased to talk to my Landlord/Tenant people to see if there can be some kind of mediation to help resolve the specific problem.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is not in his seat, but this week is National Transportation Week and, chosen as the theme for this week is 'It is Our Year'. Now, I want to ask the Premier a question, Mr. Speaker. The Premier will be attending a First Ministers' Conference in several days and, even though we realize that the main topic of that conference this time will be free trade, in view of the fact that transportation

plays an important role in this Province, and the theme this year is 'It is Our Year', let me ask the Premier will he, at that First Ministers' Conference, be asking the Prime Minister of this country for a definitive statement on where the Government at Ottawa stands pertaining to the future of our railway?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker, I will not. The matter is being dealt with by the Minister of Transport, Mr. Mazankowski, and by our federal representative in the Cabinet, Mr. Crosbie, and we expect very shortly to have a response to the whole railway question. That is well in hand. There is no need for me to raise it at a First Ministers' Conference on Trade. It is being followed up daily by the Minister of Transportation and myself, and we very shortly will have a response from the federal government as it relates to the railway. It could be as soon as four or five days.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has been saying all along that there is no proposal before this government from the Government of Canada, but the Premier is also on record as saying that a proposal was put forward from this government to the federal government last Fall. Does the Premier yet have a response to the Newfoundland proposal to the feds?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, obviously the hon. member has not been around here for the last several months. The federal government intends to respond to our proposal and to put on the table, if in fact that is what their intent is, other alternatives. I do not know how the federal government is going to respond. All I know is, from talks over the last five or six days with members in the federal Cabinet, they are going to respond to the proposal that we put forward and that will come, hopefully, in the next few days.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge. I want to ask the minister whether she did not badly misinterpret the particular clause of the Criminal Code of Canada which refers to the conditions under which a fight may be held within a province. I quote for the minister the appropriate section of the Criminal Code, which says, among other things, 'Any boxing contest may be held with the permission or under the authority of an athletic board or commission or similar body established by or under the authority of the legislature of a province for the control of sport within the Province.' My question very specifically, Mr. Speaker, is does not the city council of St. John's or its Recreation Department represent -

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that question is clearly out of order. It is not in order to ask a Minister of the Crown an interpretation of a judicial statute. I think it is even moreso out of order to ask the Minister of Justice for a interpretation of a statute that also it is a statute of the federal government.

MR. SIMMONS:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker, by the gentleman for St. John's East.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, what my seat mate for Bonavista-North is asking is not for a legal opinion but whether in effect the minister acted properly in taking the decision she did last week, did she act properly within her responsibilities as minister? I submit that is a fair question. Ministers are in this House to be accountable to the House for matters coming under their jurisdiction.

MR. MARSHALL:

That is not what the hon. gentleman asked.

MR. FUREY:

Come on, 'Bill', stop obstructing her. She can answer here own questions.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I am going

to study that matter and rule on it tomorrow.

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is: According to the Code would the minister not agree that the City of St. John's or its Department of Recreation is a properly constituted body looking after sports within this city and that they should have been able to sponsor this fight? Or did the minister act too hastily, Mr. Speaker, in creating this debacle?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the member for Bonavista North, formerly for Terra Nova, did not hear what I said last week. What happened last week with respect to the proposed professional boxing match in St. John's is that a match which was proposed by a professional boxing promoter and sponsored by the City of St. John's, which was complained of and enquired about of the Crown Attorneys in the Department of Justice by a private citizen, was in the end cancelled by the City of St. John's - not cancelled by the Department of Justice, cancelled by the City of St. John's.

The lawyers in the Department of Justice, on the Criminal side of the department, after having received an enquiry from a private citizen, looked into the matter, had the police investigate, looked at Section 81 of the Criminal Code of Canada, contacted the city of St. John's, alerted city officials about the Criminal Code

requirements, and cautioned them about the necessity of their adhering to the Criminal Code. Now the decision in light of those circumstances was taken by the city of St. John's, which presumably has access to independent legal advice. Perhaps there are arguments on various sides of the questions, perhaps there are different ways of interpreting Section 81 of the Criminal Code of Canada, and those would be matters ultimately for the courts to determine. But the decision to cancel that boxing match in St. John's last week was taken by the city of St. John's. The role of the Department of Justice was simply responding to an enquiry by a private citizen, having the police investigate and alerting the officials of the city of St. John's of the Criminal Code of Canada requirements.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, did I hear the minister to say that the city of St. John's cancelled this fight on instructions from the Department of Justice? Secondly, Mr. Speaker, did the minister not check with other cities in Canada which do not have a boxing commission, or do not have the proper authorities looking after boxing in the way that the legislation of the Criminal Code of Canada requires? Did the minister, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of saving face and saving the image of this Province, check with the other provinces and see how they got over this loophole?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many more ways I can say this. The Department of Justice did not end that fight last week. The city of St. John's, which initiated plans for the fight along with, I assume, a Mainland professional boxing promoter, made the decision to cancel the fight. That was a decision of the city of St. John's which is obviously independent of the Department of Justice. Now, Mr. Speaker, it annoys me as a Newfoundlander to hear people such as the member opposite and a St. John's open line radio host berating ourselves for what happened last week. It seems to me that the professional boxing promoter from the Mainland had some responsibility in this matter. That boxing promoter is governed in other provinces of this country by the exact same Criminal Code of Canada and presumably abides by the requirements of the Criminal Code in other parts of the country and should have taken precautions, when initiating plans for a fight in St. John's, to see that those same Criminal Code of Canada requirements were adhered to in this Province.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of making this Province an attractive place to come for promoters and entertainers, would the minister take action to enact the appropriate legislation, as they

have done in the Province of PEI, to allow these promoters to come to this Province, not that they will want to come in the near future, but will she take the appropriate action to see that we have the enabling legislation in this Province to encourage and to allow and to permit such activities in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, legislation authorizing the establishment of sport control commissions, sport regulatory agencies, would come under the jurisdiction of my colleague, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, and I would suggest that the member opposite pose his question to the minister responsible for sport.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power). I understand that the number of seats being underwritten by Manpower for business education courses, both in the district vocational schools and in the private secretarial schools and so on, are being cut back in both cases by Manpower. I understand that these cutbacks, rejection of applications for business education courses and cutting back the numbers of seats in existing courses, have been initiated as a result of representation made by the provincial representative on the

Selection Committee. I wonder would the minister be aware of that, would he confirm that it is the case and whether he agrees with such a cutback, first of all?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware of the fact that in the post-secondary part of education in Newfoundland we are making many, many changes. One of the reasons we are making these many changes is the fact that we have an over-abundance, an oversupply of certain graduates from certain courses. One of those courses that has an over-supply in many areas of the Province is the business education sector which takes in a whole range of educational post-secondary courses.

I am not aware of the individual circumstances relating to an application that may or may not have been turned down for any individual by either a private teaching institution or a public one, but I certainly am fully aware of the fact that we do have an overabundance of graduates in some of those courses and it is not a priority of this government to increase the number of graduates in an area where we already have an adequate supply.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker recognized the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

I yield.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the school at Bonavista and the school on Bell Island are two schools where the number of seats has been cut back. In the case of a private school on the West Coast, in Corner Brook, I can give the minister privately the name of an institution that has applied and been turned down for a programme for business education, an entrepreneur course, I think it is called in that particular case. With all the hoopla and, more to the point, all the preparation for the offshore, is the minister honestly telling us that there is an overabundance of entrepreneurial skills in this Province, that we have more than enough out there? Is this not the time when we ought to be gearing in that particular direction rather than walking away from it?

Secondly, while I am no my feet, would the minister tell us what has happened to the thrust of his White Paper? Has he abandoned that or where does he go from here on that particular issue given the feedback, to put it kindly, that he has gotten on that subject?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, to the two questions, there is obviously a discrepancy when you talk about business education students, persons who graduated with a clerk-typing or

some of those secretarial types of courses, and equate that with entrepreneurial skills, or shortage of thus, in this Province. We are very much anxious to increase the entrepreneurial skills in this Province to the tune, Mr. Speaker, of \$1 million this year in capital funding to begin a \$3 million extension to the School of Business at Memorial University. That is an indication of our interest in entrepreneurial skills, plus the courses that we have initiated at our own post-secondary institutions in the Province, the ones that we directly administer, the vocational schools and the ones run by the Board of Governors, one in Stephenville and one here in St. John's.

So our entrepreneurial importance is there. We are emphasizing it and we intend to fund it and we intend to change some of the course. That is exactly why we are not placing a higher priority on some of the business education courses, because we want to take that money and the students into the entrepreneurial and into the better technology courses, so we encourage those students not to go into something where there is an oversupply of graduates but to go into an area where they can get higher level skills, where there are greater opportunities for employment.

As it relates to the second half of the question, the White Paper, Mr. Speaker, was a major thrust of this government some eighteen months ago. We have not deviated from that main thrust that we had at that time. We intend to reorganize and revitalize the vocational, post-secondary school system. We did that, Mr. Speaker,

not in an arbitrary or arrogant way, but by putting out some suggestions to the public in a White Paper process. We received over 150 submissions to that White Paper, which were analyzed in great detail and, Mr. Speaker, we are in the process of making decisions about the White Paper and the responses. I am sure that the public of Newfoundland, and the students in particular, will be very delighted to see the results of that main thrust that we have in post-secondary education.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS:

I am glad the minister chose to make the distinction between the business education courses and the wider, more broadly based entrepreneurial skills, because, in refusing an application on the West Coast to a private school, the spokesman for Manpower indicated a couple of things, and one was that it was being done on the advice of their provincial representative on that committee and, secondly, his justification or the Committee's justification to the applicant -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I wonder would the hon. member pose his final supplementary?

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would further ask the minister was he aware that the reason stated for the rejection of this application was that, 'There are no jobs for entrepreneurs,' which again flies

in the face of what the minister is saying to the House? Manpower is now rejecting those on the advice of his subordinate because there are no jobs out there. Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister whether he is aware of that and, secondly, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Question! Question!

MR. SIMMONS:  
What are you so touchy about today? Are you afraid we are going to get some information or something?

MR. TOBIN:  
Is this a supplementary question?

MR. SIMMONS:  
This is a supplementary, for the benefit of the member for Burin - Placentia West. This is a supplementary, yes.

MR. TOBIN:  
What a shame.

MR. SIMMONS:  
And secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister whether there is competition for that funding between the private and public system, that is the DVSS, and if so, has the government shown its hand as to what side it comes down on on that particular competition and has it instructed its member on the Committee accordingly?

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

MR. POWER:  
Mr. Speaker, there are several branches or arms to that question. First of all, let me say to the latter part about competition, certainly there is,

in the new Canadian Job Strategy, monies made available to employers who can obviously decide that they want people trained in a certain area, and there is competition between the private schools and the public schools, if you want, for those given funds to train people in a certain way. That is a very healthy system which on the one hand is making the private sector better, and it is certainly making the public sector Vocational Schools better by making our staff administration being more efficient and more competitive.

Now, as it relates to the other parts of the question, Mr. Speaker, I aware there was some problems in Corner Brook with one course being turned down. That came to my attention yesterday or the day before, and basically it relates to an area where the Committee members did not have all the advice and they deferred it pending some advice from different sectors relating to that given course. Whether that is the same one the member refers to or not I do not know. As it relates to entrepreneurs not having jobs, Mr. Speaker, I guess that is the difference between a Tory economy and a Liberal economy; in a Tory economy there is always jobs for entrepreneurs.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

I would like to welcome to the Speaker's Gallery the Chief of the Davis Inlet Band Council, Captain Riche, and Band Council Prote Paker, the Band Council Chief of Sheshatshit and members of the Naskaupi Montagnais Innu Association of Labrador, two members of the Community Council

of Little Bay Islands, Chairman John Oxford and Councillor Irving Wheaton, and five Grade VIII, IX and X students from St. Anne's all grade school Southeast Bight with their teacher, Tobias Pearson.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Notices of Motion

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Provide For The Implementation In The Province Of The Convention On The Recognition And Enforcement Of Foreign Arbitrable Awards And The Model Law On International Commercial Arbitration."

### Answers to Questions

#### for which Notice has been Given

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, during Question Period, the member for Fogo asked me a question about the status of a police investigation begun last year into allegations by the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) about his files. I gave information at the time from my memory but said that I would double check and today either

confirm or give other information. I can now confirm that what I said yesterday is correct. The RCMP conducted the investigation. The RCMP completed their investigation several months ago and presented a final report to the Department of Justice. The RCMP recommended that no criminal charge be laid arising from this matter. Crown Attorneys in the Department of Justice, independently from the police, reviewed the file of the investigation and the police report, and came to the same conclusion, namely, that there be no criminal charge laid in this matter.

### Petitions

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I present a petition on behalf of ninety-six residents in the community of St. Lewis, Labrador. The prayer of the petition is, 'We, the residents of St. Lewis, Labrador, hereby petition the House of Assembly to ask the Department of Education and the DEC to build a new school in our community. Several years ago we were promised a new school but the school board undertook renovations and built a smaller extension onto the school. We were then told that within three or four years a new school would be built in our community. We feel that the time has now arrived, due to the fact that there are many leaks in the



school, the school classrooms, in Winter, are not receiving sufficient heat, gyproc is falling from ceilings, the tiles are coming off the floor, there is no gym, library or lab, and electrical fixtures are not properly working and are falling off the ceilings. As a result, the quality of education for our children is not the same as in other places in our Province, as well as on Coastal Labrador. We feel that we have been neglected by the provincial government, the DEC and our school board. We are not second-class citizens. We want the best for our children so they can help build a better Province for all children. We would like to know when our community can expect a new school.'

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the community of St. Lewis, Labrador, it is a community that is growing, and many younger people are staying in that community. It has improved tremendously over the past number of years, but one of the things lacking in that community is a new school, and not only a new school, but the proper facilities, such as a gym, a lab, a library, so that the children in St. Lewis, Labrador, can have the same facilities they have in Nain, L'Anse-au-Loup, Forteau or West St. Modeste, St. Anthony, Flowers Cove, St. John's or any other area.

The residents feel that they have been put off several times by the provincial government, the DEC and the school board. It is time the fire inspector went in and inspected that school, because of the falling off of gyproc and electrical fixtures that are not working. For instance, if you plug in a kettle in one part of the school, the lights in the corridor come on. Mr. Speaker,

this is not good enough.

The Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) has commissioned a study of small schools in our Province to determine why the drop out rate is so high. When the NTA and the DEC's did a report on the drop out rate in the Province, they found Coastal Labrador had a drop out rate of almost 100 per cent in some communities.

If the children in Coastal Labrador are not going to be given proper education facilities, how can you expect them to have sufficient interest to continue to stay in school? Also, there are two or three grades in one classroom, they have to go from one classroom to another in order to get a bathroom, there are leaks in the ceilings, there is not sufficient heat in Winter, plus other faults I have already pointed out. The residents of St. Lewis have understood over the years, more so than any other community, that the government and the DEC had to operate under periods of restraint, so much so that several years ago, when they were asked about a new school, they said, "Okay, we will do some renovations to the school while the school board and the government can get some money, in three or four years time, to build it." Now, that time has more than passed, we are talking about several years now, Mr. Speaker, and that community is again being told by the DEC and by the school board that they can renovate the school again, and, of course, the people feel that it is going to postpone the building of a new school, probably indefinitely. The residents of St. Lewis, Labrador, Mr. Speaker, deserve better. As they said in their petition, they want the best for

their own children.

I had the privilege of attending the first graduation there Saturday night, when seven students graduated from Grade XII; last year it was two and the year before that it was three. Mr. Speaker, that small community has shown that they have the teachers but they do not have the facilities. The interest is there with the students. But that graduating class of seven students, when it first started off there were approximately seventeen students. That means a drop out rate of over a 50 per cent.

One of the reasons why smaller schools cannot hold the interest of the children is the lack of facilities such as proper classrooms, a library, video computers, as well as, of course, a gymnasium for recreation.

I ask that the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, be forwarded to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and to the DEC. Hopefully, the Minister of Education will respond to the petition and tell the people, if not by speaking today then by letter, when the residents of St. Lewis, Labrador, can expect to have a new school with proper facilities, such as a library, a lab, and a gym, as you will find in schools in any other area of our Province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would

like to respond to the petition presented by my colleague from Eagle River. The people of St. Lewis, Labrador, are like the people of many other smaller communities around Newfoundland, they have some real problems with the educational system. The people in St. Lewis say, as read by my colleague, that the gym is falling down and the roof is leaking. Obviously, their school is in a deplorable condition. There have been some renovations, but, obviously, the situation has not been resolved, the renovations have not been adequate. They deserve a school that is good enough to go to and good enough to be taught in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the funding of education in this Province, and the way that this is gone about, points out a real weakness and impotence on the part of the Department of Education. I know that this petition is going to the Department of Education who then has to go to the DEC. Somehow, if the Department of Education agrees that this area of the Province should have a new school, they have to go and ask the DEC, I suppose, if they would release some of their funds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. If the government of this Province, who has commissioned a study of small schools, is going to have any control over the very basic decisions in education in this Province, like these people who need that school and they cannot easily be bused somewhere else - I suppose they could be flown out in the morning and back in the evening or something. I do not know if that kind of thing has been thought of, but it should not be if it is. This study of small schools is supposed to examine

these situations and is supposed to recommend ways in which these small schools can be brought up to the standard, I assume, of the rest of the schools in the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous gap between schools like that in St. Lewis and schools like Bishop's College in St. John's, and that gap is getting wider all the time. The concentration is not being put into the small schools of this Province. The educational gap is simply growing all the time. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we have heard, over the last couple of days, the fact that the funding that is allocated to this Province for education from the federal government under the Block Funding Programmes, education and health and a variety of things, is not being spent on education in this Province. A lot of that block funding is going for other things, it is not going towards education and health services. We have heard talk of that. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can certainly get up and support this petition in a moment and perhaps explain that situation using figures. I am simply saying, Mr. Speaker, that the people of St. Lewis, in Labrador, should not have to exist educationally under the conditions that they are existing under right now. The school is falling down around their ears and we should have some direct mechanism to make sure that these people have adequate and proper school facilities. It is unfortunate that the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) cannot respond to it. I am sure he would say, well, it is not really his decision. But that is another problem, Mr. Speaker, with the Department of Education.

So I would again support these people. There were, I guess, seventy or eighty names on the petition. How many?

MR. HISCOCK:  
Ninty-six.

MR. BAKER:  
That is a lot of names. I would like to support these people in their efforts to get a proper school building constructed in their town.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I rise also to support the petition. Any child in this Province, whether they live in St. John's or St. Lewis, deserves a decent education and naturally a decent building in which to obtain their education. I wholeheartedly support the petition that was presented by the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock).

I also have a petition, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker, is the Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. R. Aylward) for Labrador supporting the petition from St. Lewis?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MR. HISCOCK:

If he is, I believe he is allowed five minutes to speak on that. I understand that the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) had to take a flight, so the Parliamentary Assistant is speaking for, I assume, the government. Surely the residents of St. Lewis, Labrador, deserves a little bit more time than the member for Torngat Mountains is giving them. He said, 'okay, I support it'. Then he sat down and got up and said 'I now have another petition to present.'

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. There is no point of order.

Does the hon. member have a new petition?

MR. WARREN:

Yes, I have a new petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

I have a petition signed by 122 voters in the district of Torngat Mountains, in the town of Postville, Mr. Speaker.

The prayer of the petition is: "We, the undersigned taxpayers of Postville, petition the Minister of Rural Agriculture and Northern Development and the Minister of Municipal Affairs to make a commitment that phase one of our water and sewer system be started this year."

Mr. Speaker, I have in this House, in fact while responding to the Speech from the Throne, indicated

that in Postville at the present time there are two artisan wells, one produces salty water and the other rusty water. People have to go outside the community in order to get decent water to drink or boil the water that they have.

Last year I told the people of Postville I would do what I could, what is in my power to do, to see phase one of their water and sewer system started as early as possible. Subsequently, before negotiations began on the Native Peoples Agreement, I wrote to the federal and provincial governments respectively and suggested that the next agreement that was going to be put together by the federal and provincial governments should involve the town councils of my district, in addition to the Labrador Inuit Association.

I am quite pleased that both the federal and provincial governments have agreed to involve the town councils on the discussions pertaining to the Native Peoples Agreement. I am also quite pleased, Mr. Speaker, that on Thursday past in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, representatives of the federal government and the provincial government, the mayors of all the councils and the LIA were present and they came to a tentative agreement on the spending of some \$12 million for the next two years.

Out of that, Mr. Speaker, I am quite pleased to say that in the next two years there will be sufficient money to do not only phase one in the town of Postville but also to far advance phase two. This has come as a result of those meetings and as a result of my commitment to the people of Postville assuring them that I would work on their behalf to make

sure that they would not be overlooked, as they have been in the past. I am quite pleased, Mr. Speaker, to support this petition.

The Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) have also done their homework and we see phase one of the water and sewerage project started in Postville this year.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker, I support the petition of the Parliamentary Assistant, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). It is unfortunate we do not have a minister for Labrador.

With regard to the petition from the residents of Postville, Postville, of course, like any other community along the Labrador Coast, deserves proper drinking water. With regard to their petition, again, I not only support it but, as I say, all communities along the Coast deserve it.

One of the things with the Native Agreement is I cannot understand why we, as a Province, are administering these funds and why we do not give the Native people themselves the total responsibility for administering the money, Mr. Speaker. They can develop their own programmes instead of having big brother, the government, always looking over their shoulder and always telling

them what to do. The government is taking a good share of that money out of the fund for administration costs, paying for the people in Rural Development and political hacks that are appointed in the Goose Bay office. They are taking money away from it.

With regard to the residents of Postville and other Native communities along the Coast of Labrador, they would be a lot further ahead if they could administer the money themselves instead of the government trying to siphon off as much of the money from that agreement that they can. If the government, again, is really, really concerned about giving the Native people of our Province independence and allowing them to get out from under the hand of government, they would also allow the Torngat Fishermen's Co-op to take over the plants in Northern Labrador and administer them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the residents of Postville, Labrador, who want clean drinking water. I also ask that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) to take the attitude that there is a need for a new coastal Labrador DREE agreement for Southern Labrador so that we can have it in such a way as to support water projects in Cartwright, St. Lewis and Port Hope Simpson.

MR. WARREN:  
They need a member first.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) says that they need a member. One of the things that the people in Southern Labrador appreciate very much is loyalty to one's principles and not hypocritical people being sold out for twelve pieces of silver.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Northern Labrador got the Native Agreement because they deserved the money from the Native Agreement. If the people in Postville, Davis Inlet, Hopedale, Makkovik, Nain and Rigolet decided that the first phase and the second phase of water should go in the community of Postville, it had nothing to do with the member for Torngat Mountains.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

We are going to have to have leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

We have one member from each side to support a petition. Is this a new petition?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

No, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak to that petition presented by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to say a few words on the petition presented by the

member for Torngat Mountains and ably presented, I might say. It is sad to see that the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) has left. What he understands the people of his district to be saying is not what I understand they are saying when I go there to visit. He made it quite clear that he knows nothing about the rest of Labrador, whatever little bit he might know about his own district, but he certainly does not know very much about the rest of Labrador.

I do want to say that, certainly on behalf of government, I do support the petition presented by the member for Torngat Mountains. I am very happy to support it. As he said, there will be monies made available this year and next year to start and, I would hope, complete most of the requested water services for Postville. I am sure there will be, in the next two years at least, \$1 million and I would expect more than \$1 million, depending on the cost of the water that is necessary for Postville, to be spent in the next couple of years.

It will be spent, Mr. Speaker, as part of the federal - provincial Native Peoples Agreement for these Northern communities. Some \$6.3 million will be allocated this year and next year for that agreement. I am very happy to see that not only will Postville get funds so desperately needed for water and sewer projects but also other parts of Labrador will get much needed funds for their development, providing services that they do need in that area.

Also, Mr. Speaker, within the next little while there will be another agreement signed between the Innu for the communities of Davis Inlet

and Sheshatshit which will, Mr. Speaker, provide some \$2.8 million per year for each year of that agreement to these two communities for very needed services in these communities also.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do support the petition presented by the member for Torngat Mountains. I would like to say that yes, we will have monies allocated within this year to start and next year we hope to complete most of the Postville project.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KELLAND:

Can I have leave to support your petition?

MR. WARREN:

No leave, no.

MR. BARRY:

No leave!

MR. FUREY:

No leave for support for your petition!

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave has not been granted.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We now see the sort of political games that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is attempting to play. Instead, Mr. Speaker, of having an interest in his district, he is interested in making petty, political points. He has yet to stand up in this House and fight for the interests of the people of his district, Mr.

Speaker. He has turned into a total wimp.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

He is nothing but a wimp, Mr. Speaker. He has gotten his job as Parliamentary Assistant and he has been told to stay quiet. He is afraid to fight for his district and now he will not let anybody else fight for the people of Labrador. He is pure wimp!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. Again we see the Leader of the Opposition making a fool of himself, as he usually does.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have ruled there is no point of order. Are there any further petitions?

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order with respect to the petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. KELLAND:

I just make the point, first of all, that without the leave of the House I intended to speak in support of the petition with some other comments but leave was not given by the government side which tends to make me support what our leader has said. There are political games being played by

the member for Torngat Mountains.

But my point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may, is simply this: In presenting the petition, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), because he has constituents in the House and he wants to play the game, made the comment that in -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:  
My point of order is in his statement he made the comment that the federal and provincial governments, the mayors of five towns and the LIA, had reached a tentative agreement.

MR. WARREN:  
I did not say that or any such thing.

MR. KELLAND:  
They had reached a tentative agreement in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. That is my understanding, when I can understand the member. My point of order is simply this: This is not correct. We have information, there has been media comments and all kinds of comments that the mayors and the LIA have refused to become witness to an agreement in which they had no initial input. I think the member should be brought to task for that and that is my point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order. There is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a very short petition to present to the House. The prayer of the petition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:  
The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is "We, the undersigned, residents of Forresters Point, age sixteen years and older, do hereby request the hon. House to see that Southside Fisheries be granted a licence to operate on Forresters Point's community stage as soon as possible." There are a couple of hundred people who have witnessed and signed and attested to this petition, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Forresters Point is in the Northern region of my district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. FUREY:  
If I can be protected from the socialist and other company, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, I will wait until you get order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
If the hon. member wishes to speak, he has the floor.



MR. FUREY:

Well, there are meetings going on all over the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and I would appreciate co-operation and quiet.

Can I have order or can I not have order to present the petition?

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member wishes to speak, he can do so.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I was saying that 200 residents of Forresters Point in the district of St. Barbe have asked me to present this petition because their area has been generally known for many years to be an area of chronic high unemployment, although recently, we did get a little bit of good news from the Brig Bay area, Mr. Speaker, in terms of possibly 150 people going to work there to look after the Blue Cove/Plum Point/Bird Cove/Brig Bay area.

In Forresters Point, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a couple of hundred of my people who really are having a hard time acquiring work because the only industry there is a single industry, the fishery. Many of the fishermen are inshore fishermen, and what they are asking the government to do is to look at the possibility of giving a processing licence to South Side Fisheries -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

- so that they could create the necessary employment in an area, Mr. Speaker, that has been literally ravaged and scarred with

high unemployment for the last twenty years. We have one industry: it is the fishery.

And while I am on the subject, Mr. Speaker, Forresters Point takes into account an area that the Premier made a significant promise concerning during the election. He promised to pave the Loop Road, it is called, circling in around the community of St. Barbe, out through Black Duck Cove, through Forresters Point, out to Route 432, the Viking Trail. To date, now, we are nearly a year-and-a-half past the election and we still see no signs of the Premier fulfilling that commitment.

But I do want to say this, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), because I believe that I am his cousin on the Northwestern side of his riding - he represents the Northeastern side of the Great Northern Peninsula, that great and historic district of Baie Verte - White Bay. I am his cousin on the other side and I believe that because we are political cousins, he has managed to become extremely sensitive and acclimatized to the problems of the people on the Northwest Coast. If you look at his record of sensitivity, you will see that Brig Bay, which was the long-forgotten plant in the entire fishing industry, further North, he, along with myself and many workers on the Coast, made the proper representations to attract the company there to create work.

I am sure the minister will stand in his place today and support me - because I know he is a sensitive minister - support me in my efforts to have the little operation at Forresters Point

opened to employ fifty or sixty people in an area, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, that has been ravaged and scarred by chronic historic unemployment. I think we have a golden opportunity to invite South Side Fisheries in there to create work for our people.

Traditionally, Mr. Speaker, the next-door neighbour to Forresters Point is a community called Black Duck Cove. We see two possibilities for plants there; one is with Connors Brothers, which is operating right now and has fifty or sixty people working. But, previous to that, we used to see close to 100 people working at the Barry's Fisheries, which processed herring in the Black Duck Cove area. But that shut down. There is no possibility of the Barrys coming back. They have lost their markets in the United States and Europe. We have lost that pickled herring market. Therefore, there is going to be no processing there.

So, we are looking at an operation run by Connors Brothers in Black Duck Cove, providing limited employment, and now we are asking the minister to look at the next-door neighbour, Forresters Point, offer the licence to South Side fisheries, create work for fifty more people, take fifty more people off the U.I. and Social Services, take them out of that net; allow them to live with dignity and contribute to the government, rather than take from the government.

These are hard-working, God fearing, good and decent people, Mr. Speaker, and they are asking for a chance to live with dignity, to live with pride and to live from the work and sweat of their

own hands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this petition presented on behalf of 200 residents of Forresters Point. I too am very familiar with Forresters Point. I had the privilege of growing up and visiting Forresters Point when there was not even a road in there. You had to go in by boat, Mr. Speaker.

I notice the petition is signed by 200 people from sixteen years of age and over. Now that must take in a vast majority of the people of Forresters Point, which shows the kind of interest that is there in that community in getting a fish plant in so that they can get out and get paid and do some work.

The petition specifically states that the people who signed are sixteen years and up. Mr. Speaker, that sixteen years up is indeed to me a cry of anguish because that reminds me of the total abandonment of the sixteen and seventeen and eighteen and nineteen and twenty year olds in Forresters Point as well as in other places around Newfoundland. The highest proportion of Newfoundlanders who are unemployed today are the youth and they are from sixteen to twenty.

Is that not true? Would the member want to clarify?

MR. KELLAND:

Would he care to come in to his place and then speak?

MR. DECKER:

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that that is indeed true. That the highest proportion of unemployed Newfoundlanders today are the youth. They are the group which is being referred to as the lost generation. The generation which has been abandoned by the system. I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, in looking through this petition, which my friend and hon. colleague has presented, there are quite a number of signatures on that petition who are sixteen, seventeen, eighteen and nineteen year olds, the youth which have been abandoned and are looking for work.

Mr. Speaker, as I heard this petition being presented by my colleague, I am aware of the frustration that exist in Forresters Point today. As my friend points out, there are fishermen in Forresters Point, as there are fishermen all long that coast and fish buyers from all over Newfoundland congregate in that area to buy the raw fish, Mr. Speaker, and to truck it away from Forresters Point and that area, taking jobs with them. Frustration is in the minds of those people as they see the raw fish being taken and trucked away so that those sixteen and seventeen and eighteen year old people cannot get a job in their own community because the fish which is being landed in Forresters Point and that area is being trucked to other parts of the Province to be processed. The jobs are being trucked away from Forresters Point. That is some of the frustration that lies behind

this petition, Mr. Speaker. That is why the people in Forresters Point, in an act of desperation, has circulated a petition and today they are using a very civilized means, Mr. Speaker, and are asking that the government of this Province would be made aware of their plight and would have concern for their plight and try to make it possible that there be a fish plant put in Forresters Point so that the jobs are no longer being trucked away but the jobs are being done there.

My colleague spoke about the promises that were made during the last election when the Premier himself promised that a section of road would be paved in that area, Mr. Speaker. I am reminded again of the way the hopes and expectations of people are raised during the elections.

People are deliberately misled during elections by all politicians. They are lied to by all politicians. I am not zeroing in on anyone. It is unfortunate that this should happen at the time of an election when people are being misled and their hopes are up, as happened in Forresters Point. Their hopes were up, Mr. Speaker, and they thought, 'surely we will get this loop road paved now and that will help us to get a fish plant in here.' After the election is over, they are sent back out of sight, out of mind, to be totally neglected again, Mr. Speaker.

It is therefore my privilege and I am pleased today to stand here and endorse this petition, to back up this petition and to pray that the members of this House will support it and will see that they get their fish plant so that no more jobs will ever be trucked away

from Forresters Point.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a moment or so to say a word or two on the petition and to acknowledge the petition on behalf of the Department.

Personally, I am not familiar with the request or the application from Forresters Point. I assume there is an application in the system for a license and I can assure the hon. gentleman, who presented the petition and who represents the area, I will have my officials look at it as quickly as possible -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

- and we will respond as quickly as possible. I have to say that in the context, of course, that we have to be cognizant of both sides of the coin. We do, in terms of ground fish, still have a licensing freeze policy in place and I know that I would be severely criticized by gentlemen on the other side of the House if I were to lift that freeze and have fish plants spring up in every part of the Province. You cannot cut off your nose to spite your face.

The prayer of the petition is understandable and the need, I am

sure, is great. I will have my officials review the petition and respond to the petitioners as soon as possible, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Orders of the Day

On motion, that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole to consider certain bills, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

### Committee of the Whole

MR. LUSH:

On Bill 25, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes. The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Just a few minutes, Mr. Chairman. I again want to elaborate upon and elucidate further the amendment that we proposed to that particular bill. The amendment, as hon. members will recall, that we recommended, that we moved was to Clause 53, adding a section (d). In that section there are three objects. I suppose, really, there are only two because (c) just further reinforces (a) and (b). We inserted (d) and the reason for our inserting it was that we thought that it would certainly be a more comprehensive legislation by including more directly some direct benefits for the consumer, again realizing that the real estate people had set up this foundation to establish the fund that previously was just being non-productive, just being used by the banks or whatever

financial institutions that the real estate people would have selected for their in-trust funds and nobody was getting use of these monies other than the financial institutions.

So we thought a very reasonable and a very rational approach would be to make the objects a little larger, to make the purposes for the setting up of this fund a little more specific by ensuring that there would be some direct benefit to the consumer. I do not have the amendment in front of me, but in substance it said to establish a scholarship fund and to make a substantial contribution, to apportion, I believe is the right word, a substantial amount on an annual basis to any charitable organization of the foundation's choice or to a health institution or to a consumer group. We believe that that certainly makes it specific and makes it fairly extensive and enlarges upon the present objects of the foundation. It certainly does that, enlarges upon the objects.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken to several people in the real estate group, nobody officially on the executive of the Newfoundland and Labrador Real Estate Board, who say that they find the amendment fairly acceptable. The words they used were, they could live with the amendment and, indeed, thought it was a very practical and a very worthwhile amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the minister mentioned that he thought the real estate people would be aware of the concerns that we expressed while debating that particular bill, but I believe that that is maybe leaving a little bit too much to chance. We now have the

opportunity to amend the bill, an amendment which no hon. member, to my view, finds offensive, other than, it seems to me, it is just simply that the government just does not want to support an amendment from this side. That seems to be the only reason that I can gather. Mr. Chairman, we think it is a worthwhile amendment. We think it broadens the objects of the bill in a way that will be most acceptable not only to the Real Estate Board of Newfoundland but to the consumer. When the consumer understands the reason, the purposes of setting up this foundation, I believe that they will conclude that this is probably the only reasonable way in which the consumer could expect a direct benefit from their money. I believe consumers would be very proud to know that the interest on their money, that the interest on - well, I hesitate to use that phrase again because I do not believe necessarily that is the way to use it - but the interest on the monies that they have held in trust for them is going to a scholarship fund, going to some charitable organization or a health institution and, lastly but not least, to some consumer group. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the resolution is certainly most noble, most practical and I would hope that all hon. members would support it.

Thank you.

MR. RUSSELL:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just to want to take a couple of minutes. I really have very little else to say pertaining to this amendment, the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). I, too, maintain that there is an opportunity in this bill, and particularly in Clause 56. 1 (d), to give the board the authority when they are set up to do the things with these funds that the hon. member for Bonavista North has indicated. I think that we should give the board an opportunity to set itself up, give it some months or a year to operate and see how they do use those funds and how they intend to use them. As the hon. member for Bonavista North indicated, he has had some informal conversations, discussions with some of the members and I emphasize, as he said, they were informal conversations as opposed to a formal meeting with the executive, and they are not against this idea. I think there is an opportunity there now for them to do things, and certain things are not done with these funds that I, as minister, feel should have been done, then, perhaps, down the road we can certainly look at bringing in another amendment to this. Based on that, I think we will have to vote against the amendment.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed No. 25 without amendment, carried.

DR. COLLINS:  
Order 6, Bill No. 22.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Embalmers And Funeral Directors Act, 1975". (Bill No. 22).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

DR. COLLINS:  
Order 7, Bill No. 24.

A bill, "An Act Respecting An Increase Of Certain Pensions." (Bill No. 24).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

DR. COLLINS:  
Order 8, Bill No. 5.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Land Development Act." (Bill No. 5).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

DR. COLLINS:  
Order 9, Bill No. 6.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Labrador Linerboard Limited Agreement Act, 1979 In Order To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Amending Agreement Entered Into Between Her Majesty The Queen In Right Of The Province Represented By The Honourable The Minister Of Forest Resources and Lands And Abitibi-Price Inc." (Bill No. 6).

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Before we finalize this, we have received an expression of concern, I think they have written the Premier - no, the letter went to the Minister of Labour - with respect to the method of implementing the new sulphite machine in Corner Brook. The union there is concerned about the reduction in the labour force that

is going to result from the method that Kruger is following in getting that machinery activated. I wonder if the minister could tell us what he is aware of in that respect, and whether the minister is satisfied that the company is going about this in a way that will see the maximum benefits to the people of Corner Brook and to the Province?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, I can just respond to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) by saying I am aware of the situation, but I gather it is a situation that is being dealt with between the union and the company. So it is a matter of negotiation between those two groups. In addition to that, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), I gather, is investigating the situation, as well. I have not heard anything new on it since it was raised last week. That is about all I can tell him at this point, Mr. Chairman.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 6 without amendment, carried.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bill No. 25, 22, 24, 5, and 6 without amendment and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Housing Corporation Act." (Bill No. 17)

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister responsible for Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to spend a lot of time on this amendment to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation Act. Essentially what we are doing is providing a conversion, with Bill No. 17, of property for which title has been granted for a term of something like 999 years from leasehold to freehold. Most of these were given to people on the basis of one dollar a year. Some of them are for different costs. We are proposing that for those who have them for a dollar a year they be converted to freehold and so on, and that those people who have a lease and pay a different amount per year, once they pay the amount of the lease that it be converted to freehold as well.

Mr. Speaker, the background behind this basically is the fact that the St. John's Housing Corporation, when they operated in the City of St. John's, and the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation when it was starting

to develop the Newtown portion of Mount Pearl, the Newtown Development, what they did was put the land out on lease to have control of development. At that time, Newtown was not within a municipality, so in order to control the type of housing that went in a particular area the lot was sold on a leased basis with certain caveats put into the lease. As a matter of fact, we have letters commending us for the development in Newtown.

That was the purpose of it, but there is really no purpose to have that in place anymore. Every time a person in Newtown wants to sell his house now, he has to go to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, under the lease, and get a consent of assignment. It is absolutely ridiculous to have that portion in place, especially since Newtown as a development is now part of the town of Mount Pearl and any controls that need to be put in place for even future development is really controlled by the development plan in the town itself. So we will not be getting into very many leases in that respect anymore. So those people who have leases within the different areas of the Province, as a matter of fact, or some other areas of the Province that this will apply to, where we had to go to lease, will have the option now to convert to freehold. As long as they make the payment on the lease, then the land will convert.

Mr. Speaker, it is something that we have had on the Order Paper for some time. It has caused some administrative difficulty with the Housing Corporation so I am hoping, of course, that all hon. members will support this small amendment so that we can get on

with the job of giving the people the land that they paid for in the beginning and should have to own forever and a day, and that it be converted from leasehold to freehold. With that, Mr. Speaker, I will listen to my colleague, if they have any comments to make and, of course, I will be prepared to answer any of their questions.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the original purpose for having these leasehold arrangements was that at that time we did not have the municipal government established to the extent it is now and we did not have the municipal regulations in place relating to the control of the use of property. If you look at one of these leases you will see a whole series of conditions: the home-owner is not allowed to have garbage around the property, the home-owner is not allowed to put out lingerie on clothes lines from windows of the property, they are not allowed to raise chickens and pigs within the apartments, and so forth. Many, if not all, of these conditions are no longer necessary because they are now regulated through the municipal regulations that are in place in virtually every community around the Province. This is an archaic and obsolete method of proceeding and I think there is no harm in having this transfer from leasehold to freehold. There is a reference to a consideration of one dollar. The minister might indicate whether there are any other charges, whether there are



any legal fees that are payable or any other costs to the property owners in having that freehold transfer take place. We would hope that this is something that could be done in a very pro forma fashion without any charges to property owners, and we see no objection to this step being taken.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister a question or two on this.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

This is a necessary Bill. Certainly there is no need for it now. It served its purpose, Mr. Speaker, very well when the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation was first started, it did control building in the area and kept it in an orderly fashion. But, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of commercial areas within the ambit of the Housing Corporation in the Churchill Square area, and I wonder can the minister tell us if this bill will apply to them? For example, the land, I believe, on which Dominion Stores, Jack Hunt's Variety Store, Giant Mart and several other smaller commercial enterprises in the Rowan Street/Churchill Square area are built, I am told, is leasehold, 999 years, and I am wondering if they will be freehold for the price of - what? - \$1?

MR. DINN:

Whatever the rate is.

MR. W. CARTER:

The commercial rate, you mean?

MR. DINN:

Just for a nominal fee of \$1 we will convert it to freehold.

MR. W. CARTER:

I would like to ask the minister, when that land was first acquired by the present owners, did they then pay the market value for that land or just a straight nominal lease?

MR. DINN:

I will answer the question at the end.

MR. W. CARTER:

That is all I have to say on it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am very interested in this bill, somewhat from the point of view of my colleague, the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter). I can understand the reasoning that the minister gave and the necessity, I suppose, or whatever you want to call them, of a municipality being able to regulate its own buildings, its own land and so on. I was wondering if the same kind of thing applied to the industrial land that is under the control of NLHC, if the minister intends to use the same line of reasoning with regard to some of the industrial land that NLHC now controls? Is there a move by NLHC to pass over control to municipalities within whose boundaries this industrial land lies and to let them regulate and control that industrial land? Is this an indication of some kind of loosening up on the part of the minister, as well as the common sense kind of argument he made for

the houses? I would be interested to hear his answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. minister speaks now he will close the debate.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister responsible for Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, just to answer some of the questions brought up by hon. members. Number one, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) brought up, what is the cost of transfer? Where you are talking about the \$1 a year thing in the case of Newtown and some of the residential properties, say, throughout the city of St. John's that were formerly started by the St. John's Housing Corporation, those things can just be converted by the Corporation and the thing issued to them by the lawyer for the Corporation.

There are other cases: In cases where they were issued on the basis of the 999 year lease for \$1 a year, these will just be converted and there will be no problem with that. There are some properties in the city that have different problems with them. The commercial properties, for example, are different. They might have the 999 year lease, but it is not \$1 a year. They might have to be looked at.

The hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) brought up about industrial land. There are two ways that we operate industrial areas. Number one, we sell the land in the industrial park, and, no, we are not going to turn all the

industrial parks over to municipalities. Number one, we sell it.

The other way, so that people will move into the park when they have not got the money to buy, is that we lease it, and people request leasing in some cases. So there are two options, we can lease or we can sell and leasing is the option that some people choose rather than buying the property. We have had a case right here on Portugal Cove Road. Of course, the Churchill Park ones will be dealt with, as well. But on Portugal Cove Road there was a church on St. John's Housing Corporation property. They wanted to sell the church and move somewhere else and they sold it to a developer. I mean, it was leasehold property. The whole deal went through and all of a sudden they found out that it was leasehold, so they went to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation for a consent of assignment. And this goes on all the time. Every time somebody sells a house in Newtown now they have to go to Newfoundland and Labrador Housing for a consent of assignment, every time they want to sell their house, and it just a pain. An administrative pain is what it is and what we are doing is eliminating that here because municipalities now have enough controls in place where we do not have to worry about whether people have chickens in their backyard or not, or whether they have lines going onto other people's property, that kind of thing. So, it is just something that was brought in when municipalities were not in place and we had to have some control of how that property was developed. Now it is no longer required so we are converting it to freehold. It is

as simple as that. To answer the hon. member's question, no, we are not going to turn our industrial parks over to municipalities. We will turn them over when they are all developed and when all the land is sold in them, then they will have control over them from that point of view. Okay?

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:  
If I could just mention one thing. I am thinking particularly of the industrial park in Gander where there is no selling of lots, where everything is leased anyway and there is, I believe, a fifty year agreement with the federal government but it will be extended in 1999 and so on. At one point, it seemed as if NLHC wanted to really get in and take control and grab this kind of land. Lately, I have noticed a slackening off, where there has been a much more relaxed atmosphere concerning the use of that particular land and the promotion of it and the leasing of the lots, the whole thing. I was wondering if this relaxed atmosphere was an indication that the minister was going to continue in that direction and eventually the whole thing would be turned over to the town?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister responsible for Housing.

MR. DINN:  
I am becoming a little more relaxed as the hon. member can see from this bill alone, but we still have to have to some control in our industrial parks.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:  
The minister might have already answered this question, but if he did, I missed it. There are going to be probably hundreds if not thousands of properties affected by this bill, I presume. I wonder if the minister can tell the House, Mr. Speaker, what it will cost? For example, a person today living on Pine Bud Avenue, whose land is leased under a 999 year lease arrangement at \$1 a year, what costs will be incurred by that property owner in terms of legal fees? Is there going to have to be an outright payment to the Housing Corporation, or what? What will it cost people living on land that is presently leased under the 999 year lease arrangement?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister responsible for Housing.

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker, I can answer that with respect to 95 per cent of the leases that the hon. gentleman is talking about. With respect to specific ones, it is going to be difficult because we would have to look at that lease arrangement. But the 999 year leases for \$1 dollar year, essentially they will get a slip of paper from Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation saying, 'Your land is now freehold. Hopefully the corporation will handle that itself, so it should not cost anything.

With respect to other, and when I

talk about other there are different arrangements that have been made. The old St. John's Housing Corporation had different lease arrangements and it was not a dollar a year for 999 years. In these situations, then, we are going to have a look at that a little more closely. Because, obviously, if it was a definite lease of the land for thirty dollars or forty dollars or one hundred dollars, then you are going to have to look at that to see what the cost would be to convert. You might need some legal fees in that case, but in 90 to 95 per cent of the cases, all of Newtown for example, they will just be converted by the Corporation and the people will be given it for a nominal amount of money.

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Actually the minister closed the debate, but by leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Leave is granted.

MR. DECKER:  
Just a quick question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:  
A person in Newtown, if he has 900 years left on his lease, does he pay \$900? This is the way I understand the bill. Does he have the option of continuing to lease or not lease? Does he have to

transfer it to freehold if he does not want to?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister responsible for Housing.

MR. DINN:  
No, no. In that situation, the dollar was a nominal amount per year. It really did not mean anything, even whether they paid it or not. It did not mean anything. Nobody paid it anyway. The point is that they had to go to the Corporation for this consent of assignment to sell it. So it was just a formality. They will not have to pay anything in that sense, it will just be converted. Their land will be converted and it will cost virtually nothing. Okay?

MR. DECKER:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Housing Corporation Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act to Amend The Social Assistance Act, 1977." (Bill No. 16)

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) is out of the Province on Her Majesty's business so I am undertaking to introduce this on his behalf. It is a very simple amendment. At the present time,

the Social Assistance Act, 1977, has no provision in it in terms of a time limit within which a prosecution under the act should be commenced. This is merely adding a subsection to section 22 which does require that an action, a prosecution for an offence under the act must be begun within a three year period. If it is longer than a three year period, presumably the action cannot be brought against the individual. So it must be brought within a three year period.

So I move the order.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) is not in the House. I wanted to make a few comments on one of the things that has been brought to my attention recently concerning one of the problems under the Social Assistance Act, a problem that widows are experiencing in this Province. I wanted to ask the Minister of Social Services some questions about the way widows are being treated. In fact, as early as today, I had a couple of calls from people in my district and other districts close by, who are living below the poverty level, who are receiving less than \$3,000 a year. That amount has been received from Canada Pension in most cases, because those people are under age sixty-five and are not eligible for the old age pension. Social Assistance will subsidize up to somewhere in the vicinity of \$70 per month, which still, Mr. Speaker, only amounts

to approximately \$3,600 a year. Now, this is serious and something has to be done about it. I thought the Minister of Social Services would have been here when this bill was going through to get some questions answered and some sort of a commitment on having something done about this. Possibly the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can make some comment on it.

The poverty level in this Province for one person living alone would be in the vicinity of \$8,000 or \$9,000 a year and that would be little enough, but for a person to survive on approximately \$3,500 a year, run a home, buy food and supply the necessary heating, whether electricity or oil or wood, whatever, plus maintenance on the house, I mean, there is just no way that those people can survive. It is a very serious part of our social assistance problem. I am sure everybody on the government side is aware of it and it is being brought to the attention of everybody right across the Province day after day. The unfortunate thing about it is that there is absolutely nothing being done about it, and I do not know why. I have asked questions several times in the House during Question Period and everybody seems to ignore them. The Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications and the Minister of Social Services say, 'Well, we have a good programme in place,' but they are not taking into consideration how those particular individuals, living alone in this day and age, could possibly be expected to survive on a \$3,500 a year income. And the figure is only \$3,500 if they get the Canada Pension, which is roughly \$240 a month plus the small amount they receive from

social assistance. A lot of them are not receiving the social assistance subsidy.

I would ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) if he could make some comment on this, and possibly we could get some sort of a commitment that the government will take a very serious look at this and that it be taken into consideration in the very near future and something done for those people.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, just a few brief comments on what the hon. the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) said.

He refers to \$70 per month subsidy. There is no set rate of subsidy. When you compare Canada Pension to social assistance, whatever a family would receive on social assistance, the Department of Social Services will make up the difference between that amount and what they are receiving on Canada Pension, but in terms of it being \$70, there is really no set amount. In some cases, depending on the size of the family, it could be five times that amount.

MR. EFFORD:  
Well, I am talking about one person.

MR. TOBIN:  
The subsidy is based on the amount of the Canada Pension figure.

MR. EFFORD:  
Yes, I know what you are saying.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman realizes, there was certainly an increase in the budget this year for people receiving social assistance. There have been significant improvements made over the past number of years as it relates to the amount of funding that people on social assistance have been receiving. And, basically, what the act is going to do, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Finance just pointed out, is it will deal specifically with the prosecution period being increased from one year to three years which, for a whole pile of reasons, it was important that that be done.

MR. EFFORD:  
Just one question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
What the hon. member is saying is quite correct, and I agree with him. For families there is a substantial amount they receive and they received an increase this year of 4 per cent, I think it was, of their total income. I am not commenting on that. The one particular thing I was talking about was a widow living alone trying to maintain a house and the amount of money which she receives, just one individual in the family, is \$242 a month Canada Pension and their income from social assistance would be no more than \$70 a month, which totals \$3,500 a year. Now, if they have three or four children they will get amounts for those children, but I am talking about one person maintaining a home on about \$320 a month. That is the point I was trying to make. That is the

particular part of the social assistance programme that should be very seriously looked at.

MR. FUREY:

Just a couple of points, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

We generally agree on this side with the thrust of this amendment which increases the statute of limitation from a period of one to three years, for good reason, too. The limitation period was actually too small and this is why I believe the minister was introducing this amendment.

MR. BARRY:

(Inaudible) needed a longer period of time.

MR. FUREY:

Yes, because certain crimes needed a statute of limitation. For example, some of the investigations could go beyond a year. Is that correct?

MR. TOBIN:

They could.

MR. FUREY:

So we agree with the basic thrust of this particular bill, Bill 16, which will amend that and bring into effect a larger statute of limitations.

While we are on the subject of social assistance and what is available for people, perhaps the Premier's Parliamentary Assistant could tell us whether he is speaking on behalf of the minister. Are you?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes.

MR. FUREY:

Yes. Or is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)? I wonder could you tell us, under the Department of Social Services, what is available for young people, - say between the ages of sixteen and eighteen, who are single, young people either living at home or living on their own? Is there some kind of help for young people in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, young people who have no work, who have no source of income, who are in that age category, sixteen to eighteen or nineteen, who (a) either live at home with their parents or (b) are renting or living on their own, whether it be a single person who is a single parent, either male or female, or a single person, either male or female, who is just on their own who are not parents? Is there some sort of assistance in the Province for this particular group of people who seem to be desperately hurting out there because of lack of employment? I wonder would the Premier's Parliamentary Assistant mind responding to that?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Social Services have in place under The Social Assistance Act policies to cover people. If a family is receiving social assistance, obviously those people can be included. I am not sure of

the age they have to be, but they can be added to the family's social assistance as a third adult, which will give them a more significant increase, because the amount allocated for a child is not as great as the amount allocated for an adult. In the case where a family is receiving social assistance, when a child reaches a certain age they can be added on, in some cases, as a third adult. There are cases, Mr. Speaker, in this Province where the Department of Social Services is assisting single individuals.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
I thank the member for his answer, but if I could construct for purposes of clarification a hypothesis, let us assume that I am eighteen years old, that I am single, that I am from the district of St. Barbe, I live in Forresters Point, and I hitchhike from Forresters Point to St. John's in search of work and I am here a few days and my money runs out at the hostel, I have no money and I am struggling to find work, can I, as an eighteen year old single person from the Province of Newfoundland, from the district of St. Barbe, from the town of Forresters Point, go to Social Services and seek help in terms of food, shelter and clothing?

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I have always assumed that the hon. gentleman was about eighteen. But, in any case, as it relates to Social Services, every case is dealt with based on its own merits. There are different circumstances for every case and it depends on the circumstances of the individual involved, it depends on the age, it depends on if the parents have money.

MR. FUREY:  
In that hypothesis, what would be the situation?

MR. TOBIN:  
Every case. I spent ten years as a social worker, and with every individual you see there is probably a different set of circumstances. To give a general answer to that is impossible at this point in time. Every case would be dealt with based on its own merits.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, I thank him for his answer and we can rest assured in the Assembly today, then, that no young Newfoundlander between the ages of fifteen and twenty, who is single, unemployed, has no opportunity for work, nobody will be left out of the social safety net, according to the parameters that we have just heard enunciated by the parliamentary secretary.

I thank him for that, because there is a myth out there that young, single people in this Province cannot be helped under Social Services programmes when they are down and out, flat broke and have no where else to turn.



So that is encouraging.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, to that point, what I said basically is that every case is dealt with on its own merit. In order for somebody to receive Social Assistance, obviously they would have to apply and a proper investigation would have to be conducted. But there is certainly no general answer, 'Yes, everybody will receive social assistance. That is not what I have said. What I have said is that it is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that in the Department of Social Services regulations every individual or every case is based on its merit and dealt with by the social worker.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, in the question put by my colleague from St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) with respect to young people from fifteen to, I believe he said twenty years of age, the parliamentary assistant made the comment that there is a safety net to help these people. I think the amount is something like \$72 a month. Is that correct? Young people under twenty years of age who are unable to find work, living with parents who are recipients of social assistance, I sort of get the impression that the amount is only around \$60 or \$70 a month. If that is the case, I am afraid that is hardly a safety net. That is not enough today to keep a young person in

cigarettes, if he or she smoked.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of anomalies in the social welfare system and I think maybe the time is right for some of them to be brought to the attention of the House. Now I will give you an example. In my district there is a family, the breadwinner has a serious back injury, the person cannot work and never will work, he has a steel hip, I think, and has had all kinds of operations and weird and wonderful things being done to him in the past few years. The mother cannot get a job. They have two children, one seventeen and one nineteen years of age, neither of whom can find work. The lady of the house - and I am giving this because it is typical of a lot of cases that I am running into in my district - managed to get a job under the community development plan, which I think is a good plan, by the way. Subsequently, when the person got enough stamps, then she qualified for UI benefits. In this case, she is receiving \$125 a week, \$250 every two weeks. Now, Mr. Speaker, therein lies the problem.

While that person was receiving social assistance, she had the benefits that go with it, including a drug card. Her husband, who frequently had to go to Gander to have medical examinations undertaken, had his passage paid to and from, any expenses incurred in the process were met by the department because then that family was a legitimate recipient of social assistance. But because that lady had the initiative and the energy to accept a job, thereby enabling her to get unemployment insurance benefits, to come off the rolls of social assistance, the telephone

call today from that person, Mr. Speaker, was soliciting my help because now the husband has got to go to Gander, I think on Friday, to have an examination done to his back. It is going to cost \$80 to get to Gander and back, not to mention the cost of board and lodging should they be delayed overnight. Now, because she is getting unemployment insurance, even though it is only an almost token amount, or not much more than she would have gotten from welfare, that person does not now qualify for assistance from the department to get to Gander and back, as I said, to have a medical examination.

Maybe the parliamentary secretary can comment on that kind of scenario because I am finding, Mr. Speaker, in my district, and Twillingate district is not your average district in that people there do not take welfare only when it is absolutely necessary, and, of course, that is the rule, I guess, in Newfoundland moreso than anything else. I am finding a lot of problems in my district.

For example, one spouse is maybe receiving an old age pension and the other person, who is not old enough to qualify, has been completely cut off, even though maybe they have a lot of financial expenses, medical and other expenses, or yet they cannot qualify for a drug card, they cannot qualify for any kind of assistance.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to belabour the point except to say that I do believe there are a lot of anomalies within the system and I think that sometime, hopefully in the not too distant future, something will be done to put an end to some of these anomalies

because it is hurting a lot of people.

The case I mentioned a moment ago, that I have subsequently referred to the Director of Enquiries, I think is a pretty good example of just how unfair the system is working, certainly in the case that I mentioned and cases like that.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
If the hon. minister speaks now, he closes the debate.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in introducing the bill, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) is unavoidably absent. He is just out of the Province and could not be here today.

Many of the questions that were asked were very specific. I would suggest that the particulars of individual cases might be sent on to the minister. I am sure he will do his best to satisfy those bringing up those particular points on how they should be dealt with.

I might say though that even though there are regulations in place which set out the amount of assistance that is available on a general basis, the Minister of Social Services also has flexibility in terms of funding within his department. I am sure this must arise where there are so many people involved that a particular case cannot always fit into what are general regulations and you cannot build regulations that will possibly suit every

particular case. It was for that very reason that the minister does have flexibility to deal with the unusual circumstances. So there are mechanisms available to deal with urgent matters or peculiar matters or particularly emergency assistance matters.

For instance, the case such as the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) brought up where a young person finds himself in St. John's, separated from his family and out of money, well, that is obviously an emergency situation. You cannot let a person like that die on the streets and there is no intention that they should. The minister does have mechanisms available to him, funding available to him, that will overcome that emergency situation, presumably, in that case, to get the person back to his family on the other side of the Province.

So I think that many of the instances brought up, although no one is saying for a moment that our Social Assistance Programme is something that cannot be improved on. I am sure it can be improved on. If we had the funds available, we would do much better than we are doing. But, nevertheless, I think there are sufficient flexibilities built into the system that no one in this Province need sustain or endure unusual hardship.

So I move the bill.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. minister closed the debate.

MR. EFFORD:

There was no reference made, Mr. Speaker, to the point I put.

MR. SPEAKER:

When I recognized the hon. the Minister of Finance, I said if he spoke now he would close the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. member realizes, this has to come up in Committee again. So if there are certain points he wants to bring up, the minister might well be there by then.

MR. EFFORD:

Yes, but just one quick question.

DR. COLLINS:

Sure, carry on.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

My question concerns the widows and the amount of money that they were receiving, less than \$3,500 a year total income. I asked him would he make some kind of a comment so that possibly there would be something done in the very near future. The Minister of Finance just said there is nobody in the Province enduring any hardship. Believe me, those people are enduring a lot of hardship and they cannot get anymore from social assistance to live on. Do you want to comment

on that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that if there is an individual case that the hon. member is concerned about - and I think he said he was thinking of one particular case - be it a widow or otherwise -

MR. EFFORD:

No, it is all around.

DR. COLLINS:

Well, I think the hon. member is saying that there are not sufficient funds for particular categories in the Social Assistance Programme. I can assure the hon. member that this programme is not under a yearly review, it is almost under daily review and as much as is possible is being done to meet the general circumstances of hardship. But if there are particular cases, particular hardships, the minister has flexibility to meet those particular hardships.

I know what the member is saying but he also did preface his remarks by saying that he is thinking of one case. If there is a case in his mind where there are particular hardships, even though he says there is not enough money generally, and I suppose that is arguable, but he is probably right, I would urge him to bring it to the attention of the minister.

On motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Social Assistance Act, 1977," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 16)

Motion, second of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Marine Institute Act." (Bill No. 19)

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, this is really a very simple amendment. We are in our ongoing efforts to reorganize the post-secondary system and certainly the things that we have done at the Marine Institute. We have found ourselves in a position whereby we wish to appoint more than one Vice-President and in the Act, as it now reads, it is just 'Vice-President'. Basically, this amendment will allow for more than one Vice-President at the Marine Institute. That is really all it is.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, before the debate closes on this Bill I think we should review and consider the adequacy of the existing Marine Institute. We have a new building but, by and large, if I understand the comments that the President made last year correctly, basically that building is just supplying the needs of the various parts of the old Fisheries College that were spread over various parts of the city. If we are going to turn this into a world class institute, if we are going to set that as our objective, set that as our goal, and I think we

can and we should, we have to consider the fact that we are now moving into the computer age, the modern age of fishing as well as many other things. There are fantastic possibilities on the horizon as to what can be done with respect to locating and catching fish, as well as processing them, through new modern technology. Technology is going to have a tremendous impact in the fishing industry as well as in other parts of society, and I am wondering whether in fact funds are being provided to this institute in sufficient quantities to enable it to keep up with changing technology, to enable it to produce graduates who will be trained not for the fishing of the past but for the fishing of the future. Perhaps the minister, in the context of justifying the need for the appointment of more than one Vice-President, could tell us a little bit about how the institute has performed in the brief time that it is operational, since the official opening, and how the minister sees the adequacy of financing, the adequacy of the programmes, I suppose, we should talk about first, and what the plans are for enabling this institute to keep up with changing technological times and to produce graduates who will not find that they have skills acquired which do not permit them to keep up with the new methods of fishing that are now being developed.

I would like the minister to also talk a bit about the fact that we have, I think, very good courses over there such as the course that sees Newfoundland generating first mates, chief engineers and so forth, the Nautical Science programme, particularly. But these individuals are having a tremendously difficult time

getting sea time and in order for them to advance, in order for them to obtain their necessary certificates, they have to have access to adequate sea time to give them the on the job training that is necessary.

We have asked the question to the minister about this some time in the past. Can the minister give us an update as to what is taking place? Have there been any arrangements with private industry or with the Coast Guard or other potential employers where these young men and women can be guaranteed that they will, once they complete the academic portion of their programme, be able to acquire the sea time that they will need in order to get the final certificate, whether it is leading towards first mates or Masters ticket.

Right now there are a lot of people who have a good background, done well in their courses, walking the streets because they are unable to get the sea time necessary to permit them to continue and they cannot even go back to the institute for the next phase of their programme until they have put their time in on the vessels.

MR. SIMMS:

Are you saying this is a fact or a (inaudible)?

MR. BARRY:

No. It is a fact. I have met with young people who are in that position. They have gone as far as they can at the Institute but because they cannot get sea time, they are blocked from proceeding any further in their chosen career. While there may be a market for an individual with a first mates certificate or with a

skippers certificate, a Masters certificate, there is often not a market for the individual who is just part way through the programme. So what is the minister doing and is he aware of this problem and has he looked into the possibility of some special arrangements to deal with this?

I also should say that -

MR. HISCOCK:

Provincial ferries would be one way of getting sea time.

MR. BARRY:

Provincial ferries is one way which might be looked at.

I would ask the minister to also consider - and this applies not just to his responsibilities at the Marine Institute but the university, the vocational schools, the educational system generally and it overlaps into the Minister of Education's (Mr. Hearn) responsibilities - to what extent have we looked at the whole question of computers and developed a consistent approach so that we are not purchasing hardware and software at one institution that is not able to be networked or connected or utilized in another institution?

I might say Breakwater Books have just recently decided to open a software division, an electronic publishing division of their publishing company. They have John Harriot working down there who had significant input into the development of computer programmes and the selection of hardware in Ontario. They have a computer called the Icon which is the computer that the Ontario education system has basically decided is the state of the art

and they have established, I think, in Ontario at the elementary and secondary levels this computer as the one for students to utilize.

I do not know if that one is the one that will meet our needs in this Province. I am impressed by it. I do not know if that is the one that should be carried over into the Marine Institute, into the university, into the vocational schools, but it seems to me that this is an area that a co-ordinated approach needs to be taken. Maybe the work is being done, maybe decisions are being taken with respect to the philosophy of computers, with respect to making sure we have co-ordination in selecting the proper hardware and software programmes. Perhaps this is something the minister might say a few words on in the overall context.

I can say with a great degree of certainty that the fishing master of the very near future in this Province is going to have to be a computer operator. The successful fishing master is going to have to be a person who can read a computer printout and who could input the necessary tide, temperature, wind and other conditions that are going to tell him where the fish is, they are going to tell him where to throw out his gear and when to haul his gear and so forth. I am interested in learning to what extent are we staying on top of the new computer age and to what extent in the matter of detail are we identifying the types of computers that we should be utilizing.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. minister speaks now he

closes the debate.

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, just a few words on points brought up by the Leader of the Opposition. Certainly some of his comments are quite valid as it relates to computing, computation and what is going to be required in the future. He is also right when he says that there is space, we have the \$44 million facility that we opened just recently fairly close to here for the Marine Institute. It is \$44 million building which does not give any additional teaching spaces.

Basically, the old Marine Institute - I forget that very long title that it had down there - had space for a little over 1,000 students, that was down on Parade Street and at some other facilities scattered around the city. The new Marine Institute has training spaces for just about the same number of people. We have not increased the number of students that we can actually take in.

So a lot of that \$44 million has gone into actually physically space, but also an awful lot of it, as the Leader of the Opposition is probably aware of, has gone into new equipment. We have in that Marine Institute state of the art equipment. There is a fish plant, for instance, in the middle of the Marine Institute that is best that there is in Newfoundland. It is a fish plant where you can do all kinds of experimentation; where you can teach anybody from somebody who wants to fillet the fish to somebody who wants to bone fish,

to somebody who wants to prepare new products. It is really a marvellous facility right in the middle of the Marine Institute, this fish plant.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) trawler.

MR. POWER:

It is not a trawler, but you get the fish there and you get the people who - and trawlermen are trained there on how to bring fish in. It is really a model of what -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) a good wharf.

MR. POWER:

They do not have a good wharf. We do have or will have \$6 million or \$7 million flume tank somewhere fairly close in the future, Mr. Speaker, a flume tank that will allow us to do something which really nobody else in North America is doing, which is to experiment with different kinds of fishing gear, different kinds of fishing techniques, different patterns for catching fish and for a whole range of things. The flume tank is certainly going to be a tremendous addition to Canada, because it is the only place in Canada and the only place in North America that this kind of work is going to be done.

We are also looking at one of the problems with sea time. One of the problems with teaching is the fact that sometimes you have to teach everyone by a very practical application, some classroom learning and then practical, hands-on experience. If that was the way that, for instance, national airline pilots were taught, we would have very few pilots who would ever be allowed to get off the ground. What we

are looking at at the marine institute is a \$15 million project to buy a ship handling simulator which basically will do training in simulation; it is the way helicopter pilots learn to fly, it is the way jet pilots learn how to fly. It is a very expensive operation, Mr. Speaker, so expensive that there is neither one in North America like the one that we need here in Newfoundland, with conditions relating to icebergs and the North Atlantic conditions that we have.

So there are a lot of things happening at the Marine Institute which are going to make that institute the very best in the world. Mr. Vardy, the new President up there, has certainly realized that one of the first things he needs in order to implement the new policies of government and the institute and the Board of Governors, is some additional qualified people. That is why this amendment is here. In the old act it just said 'Vice-President'. It was not plural. Now we realize that there are needs to break down the institute into different compartments and put them under the leadership of qualified Vice-Presidents, such things as sea time, the simulators that we are talking about, the flume tank, the computers.

The day is rapidly approaching in post-secondary education in Newfoundland where every single person who does a course past high school, whether it is beauty culture, whether it is plumbing, whether it is a shipmates course at the Marine Institute, is going to have to have a portion of their course be in computer information and computer handling so that they will know how to both put

information in and how to take information from a computer system.

There are going to be developed at the Marine Institute a wide variety of new courses.

One of the main problems at the Marine Institute is, like many of the other post-secondary systems, we have not had adequate systems in place for sabbaticals, for paid leave, for secondments to industry, whereby our educators there can go out and learn and stay in touch with the real world. Certainly in the post-secondary system, at the Marine Institute and in other places, we are going to have to put in place a system whereby the instructors who have been in the education system for ten or fifteen years and did not have the opportunity to re-educate themselves can get out and do a whole range of things.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take up any more time of the House. I know the Leader of the Opposition brought up some queries other than the ones I have responded to. I am sure that in the next few weeks there will be lots of time for us to discuss post-secondary education, because what is happening at the Marine Institute is indicative of what is happening in the whole post-secondary system.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Marine Institute Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 19)

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Provide For Payment Of



Financial Assistance For Students Attending Post-Secondary Educational Institutions." (Bill No. 2)

MR. POWER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. POWER:  
Mr. Speaker, again, in introducing this bill, basically it is a very simple amendment. We have a post-secondary financial student aid system in this Province, but when it was originally done it was very much meant to be post-secondary education, thinking along University lines. In this case here, Mr. Speaker, we are simply amending the act to allow for post-secondary educational institutions to come under the gambit of the student aid system. It just takes out 'the university' and puts in 'all post-secondary institutions'. So basically that is a very simple amendment that we are doing with this piece of legislation.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
What are you talking about now?

MR. SIMMONS:  
We are trying to talk about student aid.

MR. BARRY:  
That is retroactive legislation, is it?

MR. SIMMONS:

No, no.

MR. BARRY:  
Oh, yes.

MR. LUSH:  
What is retroactive about it?

MR. BARRY:  
We cannot support this one. This is section 3 (3), retroactive legislation. The regulations will be made with retroactive effect.

MR. LUSH:  
It is only a loan, is it not? What does it do?

MR. SIMMONS:  
Excuse me. Where are you now?

MR. BARRY:  
Section 3, sub-section 3 of this bill. Section 15, 'Deemed to have come into force on the first day of September, 1983.' Is this a typographical error?

MR. SIMMONS:  
Are you looking at Bill 2?

MR. BARRY:  
Bill 2.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Give me the section again.

MR. BARRY:  
Section 3, subsection 3 - "Regulations may be made with retroactive effect" - and Section 15 are the two sections. This has been on the Order Paper a number of times now and we have given the minister notice that this sort of retroactive legislation is not the way to do things, but as far as the bill itself is concerned, as far as the substance of the bill, there is no problem.

Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

Do you want to make a speech on this?

Mr. Speaker, I was about to say, before my leader said it for me much better, that the explanatory note, both the typed explanatory note and the minister's explanatory note are much too simple. It is just not as simple as he makes it sound. If it just a change of name, it should be called that. We should, first of all, seek the minister's assurance that we can take his explanatory statement at the top of this debate at face value, that it is nothing more than a name change. Alright?

MR. POWER:

(Inaudible) already.

MR. BARRY:

This section should never have been in. You have never had this power to make retroactive regulations or legislation.

MR. POWER:

(Inaudible) student aid available to other post secondary institutions since 1983. It is time somebody put it in and made it legal.

MR. FUREY:

'Patrick' will you control your colleague?

MR. SIMMONS:

The first of two points I wanted to make is that the minister should just review in his own mind the undertaking he gave the House that this was a piece of housekeeping stuff and there is nothing substantive here and there is no hidden monsters here. It is just something to change the name and to regularize. Now that is what I heard him say, that is the

first point.

The second point is, notwithstanding the first one, there are a couple of areas here as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has just given notice that are of concern for us. We have no difficulty with the principle of the bill but we have some difficulty with a couple of items and they occur -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

I say to the gentleman if he - not the earpiece he is using now but the one that looks something like this here - if he had had the volume turned up on this one today, he would have heard the discussion about 2:15 that the leader and I had on this very subject. What I was not aware of -

MR. BARRY:

The volume has gone down (inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

You mean I missed the House?

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, he missed that.

MR. TOBIN:

I got most of it downstairs.

MR. SIMMONS:

What I was not aware of -

MR. TOBIN:

I was there the day you got mad (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

You were there that day were you? Yes. I think you should get

yourself a new glass in that case and you should put something in it the same colour but stronger.

MR. TOBIN:

It was just myself and you together.

MR. SIMMONS:

I still got that note, by the way, from Norway. Alright. I still got that note from Norway and the phone number.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I must explain and apologize to the House that when I got up I was not aware that it was Bill 2 that we were discussing today. We had some concerns about this retroactivity. We voiced them on another bill relating to labour matters earlier but this clause here, showing up, in terms of page number, on the top of page 7, Section 3, subsection 3, "Regulations may be made with retroactive effect." Again, if the minister - and I relate the two points I made - the first point that he is just trying to regularize and if he can give us some assurance and some explanation that that is all he is trying to do in respect to that clause on the top of page 7 and also the provision in clause 15, if it is just to cover, in an administrative way, past events, that is one thing, but if there is some hidden monster in here, something that allows the student to be some how penalized or out-of-pocket after the fact, that is a different issue altogether. We would have to take very strong exception to that.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, I wonder if could?

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We do not want to debate this bill extensively, but we might have to as far as the principle of this, particularly at the top of page 7, which the member was just referring to, Section 3, subsection 3. The last section states, "This Act is deemed to come into force on the first day of September, 1983." Well, you know, we object to retroactive legislation that takes away rights from individuals, but where it is legalizing something that has been given to individuals, the same concerns would not necessarily be there.

However, Section 3, subsection 3, is so broad that that could be read in the future as permitting the minister to make regulations that could take away rights retroactively from students. If the minister were to consider for committee or if we are just trying to regularize with this section regulations that have been made without legislative effect for the past, why does not the minister consider some small amendment to clarify that and narrow down that Section 3, subsection 3 to expedite the process of passage of this bill. We would be prepared, if assured this would be looked at in Committee, to move on, rather than extend on with debate on second reading.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

What this bill is simply doing is legitimizing the fact that we made student aid available to other than the university students back in 1983.

MR. SIMMONS:

Illegally?

MR. BARRY:

No, we did it obviously within the powers of government, but when we look back we see that there are certain things, where a bill was not actually passed -

MR. BARRY:

You want it copper fastened.

MR. POWER:

We want it copper fastened simply because I think there were also some instances that came up whereby some students had not paid back their student loan, and somebody, in their novel way, found that this piece of legislation actually was not passed. Although, in that case, the student involved did realize that he did have a commitment, we realized that the act should have been put in place in 1983 to cover all of the post-secondary institutions that were getting student aid.

Obviously, if the regulation in Section 3 simply says that regulations may be made with retroactive effect, rather than get into a long harangue, Mr. Speaker, in Committee I will check with my officials and if there is

a way of making a simple amendment back to 1983, simply to cover what has already been done, but not to give us power to somewhere in the future to go back retroactively and change it, that will be fine. That was not our intent. Maybe we can change the wording to accommodate the Leader of the Opposition's concerns.

MR. BARRY:

Just to that point of order. I wonder if the minister would clarify? There is no point of order, we all realize, Mr. Speaker. It is a point of expedition. Would not there be, if a student is taking a loan under the understanding that certain conditions applied, including the obligation to repay, would that not be a contract which would be enforceable regardless of whether or not there was statutory authority in place?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

That is obviously what did happen. The matter which the student tried to get out of was a contractual obligation. I am not a lawyer, but I understand the matter was rectified. The student did begin paying his student aid. But rather than have this harangue somewhere in the future again, this is why this amendment was brought up here, to make sure we are covered back from 1983. But again, Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no hesitation in saying we will change the wording if that is the problem to suit exactly what has been done and not to give us power in the future to come back and do the same thing.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, with that undertaking from the minister in terms of Clause 3, 3, we can hold that in abeyance until it comes to the Committee stage and see what he has to offer and make our judgement at that particular time.

There is another concern that we want to raise with the minister and that relates to what I would term the nickle and diming approach to this student aid. Students go out and earn a few bucks during the Summer. They have these amounts deducted from their loans. I suppose if a student were making some kind of a boondoggle that is one thing, but the kinds of dollars they are earning during the Summer are minimal and they usually take care of only the ongoing living expenses. They do not have many dollars left to put aside for education or whatever.

I am wondering why the loan administration is policed to the extent that these students almost become wards of the state. They almost have to answer for every bottle of coke or a bottle or whatever they buy. Surely there is a way to look after the public purse and ensure that the money is well expended without getting into that kind of detail.

Quite apart from the detail, it introduces an uncertainty, it introduces an unknown, in that the student who thought he had X dollars for the next university year finds out at the end of the

Summer that he has got something less than that amount of money. We have a concern that that is being overdone and that the student is placed in a position of some uncertainty as a result. I am wondering if the loan administrators are not just a little bit too zealous on that particular point. That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The other point that perennially comes up has to do with the delays in processing applications. While I have to confess that judging by the fewer number of complaints that are received, it seems to have improved.

MR. POWER:

They bought a computer and solved it.

MR. BARRY:

Yes. It seems to have improved considerably over what it was a couple of years ago. I think it is still important to make sure that we keep in mind that it is just not numbers and impersonal things we are dealing with. We are dealing with young people who often do not have the access to bank loans and financing that more mature adults might have and they are often in very difficult positions if they experience delays in having approval of their loans and getting their finances in place for university.

So I guess all I am saying is to ask the minister to stay on top of his officials and make sure they

treat these young men and women as human beings rather than just as files or cyphers or numbers and keep in mind that it is a human process and a human need that is involved when we have these problems arise with these student aid programmes.

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker, I know this is going to be astounding but I am actually going to speak on the principle of the bill in second reading just as it says you are supposed to do in the political science books. The reason I want to is because there are a number of concerns I have with the whole idea of the grants and the loans that are given to students when they go to post-secondary institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I would say about six or eight years ago, when you had a choice of post-secondary institutions, you had a choice of vocational schools, trade colleges, universities and that was pretty well the gamut of things you could go to, all of which were publicly supported institutions. Today, for a number of reasons, you actually have a much wider variety of choices. Quite frankly, a lot of the choices are private trade schools now, registered under the Trade Schools Act and operating now virtually throughout the Province. They used to be concentrated in St. John's but now, I believe, some are established in Corner Brook and other places as well.

The reason I think it is important

that we look at that is because the student loans and the grants that we have are geared to a large extent to the old system that we had which was the publicly funded institutions. To give you an idea, the Bay St. George Community College that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker, is it possible -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:  
The Bay St. George Community College, which I had the pleasure of teaching in for fourteen years. By the way, one of our pages is one of our former students from the college.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Pardon!

MR. FENWICK:  
One of our pages here is a former student of the Bay St. George Community College. Mr. Speaker, the Bay St. George Community College charges something like \$220 a semester for tuition, in other words, a total of \$440 a year. You can take courses there for that amount of tuition but, if you were to go to one of the private colleges, such as the ones that exist here in St. John's, instead of \$440 a year in tuition, you would be facing something like \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year in tuition. In other words, something like eight to ten times as much on tuition fees.

What is happening is our Student Loans Programme, which is designed for the community college and the universities and other

institutions that are heavily publicly supported, and should be publicly supported, I might add, is designed for these institutions but students are now using them to go to these private colleges. When they borrow money the limits that they are allowed to borrow and the grants that they get are designed with the public institutions in mind rather than these private ones.

So what we have are students who go to Keyin Tech, for example, Newfoundland Career Academy, Karen Hall Careers or any one of these institutions, they go there; get a bill for maybe \$3000 or \$4000 in tuition; borrow and get their grants and find that the grants sometimes do not even cover the tuition costs, let alone leave them any money whatsoever to live on over that time period. So, Mr. Speaker, we have a major problem with those institutions.

To tell you the truth, I am not overly enthusiastic about private trade schools because I believe, for one thing, we have not very well supervised them in the past and we are not sure of the quality of the institutions at this point. I also feel that we are, as a Province, abdicating a lot of our responsibility towards the education of our young people by allowing these private colleges to charge such a large amount. Now, I am not sure what the solution is and I will be interested to listen to the minister to see if he has thought about the problem and has some particular solutions to it.

The solutions, by the way, sound to be quite complicated because if you say that a person going to Karen Hall Careers, for example, needs \$3,000 or \$4,000 in tuition and another couple of thousand

dollars to live, in others words, needs \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year and somebody going to -

MR. TOBIN:

What course is three or four thousand a year?

MR. FENWICK:

An ordinary Keyin course at Keyin Tech costs between \$3,000 and \$4,000 a year in tuition.

MR. DINN:

The highest one at the Career Academy is \$1,800.

MR. FENWICK:

If the minister wishes to address that, I can also tell you -

MR. POWER:

Some of them run as much as \$7,000.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes. I have seen some, for example, electronics courses, where the tuition is something like \$7,000 to \$8,000 a year. So there is an enormous amount of money required for that. But it seems to me that this programme we have got, which puts everybody in the same category, does not respond to the needs of these people in the private colleges.

Now I am not suggesting that we drive these people further into debt because I think that is probably one of the worse things we could do about it. Other than offering enough places in our publicly funded institutions, I do not know a way around it. But that, to me, of course, is the ideal solution. That is the way that I would like to get around it and not have any particular market for the private colleges. But I think there is a major problem there and what it means is that we

will have students graduating from these private colleges with enormously larger debts or we have students at these colleges who borrow the money to pay the tuition and they have been there a couple of months and find they no longer have enough money to live on and therefore have to drop out of the courses and look for work and end up incurring the debt that everybody else has but at the same time not even getting the training that would enable them to bring down the good jobs that they need in order to pay it off.

In looking at the bill I am amazed to think that this actually seems to be right on the topic of the bill, which is the change from public institutions to private colleges and other supposed secondary institutions, allowing students being allowed to borrow money under it. But I think that there is that problem there. I would really like to hear what the minister has as a set of solutions for the particular problem.

My suggestion, by the way, would be to increase the number of publicly funded institutions and places in them so that the demand for the private colleges would decrease substantially. I think that that legitimately is our obligation as a society in terms of educating our people but there may be another approach that the minister has which is more consistent with the allowing of these private institutions. I await his comment.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of comments in the time that we have left. On the student aid business, and the Leader of the Opposition mentioned in particular the fact that student aid appears, as all of us as politicians, we appear to get less complaints in the last little while about student aid processing. That is due in part to the fact - I suppose the minister would like to take credit for everything good that happens in the world. I did find when the department was put there solely involved with post-secondary that that was a very large area of concern. We put some extra staff there and we have also now put in a computer system there which makes it very efficient. Most of the students can find out within a couple of weeks or so from the time that they apply just exactly what student aid is available to them. That does not take away from the fact that we are still going to get a large number of criticisms. We may improve the time.

We have tried to keep in place in this year's budget the best student aid system in Canada whereby we did not force our students to borrow any more than the \$900 that we now require them to borrow, whereas in places like New Brunswick I believe it is \$1,500 and it gets worse as you go through Central Canada and West. We did try to keep that in place and I guess that is part of the problem mentioned by the member for Menihek.

We spent this year, I think, about \$181 million gross on post-secondary education in this Province. That is a tremendous subsidy from all the taxpayers of Newfoundland into post secondary



education. Some of that goes directly in the form of student aid, some of it goes in the form of paying a light bill or paying a janitor or a faculty person but it is tremendous amount of subsidy for persons to get a post secondary education in a government institution.

Because we do it that way, it makes it very difficult for us to increase student aid to the point where we can deal with the private school syndrome that the member identifies now where the courses do cost much, much more than they do in the public system.

I honestly do not have a solution for that. We could, I suppose, take money from another part of the post secondary system and give a higher subsidy to the students to go to private institutes. I think the answer is in part what the member, who is very knowledgeable in this area, is aware of, it is to make our own post secondary public system so good and make courses so available that we will then not have to be able to have so many students and so many of these new private schools going up.

I think you will find that over the next few months and over the next couple of years, in particular, I think you will find that our post secondary system does lean in that direction, that the new organization that we will probably put in place, the new amounts of money that we will allocate to it will mean that we will have better equipment, better trained faculty, better trained staff and by doing that you will reduce, at least, the amount of demand that there will be for private schools. Albeit that as long as the private schools can

access federal funds for training means, then there is going to be a number of them who will stay in business for that purpose.

I am not sure what other points were brought up, Mr. Speaker, on this business but the student aid obviously, the regulations that we are trying to do here, the small problem with the retroactive part, we will discuss in Committee. I will bring it back. We will gladly deal with it because the bill is, as I said it is. If the wording is different than it should be, then we will gladly change it. As it relates to the student aid system itself, we will try and keep it in place as best we can, albeit we would love to give every student in Newfoundland a perfectly free education but at cost now of \$151 million net, I believe, it is a very expensive system for the citizens of Newfoundland and for the citizens of Canada, who also contribute to that part of post secondary.

Without further explanation, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. POWER:  
Sure.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
I thank the minister for yielding. Just a quick question in reference to one of his latter statements there. Do I interpret that he identifies with the view of the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) that there ought not to be a place for those private schools?

MR. POWER:

No. No, I do not agree if the member for Menihek thinks that the only means of post secondary schooling should be public and heavily subsidized schools. I think there is a place in post secondary for a private school system whereby a student chooses, because of a whole range of reasons, to go to a private system and by so doing - I do not like the idea of them being forced to go because our public system is not efficient or does not offer the right kind of courses. That is what we are trying to rectify in our own shop - but certainly there is a place for private schools in the Province if someone chooses to go there and take on that extra financial burden, then I do not disagree with that.

What I have found is that one of the great incentives to really spruce up the public post secondary system is the fact that the private schools in certain areas are quite good and we are losing some of the best students graduating from high school to private schools because they do not think that our courses are as good.

It has given us a little bit of extra competition, if you want, and made us reassess and re-evaluate our post secondary part of the system. I think that is for the betterment of all. So there is a place for both public post secondary and private but certainly our government's intention is to continue that very large subsidy of \$150 million plus into post secondary education in Newfoundland to make it as good as we can. The student aid system is one important component in that.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I move

second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Payment Of Financial Assistance To Students Attending Post-Secondary Educational Institutions", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 2).

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 17, Bill No. 26. That is the Reciprocal Recognition And Enforcement Of Judgements Act. Let us get that one through.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

I take pleasure in introducing Bill No. 26, which has rather a long title, "An Act To Implement The Convention Between Canada And The United Kingdom Of Great Britain And Northern Ireland Providing For The Reciprocal Recognition And Enforcement Of Judgements In Civil And Commercial Matters".

The title really explains the principle of the bill. There had been measures brought in by different jurisdictions in recent years to provide for court judgments made in one jurisdiction which may affect people changing residence from one jurisdiction to another or with dual residency, so that the judgments may be registered in a second or third jurisdiction and enforced by the parties affected in those other places.

A convention has been agreed to by the Governments of Canada and the United Kingdom. This proposed

legislation is a model act worked out by officials of all the Canadian jurisdictions, and is to be brought in by all the provincial Legislatures, providing for implementation of the convention so that, on the one hand, court judgments from the U.K. may be registered in Newfoundland, should any party to such a judgment be in this Province, or vice versa.

With these comments, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

MR. BARRY:

Would the minister indicate if it will apply retroactively to judgments that are already in place? Once this is passed it will only be for future judgments, will it?

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

I think it only applies to judgments in the future. Perhaps we could come back to that when we get to Committee of the Whole, and I will check and give exact information then.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

It is a fairly significant piece of legislation, in that it will now mean that individuals give up their right to defend an action, for example, if there has been a judgment obtained against them in another jurisdiction, in the

United Kingdom or in Northern Ireland jurisdictions. But that is not necessarily a hardship with today's modern travel, and so forth. The fact that we do have people moving, on vacation and for business, into other jurisdictions, it is not uncommon for there to be a motor vehicle accident or some other matter that requires litigation in one jurisdiction or another. This will be a reciprocal thing, and presumably there will be recognition of Canadian judgments in the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland as a result, and reciprocity is usually a pretty fair approach to take and, on balance, this is something that I think can be agreed to by all members of the House. It is an attempt to break down the barriers of borders that make things inefficient from time to time.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aaah!

MR. FENWICK:

It is only by way of a few questions on it. If you wish, I can adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes, boy.

MR. SPEAKER:

All right.

MR. FENWICK:

I will adjourn the debate.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m.

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