



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 29

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

10 April 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, before the recent recession, the unemployment rate in Newfoundland and Labrador was the highest in the nation, and still is. The recession itself hit us harder and longer than any other province in the nation. The result was two-fold - an enlarged unemployment rate and a reduced tax base. In a Province such as ours with its small private sector, this puts the onus on a financially strapped provincial government to take the lead in job creation. This is no easy task, but we have shown, I think, and will continue to show a strong determination to maximize job creation activities using the limited financial resources available to us.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that government has been able to sponsor job creation by attracting investment into this Province. Many, many hundreds of jobs were saved a couple of years ago in Western Newfoundland when this government managed to attract the Kruger company to take over the ailing Bowater paper mill in Corner Brook. Many, many thousands of jobs were saved through the highly successful restructuring of the deep-sea fishery. Many major industries in

certain jurisdictions never recovered from the devastation of the recession, but in our case, our forest industry and our fishing industry emerged from the recession in better shape than ever. And, Mr. Speaker, if I might be so bold, this turn of events came about in no small part because of the hard work and dedication of the administration which I lead.

Mr. Speaker, more recently government has supported the establishment of the Hope Brook gold mine on the Southwest Coast of our Province, creating 526 jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
We helped the Minworth Company reactivate the flourspar mine at St. Lawrence, creating another 100 jobs. And, Mr. Speaker, we should not forget the miraculous turnaround of a sad piece of our industrial history at Come By Chance. This government was successful in enticing U.S. investors to rehabilitate and reopen the refinery at Come By Chance without any money from the taxpayers of this Province. This project is proceeding on schedule, Mr. Speaker, and today there are 300 people working at that site.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
This government is making progress, Mr. Speaker. At Hope Brook, St. Lawrence and Come By Chance we have created nearly 1000 direct jobs so far and greatly strengthened the economies in those local areas.

But, as I mentioned earlier, our

private sector is not strong. The three projects just mentioned involved bringing in outside money. The provincial government, too, in the Throne Speech and the Budget has highlighted its determination to play an active role in direct job creation.

Ministers have stood in their places in this hon. House of late and announced forestry projects creating 224 jobs, park projects creating 177 jobs, fishery projects creating 373 jobs. We have committed \$144,000 to create thirty-two jobs in Red Bay to sponsor further tourism in that area of Labrador. These are not only job creation initiatives, Mr. Speaker, these projects are investments in the future growth and development of our forest, fishing and tourism industries. Unlike many of the old Canada Works Projects, the 774 jobs created by these initiatives will have long-term beneficial effects on our economy.

Also in the area of public sector initiatives, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to sign last week a \$21 million agreement with the federal government to sponsor the construction of seven F.P.I. trawlers at Marystown, resulting in the creation of 206 jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yesterday the Minister of Energy, the hon. gentleman to my right, announced projects at Holyrood and Paradise River that will see a public expenditure of \$39 million and the creation of 150 jobs.

Not counting the many thousands of jobs relating to Kruger and F.P.I. mentioned at the beginning of this

statement, I have just mentioned projects - not counting F.P.I. and not counting Kruger - that will create approximately 2100 new jobs in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
These are jobs that are valuable in their own right and at the same time make a contribution to the longer term viability of our economy. I also look forward to our private sector taking advantage of our offer to pay 50 per cent of the wages of new employees. Sufficient monies have been provided in the budget to sponsor under this programme an additional 2,400 new jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
What I have just outlined, Mr. Speaker, are initiatives of a provincial government that is, with its limited resources, creating new jobs directly and also offering a variety of programmes to stimulate our private sector. We are putting our best foot forward, and with the additional help from the federal government in such areas as transfer payments, Labrador Hydro and Hibernia, I am optimistic that better years lie ahead for our Province.

Mr. Speaker, let me summarize:

Jobs already created through Hope Brook Gold Mine 526, St. Lawrence mines 100, and Come By Chance 300. That gives a total of 926.

Our new job programme for this year, which is still not completed, there will be other

announcements next week and the week after, but the ones that have been announced to date include: Forestry Projects 224 jobs, Park Projects 177 jobs, Fishery Projects 373 jobs, Marystown Shipyard Trawler Programme 206 jobs, Holyrood Generating Station upgrading fifty jobs, Paradise River Hydro Project 100 jobs, Red Bay Archaeological Project thirty-two jobs, for a complete total of 926 plus 1,162, for a grand total of 2,088 jobs so far, and there are more to come. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
We are going to have to import labour.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:
Where are you going for Easter?

MR. PEACH:
Were you talking to the Mayor of South Brook this morning? Did you have your radio on?

MR. SIMMONS:
I see the gentleman for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) has entered the debate with his usual wit.

Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase the Premier rather concisely and accurately, I am whistling past the graveyard.

MR. PATTERSON:

I hope you are going to the graveyard.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
That essentially is what the Premier has said this morning in a lot more words. Mr. Speaker, I submit it is not an issue he ought to be drawing attention to, the employment record of his administration. In 1985, after having been the Premier of this Province for six years, he went to the people of Newfoundland for permission to create some jobs.

MR. CALLAN:
That is right.

MR. SIMMONS:
A mandate he wanted to create jobs.

MR. DINN:
He got it, too. He got his mandate.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
I know the gentleman for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) does not like it, but he should listen just for a moment.

MR. DINN:
I listened to you last night and it was a bunch of bull then.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Thank you, gentlemen, I thought I did well. Thank you. That was at the NTA function. But now here in the House we want to say a couple of things about Daniel's Harbour. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the shouting could subside for a moment while

we focus on the real tragedy that is Daniel's Harbour. What we are talking there is not cold figures, we are talking about 165 men and their families whose lives are disrupted, who next week will have their unemployment insurance run out.

MR. DINN:

Just waiting for a promotion (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I understand he gets defensive, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:

You are waiting for a promotion (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member right down at the far end if he would please keep quiet while the member is commenting on the Ministerial Statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

We know he is waiting, Mr. Speaker, but the people in Daniel's Harbour found yesterday that waiting chits do not buy many groceries at the local store. Minworth, what a charade! Minworth, tell me about it! Tell me! I was there and I know very well that but for the initiative of a former federal Liberal Administration Minworth would still be back in England.

MR. WINDSOR:

We had to lead them by the hand. Tell them what to do every step.

MR. SIMMONS:

Again, the gentlemen for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) and I have some knowledge of this affair. I went down into the mines of Minworth in Northern England and met with them.

MR. WINDSOR:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I met with them and we were able to provide some money for them. But all I am saying to the Premier is that when you get up with this whole business that, I created this and I did this, first of all, people are not buying it and secondly, it undermines your own credibility on the larger issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, talking about fisheries restructuring, there is another great initiative of this government.

The member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) is not in his seat at the moment and the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is not here, but they will recall better than most the pain and the agony that the people of Grand Bank and Fortune, in particular, went through from August 1982 until November 1982 - initially from April but then the plants were closed in August and then through September - agony really extending over a five to six month period during which time there was an application sitting on the desk of some minister here in the government for funding to help keep that old Lake operation going. You will recall that they wanted \$25 million or \$30 million, and after five months this government said no. In November,

they said no to the people whose plants had been closed for several months. Then they came to Ottawa. Mr. Spencer Lake came into my office and twenty-eight days after he entered my office, Mr. LeBlanc and I were in St. John's announcing a package to keep Grand Bank and Fortune going.

Now, if you are going to talk about restructuring and who gets the credit, let us not forget it was this Premier who said on National television 'some fish plants will have to close.' That is not his line today, and I have some concern, Mr. Speaker, about people who get up willy-nilly and say one thing one day when it suits their convenience, and the direct opposite another time when it equally suits their convenience.

Mr. Speaker, Come By Chance was another one of his items that he cited this morning as an achievement. If I were he, I would stay far from that, too. He was the person who wanted to dismantle Come By Chance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Not true.

MR. SIMMONS:
Not true now? He wanted to dismantle Come By Chance. They said it was impossible for a refinery to succeed at Come By Chance. The public of Newfoundland know that, they heard it on the radio many times. How did Mr. Brown and company find Come By Chance? As the result of a thorough search by this government? Yes, they read it in the Boston paper. They said so themselves. So much for the investment searching of this government and the globe trotting of my good friend from - where is he from? -

MR. FUREY:
Who cares?

MR. TULK:
St. John's West.

MR. SIMMONS:
St. John's West, Hong Kong and Vancouver. It is good to have you back temporarily.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the real issue here is the devastating out-migration.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. SIMMONS:
Could I have just a moment to finish?

The devastating out-migration, the 44 per cent youth unemployment, that is the record of this administration.

Thank you.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is interesting to see the Premier close the session before we go into Easter break by coming in and singing alleluiah for announcements that we have already seen. There is nothing new in the statement that the Premier has made today. He ran through some so-called successes that were also brought out in the Throne Speech, and then he covered announcements that have been made by ministers

in the last couple of days and in the last couple of weeks.

What we have is the Premier trying to total up jobs to address the question that is on most people's minds in this Province, a question that will not go away for some time yet, which has to do with the promise of 40,000 jobs. The totals the Premier has put in front of us today will show that he and his government have a long way to go to meet the promises they made over the last three elections to the people of this Province.

The projects that he refers to in Hope Brook, in St. Lawrence and Come By Chance, each of these three major industrial projects have their labour problems, all of them represent a symbol of this government being unable to come to terms with labour relations in this Province. In particular, the Come By Chance fiasco that is unfolding, with workers being forced to continue to protest and picket at the site, shows that this is another example of the government making, with a wink and a nod, a deal with private, secret, hidden overseas investors to come into the Province, while, in the meantime, the workers of this Province are being sold down the tubes. That is hardly a success. The kind of disrespect that is being shown for the union movement in this Province, the attempt by this Province to de-unionize the work force in this Province is an issue that this government is going to have to confront for some time yet to come.

The other projects that are listed in the second part of the sub-total are all short-term. The Premier says that this will have good long-term implications for

our economy but it says nothing about what it is doing for the people who are waiting for Summer projects, for students, for workers who are waiting for an announcement by the minister to go to work on fisheries projects, painting wharves or on parks, working on environment in the parks. They are short-term, with low paying wages. People then have to wait to go back on UIC with low wages, they are going to have incredibly small amounts being paid to them in the UIC cheques.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LONG:

The Premier has to address what is happening to the people who are unemployed and the people who are waiting for these announcements.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

At this stage I would like to welcome to the galleries fifty-five students from Fatima High School in St. Bride's, St. Mary's - The Capes, accompanied by their teachers, Hubert McGrath and Melvin Critch.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome thirty Grade VII students with their teacher, Gordon Hicks, from Mount Pearl Junior High School.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier. It relates to yesterday's Supreme Court decision relating to collective bargaining and the right to strike, and to what extent the Charter of Rights has implications for these matters. In particular, I wonder would the Premier - I realize, like I and like other hon. members, he heard the news when we did and he has probably not had a lot of time to cogitate on it - give us the benefit of his thinking on the issue of what happens now in terms of the many concessions, the many benefits, that have been won over the years by people under collective bargaining agreements? More to the point - and this is really my question - what steps would he contemplate taking, as the head of an administration, to help ensure that an alternate security guarantee is built in so as not to have those many benefits and packages undermined by the ruling of yesterday?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question and his recognition that neither he nor I have had an opportunity to look at the decision in detail. As a matter of fact, we do not have the decision per se. Our Justice Department, through the hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge), was on to Ottawa yesterday evening, and some of the agents we

have who worked with us over the years on the Supreme Court of Canada decisions and the like, have, over the phone, given us some information.

I think, from our own provincial perspective, that whilst the decisions relating to the Public Service Alliance of Canada reference, as it relates to the Alberta reference, as it relates to the Saskatchewan reference - there were three references and three decisions based upon one from the Public Service Alliance of Canada, one coming out of legislation in Alberta, and another coming out of legislation in Saskatchewan - the decision says there is no constitutional guarantee under I think it is 2D, Freedom of Association, which was what was argued. The equality section was not argued because it was not in force at the time the matter went to court. There may be avenues that some of the people who brought these matters to court can argue under the Equality Section later in subsequent litigation. I think we have to be clear that in all three cases the arguments put forward by the groups that were supporting the Public Service Alliance, the other unions and other groups who are arguing against the legislation in Saskatchewan and Alberta, were arguing from the Freedom of Association provision and not from the equality provision, and therefore, there may be the opportunity to argue from different grounds later which have the potential to result in a different decision. So I think we should be clear that the arguments that were put forward were put forward under that provision of the Constitution. Now, after having said that, the decision that there is no constitutional

guarantee in the Constitution right now as it relates to the right to strike -

MR. FLIGHT:

You are making a speech.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am trying to be as fair as I can here. - and collective bargaining from our own position, we do not intend, because there is no constitutional guarantee, to turn back the clock, and the rights we have guaranteed through our laws in this Legislature will continue to apply from our particular perspective. We have no intention of turning back the clock but to continue on to ensure that what has already been won, if you will, or provided to the labour movement in this Province, will continue to be the approach that we will take in the future.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

I was deliberately keeping my question quite short because I would hope that we could have just a brief exchange with the understanding that the Premier would want to contemplate the matter and maybe raise it at another time. My supplementary is simply this: In the light of yesterday's events with the Supreme Court will he now take the opportunity to reassure the workers who are involved in government agreements in the public service sector, that yesterday's decision will in no way impair, denigrate, substract from or undo these agreements in any way?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I answered that in a previous question, Mr. Speaker. May I just say to the Leader of the Opposition that whilst his question may have been brief, brief questions do not necessarily demand brief answers. Sometimes a very brief question can be fully loaded and take a longer time to answer the question that to pose the question. But, having said that, as I said in the previous answer we assure those people in the labour movement, and other people who are concerned about this issue, that we have no intention of turning the clock back from where we are now as it relates to the whole question of the labour laws that we have in place in this Province.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Premier, as always, for his instruction on the matter of why questions and answers get long sometimes. I suggest to him that sometimes the restraint of the individual giving the answer could be a factor in its length too.

Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is this, though, because I want to get to the substance of the issue: Given the record of this government in labour relations, which, to be kind, is less than perfect, does the Premier now see the need, following yesterday's decision of the Supreme Court, to speak out in

a conciliatory way with a view to reaching a new accord with the public service unions in this Province, to set a new tone, a tone based on mutual trust, a tone whose objective is to improve the lot of people who are involved in the public service unions?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we think that we are doing that every day in our negotiations. We do not agree with the Leader of the Opposition that we have been the primary cause of labour relations strife in this Province. We have a responsibility to all the people of the Province, and within that context we will do all we can to ensure that the workers, who are unionized, are treated fairly, squarely, and rightly, and that their lot is improved over time.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. It concerns Newfoundland Energy Limited. It concerns, again, the principle of the public of this Province having the right to know who the shareholders of that company are, especially since the property being passed over is theirs. I want to say to the Premier that Newfoundland Energy Limited is still, as far as Newfoundlanders are concerned, in the hands of anonymous, unknown shareholders.

The Premier told us two days ago that all of the shareholders are Americans except two. I think he

pointed out, and Hansard will bear me out on this, that one shareholder is British and a lawyer, and the other lawyer is a Bermudian. As the Premier well knows these lawyers, whose names appear on the share list of companies, are not always the beneficiaries, the people who benefit from the investment that is obviously necessary for the reactivation of Come By Chance. Having said that two days ago, I ask the Premier would he now tell the Newfoundland people, who are entitled to know - forget who the people are, supposing they are Mr. Joe Blow or Mr. Dick Young, or whoever it is - who these lawyers are, if he would now tell us in this Legislature just who the two lawyers, who are not Americans - one is British, I think he said, by birth, not necessarily by where he lives, and the other one is Bermudian - in view of the fact that this company is registered in Bermuda, just who those two shareholders are?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland Energy Limited is a private company, and the member for Fogo will have to go to that private company if he wishes to get that information.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The company is a private company and it is receiving public property and public dollars from this Province, and that is the principle on which the Premier has

to stand. And as the person responsible for handling the Premier cannot duck out by just making that -

MR. MORGAN:

It is a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier does he feel that he can duck out from under his responsibility of telling the people of this Province who he is passing over their property to and where he is spending their money by saying that this is a private company? I would ask him once again to quit being as arrogant and as stubborn about this as he appears to be now, and to tell the people of Newfoundland just who the beneficiaries are and, if he does not know, will he find out?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the member opposite was on a supplementary which is suppose to be a very brief thing. He got into an argument. He made accusations during what was supposed to be a very brief supplementary. So he is totally out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I would like to point out to the hon. member that he seems to be asking a question, then gets into comments and then gets back to asking a question and then gets back into comments. So perhaps

the hon. the member would just simply ask a question and that would deal with the point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier, and the Premier knows full well what I am talking about, if he does not know - at one point he said he does not know, he just knows they are lawyers but apparently he does not know their names - would he now conduct an investigation into who those people are, who, perhaps, they represent, and then inform the Newfoundland public, as they have the right to know where he is spending their money?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we have no money in Newfoundland Energy Limited. It is a private corporation. If the hon. member wants to get that information he should go to the private corporation. It is not a government corporation, therefore, he should go there, like any other citizen.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, as I said to him, cannot slither out from under by saying that it is a private company. He just gave \$135,000 to DOR Chemical. Now I would ask him once again, is he going to table the information or is he going to sit there and say nothing, pretend that there is

nothing going on here? Would he now tell us that there is not a cover-up and will he now tell us the names of those two lawyers and the people who are going to benefit from those two lawyers' names being on that share list? I know his answer will probably be no, but I say to him it is not the right answer to that question.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have already answered that question three times, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), who has indicated very recently that his department will be bringing forward legislation governing ambulances, dealing with The Ambulance Act. I would like to ask the minister can we expect that legislation in this session of the House?

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

We are preparing legislation. I cannot give a date or a time.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

The reason I bring this as an urgent matter is there is a news report this morning that says that members of the Newfoundland Private Ambulances Operators Association are threatening to withdraw services because they have gotten no response from this government on a number of serious concerns that have been brought forward. Is the minister aware of the intended action by the Private Operators Association? What does he intend to do about it?

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, I am aware.

MR. LONG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The concerns that are being brought forward have to do with the lack of a trained attendant accompanying drivers in the ambulances, the lack of training, and the lack of radio facilities. There is a serious problem.

I would like to ask the minister what is the minister doing to deal with the lack of facilities and the lack of training of ambulance operators who are on the roads in this Province, and the threat to the safety of the people of this

Province? What is the minister doing right now?

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. TWOMEY:
The Ambulance Act is being reviewed by the department and he will hear in due course.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett). Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services yesterday acknowledged that there is overcrowding at the Boys' Home in Whitbourne. He also admitted that he has allowed this serious situation to take place over some time. Even more seriously, he has admitted that in doing so he has contravened fire regulations. Will the minister now tell this House why he has persisted so long in breaking the law?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I answered that question three times yesterday here in the House and I have no intention of repeating it again this morning.

MR. EFFORD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services has to answer the question on why he has persisted so long in breaking the law. He clearly admitted yesterday, twice in the House of Assembly, that he broke the law and the people of this Province want to know why he has persisted so long in doing it.

The next question, Mr. Speaker, is will the minister after admitting breaking the law, now do something about the overcrowding of the Boys' Home and immediately set up temporary residences for those boys there before something serious happens and before there is a loss of life?

MR. REID:
Do you want some contracts to build some?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I did not admit to breaking the law. I told the House three times yesterday exactly what the government is trying to do to alleviate the overcrowding situation that we have in our two correctional centers.

MR. EFFORD:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Minister of Justice. This is a serious problem that is going on

in the Boys' Home in Whitbourne. The fire regulations are clearly being broken and the minister knows full well what is taking place. I will ask the Minister of Justice - she is the Minister of Justice and she will have to take the responsibility if anything serious happens - will she immediately insist upon the Minister of Social Services doing something about this before there is a dangerous precedent set?

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to insist for any minister to do anything. I have no information that any fire regulations are being broken, but I will have the Fire Commissioner look into the situation.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. The Premier, this week, Mr. Speaker, compared Newfoundland Energy to Ayre's, Lundrigans, I believe, and Bowring's, Newfoundland companies. I want to tell the Premier these are all companies that are located and set up in Newfoundland. Why is it that Newfoundland Energy has decided to set up in Bermuda?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
That is a corporate decision. It is a private corporation. The hon. member will have to address

his question to that private corporation.

MR. FUREY:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
This is a private corporation, Mr. Speaker, that has over \$100 million of public assets, that has been given first call on Hibernia. Now will the Premier - he told us he knows who Newfoundland Energy is - table in this House who are the shareholders of that company that has first call on our birthright at Hibernia?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, that question is out of order. It is repetitive and under the Standing Orders it has been already answered a number of times. The question is out of order.

MR. FUREY:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary.

MR. FUREY:
Is the Premier telling the people of Newfoundland that it is out of order for them to know who has first call on Hibernia?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I am telling the hon. the member, through you, Mr. Speaker, that he does not know the

rules of the House.

MR. FUREY:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. He cannot weasle out -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio-Bell Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier I think confirmed that there was a repayment of monies to DOR Chemical for what they had expended on mothballing the oil refinery for the month of July, I believe, but I am not sure of the exact month. Would the Premier indicate whether in fact he was correct when he said there was a prior agreement in place that that money would be repaid to DOR Chemical?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I will have to get the exact wording of the agreement that we entered into, but we felt we had an obligation to DOR because they had been putting their best foot forward with us to absorb the costs of mothballing while we were still negotiating with them. So I am not sure whether in fact there was an exact legal provision in the agreements that we had with DOR - I would have to check that out before I make a definitive statement on it.

But the bottom line is, in trying to answer the hon. member's question without the specifics of the wording there, we felt that there was some obligation given that DOR was co-operating with the government in financially incurring the cost of mothballing while we were still negotiating with them in the hope that we could reach an agreement with them.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier if he would check his words that were given in this House of Assembly a few days ago when he said there was a payment under an agreement with DOR. Those were the words used, 'under an agreement,' not just an obligation. I would ask the Premier whether in fact the obligation did not arise because his administration was not acting in good faith at the time, that while DOR was mothballing they were out negotiating with another company. Is that not in fact the case?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We informed DOR immediately when we started to talk to Newfoundland Energy and Cumberland Farms Limited. The agreement I referred to was an agreement between DOR and the government to share in the mothballing costs.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

Did the Premier receive a letter or other communication from DOR Chemicals objecting to the lack of good faith in these negotiations, objecting to the fact that government had been negotiating with other parties while DOR was engaged in the expense of mothballing and expending considerable money in putting forward a proposal for government? And will the Premier agree to table the contents of all such letters or communications?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know if I will or not, Mr. Speaker. I will have to take that question under advisement. I think we started talking to Cumberland after both parties had expended the money on mothballing for the period under consideration here, the mothballing that was for July or August. I am not sure which month, so I will have to check that out. But it was after that time that we began talks with Newfoundland Energy and Cumberland Farms, and we informed DOR of that. DOR had had the opportunity from 1984 until well up into August - September, 1986, of negotiating, and they were the only company who were negotiating with us. They had almost two full years of negotiating, and that led to the point, as I said the other day, where DOR's final position was that they wanted \$58 million in soft loans, meaning that they needed a subsidized interest rate

on those loans that government would have to pay for, plus an \$18 million grant, and, I think, a rehabilitation cost which was far higher than what Newfoundland Energy proposed, and besides which Newfoundland Energy did not want any money from government. I will check on the question of documents.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier, does Newfoundland Energy have first call on Hibernia oil on the offshore? I would like to know that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, I think the hon. member should read the Atlantic Accord. Obviously he has not looked very closely at the Atlantic Accord.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I will ask the question again.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I just want to hear it, yes or no. I cannot read, so tell me, yes or so. Do they have first call or not?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is a repetition.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is quite an

admission by the hon. member for Stephenville. I hope all his constituents have heard that admission by the hon. member for Stephenville, that there are members of the Liberal Opposition who really are illiterate. I think that is a terrible admission by the member for Stephenville. Now I understand why he has not done all he could do to try to get the Sea Cadet base in Stephenville, because somebody who cannot read it going to have great difficulty in proceeding through the system to try to get that very valuable benefit for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

You wish. A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Would the Premier then tell us where the management and control is now concerning Come By Chance oil refinery with this government that he supposedly has fought for so long?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The question is where is the management and control. The management and control is with Newfoundland Energy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

And where is Newfoundland Energy?

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

My question is for the hon. the Premier as well. This Newfoundland Energy is creating a lot of confusion around the Province. My question to the Premier is - and I am not going to give him anywhere to skate around - Does the Premier know who the shareholders are and is refusing to say, or is the Premier kept in the dark like the rest of us?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The confusion is in the Liberal Opposition. There are three or four leaders over there - a House Leader, a leader in-House and a leader out-House, Mr. Speaker, over with the hon. members opposite. There is no confusion. We are very proud of what we were able to accomplish. We have been able to attract new investment to the Province, we have been able to reactivate the refinery and have upwards of 300 people working out there today who would not have been working otherwise, making anywhere from \$10.50 to \$16.50 an hour, as I understand it. The people out there are very happy with what is going on. The Liberal Opposition are very disappointed, I know, that we have been able to take a Liberal disaster and turn it into a PC victory. That is what we have been doing over here, Mr. Speaker, for the last fourteen or fifteen years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A Liberal disaster, the Linerboard mill, a PC success; the St. Lawrence mine, a PC success. We are doing it all over the place

and we are going to continue to do it. All of the negativity that the Liberal Opposition are passing out around the Province the people are just laughing at, Mr. Speaker. We are about our job of creating jobs.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Are the shareholders of Newfoundland Energy insisting that the Premier not make their names known? Have they muzzled the Premier?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
The hon. member should not be so silly.

MR. DECKER:
A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary.

MR. DECKER:
Would the Premier undertake to speak with those shareholders privately and ask them if they would allow him to let the people of Newfoundland know who owns this company? Would he speak to them privately?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, it is a private corporation and if the hon. gentleman wants any information on it he can go and ask the

corporation.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). The minister is aware that the FPI plant in South Dildo has been operating with up to ninety people the past several months, all Winter, because of the renovations that have been taking place at Burin. On the sixteenth of this month the plant at South Dildo will close because the secondary processing will be transferred back to Burin. Let me ask the minister what is the long-term plan of FPI Inc. for the South Dildo FPI plant?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I am sure if the hon. gentleman were to pick up the phone and check with FPI they would be glad to tell him, but since he has not done it, and he has asked the question, I will tell him. The hon. member should be very thankful that FPI were able to transfer successfully their operation from Burin to South Dildo for all those months, and as a result of that the people in that community have gained a lot of experience and had a lot of work in secondary processing. It is the long-term vision of FPI that they are going to be able to successfully expand secondary processing in this Province. If they are successful in doing that, then the South Dildo will be a prime consideration, Mr. Speaker, if and when that expansion can

take place.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier.

The Premier has been standing in this Legislature this morning telling us to go get the information from a so-called private company. The Premier knows full well that that is not -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Tuck in your shirt.

MR. TULK:
I will tuck in my shirt or keep it out as I see fit, and I will not ask the hon. gentleman. The Premier knows full well that that information is not readily available. He knows that. Now the Premier told us in this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Since he told us in this House the day before yesterday that there were no Newfoundlanders on that share list, we will take his word, I say to him. But let me ask him, has he seen the share list of Newfoundland Energy Limited? Did he bother to ask who was on the share list or did he not? Or did he just allow a company that is registered in Bermuda, and that he knows the share list is not available from because it is registered in Bermuda, did he just allow a group of unknown people to

take over practically \$200 million worth of the public assets of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Rex should find out.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that question and it is out of order.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, the Premier has told this House that no Newfoundlanders are part of Newfoundland Energy. Now we do take his word on it, he is an honourable gentleman. In order to know that he had to see the share list. By logical extension then, will he not table that share list in this House for all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to see just who has first call on Hibernia?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
The question is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Fisheries a question just now. I did it in a civil way but he attacked the individual rather

than the argument. Let me ask the Minister of Fisheries this question, Mr. Speaker.

At South Dildo we also have a seal pelt plant. Now the government opposite set up a seal pelt plant, in direct competition to Carino in South Dildo, at Fleur de Lys in the minister's district. Let me ask the minister, in view of the fact that the seal pelt plant in Fleur de Lys is heavily subsidized by the taxpayers of Canada and of this Province, is his department prepared to subsidize the purchase price of seal skins for the South Dildo Carino plant?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I apologize for the sensitivity of the hon. gentleman this morning, but I am delighted, I am finally delighted that I was asked that question in view of some comments that people have made about that particular operation in Fleur de Lys over the last few days. Let me first of all say that I was not Minister of Fisheries, I do not believe I was minister of anything, when the sealers themselves formed themselves into a co-operative in Twillingate and unanimously - sealers from all over the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador - decided that they would set up their own business in Fleur de Lys. That was not the decision on this government, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

So I am delighted that I got the chance to answer that, Mr. Speaker, for the sealers from Fogo, for the sealers from St. Anthony, for the sealers from Conche, for the sealers from Fleur

de Lys. We have supported them with no subsidies, Mr. Speaker, but with a loan guarantee, the same thing that I offered Mr. Nygaard in my office two months ago, and he turned down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier once again a question that is very important to the people of this Province. The Premier has indicated that as far as he is concerned who the principal shareholders of Newfoundland Energy are is a neutral issue, he said it is a neutral issue. Will he now explain where he is getting the information that there are two lawyers on that share list? Is he getting his information from the President of Newfoundland Energy, Mr. Brown? Is he relying solely on Mr. Brown to give him that piece of information? And, why, if it is a neutral issue, is he so reluctant to tell the people of Newfoundland just who is getting \$200 million of public assets? Why is he so reluctant? Where is he getting his information? If Mr. Brown told him to go jump over the wharf, would he do it?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier that question is out of order. From the strategy that the Liberal Party has developed over the last couple of weeks, my information indicates that the member for Fogo is supposed to be asking questions

about inadequate funds for transportation, including ferry services.

MR. TULK:

Not quite. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the question I want. I will not trust to your Tory buddies.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table, for the information of hon. members, a copy of the Executive Summary of the Provincial Bed Study Report which was carried out on behalf of government by the consulting firm William Nycum and Associates Ltd. If any of the hon. members wish to have a more detailed report, it is available by contacting my office.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before calling Orders of the Day, I would like to recognize in the Speaker's Gallery Pastor Roy King, the General Superintendent, and Pastor Earl Batstone, Executive Director of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

DR. COLLINS:

Motion 6, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, the hon. the Minister Responsible for Energy to introduce a bill, 'An Act To Amend The Canada-Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation (Newfoundland) Act," carried. (Bill No. 23).

On motion, Bill No. 23 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

DR. COLLINS:

Motion 7.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Emergency Measures Act," carried. (Bill No. 19).

On motion, Bill No. 19 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

DR. COLLINS:

Motion 8.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Occupational Health And Safety Act," carried. (Bill No. 18).

On motion, Bill No. 18 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

DR. COLLINS:

Motion 9.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Social Services to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Rehabilitation Act," carried. (Bill No. 15).

On motion, Bill No. 15 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

DR. COLLINS:
Motion 10.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Social Services to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Day Care And Homemaker Services Act, 1975," carried. (Bill No. 17)

On motion, Bill No. 17 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

DR. COLLINS:
Motion 5, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Motion 5, the hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to have this opportunity to move this motion which I gave notice of a couple of days ago. I would like to, before I go any further, recognize, as Your Honour has so appropriately done, the attendance of Pastor Roy King and Mr. Batstone in the galleries as this very important matter is being debated here in this Legislature.

May I say at the outset, I found it somewhat strange the other day when members of the Socialist Party in responding to the notice of this very important matter referred to it as almost a housekeeping piece of business. Mr. Speaker, it is not a minor or a housekeeping piece of business for this Legislature. What we are doing here and what they are doing in Ottawa, in the Parliament of Canada, is amending the Constitution of this country. That is not minor. That is not housekeeping, number one. Any amendment or change to the

Constitution of Canada is a significant piece of business for the people of Canada, and in this particular instance to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, on its own merit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Secondly, it is given greater importance and significance when one considers the nature of the amendment. Any amendment is significant when you are dealing with the Constitution of a country. But when you look at the nature of the amendment, the importance of it is even more striking. Because what we are doing and what the Canadian Government will be doing, when it should have been done a long while ago, is ensuring that people in a province of Canada have the same rights and privileges - rights and privileges, Mr. Speaker, not a housekeeping piece of business. We are giving the same rights and privileges to a religious denomination that the other religious denominations have enjoyed under the Constitution since 1949. So we are now giving equality to a significant religious denomination in this Province to practice and have the constitutional certainty that the other denominations had since we entered Confederation in 1949.

Thirdly, this religious denomination, the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland, as we all know, have become a very, very significant force. We are not talking about a very minor or small group of people. This denomination has grown in the leaps and bounds around the Province, in my constituency and in many other hon. members'

constitutencies, over the last two decades and are performing a very valuable service, spiritually, to society generally, and more particularly, in this case under the amendment, to the educational well being of a lot of students in this Province.

From a personal point of view, may I be so bold as to add as a fourth important point, and this one more personal than societal generally, that in my experience, which has been, if I may be so bold as to say, extensive over the last five years in particular, but I could go ten, the education, academic as well as religious but just let us look at academic, the academic education that the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland are providing to the students who attend those schools is absolutely exemplary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Now, I have reason to know that because I have had two daughters attending their school system in the last three or four years, and I, myself, was a teacher in an integrated school board for a number of years and I have been into, I guess, as many schools in Newfoundland as perhaps any other hon. member here - perhaps not more but just as many - and I know from personal experience. I also know from personal experience not only as it relates to my own family, my daughters, but I know from other members of my own family who had the opportunity to send their children to a Pentecostal School. I would say to hon. members more as a citizen of Newfoundland and as a former teacher, forgetting my role as a politician at any level, that if

any member of this House has not visited a school which is run by the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland do so, do so, because it would do your heart good to walk into any one of their schools.

Let me really show you my personal philosophy from the point of view of sheer cleanliness and organization, and from the point of view of discipline: When you walk into the doors of a Pentecostal School it is an unbelievable experience. They have operated their facilities just from the point of view of cleaning and keeping the facility in good shape, from the point of view of their interaction with their students, and from the point of view of their broad curriculum, not just academic and religious but recreational as well. They have done an absolutely excellent job. I want to publicly compliment them on the job that they are doing in the education of students in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Let me just relate one particular experience. I was in Nain and Hopedale last Fall and I ended up in Postville. There were a number of ministers with me and a number of members of the media. One of the members of the media is present in the gallery today, and I am sure she would confirm what I am going to say now. The town of Postville had put on a particular reception as a result of our arrival on the new landing strip there, and to go into that school and to be a part of those students and the performance that the students put on was unbelievable. And however many schools the Pentecostals have, that can be

repeated 100-fold throughout the Province, not only in Postville, Labrador.

And the other thing is, while I remember it, when I said cleanliness earlier I also wanted to mention something which, unfortunately, seems to be becoming less a part of our parental authority and educational authority, and other community interest groups who are involved in education, and it used to be manners and courtesy. You will find students in the schools of the Pentecostal Assemblies to be mannerly, you will find them to be courteous, you will find them to be respectful of their peers, you will find them to be respectful of older people, of the clergy, or of whatever. Over the last decade not only in Newfoundland but throughout Western society there has been a looseness associated with manners and courtesy. I always say from time to time now, even in the House here - I have started doing it deliberately. I used to do it accidentally - to, for example, Dr. Collins on my right here, or Dr. Twomey or somebody who was older than me, I always had the habit of saying "Sir", or "Mister". And sometimes people will say, "Well, you are the Premier of the Province, why are you saying Mister or Sir?" Because they are older, I was brought up to believe that I should call them Sir. You will find that still very much a part of the whole fabric of education in the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland and other educational facilities which are operated by the other boards and religious denominations, could do well in the delivery of their total educational programme to not forget the family, and not forget that the instilling of values, of

respect and courtesy and manners is more operative today than it was even twenty or thirty or forty years ago. And I am very, very happy that the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland have seen fit in the delivery of educational programmes which have been provided by them with the help of government, and recognizing them as a major denomination in this Province even without the Constitutional guarantee, to operate their institutions in this particular manner.

Now, today, we are going to make sacrosanct, if you will, make guaranteed in the Constitution of Canada the recognition of educational rights to the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland and Labrador and, as I say, I hope other denominations in the operation of their educational system will take a leaf out of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland's book as it relates to the delivery of educational services, especially in the areas that I mentioned, of discipline, of manners, of courtesy, and of the whole way in which they operate their system.

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very pleased to lead off this debate and discussion on this very important amendment to the Constitution of Canada. I would have liked to have done it earlier, back when we were into the momentous Constitutional discussions of a number of years ago, but it was not to be at that time. We now have it here before us today. I have been busy over the last several hours; I do not know if the Parliament of Canada have actually given notice to it, but I will find out later today. They are introducing it today, and

we will try to find out when they are going to have it debated and how long it will take to get through the system.

It is an important, significant matter for this Province. We have, as the Minister of Education has said and some of the school board chairmen - more of them should be speaking out on that - the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and other members of the public, and rightly so, arguing about the value of denominational education. I think, unfortunately, the debate and the discussion has been wrongly focused. It should not be on the value of denominational education, it should be on the co-operation of various denominations throughout Newfoundland to ensure that in the delivery of their educational services, which they have guaranteed under the Constitution, that they are doing it in a co-operative fashion so that duplication and this kind of thing does not happen to the extent that it happened in the past.

There are a lot of good initiatives being made. No doubt, when the Minister of Education gets up in his place to speak on this motion he will address himself to some of those things. We have to do a better job in the future, but we should not throw out the baby with the bath water. We should be very careful in the future, that we have to move and to improve the effectiveness of the delivery of educational services, and that we are getting full value for our dollar. There is no question about that. But, by the same token, let us not at the same time throw out all those things which are good in the delivery of that educational

service, like, as I said, the whole business of the values of our society and how they are instilled in our students.

It is not just a question of slovenly walking into a classroom, throwing your body down into a desk and listening to a mathematical lecture being given by a teacher for forty minutes, then get up and walk out, throw your book in the locker, meander down the corridor and go into the cafeteria. It is just not an academic learning process, it has to be a learning process for life which involves the whole question of values. It is just not a question of knowing how to do a quadratic equation in Grade X or knowing the Prime Minister of Canada in 1967, it is a question of learning how to live with other people and learning how to function with other people. Because your school - I am talking to the students. Here is a good word for you, that you hear in the House from time to time - your school is just a microcosm of the whole society. If you cannot get along with the other students and if you are not mannerly to your seat mate, then it is highly unlikely that you are going to be mannerly to somebody else when you get out into the real society and get a job. It starts in the school and the school is just a microcosm of all of that.

Whilst it has certain structured classes or certain structured subjects that you are obligated to learn in order to understand about the workings of the economy, and you have to learn mathematics and you have to learn history so that you can, perhaps, do better in the future than we did in the past, the other intangible things that should be learned throughout the

school system by students is this whole question of values, your values: What you believe in. What is your philosophy. That is just as important. It is no good to have a machine coming out of school after Grade XII that has 98 per cent in Math, 98 per cent in History, 95 per cent in this, straight As, going on to university a bundle of information and with no idea how to use that information; you have no idea how to say 'Hello' and 'Good-bye' to your friends, you have no idea how to tell somebody down on Water Street how to get to the Marine Institute, you have no idea how to get along with other people. A bundle of information is one thing, but being able to use it for human betterment is the key, how to use it after you have it. It is pointless to give a motorcycle to somebody in the deepest forest of Angola if they do not know how to use it. They will throw it in the river if they do not know how to start it. It is one thing to have it, but it is another thing knowing how to use it. It is one thing to know facts, and it is another thing to know people. Another thing is how to get along with these people. Education is not just simply a matter of amassing a whole bunch of information and then thinking you have the world by the tail, you have to know how to use it to get along with other people.

Some of the greatest philosophers and greatest thinkers in the world, some of whom have committed suicide, others who have been troubled all their lives, musicians, poets, and philosophers, as they lived their whole lives and came to the end of their lives, the thing that always startled them most and which they tried to pass on to something else

was not that I knew how old Aristotle was when he wrote a certain piece of work, it went beyond that, it was how are we with our information and with our brains going to use them to make the society that we are now a part of have some chance to be a better society when we are no longer here and when our children and our children's children are here. That is the key to education. Education must always be considered in that light as we continue to debate, as we will over the next few years, the whole question.

As I say, there may be some legitimate criticisms of present and past systems and we must improve on it - do not get me wrong, we must improve on it - but it is still ironic that at the very time that in Newfoundland we are opening up the whole question of denominational education we see the wealthiest province West, Ontario, giving the right to certain denominations to get into the educational process and for the government of Ontario to fund them. It has been a big, hot political issue in Ontario as to whether in fact the government of Ontario should fund religious schools - or schools operated by denominations, better said. It is really ironic that it is turning different ways in different provinces, but I think in the whole question and issue of education we should be very clear on what the goals, aims, objectives and philosophy of education should be. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I, personally, even though one could argue that we did not have the money - of course we never do in Newfoundland - go ahead with the reorganization of the high school programme. There was a lot of

debate at the time and letters in the paper. If you looked at the letters in the paper and listened to the open lines and things that you were hearing, you should never have gone ahead with it. But we went ahead with it and there is now Grade XII on the system and it does two things which I think are very important, it gives the student one more year in that system to grow emotionally, psychologically, sociologically and then be in a better position to decide upon their career when they come out of Grade XII. Rather than most of them coming out at fifteen and a half, or sixteen, or sixteen and a half, it is now sixteen and a half or seventeen and a half before a lot of students come out of Grade XII and they are older and they have had another year.

Secondly, to diversify the curriculum, to make it more attractive, to give them more options to choose courses, we had courses put in the curriculum dealing with Newfoundland Culture, for example, meaning culture in its all-embracing term - it means everything to do with the Province: the politics of the Province, the economy of the Province and so on - so that they have a better understanding of the Province, and to give them more choices in their selection of a science course or whatever. We have to do more in that and, as the Throne Speech said, we should do more of that and we should know our Province a lot better than we do. We are part of a global village, we are part of a planet, but how good we understand somebody else might be partly determined by how well we understand ourselves and where we came from.

I attended an elementary school a couple of years ago during Education Week and they had an absolutely excellent programme. There were students there from many parts of the world and the programme that they put on in that school that day was a really good programme. They had a student from the Orient, a student from Europe, I think there was one student from South America, and so on. They had these students perform the music and song of their origin. When I had an opportunity to speak after that assembly was almost completed I indicated to the students at that time that, 'this is fantastic! students are really getting a good dose, a good diet of what other peoples in the world sing and say and their culture.' But there was nothing there about Newfoundland. So I asked the students - not saying that there should be either/or, there should be both - what they knew about Newfoundland and Labrador: I asked them who lived in Nain, what group of people. 'Can you put a name on the group of people who live in Nain and live in Hopedale, some of whom live in Makkovik, some of whom live in Rigolet? They could not answer it. I asked them who lived in Davis Inlet and who lived in Sheshatshit. They could not answer it. I asked them who lived in Conne River. They could not answer it. I asked them who lived on the Port au Port Peninsula, in St. George's area, or in Glenwood, a small number. They could not answer it. I do not know if I made myself very popular that day or not to the future voters of the Province.

In the new geography book now in Grade IV, which deals with different people's of the world, they use Nain as an example for

the Inuit which is a help but we need more of it. How can somebody clearly indicate their position, even on a ballot paper in a provincial election, if they do not know and understand the positions that we may take or the Liberals may take or the NDP may take on something to do with the Natives of our Province, or what goes on in Labrador City, or what goes on in Grand Falls? You will find that there is somewhat of a lack. That is being addressed now by the Minister of Education. We are going to have more. Never exclude Africa, never exclude Asia because we are part of the whole world but do not exclude your own. I knew more about Bunga than I knew about Jim. I knew more about Bunga in Grave IV, and coming all the way up through. I knew all about the history of the British Isles, which was totally divorced from Newfoundland altogether, and about the royalty of England, and about South America and so on. I knew all about something do with all the rest of the world, but I knew absolutely nothing about me or where I came from or what Newfoundland was all about.

From time to time there were questions asked in school and something came up about the Beothucks, and that was some distant race with very little ever said about it.

MR. TULK:

Do you remember that great big New World Geography, that blue one, in Grade XI?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

In Grade XI? I took that one, that blue geography. Was that not something! What an unbelievable mishmash!

MR. TULK:

I took mine out and skinned it after I was finished with it.

MR. SIMMONS:

The author got paid by the word.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

An absolute mishmash! It should never have been allowed in the classroom. What an unbelievable geography book! They did improve on that. When I went teaching, there was a Grade X geography book written by a gentleman by the name of Bradley. I taught it when the Leader of the Opposition was Principal of the school I taught in, as a matter of fact. It was one year that I taught the geography course, and it was an excellent text book, an excellent guide. But it was a far cry from that one the hon. the member for Fogo reminds me of, because I took that as well. It was just an unbelievable book.

I have often said in recent months, 'As you read about what is going on in the world and what is going on in Canada, there is almost nothing worse than absolute dogma, because you have a pendulum on one side and you have a pendulum on the other side, and nothing in the middle.' It very often retards progress that can be made. And I think that is true as it relates to the whole question of the educational system. I do not think there should be a group on one side saying 'Throw out denominational education,' and another group on the other side saying, 'We have to have the denominational system of the past,' there must be something in between where we can grasp hold of all the important and tried and tested values which we can carry along with us in trying to improve the educational system of the

future. That is where we should be, in my view, and that is where we can make the most progress.

And the press very often does not help matters, because the headline which most people will read, and not the story, will help polarize the opinions so that it does become way off on one side and way off on the other side and the two can never get together. But hopefully we will not have that problem and we will be able to, over the next couple of years, resolve our problems and still have an appropriate and effective educational system with the denominations involved intricately in it, because I think that is very important, given the nature of our society.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up any more time at all, just simply to say that I am very proud today to have the opportunity to lead off the debate on this extremely important amendment to the Constitution of Canada which recognizes the equality of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland with the other denominations to deliver educational services in this Province.

I would only add one more thing: As time goes on, I would hope that the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland, with their start into education over the last couple of decades, will not be tempted and will not fall to temptation, that what they have now as an approach and a philosophy to education will not get diluted over time as we "progress" as a people. There are certain things that can be carried on that are very important: We do not lose that discipline, those manners, those courtesies and

values which are very much a part of their educational system. Hopefully they will continue and become a shining light for others to adopt and to ensure that it is part of their overall educational system and philosophy.

It is with great pleasure that I stand here today and see something wrong being corrected for the benefit of a large number of people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before recognizing the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to take a moment to welcome to the galleries seventy students with their two teachers, Mr. Boyd Badcock and Mr. Dave White, from St. George's High School in New Harbour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to be able to take part in this initiative. It is an historic initiative on at least two counts that come to mind.

First of all, of course, it will be for Newfoundland, and, in particular, for the people who are a part of the Pentecostal movement in this Province, a proud moment to have embedded in the Constitution a right that has been there for many years and honoured during that period.

It will also be historic in another context. I believe that it will be at least part of the first set of amendments which will have been made to the Constitution of Canada since it was patriated on April 15. Next Wednesday will mark the fifth anniversary since the Constitution of Canada was patriated from Great Britain, and this, I believe, will represent, if it goes forward expeditiously, as we sincerely hope it will, the first amendment, though it may not go forward by itself, because, as you will understand, there are other events happening elsewhere in this country which, I believe, will generate an amendment related to Aboriginal rights.

It will be entirely appropriate that an amendment of this historic significance should go forward as one of the first amendments, and I believe appropriate as well that it should go forward with a set of amendments which recognizes, to what degree we will not know until that amendment is formalized, but an amendment which recognizes, insofar as Aboriginal people are concerned, some basic rights for people who are here long before Pentecostals and long before peoples of other denominations. I think it is entirely appropriate that these two amendments may find themselves in bed together because, in some respects, they speak to the same issue.

They speak to the importance of recognizing that certain things are inviolate, certain things are sacred, certain things are right, no matter what numbers are involved, be they the majority of the people or, in both those cases, a minority of the society in which they, the Pentecostals and the Aboriginals, happen to find themselves.

Mr. Speaker, for me it is especially fascinating in that I was in another House in 1981 and in another caucus able to participate in another part of this same exercise. I am thinking, in particular, of Section 29 of the Charter of Rights which provides that nothing shall derogate from any rights or privileges guaranteed in respect of denomination and separate schools. I remember well the discussions in the government caucus of the day, the National Liberal Caucus in Ottawa under the leadership of Mr. Trudeau, the discussions, point by point, on the issue of the Constitution generally, but I remember, particularly, and I was telling the story to a couple of members of caucus only last evening, an incident that happened in the National Caucus around September or October of 1981. My friends in the House and those in the gallery will recall a public event at that time in which there was some concern expressed that the word 'God' and the reference to God and the recognition of God had been left out of the draft Constitution, although, Mr. Trudeau had seen to it that it was in the proposed Victoria Charter some years before, in 1971, I believe. The word was in that document at his initiative but it had not been in the draft constitution of 1980/81.

I remember well for some weeks very little was said. One or two of us had raised the issue, including my good friend, the hon. David Smith. I mention him in particular because he comes from a long tradition of Pentecostal people. Indeed, his late father was Pastor Smith, the President of the Pentecostal Bible College, if you like, the theology school for

the Pentecostal movement in Peterborough, Ontario. I remember David Smith getting up but not getting an awful lot of support on the issue of the inclusion of a reference or an acknowledgement of the supremacy of God in the Constitution.

So the matter went on for some week then one Wednesday, a month or two later, there was suddenly a big kerfuffle in caucus. Everybody was getting up and wanting to have God put in the Constitution. That day, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, like no other day, like no other instance, like no other time when I watched Pierre Trudeau up close, I saw that day the real man. I wish I could have a film to show you.

He has been said to be many things because he has been a controversial person. Some people take from that certain negative connotations or certain positive impressions, but I tell you as one who had the privilege of seeing him up very close, that day, if he did nothing else during the time he was Prime Minister of Canada, during the times he has been a public figure in this country, that day he did a great service to a lot of people. I watched him from about the distance of twenty feet in the caucus room with 70 senators, 148 Members of Parliament, 200 or so people.

That day a number of people were up saying, "We have got to put God in the Constitution." Of course, the Prime Minister of the day saw the irony of it and I am sure he was saying, as I was saying, as David Smith and two or three others were saying, "Where were you when we needed you about a month ago?" Of course the Prime Minister had figured out what had

gone on; he had figured out that it was not those guys in particular who wanted God in the Constitution but their constituents who started talking to them. They had now realized it was politically opportune to do something.

When all the speeches were made at the end of the caucus, the Prime Minister, as the leader of caucus, who would inevitably stay quiet for the whole two hours, I wish I had such restraint, and my friends in caucus wish I had such restraint, but he would sit there for a couple of hours and then make his first intervention at the end of caucus. On this particular day, after he listened to literally a dozen people talk about putting God in the Constitution, at the end of the caucus, he got up and in a very quiet tone, in these sessions he was not the person who appeared to be so arrogant as some others in public, he was a very quiet spoken, almost in a whisper, I can see him now and I shall always see him, he got up and he said, "So you want to put God in the Constitution. Where were you six weeks ago when David Smith raised the issue? Perhaps your constituents have been talking to you. We will put God in the Constitution just as we did in Victoria some years ago."

And then, and I do not think he meant to be sacrilegious but I will report it as it happened and let you decide. He said as his last statement, and it is hard to covey, I could see in him the disgust that he was feeling. Something right was about to be done for the wrong reason. So his last line was, after saying, "Yes, we will put God in the Constitution." And I say to the

Minister of Education, not meaning to be sacrilegious, his last line was, "I wonder what he thinks about all this?" In that moment, I saw the real man standing before a bunch of politicians who sometimes get the feeling that everything has to be done for political reasons. If the people want it, we do it. If enough say it is good, it has got to be good. Here is a man who had the courage to stand in that group and say, "Yes, I will do it but I am disgusted with you because it had to be done for this reason."

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, for me it is a fascinating experience to be here today participating in this important step particularly since I was involved at another time, in another place, in another part of the same overall initiative.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very proud tradition of denominational education. I went over to my friend and colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) a few moments ago, a man who, like I and like everybody in this room, have come up through a denominational system. I said, 'Tom, there has got to be another word for the purpose of my speech', because sometimes denomination - I am not about to rewrite the terminology of the system, I say to the Minister - but there has got to be a better word that conveys what I want to say better than denominational. He is working on it over there right now and we might have a word before the end of the speech.

What I wanted to say it this: Denominational education sometimes connotes for some people, division, little pockets, and little compartments. I want to

submit to you that the essence of denominational education is something quite different. Let me say it this way, secular education says that child has a mind. The type of education we are talking about here today, denominational education, if you like, but, I guess, soul-based education, spirit-based education - we have to find the right word - secular education says that child has a mind; denominational education says that child has a mind and a soul. Therein is the distinction.

It is not a distinction of dollars and cents or more efficiency. It is a very important, profound distinction. You either believe that there is more to education than making the marvellous computer that God gave us an even more marvellous computer, as important as that is, or you believe that education consists of that but also you worry about what the guy has got in his gut, in his breast, you worry about what he is going to do with that computer when it is really tuned up full speed.

I have seen some very intelligent maniacs. I have seen people with brains to spare but no soul. I have seen people with superior intelligence who did not quite know what to do with it because they had no overall objective. They were like that person who went to work so he get some money to buy some bread to eat, to get the energy to go to work to get some money to buy some bread. It became a vicious circle. There was no overall objective. He could never get out of the vicious round of making money, making money. He was using his head, yes, but he had been robbed somewhere along the line, maybe

robbed by a secular school system, I do not know, but robbed nevertheless in that nobody had given him an overall vision of life, an overall objective.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that if the right values are operative in a home and in a school system, the academics will follow. You see the academics are only the mechanism; they are only the process. Whether that child gets 90 on chemistry is important today or 75 on geography is important today, but on the overall scheme of things she might not remember thirty years from now what she got on chemistry and it might not matter if she does not remember. What will be important is whether in the process of getting that chemistry and that english and that geography she has been equipped to deal with life and equipped with overall objectives as to what her direction is as a human being. Denominational education is a system that puts the objectives first. We ask the question, what is it we want to achieve? Then we put the mechanism or process second.

Mr. Speaker, I want to submit that we as a society here in Newfoundland and Labrador have been somewhat guilty of denigrating the denomination system. I suppose all of us in this place have been guilty to some degree, I know I have, because it has become the in thing, the thing which it in vogue to say, "Ah, yes, denominational education is inefficient." Yes, Mr. Speaker, yes, there are inefficiencies.

I can tell you a way to make the system very efficient, build one great big school for St. John's and put them all in the same

school and then you would have an efficient system. Now, while you are at it, will you do something else? If you are interested only in efficiency, I suggest you haul all the people in from Grand Bruit and St. Lunaire, St. Leonard's they say up there, and Cartwright, close her all down out there, all those communities because it is very inefficient, you know, and let us put them all in St. John's, because you cannot have your cake and eat it too. You cannot say that the ultimate objective in education is efficiency, but the ultimate objective in other areas of spending is not efficiency.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, efficiency can never be an overriding objective. I am not advocating that we be wasteful. I want to advocate in the process the opposite that, of course, men and women of good faith will see in any situation there is moderation and there is co-operation. Let me take the community's example that I gave you a moment ago. People in Grand Bruit make a choice that if they live in Grand Bruit they cannot expect to have a university in Grand Bruit, plus a bus system, plus paved roads necessarily. There are certain consequences which flow from certain choices, but that does not mean that the people in Grand Bruit should not have a quality of life that they can be proud of. So, as a citizenry and as a group of taxpayers, as the people who fund the Public Treasury, we have to ensure that if people decide to live in Grand Bruit, then there are rights that are their's, rights as human beings and, in parallel, so are there insofar as denominational education is concerned because, for the people in Grand Bruit, their overriding objective is not efficiency but

other matters about the way of live, the quality of life which has to do with, in some cases in our quasi folk society, being near the people that are dear to you instead of moving away from grandmother and your aunts for the rest of your life. That has to do with the quality of life, and that is one reason people stay in the Grand Bruits of this country.

In the same vein, the overriding objective in education has to be something other than efficiency. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, my thesis is not an argument for waste. I repeat, it goes without saying that men and women of good will will ensure that there will be co-operation among denominations. I mention that because that is the main bugbear that is thrown in by the efficiency experts, that they are not co-operating and they are all out building walls around themselves. I have never bought that line, and I will tell you why. Because I believe in the objectives espoused and laid down by the leaders of denominational education in this Province from of all denominations. In essence, those objectives say that they are concerned and they are committed to helping a child to be fully developed, insofar as possible, for life. This life does not consist of partitions or isolated cells. We are together in this society.

A school system, be it Pentecostal, Integrated, Roman Catholic, Seven Day Adventist, or secular, that, either by implication or deliberately, turns out graduates who cannot cope - I did not say who cannot compromise - with the realities around them, whether secular or otherwise, that school system is failing its mandate; that school system is not

doing the job it tells us it is doing. I throw that in just as a caveat because I do not believe that is the case because I believe men and women of good will will ensure that it is bridges we will build to other people, not walls.

Mr. Speaker, the Pentecostal Assemblies in this Province have made a sizeable contribution to the development of our society since they first came here around 1910. The name Alice B. Garrigus is a name that you hear in relation to a particular school. Perhaps the minister can help me. Where is the school? I have forgotten.

MR. HEARN:

Up in St. Lunaire.

MR. SIMMONS:

Up in St. Lunaire, the Garrigus School. So the people of Northern Newfoundland will always have, as part of their local folklore and terminology the name Garrigus, and so will always the people of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland, but so should always every Newfoundlander, in fact. That lady and the movement that she helped found, in the process did Newfoundland and Labrador an awfully big favour.

I have some notes in front of me. I am not an expert on the history of the Pentecostal Assembly, but I want to read a couple of things into the record for the information of the hon. members of this House.

The first Pentecostal Mission was opened and dedicated to the propagation of the full gospel message throughout the Province of Newfoundland on Easter Sunday, 1911. The article - and I am quoting actually from The Grand

Falls Advertiser of June 17, 1976 - earlier talks about Miss Garrigus and talks about how the Pentecostal Assemblies were then, in 1975 - 1976, celebrating their Fiftieth Anniversary in Newfoundland. The article goes on, Mr. Speaker, "The name given to that first little mission on 207 New Gower Street, St. John's, was the Bethesda Pentecostal Mission." Bethesda, of course, is a name that has embedded itself into the folklore of this city and many of us know well the work of that particular congregation. But, as I understand it, at that time it was the handle for the old movement in Newfoundland.

Names like Eugene Vaters, whom it was my great privilege to know; Stan Bursey and his brother Frank Bursey down in Botwood, and, of course, Pastor Roy King and Pastor Earl Batstone, both of whom have done us the privilege of being in the gallery today. The name I want to mention at the risk of in the process I exclude so many others, but the one I want to mention because I knew him so well - he was of such great help to me in many ways - Pastor Ball in Bishop's Falls. For the life of me I cannot remember his first name because I never knew him by his first name but I was in his home and I knew his last name and I knew his family extremely well. I spent many, many hours with that particular family. If he is typical, and I am sure he is, if he is typical of the pastors who people this Island Province on behalf of the Pentecostal Assemblies, then I have no doubt that the movement is in extremely compassionate hands.

There is one other line, Mr. Speaker, that I want to read from this article because it says

better than any long speech could say what this event is all about today. "The fellowship has always maintained a fairly strong Sunday School emphasis." Now, why is that so significant? Here we have a movement that does on Monday what it preaches on Sunday. For them it is a seven-day school. I am not talking about a five-day school here. We are talking a life school. We are talking something that is part of an integrated whole. You do not have the pastor tell you one thing on Sunday and then the teacher get up and tell you something that is okay for the other five or six days of the week. That, Mr. Speaker, is why we are here, and that is why people who came before us ensured that we would have a thing called denominational education; that we would have embedded in the Terms of Union between Newfoundland and Canada, Section (17), the rights to ensure that denominational education would be preserved and flourish; that we have in the Charter of Rights adequate provisions to ensure the continuance, with all its inefficiencies, a system that has served us so well.

Now we come to the next step, the step of insuring that rights that have been part of the Pentecostal movements prerogative and weaponry since 1954 will now be guaranteed. In a sense today we are doing something new, because they have those rights already.

But I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are doing something very, very new; we are doing something very, very important. It could be argued that there are no practical implications to this and that, in general, in the normal run of events, would be the case with one important exception.

There is always the possibility, and I submit to you it is more than a possibility, it is a probability if I may judge from a couple of conversations I or a member of my staff have had in the last few hours, there is always the possibility that the rights of groups not specifically guaranteed under statute or, in this case, under the Constitution, could be challenged under Section 15 of the Charter of Rights, which addresses the issue of freedom of religion. For that reason alone, Mr. Speaker, if this whole issue did not have any grand historical connotations - and it has that - if it had nothing in terms of courtesy to a people who served us so well, if we were not concerned a wit about courtesy to those who lived among us, all that aside, in substantive terms we owe it to the people who make up the Pentecostal movement to ensure there is not a wit of a chance that this thing could come unstuck, because in future times there may be people of less good will than exist among us right now. Or, to say it differently, some of the people with another agenda among us right now might prevail on some technical argument down the road in relation to Article 15 of the Charter. This is not a matter that you leave to technical error or technical accident. This is a matter you salt away while you have the opportunity.

I have had people put to me in the last few hours, what does this initiative mean for other religions, such as the Jews and the Baha'i, if this resolution is put through. I have others say to me, 'What are the implications for the Seven Day Adventists who have operated schools in this Province?' There could be other specific questions. The

overriding question is: What is the implication for other groups who are not now guaranteed protection under the constitution?

My general answer has to be - and I think it has to be almost axiomatic to anybody who thinks about it - the one that I gave in a more partisan context to my good friends from Menihek and St. John's East the other day when we were on another issue, the NATO issue. I am sorry, that is wrong, not that issue at all. It was when we were on the issue of a budget briefing prior to the bringing down of the budget.

Members of the House will recall that I had gone to the Minister of Finance a week before and put to him, on its merits, the possibility of our doing what has been done in Ottawa and Ontario and other jurisdictions, the possibility of having members of the Opposition sit in on the confidential briefing as the press does on budget day so that we would have an informed view of what was coming down in the budget, so that when we came to give comments we would make informed comments instead of uninformed comments. The minister agreed with me that that would be, in principle, a good idea, to see if they could inform the Opposition. The minister is always willing to lift us from our realm of ignorance, I am sure.

I said to him, in the process, 'Now, do not forget you have another parliamentary group too, and we would have no objections if somebody from that third group - meaning the NDP - 'sat in too.' I will not take hon. member through the circus that followed. The bottom line is that the thing came unstuck. I submit it came unstuck

because the gentlemen in the third group did not do their homework, and on the day of the briefing, began screaming and bawling because they did not have a sucker. They could have had their sucker if they had gone a week before to the Minister of Finance as we had. But that is another story.

What I want to say here is this: That day, in talking to that issue, I said something to the gentleman from Menihok, who had robbed us by his theatrics from having a briefing that day, something that I want to say on a much more global issue today, a much more universal and a much more important issue. It answers the question of what implication this has for Seventh-Day Adventists, for the Jewish people, and for the Baha'i, all of whom, Mr. Speaker, have made marvelous contributions to our society.

My answer is this, as I gave to the hon. the member for Menihok (Mr. Fenwick), surely, nobody is suggesting that the Pentecostal Assemblies in saying so long, in so many ways, and in so many different forums that they wanted this right embedded in the constitution, surely, nobody is suggesting that they are saying 'We want it but we would deny it to somebody else' because that too would fly in the face of the very fairness that they espoused and that we know to be part of their creed. This is what I said to the member for Menihok: "You cannot piously look for your own rights by trampling on the rights of other people."

Earlier today a couple of the Pentecostal leaders who are with us today in the gallery did me the courtesy of chatting with me for a

few minutes about this particular issue. It was not that I needed to be reassured but I just said to you what, in essence, they said to me before I even had a chance to even ask the question, namely, rights whether for secularists, for people who want secular education, or for people who want denominational educations of other types than Pentecostal are rights. You do not say it is less of a right because somebody else wants it.

Mr. Speaker, I am just about through. I want to thank the House for its indulgence. I want to remind the House that this is not the first time this chamber has dealt with this subject. It is in a different form today, it is by way of a resolution which would seek to amend the Terms of Union and with the appropriate concurrent action in Ottawa, in the other chamber, because it requires both chambers or both Houses of Parliament to act. With the concurrent action we will have, in time, an amendment to the constitution because we now have in place, thanks to the initiative of Mr. Trudeau, which I talked about earlier, we now have in place a mechanism to get an amendment without going back across the water.

In 1968 this subject was dealt with in this forum in another way. It was a resolution and it would have had the same effect. The mechanism of changing the constitution with the British North America Act would have been different but the intent was the same. You recall, Mr. Speaker, that resolution passed this House unanimously in 1968. It, or a form of it, then went forward to the Parliament of Canada and died on the Order Paper in 1972 with

the dissolution of the House for the calling of the 1972 election.

I just wanted to recall that for the benefit of hon. members, that we have in this Chamber acted in good faith on this matter before and I have not doubt that today too this issue will be resolved unanimously.

My good friend for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) has come through, as usual, and I must say to him that I was - you know the expression you cannot see the forest for the trees, it is right under your nose there and you miss it. Why do we not start calling it for what it is? We know it in our vernacular as denominational education, and there is nothing wrong with that, but why are we skating all around it? Of course, what we have is a Christian education system. We have a system based on Christian values. That is the word I was struggling for and, as I say, were so near my nose I was missing it completely. Let us call a spade, a spade, as the poker players would say. We have a Christian system, others want a secular system.

I want to say, with all its warts, all its inefficiencies, with the understanding that we must continue to do things to reduce those inefficiencies, to reduce those duplicated costs, as long as in the process we do not throw out the baby with the bath water, as long as in the process we do not compromise on the principle that is involved, that is implicit to Christian based or, if you want to call it, denominational education. It is a system, Mr. Speaker, that we can be completely proud of but, like most of our systems or institutions, it is a system that requires continuing

care and improvement.

I have faith that as a group of legislators, together with the leaders of the denominational education groups in this Province, care will be forthcoming as it has been in the past and an evolution towards an even better system will be an ongoing process for the betterment of the children and the young adults who have the privilege to go through that system.

We have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the resolution. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am honoured to be able to follow the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in standing in support of the resolution. Perhaps for the record I will refer to part of the resolution because it has not been done and some people in the galleries, in particular, might be wondering exactly what we are talking about. Part of it says,

WHEREAS Term 17 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada provides as follows:

"17. In lieu of section ninety-three of the British North America Act, 1867, the following Term shall apply in respect to the Province of Newfoundland:"

Now this is unique to the Province

of Newfoundland.

"In and for the Province of Newfoundland the Legislature shall have exclusive authority to make laws in relation to education, but the Legislature will not have authority to make laws prejudicially affecting any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, common (amalgamated) schools, or denominational colleges, that any class or classes of persons have by law in Newfoundland at the date of Union, and out of the public funds of the Province of Newfoundland provided for education."

Now at the date of the entry of the Province of Newfoundland into Confederation in 1949, the Catholic schools and the Integrated schools had these rights and privileges which were then enshrined in the Constitution of Canada. Since then in the Province, the Pentecostal Assemblies have been given true recognition by all of us in relation to fair treatment. They have been treated as equal partners with the other denominations, they have received an appropriate share of the funding based upon per capita in the Province, treated exactly the same as the other denominations. However, one major problem still existed. Even though we treated them, as I said, fairly, they were recognized as true partners in the educational field in the Province, but yet this Legislature had the right to make changes if somebody somewhere along the line deemed that they wanted to affect their standing in relation to the rights and privileges that they had. Their rights and privileges were not enshrined in the Constitution of Canada. However, today this

resolution will pass along from our House to the Governor General of Canada the desire to have this right entrenched in the Constitution of Canada and, of course, we have every indication that this will be done, and we are very, very pleased about it.

Newfoundland, being the newest province of Canada but the oldest settlement in relation to the Canadian structure, we have to go back a long way to look at the start of our educational system. And as we look at where we are today, despite the fact that we perhaps do not have a perfect system, each day we have people looking for improvements in facilities, in programming, in resources that will help in the delivery of education to the various parts of the Province, to the young people and the older people in the Province, and we know that education is a field that will always continue to improve. We will have to improve the standards and the different mechanisms to make sure that we keep current. Every day is a learning process. Every day is a day where education plays a part in our lives, and as we change, then, of course, educational values change.

However, too often perhaps we do not appreciate how far we have come unless we stop and look back to see what we had in the past, and both speakers before me today referred to many of the things that have happened over the years, even getting into specific subjects in the class. The Premier referred to Bunga and if there is one name I suppose in the history of education that stands out, even above some of the great educators, it is the name Bunga, the little short curly headed

fellow who reminds me of my seat mate, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt).

It stands out, I suppose, when we look back to see the irrelevance of some of the stuff that we learned as we came through the school system. Now, hopefully, our materials are becoming much more relevant and with present initiatives hopefully we are going to improve that area much more quickly than we have done in the past even.

But looking at the educational set up, realizing that the first schools in the Province were set up by the different denominations, the clergy and the missionaries who came and travelled through the different nooks and crannies along the small coves and inlets in the days when they were not allowed to set up churches or schools, or talk about religion or practice religion openly and freely in the Province, who established small groups in communities in order to bring to them the teachings of the church and to try to educate the young people, and as you travel into the more central areas of the Province to hear about the missionaries who walked many, many miles over many, many days to spread the word and to carry educational values to the people in the different smaller communities that were established over the Province of Newfoundland, we realize the tremendous sacrifice and effort that these people made in those days to set up on a sound base, the type of base that gave us the well-rounded type of individual who is recognized today as a true Newfoundlander. We talk about the Newfoundlander with solid values, a person of stature, a person of pride, but where did it come

from? It came from the teachings of those who came before us and the example of those who came before us.

Only too often, perhaps, in our schools we get caught up in teaching our young people how to make a living, telling them that they must learn, they must study, they must practice, they must research so that when they go out they will be able to make a living. Perhaps too often we have forgotten to tell them that we also have to teach them how to live and to teach them about life and, if there is one aspect that is a little bit of a concern to all of us, it is that that latter part might be neglected in the present day.

However, as I said, when we look back to see how far we have come, we recognize that the original schools, whether it be a group or whether it be a building that we are talking about, were established by the different denominations, and what we have today has been built upon that. Over the years, as improvements took place and as government stepped in to help in funding, we found a more common ground, a coming together, an education which has been a benefit for everybody. We saw a number of groups - the Anglicans, the United Church, the Presbyterians and the Salvation Army - come together as the Integrated group so that they could work more closely together to share facilities and teachers and what have you.

We saw the three major groups, then, the Integrated group, the Catholic group, and the Pentecostal group, emerge as leaders in the field of education now supported solidly by

government, but not exclusively. This is what a lot of people fail to realize, that many of the buildings we have out there today, much of the infrastructure - not much of it, all of it was originally put there by the different denominations directly. Much of the infrastructure that is there today is still owned by the different denominations, not owned by them and funded by government, but owned by them and to a great extent still funded by them. That is a fact that a lot of people fail to realize. The contribution made in the past is too often forgotten, and it cannot be forgotten. The contribution that is being made today is quite often overlooked and should not be and will not be overlooked.

We in this House, our party here, the Opposition, and even in relation to public statements last year, at least, the third party, all have stated support for the denomination system. It is not an issue where you sit on the fence, it is an issue that perhaps you are either for or you are against, and we have made no bones about where we stand in relation to the system of education. We appreciate what has happened and we value what we have, and consequently we support it. But in saying that, all of us, and I might add here the people who are directly involved in the various denominations, have also said, in our consultations, that we cannot stop where we are, we cannot be satisfied with what we have, we must continue to improve, and by improving we will not weaken our denomination system but strengthen it.

Some people, perhaps, think things should happen overnight. Things usually do not happen that way.

When we look at the simple fact that just a few short years ago we had almost 1,300 schools in the Province, today we have fewer than 600, which shows a coming together; when we look at the improvements that have taken place in our teaching force, when we look at certain things that are happening now, the IEC's boundary report that has been made public, when we see the coming together of the operation of bus systems, when we see the sharing of facilities throughout the Province, then we see that a major concern of denominations, because they are people directly concerned with the future of our young people, is to make sure that the best possible education is provided for them.

But we also have to remember that there is another side, and both speakers before me emphasized that, the side which involves morality, character building, teaching people the common courtesies, manners, respect, and these are things which are very, very important part of growing up, a very important part of life.

So the system we have in the Province does include the things that count. Yes, there are weaknesses, but, yes, they can be corrected. The changes that have occurred and are presently occurring are very, very positive. We still have some way to go, but when we go there together, well, then the going is a lot easier.

Quite often, Mr. Speaker, it is not the end of the journey, it is not our final destination, that is always the most important. The final destination has to be reached, and the method of transportation is so important - how we get there, the safe way,

the secure way, and not necessarily the fastest way - so we have a destination to reach, and it is one, I am sure, with the co-operation of our partners in education, we can reach it.

I do not want to prolong debate, because there are many others who want to speak. It is such a broad topic we could speak for days, not to say hours. But today we see the recognition of a partnership. I have mentioned that over the years we have treated the Pentecostal Assemblies the same as the other major denominations. They have been accorded by us the rights and privileges that the others have. They have been our partners. We have consulted them on all issues and we will continue to consult them and work with them. But they were partners without having that real, true, entrenched recognition. Today I am very, very pleased to join with the others in supporting a resolution which is a major step towards full recognition of that partnership, and to say that I am very, very proud and pleased to be associated and part of the partnership with them. Thank you.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to be able to participate in this historic debate, because I do agree with the Premier on this. It is not, as has been mentioned by the member for St. John's East, a mere matter of housekeeping. It is a very significant and historic occasion, because we are involved in the process of amending the

Constitution of Canada, and the constitution of a country is not amended lightly, is not amended as a matter of housekeeping.

What we are also doing here, which should be realized by all members, is we are limiting the powers of this Legislature. We are agreeing to enshrine certain rights and privileges into the Constitution of Canada, rights and privileges which, following their enshrinement, can no longer be affected by decisions of this hon. House. So, it is not a minor matter, it is not something which should be dismissed lightly. It is something that should be participated in with all due seriousness and with the recognition that what we are doing is a very serious matter. But it is something that I know most, and probably all members will be able to stand and support as a matter of principle because what really, as I see this, is at stake is the question of whether or not all religious denominations should be treated equally. I believe that the Pentecostal Assemblies, with their significant proportion of the population of this Province, with their significant involvement in education, have established themselves as entitled to participate on the same basis in the constitutional protections provided the other denominations.

As the Leader of the Liberal Party I can say that we have for a number of years supported this matter, supported the enshrinement of the rights of the Pentecostal Assemblies in the Constitution of Canada, and we have also supported the denominational educational system, as I will mention in a few moments.

Now, the Pentecostal Assemblies

have grown significantly since 1949. I guess the share of the population affiliated with the Pentecostal Assemblies has approximately doubled since 1949. Their influence is seen throughout all the Province. I have to say, with pleasure, that in the boundaries of my former district I had the Vaters School. It has been carved out of my district now since the last realignment of boundaries, but I still have constituents who attend Vaters, and I have been very pleased and honoured to participate on occasions of school graduations and so forth. I can support and confirm the Premier's statements with respect to the tremendous efforts in education that are being made by the Pentecostal Assemblies, and the tremendous achievements that are being made.

Members of this House may not realize it, but looking at the statistics in terms of numbers of pupils graduating and numbers of pupils graduating at high levels, Vaters has been one of the leading schools, and I think at times the leading school, not just in the city of St. John's but in the Province. That is an example of how the commitment and the dedication and the approach of the Pentecostal Assemblies to education has paid off, and has paid off in a very large way, in contributing to the education of the children of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I think at the time of Confederation there were only six schools in six small communities - well, five of them, I think, were small communities. Windsor would have been a larger community even then, but Point of Bay, the Horse Islands in White Bay, since resettled, Samson's Island, Black

Duck Island, and formerly Salt Pond, now Embree, I believe, were the locations of those schools in 1949. On a percentage basis, I suppose, it was decided that they, in terms of the percentage of the population and the number of schools, that in 1949 they were not successful in being recognized as being covered by the constitutional protection provided under the Terms of Union. But with the increase in population, with the significant increase in the number of schools, indeed, I would have been amenable too even if it had been the situation back in 1949, I would have suggested that even at that time, that the Pentecostal Assemblies should have been recognized as entitled to the protection which can be provided by this constitutional entrenchment.

To go back to what it is we are doing here, we have to look at Section 17 of the Terms of Union. It says that while this Legislature shall have exclusive authority to make laws in relation to education, this Legislature is expressly prevented and is said not to have authority 'to make laws prejudicially affecting any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, common (amalgamated) schools, or denominational colleges, that any class or classes of persons have by law in Newfoundland at the date of Union, and out our of public funds of the Province of Newfoundland provided for education, (a) all such schools shall receive their share of such funds in accordance with scales determined on a non-discriminatory basis.'

This Legislature would not have the right, even if it wanted to, to discriminate in terms of

funding. 'All such colleges shall receive their share of any grant,' and that grants shall be distributed on a non-discriminatory basis.

So, by this measure today, we are part of a process which, in conjunction with the House of Commons, the Canadian Parliament, will ensure that certain rights are taken away from this Legislature and certain protections, rights and privileges given to the Pentecostal Assemblies whereby they will be treated equally with other religious denominations in the Province and that equality will be enshrined in the Constitution of Canada.

So I take great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this resolution. I would like to speak just briefly on the denominational system of education. The Liberal Party has taken a stand, and I and other members of the party have spoken in this House on previous occasions. We have had to, from time to time, suggest that there were grounds for greater co-operation between the various denominations in the way in which educational services were provided. That was not in any way to take away from the benefits of the denominational educational system, the value of the denominational educational system, to this Province.

You know, I laugh and I find it amusing when I so often hear visitors from other provinces, other parts of Canada, come to Newfoundland and, in a patronizing tone, in a half sneering tone, say, as though we were backward, 'Oh, you still have the denominational system of education. How quaint! How

strange! How antiquated!' is almost what they are saying.

I know the history of many of these provinces, I know the scars that religious bigotry and lack of co-operation and lack of a sensible, logical approach such as we saw with the denominational educational system development in this Province. I know the scars that that has left in some of these other provinces. We can still see today where in those provinces we still have decisions being taken on the basis of intolerance at times, and we have great political rows, which are only thinly veiled, which have as their background a sense of religious intolerance. I am prepared to defend the denominational system against any group, whether it be in this Province or whether it be those individuals who have forgotten their own history or else choose to ignore their own history, I have no problem in standing and defending the denominational educational system and pointing out how it dealt with, in an open, direct fashion, the fact that in our past there have been at times problems because of religious differences and religious intolerance. A system was set up that would help alleviate and remove what for me, in my personal belief, I think often comes not from sense of meanness, not from a sense of hatred towards your fellow man - or fellow person, I should say, before the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) picks me up - but often comes from a sense of fear, a sense of insecurity on the part of the individual who shows that intolerance. It is something, I know, that we all believe we should work consistently, in this House, and outside this House to try and see

removed, the sense that because a person has a certain particular religious belief or other belief that somehow that person is not worth as much as you, is something less than you. We have to respect our fellow human beings and I know that that is something that every member of this House always has in the forefront of their minds. The denominational education system, rather than designed to perpetuate religious differences, was designed as a way of permitting greater co-operation and was designed as a way of removing the fears and the insecurities, through back room deals or whatever, that their politicians would not treat all denominations fairly and equally. We can be proud that we have put in place, institutionalized a system which ensures that all denominations can be treated equally in terms of funding for education, and recognizes the great contribution that so many religious leaders and so many religious workers have made.

I know we have around this Province people who have given up salaries and invested their time and their incomes or their lost incomes into the educational system, they have made that direct contribution through religious contributions in their churches and through the funds that are put by the churches into the construction of schools, the operation of schools and so forth. Over the years there have been millions and millions and tens of millions, maybe hundreds of millions put in in terms of value to our educational system by the various religious denominations, and that should be recognized. It is something that we should all commend.

But, Mr. Speaker, we should not be afraid or reluctant in this House of Assembly to stand up from time to time and to point out if there are problems that develop in terms of lack of co-operation which lead to an inefficient manner of expending public funds. People are only human. People within the various denominations on the denominational education committees are only human, and, at times people can get into ruts and can become complacent, can ignore the effect of changing times. I believe that reasonable efforts have been made to continue to strive to get the best value for the expenditure of public money in the denominational system. I believe that many people have put in a lot of time, a lot of hard work, to ensure that in the way the school boards spend money they do try and co-operate, but there have been times and places when they have fallen down. I think that the discussion which has taken place over the last couple of years on this has in fact encouraged and led to the leaders of various religious denominations, those involved in the DECs, those involved in the school boards, to be even more aware of the fact that in this Province we have limited funds for education and we have to get the biggest bang for our buck, we have to get the best possible value in the way we expend those funds. I do not think that there is anything wrong with legislators getting up and in a responsible fashion making suggestions and recommendations as to how there can be greater co-operation, whether it be in terms of sharing school buses, or sharing gymnasias, or sharing laboratories in whatever fashion. We can encourage greater co-operation and I believe that the will is there,

the spirit is there to move in that direction.

I have no hesitation in saying that I know that the Pentecostal Assemblies are responsible, are ever alert and ever vigilant to the need to ensure that we get the best value for our educational dollar in this Province. I have no hesitation in saying I do not fear that enshrining the rights of the Pentecostal Assemblies in the Constitution will in any way inhibit or prevent the continuation and the co-operation which has been shown by the Pentecostal Assemblies and by other denominations in ensuring that we, with the limited resources we have, continue to improve our educational system and continue to get the best value for our educational dollar.

We have seen this year a poll taken which has been interpreted as indicating that amongst the population of Newfoundland and Labrador there is declining support for the denominational education system. Well, as has been pointed out by certain leaders, one has to look at the wording of the particular poll, and one has to recognize that the poll did not ask whether people in this Province believe that it is important for young people to be educated with respect to moral values and with respect to religious beliefs and have available to them, in the school setting, access to that higher sense which is part of what I think makes us civilized beings, this notion of God, an after life and how we should live in this world in order to justify the expectations that the higher being has of us. I think that if we had polls done that ask questions such as whether the people of

Newfoundland and Labrador believe we should continue to instill moral values in the process of giving an education to our children, you would see significantly different results of that polls.

So I am not one to be stampeded by polls, nor frankly am I one who believes that at all times we must jump to what a majority of the population may conclude at any particular point in time, and this at times may be taken as heresy, this concept that an MHA is elected and must go in and then do whatever the majority of the population wants at any particular point, or if the majority of his or her constituency wants at any particular point is something that is only partly correct. Because all members of this House were elected on all sides to show leadership. In addition to being responsive to the needs and concerns of our constituents, we must show leadership from time to time. I am getting a little bit off the topic because I do not think it is all that relevant in this case, although with respect to that poll if it was taken a day or a couple of days after there is a furor over too much money being spent in a particular community in building two schools when only one school can be supported by the population, as an example, that sort of thing, popular opinion, can affect the poll. But polls change, popular opinion changes. And I believe the members of this House, the members of parliamentary generally, the House of Commons as well, have to show leadership and have to show consistency in belief and matters of principle, and we should not be swayed from day to day by the swings of opinion that can take place affected by a particular

instance, a particular sensationalized news media story which might occur from time to time.

I want to say quite frankly that I have some concerns that I would express, and there may be differences or I may be not fully informed but I am willing to receive further information on this, but I am concerned, as a member of the Roman Catholic Church, about the basis of firing teachers who marry individuals who are not Roman Catholic. I have a great problem with that as a basis for whether or not a person should teach in a Roman Catholic school. The school boards of the Pentecostal Assemblies have their criteria for hiring as well. I say to them, as I say to all denominations, that granted the moral values of an individual teacher will be reflected in what is communicated to his or her pupils but, and this is only one example, the marriage choice of an individual, whether a person marries in his or her religion, is pretty far down the list in terms of, for me, reflecting moral values that should put that teacher's job in jeopardy. I can think of the mortal sins, the serious flaws that are evident on a daily basis amongst teachers, as amongst all of us, where nobody is perfect, but regularly, unfortunately, we see individuals who succumb to various mortal defects and some of those, definitely, I believe, would lead one to question whether the person should be teaching children in the schools of our Province.

But I raise this only to say that there are grave responsibilities that are then going to be present in any denomination which is given constitutional protection; there

is grave responsibility to ensure that those rights and privileges then enshrined in the Constitution are exercised in a way that recognizes certain fundamental human rights and recognizes the effect that decisions can have on the lives of ordinary human beings involved in the teaching profession or otherwise.

But, again, I have great confidence in the responsible approach of the Pentecostal Assemblies. I know we have dedicated people who worked hard, who have made great contributions to the educational process in our Province, and I wish them well in the future. I say, and I know all members would say that our support is there. If from time to time problems arise in dealing with government, whether it be provincial or federal, I know all members of the House would make themselves available to consult with representatives of the Pentecostal Assemblies, or any other religious denomination, to ensure that their work is carried on unimpeded, and that wherever we can we assist in making sure, because what is at stake here for our Province is ensuring that our greatest resource, the young people who are coming up to the age when they are going to be leading this Province, when they are going to be the ones who determine whether we progress or fall back, what is at stake here is making sure that we have the best possible system of education, a system which in addition, as other members have said and I will not repeat, to just giving the technical knowledge that is so important in the modern age also gives those moral values which help to make a province or a country great. I, again, Mr. Speaker, say that we support

wholly the enshrinement of the rights and privileges of the Pentecostal Assemblies in the Constitution of Canada and we will be voting in favour of this resolution.

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, I rise today with some pride to lend my support to this resolution so ably presented by the Premier and so ably spoken to by members on both sides who have gone before me in this particular debate.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be long for a number of reasons; I am not, perhaps, noted for long speeches, and the second one is that time is running out. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I would be somewhat remiss if I did not rise in my place in this Legislature and lend my support, as I said, to this very important amendment to the Constitution and this very historic occasion in the life of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland. Representing a district, Mr. Speaker, that has, I would suspect, some 40 to 45 per cent of the Pentecostal population in it, I, over the years in representing that district in this Legislature, have had on several occasions the opportunity to meet with and to discuss with the Pentecostal pastors in my district some of their concerns, and tried to help them in various ways to resolve some of their problems. So, I would like to, first of all, congratulate the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland on this occasion, and take this

opportunity as well to express my gratitude and appreciation for the contribution that their church and their schools are making to the district of Lewisporte. I have, as a former teacher, of course, had the opportunity to speak to some of the students, particularly the Grade XII students, if you will, on the role of a member and particularly the role of a Speaker when I was in that position. Certainly it was a great opportunity to chat with the teachers and with the students and hear from the students, perhaps particularly, and try to field some of their question in which they showed such a genuine interest in the political system, if you will, and more specifically the topic on which I had the pleasure to speak.

I would also be remiss, Mr. Speaker, and I know there is a danger, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, in naming names, referring to individuals, however, I feel that perhaps I should make some reference to the contribution that has been made by the Bursey brothers, if I may refer to them as that, two gentlemen, along with many others, of course, that I have the greatest admiration for, and the gentleman who is now retired and living in Embree, I think, whom I converse with when the opportunity presents itself and who from time to time has been a source of encouragement to me. They have made and will continue to make, I am sure, and the gentleman who now resides at Embree, a contribution to the system and the life of the Pentecostal church.

Mr. Speaker, we are today reaching a historic occasion in which we in more than perhaps a symbolic way say thank you to the Pentecostal

Church for their contribution and hopefully in some small way - or some big way, perhaps I should say, showing them that all of us in this Legislature support this amendment and are looking forward to having it enshrined in the Constitution of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, there may be others who wish to add a few words before the House adjourns. I am please to be part of this today. It is a historic occasion. It is not often, perhaps, in the life of a politician in a Legislature that he or she has the opportunity to be part of an important piece of legislation, a resolution, having to do with the country's constitution, so for that reason alone it is a historic occasion for me and one which I shall remember for some time. I certainly and obviously will be supporting the resolution and wish the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland every success for their future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, a point of order, with leave, just to make one important sentence that I overlooked.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:
It affects one of the members on that side, if I may.
We should not let this occasion pass without noting that the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) has a very direct and affectionate connection to this

movement, apart from being a member of it himself. His father, Pastor Tom Mitchell, together with Pastor Gillett and Pastor Windsor, were three of the pioneers of the movement. Indeed, Pastor Tom Mitchell was a convert under the ministry of Sister Garrigus. I just wanted to get that into the record. He went on to open more than thirty or so congregations in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Question.

MR. SPEAKER:
All those in favour, 'Aye'. All those against, 'Nay'.

On motion, resolution as put carried unanimously.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Before putting the adjournment motion, I would inform hon. members of the meetings of the Estimate Committees for the week after we return. We would ordinarily be adjourning from today until April 27, Monday, but April 27 is a statutory holiday, St. George's Day, so, therefore, we will be adjourning until April 28.

So, the Committee meetings I will

give now will be for April 28, 29, and 30. On April 28, in the morning, the Resource Committee, Fisheries. On April 28, Tuesday, in the evening, Government Services, Labour. Wednesday, April 29, Resource Services Committee in the morning, Energy. All are invited. Bring your own baskets. Wednesday, April 29, in the evening, Social Services Committee, the Department of Social Services. Thursday, April 30, in the morning, Government Services, Municipal Affairs. Thursday, April 30, in the evening, Resource Services, Development and Tourism. So that is the schedule of meeting for the Estimates Committees during that week.

I now take advantage of the opportunity to wish hon. members a happy Easter, and to move that the House adjourn until Tuesday, April 28, at three o'clock.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 28, at 3:00 p.m.

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C., Premier

Hon. P.J.McNicholas, Speaker

Hon. Roger Simmons, P.C., Leader of the Opposition

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Aylward, Kevin (Lib)	Stephenville
Aylward, Hon. Robert J. (PC)	Kilbride
Baird, Raymond J. (PC)	Humber West
Baker, Winston (Lib)	Gander
Barrett, Hon. Harold (PC)	St. John's West
Barry, Leo (Lib)	Mount Scio - Bell Island
Blanchard, Hon. Ted. A. (PC)	Bay of Islands
Brett, Hon. Charlie (PC)	Trinity North
Butt, Hon. John (PC)	Conception Bay South
Callan, Wilson (Lib)	Bellevue
Carter, John A. (PC)	St. John's North
Carter, Walter C. (Lib)	Twillingate
Collins, Hon. John F. (PC)	St. John's South
Dawe, Hon. Ron (PC)	St. George's
Decker, Chris (Lib)	Strait of Belle Isle
Dinn, Jerome W. (PC)	Pleasantville
Doyle, Norman E. (PC)	Harbour Main
Efford, John (Lib)	Port de Grave
Fenwick, Peter (NDP)	Menihek
Flight, Graham (Lib)	Windsor-Buchans
Furey, Chuck (Lib)	St. Barbe
Gilbert, Dave (Lib)	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Greening, Glenn C. (PC)	Terra Nova
Hearn, Hon. Loyola (PC)	St. Mary's-The Capes
Hiscock, R. Eugene (Lib)	Eagle River
Hodder, James E. (PC)	Port au Port
Kelland, Jim (Lib)	Naskaupi
Long, Gene (NDP)	St. John's East
Lush, Tom (Lib)	Bonavista North

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

...2...

Member

Matthews, Hon. William (PC)
McNicholas, Hon. Dr. P.J. (PC)
Mitchell, Calvin (PC)
Morgan, James (PC)
Ottenheimer, Hon. Gerald R. (PC)
Parsons, Kevin (PC)
Patterson, William G. (PC)
Peach, Milton (PC)
Peckford, A. Brian, P.C. (PC) (Premier)
Power, Hon. Charlie (PC)
Reid, James G. (PC)
Rideout, Hon. Thomas G. (PC) ,
Russell, Hon. Maxwell James (PC)
Simms, Hon. Len (PC)
Simmons, Hon. Roger P.C. (Lib)
Tobin, Glenn (PC)
Tulk, R. Beaton (Lib)
Twomey, Hon. Dr. Hugh Matthew (PC)
Verge, Hon. Lynn (PC)
Warren, Garfield E. (PC)
Windsor, Hon. H. Neil (PC)
Woodford, Rick (PC)
Young, Hon. Haig (PC)

District

Grand Bank
St. John's Centre
LaPoile
Bonavista South
Waterford - Kenmount
St. John's East Extern
Placentia
Carbonear
Green Bay
Ferryland
Trinity - Bay de Verde
Baie Verte - White Bay
Lewisporte
Grand Falls
Fortune-Hermitage
Burin - Placentia West
Fogo
Exploits
Humber East
Torngat Mountains
Mount Pearl
Humber Valley
Harbour Grace

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C.	Premier
Hon. Robert J. Aylward	Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development
Hon. Harold Barrett	Development and Tourism
Hon. Ted A. Blanchard	Labour
Hon. Charlie Brett	Social Services
Hon. John Butt	Environment
Dr. The Hon. John F. Collins	Finance
Hon. Ron Dawe	Transportation
Hon. Jerome W. Dinn	Mines and Energy
Hon. Norman E. Doyle	Municipal Affairs
Hon. Loyola Hearn	Education

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

-2-

Hon. William Matthews	Culture, Recreation and Youth
Hon. Gerald R. Ottenheimer	Energy President of the Council Government House Leader
Hon. Charlie Power	Career Development and Advanced Studies
Hon. Thomas G. Rideout	Fisheries
Hon. Maxwell J. Russell	Consumer Affairs and Communications
Hon. Len Simms	Forest Resources and Lands
Dr. The Hon. Hugh M. Twomey	Health
Hon. Lynn Verge	Justice
Hon. H. Neil Windsor	President of Treasury Board
Hon. Haig Young	Public Works and Services