



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 21

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

30 March 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Before calling Statements by Ministers I would like to have a few words to say about presenting petitions. If you recall, we had some problems last week; there was a very large petition presented but it was to the Department of Justice instead of to the House. Then there was some controversy about another petition that was presented the same day and leave was withdrawn. Actually, when that petition was presented the next day I was unaware, because I do not get the petitions until afterwards, that that petition was not quite in order either as it was a petition to the provincial government; there was an unsigned note stapled to it stating, 'We want this presented to the House of Assembly.' But that does not validate a petition. So over the weekend I looked to see what precedents and what rulings we have had in the past and I have got one here that I would like to read so that it will be in Hansard for the guidance of all hon. members. It was by a predecessor of mine, and he summed it up in a much better way than I could do, so I would like to read this. It is dated almost ten years ago, 10 March, 1978, and it is to the Opposition House Leader.

It says: "Dear Mr. Neary:

"I am writing you and the Government House Leader with the request that you advise members of your caucus on the requirements of the rules with respect to presenting petitions. I have always regarded the right of citizens to petition the House of Assembly as a fundamental one. It

is not my wish to embarrass any Member or cause inconvenience to petitioners. It is my understanding, however, that I am required to apply the Standing Orders as they are. To be selective in this matter, to decide to apply certain Standing Orders and to ignore others, would be improper and would establish a dangerous precedent.

"In my opinion it is not necessary that a petition be a duplicate of any one rigid form. You will find attached a photostatic copy of the format in Beauchesne which is the general format traditionally followed in the House of Assembly. As was pointed out by one Member, some of the words are archaic. It is not in my opinion necessary that any particular word formula be employed; certainly the language can be modernized. While therefore it is not necessary to reproduce any particular words, it is necessary to follow the general format.

"It is essential that what is supported and tabled under the routine order under Presenting Petitions be in fact a petition, which I understand as a request whereby the petitioners ask that something be done. It is not a demand. Moreover, the petition must be addressed to the House of Assembly and not to one or several individual Members or anybody else.

"I am always available to any Member who wishes to consult me on this or any other parliamentary matter on a confidential basis. The Officers of the Table area also available to be of service to Members in these matters. I would appreciate it if you would draw this to your caucus' attention.

Yours sincerely,

Gerald R. Ottenheimer, M.H.A.
Speaker"

Statements by Ministers

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to inform this Honourable House on government's position on the recommendations contained in a report of the Construction Industry Advisory Committee.

The Construction Industry Advisory Committee was appointed by me on 11 July, 1985. The members of the Committee were Gordon Easton, Chairman, William Alcock and Gonzo Gillingham. The Committee's terms of reference were to examine and report on four specific terms of reference. The first of these terms of reference, Mr. speaker, deals with:-

(1) Methods of settling jurisdictional disputes between unions operating on large construction projects.

(2) Collective bargaining in the construction industry with particular reference to facilities related to the Petroleum Industry.

(3) The adequacy of accreditation and speedy arbitration provisions in the Labour Relations Act.

(4) The practice of employers in the construction industry over the past several years of maintaining a unionized and non-unionized company employing the same

classifications of employees and performing the same kind of work.

The Committee held a number of private and public hearings throughout the Province and accepted briefs from a number of interested groups, following which the Committee filed its report on 17 February, 1986. The report was released publicly by me on 14 April, 1986. Submissions on the report were invited from employer and labour organizations.

Cabinet has carefully considered both the recommendations in the report and the representation that has been made in response. At this time government wishes to announce its position on all recommendations contained in the report.

The first term of reference:

Methods of Settling Jurisdictional Disputes Between Unions Operating on Large Construction Projects.

Government has accepted the recommendation in this area pertaining to:

(a) Jurisdiction disputes being submitted to the Labour Relations Board with a jurisdictional umpire selected by Labour and management to adjudicate disputes;

(b) Employers making more use of job mark-ups and pre-job conferences; and

(c) Parties making use of composite crews on work where there may be jurisdictional cross-overs.

The second term of reference:

Collective Bargaining in the

Construction Industry With Particular Reference to Facilities Related to the Petroleum Industry.

Government is substantially in agreement with the Committee's recommendations with respect to facilities related to the Hibernia development.

Government accepts the recommendation that the construction of the gravity based system be declared a special project under Section 70 of the Labour Relations Act and amendments to be made to sections of the Act to allow the Newfoundland and Labrador Construction Labour Relations Association and project contractors to negotiate and administer the agreement. This is done on the understanding that non-union companies be permitted to bid on gravity based structures and bring their work crews to the project, provided that they adhere to all the conditions of the project agreement and that non-union companies should be represented during the negotiations of the project agreement by the Newfoundland and Labrador Construction Association.

Furthermore, we endorse:

(a) A project agreement to cover all construction and ancillary work;

(b) The arbitration procedure as set out in the Committee report;

(c) The concept of a broadly based joint bargaining council which recognizes all relevant union groups, including the Building Trades Council and the Industrial Union of Marine Workers;

(d) A composite crew concept be expanded but with due regard to union dues being paid to the appropriate union, subject to its being implemented through negotiations;

(e) The appointment of a person to oversee labour - management relations and advise the Minister of Labour; and

(f) The establishment of a comprehensive training strategy for workers to maximize the accessibility of skills. Government's preferred position with respect to seniority is that it be applied on a province-wide basis, that workers not be recruited from outside the Province and that there be no local hiring policy within the Province.

The third of reference, Mr. Speaker: The Adequacy of Accreditation and Speech Arbitration Provisions in The Labour Relations Act.

Government has approved in full the recommendations in this area. Specifically, we agree that:

(a) No change be made in the current arbitration provisions as set out in the Act;

(b) That legislation be introduced requiring multi-trade bargaining in the commercial/industrial sector of the construction industry and the Office of the Legislative Counsel is directed to prepare draft legislation to implement this recommendation;

(c) An economic forecast be prepared by Government or the Economic Council of Newfoundland and Labrador and be presented to labour and management prior to the

bargaining positions being formulated; and

(d) The industry commit itself to a five year strike and lockout free period with disputes being settled by arbitration.

The fourth and last term, Mr. Speaker: The Practice of Employers in the Construction Industry Over the Past Several Years of Maintaining a Union and Non-unionized Company Employing the Same Classification of Employees and Performing the Same Kind of Work.

Government has accepted the recommendations in this area pertaining to:

(a) An amendment to The Labour Relations Act to require an employer in any application to adduce the facts relevant to the allegation that a sale or transfer of a business has occurred;

(b) The Labour Relations Board be given the power to determine any questions arising in the commercial/industrial sector. The Department of Labour, in consultation with the Department of Justice, will review the appropriateness of regulatory or legislative change to allow the Labour Relations Board to determine the appropriate sector within the construction industry for purposes of Section 54 of The Labour Relations Act, 1977 and prepare a submission to Cabinet appending the draft regulations or act.

With respect to the recommendation of the report that in a Section 89 application, the onus be placed upon the employer to prove that there has been no sale, transfer or other disposal of the business,

government feels that this would be an unnecessary step in light of its decision on adducing the relevant facts, which has been the primary stumbling block in this case.

Government's fundamental concern has been with the concept of 'reverse onus' in which a party is presumed guilty until they prove themselves innocent. This is contrary to the basic principles of natural justice and Government has decided not to accept this recommendation. Further, in light of recent court decisions, a number of the reservations expressed by unions with the operation of Section 89 have been allayed. Government has also taken measures to greatly speed up the hearing process of the Labour Relations Board by the appointment of special panels to, in particular, serve the needs of the construction sector.

Government does not agree, Mr. Speaker, with the recommendation that a separate minimum wage be set for the construction industry to be the same as that of unionized tradesmen. This recommendation would have the effect of creating a two tier minimum wage and could have a profound impact on other sectors of the economy which would legitimately insist on equal benefits.

I would be pleased to meet with any group from the construction industry who may wish further details on Government's position on the recommendations of the Construction Industry Advisory Committee Report.

Government is extremely pleased to be able to support and approve the majority of recommendations

contained in that report. It is hoped that action can be taken immediately where legislation is required to implement these recommendations. Mr. Speaker, Government looks forward to a stable construction climate in the coming years, especially during the construction of petroleum related projects.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the absence of the gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) who would normally address these matters on behalf of my colleagues in the Official Opposition, let me say a few words. I want, first of all, to thank the members of that committee for what would appear to be a very thoughtful and well thought out set of recommendations. Messrs Easton, Alcock and Gillingham have brought to the assignment considerable experience and expertise, and I believe both the experience and expertise show through in the thoroughness of the recommendations.

Having said that I say to the minister that we will reserve the right to make a fuller statement once we scrutinize. I recognize this is an important statement, and I would want to have the input of the gentleman from Fogo, in particular. It is a statement

that, it would appear to me, has some fairly far-reaching implications for labour relations in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, the reference early in the document, on page 1 of the document to, 'The practice of employers in the construction industry over the past several years of maintaining a unionized and a non-unionized company', brings to mind something of the pain and the havoc and the confusion that we have seen in the Come By Chance situation and I would hope that this government has learned a hard lesson from that particular experience.

We would be interested, Mr. Speaker, in seeing the Terms of Reference of the sales of the refinery to see what kind of successor rights are involved there, to see, in particular, whether this confrontation of these past few weeks could have been avoided with more astute pre-planning of the situation at the time the sale was being negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, any initiative which has the effect of lowering the temperature of government labour relations in this Province is a step in the right direction. In no area is the record of this particular administration more thoroughly abysmal than in that of labour relations. I want to say to the minister today that I believe he would appear to be on the right track, and Lord knows it is about time. We welcome him back to the beaten path, we hope now he stays on it, and we hope he uses the same persistence now that he used to be so famous for when he was a deputy minister. He seemed to have lost his vision for a period, but today is a new

sign. Perhaps it is the beginning of a new week, perhaps it is nothing more significant than that he has a new shirt on, I do not know. We hope it is because his mind has been focused and he has decided there is no way the problems are going to go away, that he has to do something about the problems and, I say to him, perhaps today's statement is the first important step in that direction. I certainly hope so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am afraid my comments are not going to be quite as laudatory. There are at least four points in here I see as major deficiencies in terms of trying to settle the problems that we have in the construction industry and I will go over them one by one.

The first is on page two: "Government is substantially in agreement with the Committee's recommendations with respect to facilities related to the Hibernia development." Of course not to the petroleum industry, because otherwise that would include the Come By Chance oil refinery and, as we know, that was one of the major problems there.

The second point is on the next page of the statement and it says there will be project agreements in the manufacturing of the gravity based structures, which I see as a good point, and the non-union companies will be allowed in, "Provided that they adhere to all the conditions of

the project agreement and that non-union companies should be represented during the negotiations of the project agreement by the Newfoundland and Labrador Construction Association." Now, my interpretation of that - and I will ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) at some later date and he might correct me if it is wrong - is that it would mean there would be master agreements and there would essentially be uniform rates on the project for the same kind of trades. So in a sense we have a minimum wage rate for tradesmen on the gravity based structure projects.

But later on when he talks about double breasting, which is referred to several pages later, he indicates that they will not do that for construction throughout the Province itself. I would suggest to the government opposite that they have not really solved the problem that we have and that is that in double breasting the major problem is that the non-union companies paying lower rates can consistently undercut the unionized companies and that is what is causing the majority of the problems.

On page six it says, "Government does not agree with the recommendation that a separate minimum wage be set for the construction industry to be the same as that of unionized tradesmen." Quite frankly, without that being in the agreement, without that being part of the settlement for it, then the double breasting will continue no matter what the niceties are in the rest of the thing, and we will continue to have the kinds of problems we have had. I find it extremely unfortunate that the

minister has not been able to bring up the courage to solve the problem in the only advisable way, which was to set unified construction rates across the Province once they have been negotiated.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the Premier back to his seat after his sojourn in the nation's capital. I would hope that in addition to his having had time to talk about aboriginal rights, as important as that matter is, that he also took time to find out what in the name of goodness is going on insofar as the Canada/France issue is concerned. The last day he was in the Chamber we raised the matter of Mr. Clark's letter to the gentleman who was once the Deputy Mayor of the city of Saint-Malo and also the Assistant Representative for Maritime Matters. They have that system over there where you can, I think, be both Premier and Mayor at the same time.

MR. J. CARTER:

What is your question?

MR. SIMMONS:

I have a good question for the Premier. There is no worry about that I say to the gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if during his visit to Ottawa the Premier got some answers as to why those commitments were put in that

letter to the people of Saint-Malo just about a year ago, long before the matter broke open publicly. Did he have an opportunity to talk with the Prime Minister and/or Mr. Clark about this whole issue and get some answers as to why the Government of Canada had a well thought out plan many months before it alerted the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to that plan?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to speak to a number of people in Ottawa about it and express our concerns about the letters. I guess the bottom line, from where the federal government is coming, is that they continue to insist to us, and up to this point in time we have no reason to disagree with them, that this is a whole new ball game now. The controversy that erupted in January is one which is highlighted from Newfoundland in that Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Clark both are on top of the situation and they continue to indicate to us now that there will be nothing done unless Newfoundland is completely involved. Certain letters were written back a year or two ago, and that in no way now impinges their new mandate to try to move forward in line more with what Newfoundland considers to be appropriate than they did back at that point in time, back in February 1986. We will have to wait and see whether in fact it is true. The negotiations are continuing, there has been nothing finalized, so I guess the proof of the pudding is in the eating. We will have to wait and see whether the new co-operation and the new input from us will mean a

difference in the approach that they took last year and the approach they will continue to take this year.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

The Premier will be aware that the minister from Newfoundland in the federal cabinet, Mr. Crosbie, attempted last week, when this letter became public, to justify its contents. I gather from the Premier's answer a moment ago that Mr. Clark is now putting some distance between himself, Mr. Clark, and the contents of that letter, and he would be wise to do that. I ask the Premier if Mr. Crosbie's justification of it would signal to him, or should it signal to us, that Mr. Crosbie and he, the Premier, are still on very different wavelengths on a number of issues, including in particular the handling of the Canada/France issue?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Obviously, I have indicated to them again, as a result of this letter being made public, that the approach that the federal government was taking up until this year, up until the last few weeks, was one that we could not support at all. We indicated to them that this letter and other things that they did in 1986 we thought were completely inappropriate. I have not got a copy now of what Mr. Crosbie said in defence of the letter, but obviously from our point of view there can be very little defence of that letter. We are continually told, and it is

indicated to us, that nothing will occur at the table unless we are there and unless we are totally involved. So we will have to take that as being fine for now, and monitor what goes on at the table. If in fact something goes askew, then we will be making our position known in no uncertain terms. We have not changed one inch from where we were back four or five weeks ago, or six or seven weeks ago. We continue to reiterate to the federal government that that is our position and will remain so. If anything different is tried at the table, well, then we are going to oppose it both at the table and in other places.

MR. SIMMONS:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Would the Premier indicate to the House, apart from a casual hello in the corridor or by virtue of having been in the same place at the same time with Mr. Crosbie, when was the last time he and Mr. Crosbie had any discussion on a substantive matter affecting the interests of the people of Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let me see now. Last week we had a fairly extensive conversation on two occasions, on Thursday afternoon or Thursday morning, I am not sure which now. The week before that I had a meeting with Mr. Crosbie in Ottawa which lasted about three and a

half or four hours.

MR. SIMMONS:

Just the two of you?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes. Just the two of us.

So, we have been communicating and having extensive meetings, just the two of us, as well as extensive meetings with some of his staff with our Intergovernmental Affairs Department. So there has been a fair amount of interchange between Mr. Crosbie and myself on all of the issues which face the Province, totalling fifteen or twenty individual items. We have been following up on them. Last Thursday's conversation with Mr. Crosbie was to follow up on some of those that had come out of the previous meeting the previous week.

MR. SIMMONS:

So you have kissed and made up, as it were.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

My question is to the hon. the Premier as well. It concerns the privatization of Fishery Products International. Mr. Speaker, in the preliminary prospectus there is provision made for an executive stock option plan. That plan will undertake to provide \$2.5 million worth of common shares, 53,500 shares, to thirteen executive members of Fishery Products International, shares that can be purchased at any time during the option period at today's prices.

Could the Premier tell the House, Mr. Speaker, what is the option period? How far in the future does that option extend?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know off the top of my head, Mr. Speaker, but I will undertake to get the answer for the hon. member either later on this afternoon or tomorrow.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, there is a suggestion that the option extends for about five years. Will the Premier comment as well on the fact that at least two of the highly placed executives of FPI, one who is Chairman and the Chief Executive Officer, and the other Executive Vice-President of Financial Management, were at one time highly placed provincial public servants? Can the Premier tell the House if these men, even in their present capacities, retain their status within the provincial public service with respect to pension rights, etc.?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker. They are completely gone from the government now and are in the private sector. They are no longer public servants in any way or shape of the definition. They have taken their pension rights or whatever and gone to FPI with them. So there is absolutely no connection between these two gentlemen, that the hon. member

refers to, and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. They are gone. God bless them! They did a good job while they were here, and they are out in the private sector and there is absolutely no connection with this government or any government of Newfoundland that I know of.

MR. W. CARTER:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, again in the course of restructuring of FPI there were references made to some of their so-called social plants, most of which have been disposed of by that company. There are still three of three or four so-called -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, my question, Mr. Speaker. My supplementary is there are still three or four so-called social plants still held by FPI, Ramea, Gaultois, and, I believe, Harbour Breton. Is the Premier satisfied that there is sufficient guarantees written into the privatization agreement to ensure that these plants will be allowed to continue within the FPI operation?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the short answer to that question is yes. I think we are all surprised that

the thirteen plants now, and Charleston, that have been divested by the FPI company itself have gone to the private sector without any money from the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. Two or three years ago I would suspect that there would be very few people here in this House would have ever imagined not only that FPI itself, as it is now structured, is profitable, but that they were going to be able to divest of these plants to the private sector without one single dollar from the federal government, without one single dollar from the provincial government.

We are satisfied now that with the collection of plants that they have they are going to be able to retain ownership of these plants and make the whole operation work. Secondly, of course, we have provisions in the agreement which mean that they have to give notice to the governments, and then it will be up to the governments to decide whether in fact these plants stay open. So the onus does come back where it legitimately belongs, if it relates to a given plant in some more isolated part of the Province, back to the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada to decide.

So I think we have sufficient protection there to ensure it. Not only that, there is and will continue to be, as there is in any good company, from time to time some cross subsidization, and that is no doubt what will happen in FPI. You know, the plant in Ramea is absolutely critical to that island, and so are some of the other plants. So we think we have sufficient protection there that if in fact sometime in the future

FPI does decide that this or that plant is one that they have no longer want then the responsibility comes back to the governments to decide upon it at our level. That is where that kind of a decision should be made, and we do not shirk our responsibilities in that regard.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell). The minister will know that Bill C-22 is back on the floor of the House of Commons in Ottawa, and this is a bill which will limit the generic drug companies' ability to keep the costs of generic drugs down for consumers in Canada. I would like to ask the minister what is the Provincial Government's position with respect to this proposed federal legislation?

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question, and I would like to think that he is already aware, perhaps, of the answer to it. However, in case he or members opposite are not, the Provincial Government's position on this piece of legislation on the matter of generic drugs and the amendment to The Patent Act is very clear, that we are not in favour of this piece of legislation. We feel that the

result of it will be, down the road, increased prices to everybody, but particularly to those on fixed incomes.

On more than two occasions I have written the previous Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to this effect. I have written to the present Minister of Consumer and Cooperative Affairs (Mr. Harvie) expressing government's views on this matter. My colleague, the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), has on numerous occasions made his view known to his counterpart, the hon. Jake Epp. And on two occasions I attended meetings at Halifax and verbally gave our position to the federal minister. So, Mr. Speaker, it is very clear where we are coming from on this piece of legislation. We do not think it is a good piece of legislation, and we are not in favour of it.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. Barbe, a final supplementary.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, this is a extremely serious issue which affects people on fixed incomes, particularly senior citizens in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I wonder would the minister undertake to convene an all-party committee, lead by him, to go to Ottawa to state Newfoundland and Labrador's case forcefully, in person, to the federal Conservatives to show them that we mean business to protect people on fixed incomes in this Province?

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

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I do not particularly think that that is necessary at this particular time. Without repeating the answer I just gave to the hon. member, I know that the Premier has made known to Mr. Crosbie and to others the government stand on this piece of legislation, I have made it known in writing and, as I said, my colleague here, the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), has made it known. I do not particularly think that the suggestion made by the hon. member for St. Barbe is necessary and certainly not acceptable to me at this particular time.

MR. FUREY:

One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) concerning the recent appointment to the Young Offenders Board of a former hon. minister, Mr. Hickey. I would like to ask the minister does he still stand by his original statement where he was quoted as saying that the reason for the appointment on the Young Offenders Board was the fact that the provincial Court system was overloaded, in light of the recent news that has come from employees of the Department of Justice saying that in fact the provincial Juvenile Court system is not overloaded, and even when the Young Offenders Board is in

place cases still have to come before a Provincial Court Judge?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

We would hope, Mr. Speaker, that with putting in place this board that more cases will be reviewed over shorter periods of time. The hon. member is correct when he says that the court has the final decision. It is our understanding that unless someone intervenes and the committee recommends that a sentence be shortened or whatever that in just about every case the court would go along with the decision. So we would hope, Mr. Speaker, that more cases will be appealed or checked in a shorter period of time and hopefully relieve some of the overcrowding in our two institutions.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the hon. the Premier.

In light of the answer just given by the Minister of Social Services in that he would hope that more cases will come before the Appeal Board, does the Premier not see it necessary to put this appointment on hold and have a further enquiry into it before all these amounts of monies are spent in office space and in wages when probably it is not even necessary at all? The minister is just saying that he hopes that more appeals will go into the process.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the hon. member's attitude on this. There is an increasing number of cases that are going through the courts right now and they will be dealt with the same as almost any common criminal will be dealt with. You have The Young Offenders Act there which deals with young people from age twelve to eighteen, and the reason why we are bringing this in at this time is that we are seeing an increasing number of children, of people from twelve to eighteen, who are going through a court process. They have no way whatsoever now of getting out of the process unless you go on up through the court process, and the court process does not work for them. The whole idea of why this was put in, and we agreed with that provision - we still do not agree with The Young Offenders Act as presently legislated, but we had no choice; the federal government had the jurisdiction and went ahead and pushed it on us without our having the proper money and the proper facilities to deal with it - is that this board then can review and have social workers - it only takes the mother or the father or the client or the child to make that kind of an appeal - and then the appeal has to be heard by this Appeal Board that is established, and it will provide for the more social and cultural aspects of the case to be discussed, so that a twelve or thirteen year old is not by court order to stay in a closed custody institution and will give the opportunity for the board to view all of the other circumstances surrounding the case.

If there are one or two, or if there are ten or fifteen young people today who do not have that opportunity, surely the establishment of this board will give them that opportunity so that they may have their sentence reduced or the way that the whole punishment system will work will be more compassionate and give a person, twelve years old, the opportunity that by the time they are eighteen years old they will back into society and be a contributing member of society rather than harden them in the closed custody situation, so that you almost inevitably lead to a hardened criminal when they are eighteen or nineteen or twenty. So it is a progressive move on our part to try to eliminate, as much as we can, these young offenders from becoming, right from the start, viewed by the courts as another criminal.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question too is to the Premier. It has to do with the conference last week on Thursday and Friday which turned out to be a futile attempt to enshrine aboriginal rights in the constitution. I think myself and a number of other people were somewhat dismayed to see our Premier in a position where he was aligning himself with the Premiers of British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan, they being the four who refused to allow that to go in.

My question for the Premier is this: What rationale does he have for not allowing some entrenchment

or some guarantees for aboriginal rights in our constitution so that Native peoples, who have been discriminated against in the past, can hope to improve their status somewhat?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Number one, Mr. Speaker, I have to correct the hon. member for Menihek. We are not opposed to entrenching aboriginal rights into the constitution. There are already some rights entrenched in the constitution. It was entrenching the right to self-government before it is defined. It was the right to self-government undefined, as a general right, which would give aboriginal groups all across the Nation the opportunity to have the court adjudicate on the Province and on the governments throughout Canada just exactly what that meant.

As I said at the conference, I do not think any Canadian would want to be asked by another Canadian, 'Will you please come down this highway with me? I do not know the condition of the highway and I do not know the destination that I am headed in, but will you please come with me?' My answer to that is, no, I am very sorry, fellow Canadian, I do not intend to go down a road when I do not know the condition of that road, nor do I know the destination that I am about to get to.

I did not align myself with Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. I aligned myself to an idea, and the idea is that until it is defined for me how much it is going to cost the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, and how

much is going to be borne by the Government of Canada, and until I know more about the powers that that third or fourth level of government will have, I am reluctant to take the leap of faith and just put into the constitution a general right, which always has the option to be adjudicated in courts and not just negotiated with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

The situation now is, from where we sit we are prepared to sit down with the various aboriginal peoples, the Native peoples of Newfoundland and Labrador, and negotiate particular self-government agreements with those aboriginal peoples. Hopefully we will be able to do that over the next couple of years. Then, as we have already agreed, those agreements can be entrenched in the constitution.

As I indicated at the conference, that is a far cry from what we have right now, even with provinces from time to time who do not have agreements entrenched into the constitution. They would have these agreements in the constitution. They would be unable to be changed very easily. So I think that is the approach that we are taking and we think it is a reasonable approach.

If you look at, for example, the Federation of Newfoundland Indians on the Island, who are in Port au Port or the Codroy Valley area, St. George's area, or in Glenwood area, that is one particular self-government agreement, and it might vary between Glenwood and Bay St. George. It might vary with the Innu in Labrador, if they would ever recognize us as a government, because right now, as I understand it, the Naskaupi and

Montagnais have not recognized the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. It is very difficult to negotiate with them. The LIA would be a different self-government agreement again.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My supplementary for the Premier is this: I think there is a degree of credibility to an argument that says we should know exactly what we are getting into before we go down the long road to a major development like that. My question to the Premier is: In Labrador today, where the vast majority of our Native peoples live, we are now proceeding down the road with major military development and the NATO base in a way in which we do not know what the impact will be on the Native peoples. Can the Premier now agree with us that it is very important to know what development is coming up in order to be able to tell whether or not Native peoples' rights are being completely exterminated by our own actions and our endorsement of the project in Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Everybody knows that whole tactical NATO base operation is not a secret or a myth.

Most people who have done any research on it, and we have established various environmental committees and other things to try and ensure that the environment is

protected, not just for the Native people of Labrador but for all the people of Labrador, the 30,000 whites and the 2000 or 3000 Native.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is not the same thing. If the member for Menihek is trying to say that entrenching a self-government undefined right in the constitution is exactly the same as not knowing anything about what a NATO Base is, then I would say the hon. member for Menihek better wake up and start reading some of the material that is available as to what the NATO tactical base is all about.

MR. GILBERT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

I have a question for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt). There was an alarming statement in the The Sunday Express over the weekend concerning a very serious pollution problem in the Exploits River. Is this pollution problem a fact or is it just being overplayed by the press as the members over there seem to think?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, we have recognized for quite some time, actually, that things are not the way they should be in the Exploits River, because the towns of Windsor, Grand Falls Bishop Falls are dumping untreated sewerage in that

river. But it is about a \$20 million project to bring it all together, to tie in the outfalls and to treat it before it goes into the river. My department was instrumental in doing a number of environmental studies there two years ago, in 1985, and the results of these studies have been made known to the municipalities of the three towns in question. As of today, I might add, which is somewhat ironic, even though I can tell the hon. gentleman that I do not have \$20 million to put in a sewerage treatment plant, we do not have a request from the municipalities even for funding to put a sewerage treatment plant in place in the Exploits River.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) will recall a few days ago - on March 24 in fact, the Hansard reference is L906 - I asked about an electrical inspector's job in his department. I would now like to put it to him again, as he said he would find out the information, what method was used to fill the job? Did it go through the Public Service Commission?

MR. BLANCHARD:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:
I tabled that information - I did not table it. I gave that

information in the absence of the hon. gentleman on Friday, but I will see him after behind the curtain or wherever, and tell him personally.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. KELLAND:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:
I am sorry but I was not here on Friday and I did not get that information. However, I would like to ask a supplementary. Would the minister confirm for this House that there was nothing that could smack of patronage in filling the job? Would he tell the House whether or not he has received any representation from any of his colleagues on the government side, either verbally or in writing, as to who should fill that job?

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
The answer is simple, Mr. Speaker. As I said on Friday there was a vacancy created by an inspector from the St. John's area being dismissed. Because there was a grievance over that and eventually an arbitration, it has not yet been settled. We have to wait to get the arbitrator's report, so we cannot advertise through the Public Service Commission to fill the position permanently. Another inspector has been off sick, and consequently there was a backlog

of work. Now, as far as how it was done, Mr. Speaker, we have, I guess from time to time, where there are a lot of tradesmen unemployed, they send in applications and we had a curriculum vitae on file belonging to a person who is known to the other inspectors - a good workman, good credentials, a good tradesman with course work beyond the trade level - and we offered that person about twelve weeks work. We followed the collective agreement and offered that person twelve weeks work on a temporary basis.

MR. KELLAND:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. KELLAND:

I gather from what the minister said there was no patronage involved and no representation was made by any of his colleagues on the government side. So, based on that, how would the minister explain the fact that the successful candidate happens to be the Vice-President of the PC Association of Conception Bay South?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

You are wrong. That is wrong.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I am told by my colleagues that that is inaccurate information. But, Mr. Speaker, we do not go around checking to find out what political party a person belongs to, at least I do not in my department. They may. If this

person was selected for his qualifications, Mr. Speaker, there is no patronage. I had no representation from anybody. It was just that the person has a good record, he is on for twelve weeks. The job will be filled through the proper channels, Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

- Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power). My question is, in the light of recent information indicating that Memorial University is in a severe financial crisis, I wonder if the minister can indicate the validity and substance of this rather disturbing news and how this coincides with his own information re the financial situation of Memorial University?

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that that

member also read The Sunday Express this weekend and is now aware of what some people presume is a crisis. Mr. Speaker, at Memorial University we have the only university in Newfoundland, which has made tremendous gains in recent years in relationship to other universities in Atlantic Canada in supplying excellent academic services to its students. The University, because of the nature of its programmes, and because it has done such an excellent job, is now attracting more and more students every year. The percentage increases last year was over 11 per cent, over 11 per cent more students wanted to go to Memorial.

MR. BARRY:

That is because they are unemployed.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, it might be the fact that some of them are unemployed, it might also be the fact that a lot of young students realize there is a relationship between being unemployed and being uneducated -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

- which in Newfoundland certainly seems to be proven every time you turn around.

Memorial University, Mr. Speaker, received the highest percentage increase of any department of government last year, in excess of a 13 per cent increase last year, more than any other given department of government. That money helped the University to rectify some problems that it had and certainly to get on the main stream so that they can continue

with the work they have. This year, when our good Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) does his budget again sometime in the very near future, you will see that Memorial University has been very, very well treated by this government in relationship to other agencies within the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. We intend to make the University the very best place we possibly can, Mr. Speaker. We are doing that by establishing such things as a Fine Arts degree granting programme in Corner Brook, by an extension to the Business Administration Building there last year of \$3 million; by \$25 million for an Earth Resources Building, a new School of Pharmacy and a new School of Music, Mr. Speaker. The University is certainly not being poorly treated by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! At this time I would like to welcome to the galleries Mrs. Hazel McIssac, former MHA for St. George's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Motion 1.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion 1. Is the House ready for the Question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

All those in favour of the motion, 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the motion, 'Nay.'

The motion is carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Division.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the motion please rise:

The hon. the Premier; the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe); the hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge); the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power); the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey); the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout); the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell); the hon. the President of the Council and Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer); the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins); the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms); the hon. the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor); the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young); the hon. the

Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews); the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn); the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt); the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle); the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard); the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett); Mr. Baird; Mr. Greening; Mr. Patterson; Mr. J. Carter; Mr. Tobin; Mr. Peach; Mr. Parsons; Mr. Hodder; Mr. Morgan; Mr. Warren; Mr. Mitchell; Mr. Woodford; the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons); Mr. Hiscock; Mr. Tulk; Mr. Callan; Mr. Lush; Mr. W. Carter; Mr. Gilbert; Mr. Aylward; Mr. Efford; Mr. Furey; Mr. Kelland.

All those against the motion please rise:

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, your order was called to ask those in favour to rise, which members did in the official Opposition and Government. Two did not, and that is their privilege, the two Socialist members. Then Your Honour asked those opposed to please rise and the two hon. Socialist members did not rise. That is not their privilege. It is their privilege to vote for or to vote against.

Standing Order 83 is very specific. It says, "On a division every member present in his place in the House when the question is put shall be required to vote." It is very straightforward.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is obviously straightforward - some rules are so obvious that they are incapable of interpretation - and no doubt it is there for a specific reason, and that is people in this Province, when they elect members to the House of Assembly, have a right to know on important matters - that is why on important matters there is a division - where those hon. members stand. They can stand anyway they want to, but they cannot sit on the fence without being injured.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, it is a long and honourable tradition that members abstain on motions in which they do not have enough information one way or the other.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, last week, on several different occasions, we attempted to do that. Since these children in this House wanted to play games that is up to them, but we have decided that we are not going to play their games any more. We have some serious reservations

about the development. We do not wish to vote against it and we do not wish to vote for it. Mr. Speaker, if that is a violation of the rules, so be it.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of knowing the rules. If the gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is pleading ignorance not only will we understand, we will recognize what he is talking about from other experiences with him in this particular Chamber. If it is ignorance that is one thing, because the rules are very specific. The road runner routine last week was not brought on by a consciousness of high standing traditions but a concentration of the mind on the issue the gentlemen were not prepared to face.

The rules are very clear: On the matter of voice votes you can be silent. I suppose if you read into it, if you extrapolate, you can be on both sides of an issue, but, as my friend from Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) has so well said, the rules are very clear on the matter of a Division. Because that Division is put there not so that the House will be repetitive, not so that we can say it with our voice and then with our bodies by standing, it is put there for a different reason than mere repetition of vote, it is put there so that those people who have a strong viewpoint on a given issue are given the opportunity to give witness to that particular point of view,

that particular stance. The Standing Orders are very kind to members who are elected to this House, they presume that everybody who comes here will stand for something. They do not imply that we should all be on the same side of an argument, but they imply that eventually you stand for something.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Long) and the gentleman from Menihek, there was another way out and it did not consist of adopting the road runner routine and getting out of here on a voice vote. The gentlemen could have stayed in their place, as was their right and within the rules of the Chamber, on the voice vote. And perhaps the problem, Mr. Speaker, is that they actually know as little about NATO as they know the rules. Perhaps that is the issue. Perhaps we have been overestimating their grasp of the issue. On the matter of the Division, Mr. Speaker, the rules are clear. It is not a matter of telling us about long standing tradition, it is a matter of obeying one of the first rules of the game, and the first rule of this game, since he has called it that, is that you live by the rules in this House. We can only assume that he is less excited about voting for this than he was about voting for it in Montreal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Just one further thought on the rules. The gentleman ought to know that when the bar goes across he cannot leave. If he wanted to leave, and it is not a matter of playing games, not a matter of children or anything else, it is a

matter of if he knew the rules and he would live by them, he could have stayed for the voice vote - he chose to run out of here like a scald cat - he could have risen in his place and voted for or against, or he had one other choice which was not to sit down but to say, I respect the rules, Mr. Speaker, and quietly - not like a scared cat - I will now withdraw from the Chamber before the bar goes across, and that would be in accordance with the long standing tradition he talks about.

Mr. Speaker, the essential point raised by the gentleman from Waterford - Kenmount is this: This matter must be dealt with. This matter must be dealt with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
And now. Now!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Waterford - Kenmount, who is a man of great compassion, let us not use a sledgehammer for some small creatures but, at the same time, let us be clear that we cannot have people in this Chamber skating around the rules of this House for whatever reason. I support him in the principle he has espoused and the need to address it with some action at this particular time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The point raised by the hon. the Government House Leader is well-taken. I will read our Standing Order 83 again: "On a division every member present in

his place in the House when the question is put shall be required to vote."

I now call on the two hon. members, the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) and the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) to vote.

MR. FUREY:

Get up and vote. Come on. Do not be such children.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, we know exactly what we are doing. As far as we are concerned, there are some very serious questions that have to be addressed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am calling on the hon. members to obey our Standing Order 83 now, and that is to vote. If they do not obey, it is up to the House what is to be done with them.

I call on the hon. member for Menihek and the hon. member for St. John's East to vote, not to speak on the matter.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, we will not vote on it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

This is a direct challenge of the authority of the Chair and the usual procedure is for the Speaker to name them and the Government House Leader to put a motion. I will inform hon. members what the

motion will be, if Your Honour names them, or when Your Honour names them, and that will be that the hon. members not sit for the remainder of today.

I do not like to do that, but I think if the rules are going to mean anything and the authority of the Chair is going to mean anything, then we have to proceed that way.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I now name Mr. Peter Fenwick and Mr. Gene Long for disregarding the direction of the Chair.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I move that the hon. members just named by the Speaker be required to remove themselves from the House for the rest of the sitting day, today.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. TULK:

The hon. the Government House Leader is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the motion has not been passed at this point. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen cannot be allowed, as the Government House Leader says, to break the rules of this Legislature. They have to be enforced, and Standing Order 83 is being suitably enforced in our opinion.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour, 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against, 'Nay'. Carried.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The motion is carried, forty-one in favour none against.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Standard Time Act." (Bill No. 14)

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I take great pleasure in introducing and asking for approval of this act, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Standard Time Act". I am sure all members of the House of Assembly are very much aware that this bill is motivated by the desire to maintain a consistency in the adoption of Daylight Saving Time throughout Canada and the United States. The Government of the United States have already set the first Sunday of April, 1987 as the date for the commencement of Daylight Saving Time. All provinces of Canada, with the exception of Saskatchewan, have also now served notice of their

intention to follow suit.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, will provide for the commencement of Daylight Saving Time in our Province on the first Sunday in April each year. It will also permit the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to vary the date of the commencement of Daylight Saving Time or Newfoundland Standard Time.

These amendments to the Newfoundland Standard Time Act will ensure that our Province's time practices are kept up to date with current changes and will facilitate any future changes deemed necessary or desirable.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to outline for hon. members that "Clause 1 of this Bill would provide for the commencement of Daylight Saving Time on the first Sunday in April of each year" and "Clause 2 would permit the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to vary the commencement date of Daylight Saving Time or Newfoundland Standard Time."

I am sure, as well, Mr. Speaker, that all hon. members are very much aware that some five weeks ago, to deal with the long-term solution to the use of daylight in our Province, we released a Green Paper on Time and we are looking for a lot of responses from individuals, organizations and groups in the Province. The deadline for responses is the last of June, and we are hoping, from those responses, that there will be some trend or majority opinion expressed on the use of daylight in our Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing the act.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Any move by government to improve the utilization of daylight time is a welcome move to this Opposition and, I think, for most members of the House of Assembly. The length of time and the effective use of time affects very much, I think, every facet of our daily lives in this Province. Consistency with other jurisdictions throughout the country and the United States is a goal which I think most of us can go along with, in spite of our distinguished character.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That will not change us.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I know it will not. I am just making sure as we read the jargon. But our being a half hour ahead of everywhere else does make us stand out.

In looking through the Green Paper on changing Newfoundland and Labrador's time practices, I am looking forward to seeing a lot of input from a variety of interest groups throughout the Province since there are a number of recommendations made in the report which can affect people from all over the Province and can have different effects on a various interest groups. So I look forward to seeing these groups and interested individuals putting together briefs and submitting them to the minister for discussion. The Green Paper is well laid out and will give many

people an opportunity to express their thoughts and their viewpoints.

"Clause 1 of this Bill would provide for the commencement of Daylight Saving Time on the first Sunday in April of each year." While we are moving towards consistency with other jurisdictions, the short notice of it is one of the major questions that we would bring up, in that there has only been a few days to bring in the bill, whip it through and then in four or five days it will be heard on radio. We would appreciate having more time to look at the move and to study it. Again, we will not have a problem with it. I think it will not take anything from our character with respect to our time standards down here.

One point in looking for improvement in the utilization of time, as the Green Paper points out, is that it can affect people in the work force, it can affect people involved in a variety of different organizations, for example, wildlife people or people involved in those types of pastimes. These types of changes proposed through the Green Paper, which will be studied, should be looked at very carefully. I hope that people will take advantage of the opportunity as these changes could have an effect on people's pastimes and their ways of carrying on business and so on.

Looking at the options they have here in the Green Paper, Option No. 5 is a new standard in double Daylight Saving Time. Hours of daylight saved per year will be 406.5. It is the one which easily surpasses most of them, and I would think that most people will be looking closely at them because

the effective utilization of our Daylight Saving Time can improve and make this Province more effective in many ways, in industry especially, and of course, for people who participate in outdoor activity and working in the outdoors. This can affect people positively, if it is brought in in the right vein. If an analysis is thoroughly done of it, and of the concerns of the people of the Province, this can positively affect those people and the types of industry and business and the things that go on around the Province.

The options, although I have not had a chance to look at them so far, are interesting. I think most organizations will hopefully be submitting briefs within the next little while so that we can get a good discussion on the go. I am looking forward to seeing other legislation from the minister's office coming in. I am looking forward to discussing it with the minister hopefully beforehand to get a briefing as to the major changes that they will be proposing to bring in.

"Clause 2 would permit the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to vary the commencement date of Daylight Saving Time or Newfoundland Standard Time." One of the concerns I have is allowing the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to do this is giving them another responsibility. I do not think as a Cabinet they are handling a whole lot of responsibilities around the Province as it is. So giving them another one makes me a little bit wary, but that is all you can do. I do not think we will have a problem with it, but I express that concern to the minister.

So we are going to get in line with everybody else. That is nice. We might as well join them, but make sure that we have our distinction. I want to tell that to the minister.

Also, I believe that more publication of exactly what it is all about for people out there in the Province would be a help in trying to get the message out as to what will be happening. As one of my colleagues pointed out to me, the short notice will probably mean some concern for some people. I would like to tell the minister to make sure that the message that gets out is very clear to people, as it is quite a tradition that we are going to change in the next little while.

I look forward to putting together a submission to the minister on this. We are going to be talking to a number of groups who are going to be proposing changes or proposing their viewpoints as to the changing of time practices in the Province. I feel that the greater utilization of daylight time would have a positive affect if it is done in the right manner. It will have a positive affect on the business activities; it will have a positive affect on the pastimes of many people, especially in this Province, where many people work and live in the outdoors and their pastimes include the outdoors. I am looking forward to seeing some debate on that, and hopefully some positive results.

As I said to the minister, we will not be having a real problem with it. There is no problem at all on this bill beyond to express the concerns of the time span here for bringing it in and implementing it. It will be just a few days.

I have a concern with that and I hope that the minister will take it under advisement. I will now close my comments.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. J. CARTER:
Before the minister rises to close the debate which, I think should and will be a short one, there are a couple of comments that I would like to make.

I certainly support this bill. This bill essentially allows the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to bring in Daylight Saving Time approximately three weeks earlier than it otherwise would. However, I cannot get up and speak on a time bill like this without putting in my five cents worth and my five cents worth, for what it is worth, is, I think, what all members will more or less agree with when they think about it.

It has been said that the world will come to an end at nine o'clock in the morning, nine-thirty in Newfoundland. Well, for a long time we have been the butt of many jokes because our time is half an hour different. It has been an honest attempt to share out the hours of daylight during the shortest day between the morning and the evening. I think the same thing could be affected by moving our clocks ahead one more half hour so that Newfoundland time would be one hour different from Nova Scotia, that is Atlantic Standard Time. I think that is something that would be a desirable change.

Also, I think, a very desirable change would be to go to Double Summer Time in the Summer, that is from perhaps the middle of May until the end of August. Some of us are old enough to remember Double Summer Time during the war. It was great because it was daylight until nearly eleven o'clock at night. Now, this would make a tremendous difference for tourism and for the working public who do not get off until four-thirty or five o'clock in the afternoon. It would give them almost a whole day of activity to look forward to.

Our Summer weather is rare and all too brief. Also, we do not have the kind of climate that gives us a warm evening. If we were to move our time ahead two and a half hours, it would mean that supertime would really be about three-thirty while the sun is still quite high in the sky and it would allow a lot of us to have barbecues out doors and to spend more time out of doors. I am not an early riser but sometimes I find myself awake at four o'clock in the morning in June and it is daylight then.

I say to this House and its members, what on earth is the use of daylight at a quarter to four or four o'clock in the morning? I say let us change the hours of daylight so that we get them when we can use them and not when we cannot use them. It is much easier to move the clock than to change ones own personal schedule.

I give complete approval to this Bill but I urge the government and the minister to look at the maximum option which would be two and a half hours, not one hour.

Thank you.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank both the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) and the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) for their comments, particularly the hon. member for Stephenville for his co-operation. I think both gentlemen have really summed up the issue.

All we will be doing is going to Daylight Saving Time three weeks earlier than usual to fall in line with the other provinces of Canada, with the exception, of course, of Saskatchewan, and to fall in line with the U.S. Of course there has been a fair degree of lobby and pressure from the business community and particularly the airlines who have to schedule across the country.

As the hon. member for St. John's North said, of course, what we will see is more daylight in the evenings when people get off work. He alluded as well to the fact that we do have daylight rather early in the mornings. I think in mid-June, the longest day or the earliest time of daylight is at 4.08 a.m. That is rather early and, of course, most people sleep during that time.

For the long-term, of course, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Stephenville has alluded to, in the Green Paper, what we are

really asking Newfoundlanders is how they feel about the use of daylight. We have outlined five options in the Green Paper and they are merely options to more or less indicate to people that if you do such and such with your clocks, well, this is the result. We have outlined five different options but they are really only options to trigger some thought.

Just for the information of the hon. member, at present there are only approximately thirty responses in and we are a little disappointed with that so anything the hon. member can do or hon. members present can do to trigger more response to the Green Paper, we would certainly appreciate it because we want a lot more response. We are hoping, of course, that there will be a trend in the responses and a majority opinion so government can then look at it and very seriously consider it.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move adoption of the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend the Newfoundland Standard Time Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 14).

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The School Attendance Act, 1978." (Bill No. 5).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

This seems to be a minor

amendment. It is only a one word change but it might have major repercussions. It is to strike out the word "fifteen" in the School Attendance Act, 1978, and substitute the word "sixteen".

As we now have Grade XII in our schools, an extra year added on to the life of any school student, consequently we felt it appropriate that we raise the school leaving age by one year, from fifteen to sixteen.

There is another part there that is perhaps is more important. One of the major problems facing us here in the Province, a problem which has been declining in stature, thankfully, is our dropout rate. Anybody familiar with the school system will tell you that the dropout problem does not occur necessarily in the later years of a student's life but somewhere in the upper elementary, perhaps, and lower high school years. The school leaving age of fifteen quite often becomes the automatic time when somebody says without proper thought, I am old enough to get out of school and I am going. That extra year of maturity and being involved in the school system might effect a change of mind in a lot of cases. With the reorganized high school, and now with the upcoming reorganization of the junior high school, many students are finding certain subject areas which interest them more than they did back in the days when we had a very small and rigid curriculum. Consequently, from teachers and principals out around, we are learning every day that more and more students are finding courses which are of great interest to them and these courses give them a new lease on life. Consequently, by finding something to which they

can really become adapted, they seem to tend, then, to get more interested in the overall educational picture and quite often do it very well.

Just a short while ago I attended a graduation and the principal remarked to me as a certain young lady left the stage that a couple of years ago the girl was a prime potential drop out. However, because she became interested in art, she then stayed in school, did very well in that, and also became more interested in her other courses and began to mix socially, moreso than she did before. Consequently, she ended up doing very well in school and graduating with a very high average. We see that happening more and more. I certainly think that by adding the extra year to the leaving age of school children we will benefit them, and certainly our Province in the long run.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to Bill No. 5, An Act To Amend The School Attendance Act, 1978, many educators in our Province feel that this is long overdue, when we consider not only the dropout rate but declining school attendance.

The NTA, as well as other school officials, feel that by raising the compulsory school attendance age to sixteen you are going to stop students from dropping out for a while and keep more people in teaching positions. That is, in a way, looking after their own

ends.

When it comes down to the bottom line it is not such a bad idea, period, because does a person at the age of fifteen really know what is good for them and what is best? At that age they feel they know everything, the world is on their shoulders, and they often make decisions they regret for the rest of their lives.

In debating the School Attendance Act, the minister mentioned the dropout rate. In the district of Eagle River, we still have the highest dropout rate in the Province, and it is because of small schools. The NTA convention is coming up in April. I was reading in *The Telegram* on the weekend that the President of the NTA said he is still waiting for the report on small schools in this Province to be made public. We have asked in this House for the report to be tabled. From what we can gather, a lot of people have access to this report yet it is not brought in for debate. So I ask the minister to release this report not to selected individuals but to the public at large so that people can scrutinize this report and see how it affects them.

If you are only thinking about keeping bodies in school for the sake of occupying desks, then you can raise the age to twenty-five or whatever. One of the things that we have to do in our schools all around the Province is make the courses more interesting, make them more relevant. The Royal Commission on Education recommended this some time ago. This recommendation was again made with the reorganization of our high school system, 'make programmes more relevant to the

local areas of the Province.'

We know that our school programmes are not relevant, that there are children in communities in this Province of ours studying about mass transportation when they do not even have roads, they do not have electricity, and there is only one phone in the whole community. They do not have cable television, and they do not even have good CBC reception in some of those communities or a choice of another channel.

So here we are teaching about modern technology which is certainly not relevant to a majority of communities in this Province, for example, Grey River, Gaultois, Francois, the Coast of Labrador, the Northeast Coast, Twillingate and Change Islands. So the idea of keeping children in school, Mr. Speaker, just for the sake of keeping them in school is not good enough.

The Minister of Education stated that when they brought in Grade XII they would bring in different courses. What happened with the different courses? A lot of schools were not given enough money to help them with the change over. Schools in larger areas of the Province have very modern equipment thanks to The School Tax Authorities: They have drama classes, home economics, industrial arts, computer science, and typing. They also have courses such as photography and X number of other things to keep the the students interested in getting involved. In many of the smaller schools in the Province they do not have these facilities because they do not have the tax base and the school boards are taking money from their general revenue, from their science programme and from

their library programme to pay the heat bills.

Also, many of these schools do not have gymnasiums or any form of recreation. But the bottom line is, at the age of fifteen, because of the lack of programmes I outlined before, students lose interest, discipline problems develop and many teachers who have to deal with these problems would much prefer the offenders left school before the other students are affected. So students who are not interested in learning make the decision to leave. The idea of having the compulsory school attendance age raised from fifteen to sixteen is not going to solve the discipline problems of the child who does not want to be there, who wants to get out, who is not interested.

We have a problem in our Province, Mr. Speaker, with regard to school counsellors and guidance counsellors. We do not have enough guidance counsellors.

We are saying to these students you cannot leave now at the age of fifteen, you have to remain in school until you are sixteen, when many students have given up on the educational system altogether because they find it irrelevant, they find it boring, schools are old and lacking proper facilities, a lot of them are overcrowded, and they do not teach courses that are relevant to the cultural needs of the particular areas.

Then we have the problems with busing. Again, the weekend paper stated that because of a Department of Transportation regulation regarding the inspection of school buses almost 1,000 buses were inspected last year, 99 were taken off the road

temporarily and 9 or 10 were taken off permanently. Many children have to be bused twenty, thirty, or forty miles which means they cannot get involved in extra-curricular activities, because as soon as school is over they have to board the bus to go back to Catalina, or to Raleigh, or to various communities around the Province.

With the realignment of the school boards and more co-operation between the different denominations, we are going to find more children being bused all the time. For example, when you talk about The School Attendance Act, there are the parents in the Winterton area who deliberately took their kids out of school, set up a classroom in a fire hall, and got their own teacher involved in defiance of the law. The point is parents are saying it is not good enough to close down schools and then bus children in the primary grades - Grade 1 and Grade 11 - over long distances of highway that the Department of Transportation cannot keep cleared in the Wintertime, and over gravel roads which become impassable in the Spring because they become so soft. Under such conditions parents become very, very concerned and take their kids out of school, as they have done in the past few weeks.

We have had other incidents where parents have deliberately taken their kids out of school because they feel that the lives of their little ones are being jeopardized while being bused over some of our roads.

The Department of Labour has brought in safety legislation which says employees in this Province have the right to refuse

to go to work if they feel their lives are in jeopardy. They have that right under legislation. Where is the right of parents who feel that because school buses are in a state of disrepair - the report has shown, and I have said this before, that 1000 were inspected and 99 were taken off the road temporarily and 9 or 10 were taken off permanently - their children's lives are in danger? These parents feel that they have a legitimate right to take their children out of school until the Department of Transportation, the municipal authority, and the Inspection Branch of the Department of Transportation - with regard to school buses - do something. It is very, very disconcerting to students who have to go twenty-five or thirty miles a day in the Wintertime, as the member for St. John's North pointed out, getting up in the dark, getting on the bus in the darkness and coming home in darkness..

It would seem to me that you are just raising the compulsory school attendance age to sixteen to solve the problem of declining enrollment and as a means to keeping more teaching positions open. If we do not address the reason why students are dropping out of school in the first place, then no progress is going to be made. We have to attack the problem of why are they dropping out. Why do they not want to be in school? Mr. Speaker, the reasons are many: they have to be bused great distances over highways and roads and therefore they cannot get involved in extra-curricular activities. And even if they wanted to, a lot of the schools do not have gymnasiums, they do not have libraries, they do not have

resource centres, and they do not have other facilities.

One of the things pointed out by the university and the College of Trades - the Marine Institute now - and other educational institutes in our Province is that many of our students are lacking courses in the sciences because we cannot get teachers to teach physics and chemistry and biology in the remote areas of the Province. As a result, students find that they are deprived of the opportunity to take the best courses in given our Province because of their backgrounds. So, it is my opinion that the dropout rate, Mr. Speaker, is the result of courses being uninteresting, transportation and the lack of proper facilities in many of our schools.

There is a rumor going around that the Minister of Education said to some of the Roman Catholic school boards that there will be a cut in financing in the amount of \$8 million. If financing is going to be cut by \$8 million, we will again see classes in schools around our Province having to double up. There was a time when we were quite proud that we no longer had classrooms like when I went to school, and a good many other members here, where we had Grades III, IV, and V together, or Grade V, VI, VII and VIII together.

MR. TULK:
Or Grades I to X.

MR. HISCOCK:
Or, as the member for Fogo pointed out, Grades I to X. Again, there classrooms in schools down in Labrador that have five and six grades together.

So the report on small schools is

needed. The smaller schools are where the dropout rate is taking highest. And the amount of bursary money is not enough. There are students who want to leave these smaller schools and go and live permanently in another community because they want to continue their education, but there is not enough financial help available.

I have also had, Mr. Speaker, people in my district defy the law of the land by keeping students out of school. That has happened in the community of Cape Charles. People from this community came here and met with the Minister of Education, met with the Premier, and basically were assured that the Minister of Education and the Minister of Transportation would meet the local people down in Cape Charles to discuss the bridge across Lodge Bay and the school in Cape Charles. Because what was happening was that over the years - they always had a school in Cape Charles, the fishing community - most parents from other communities took their kids into the Winter communities, but in Cape Charles they always stayed longer and fished longer and they had a teacher out there. The school board took that away without any consultation, and to this day the parents down there feel that their economic livelihood is being threatened by the fact that they have to go into the bay and look after their kids. They are still waiting, to this day, for the Minister of Education and the Minister of Transportation to come down.

I hear that the Minister of Education is going to a graduation in St. Lewis. Hopefully, the Minister of Education will see fit to go to Lodge Bay, or have them

come to him.

MR. WARREN:
Do not worry.

MR. HISCOCK:
The member for Torngat Mountains said, 'Do not worry.' The member for Torngat should be worried by the slap in the face the Premier gave residents of Torngat Mountains when he did not invite the hon. member to the First Ministers' Conference on aboriginal rights.

So the small schools report has to come out. We have to have our bus system upgrades, but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to condemn these buses, we have to find some way of helping some of these companies that need financial help to continue busing. Right now some of the school boards are talking about getting into their own busing programme.

MR. BARRY:
They are making them get into their own busing, because they are not paying them as much.

MR. HISCOCK:
The point I am making here is that instead of school boards, Mr. Speaker, taking money they raised through School Tax Authorities and parents and PTA's raised for schools and putting that toward paying for transportation, we now find the school boards wanting to do the busing which means they will have to first obtain new buses, and then pay drivers' salaries, repair costs and depreciation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK:

May we have order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:
So, Mr. Speaker, school boards will have to take funds from other educational programmes to put into the busing programme.

Another point I wish to make is that we make rules and change regulations in this House without consulting those affected by them. Have the Department of Education or any of the school boards consulted Grade XII students or the student councils for their opinions on our locking them in? That is what we are doing - we are changing their lifestyle, putting on them the regulation that they must stay in school to the age of sixteen - saying, 'You have to stay whether you like it or not; otherwise, we will fine your parents or jail them.' I do not know what discussion there has been with the various churches regarding how this change will affect the educators and the young people of our Province. I know that other provinces of Canada are now raising the drinking age from eighteen to nineteen years. There may be an indication of a similar move in our upcoming budget, and along with students being required to remain in school an extra year, again, without consultation, action may also be taken by this government to deal with the high accident rate among the youth of the Province.

Another problem, quite a problem in our Province, is that of teen-age pregnancy, which results in many young girls leaving school and becoming dependent upon their parents or having to resort to

welfare.

I would make the point here that I am not in favour of abortion, which some students might consider the logical choice. In most cases, with a respect for life, they prefer to avoid abortion, and to allow these young people to continue their education I feel our Department of Education, in co-operation with school boards, should be setting up a day-care programme in the larger schools to accommodate them.

Many of our educators encourage young women students to continue their education and, with such encouragement, these students are able to overcome the social stigma attached to teen-age pregnancy and remain in school. But many do not continue school.

The question I am asking is, is a young girl who gets pregnant at the age of fifteen and drops out of school then forced back into school at the age of sixteen, after having her baby? That is one question that has to be answered.

As I have said before, we are not addressing the problem; we are not addressing why students are frustrated and why they are dropping out. We also have to look at another problem: At the age of sixteen young men and women can draw UIC. Many of the younger men go out and make a good living in the Summer fishing and they see that their lives are going in that direction, that they are going to become fishermen themselves. Many of their parents and grandparents were in their boats at the age of ten, twelve and fourteen, and here they are fifteen and sixteen basically saying, I am going to be a fishermen anyway, what is the

point in prolonging this for another year? So many of them go fishing in the Summertime and then collect UIC, because they have gotten a taste for money. There is also pressure put on some students by parents who need money. They basically say to their children, You are not doing very well in school anyway, it is just as well for you to quit and go to work.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister of Education will not just come in and pass a law unilaterally saying to our students, You have to stay in school for another year', unless he is going to put the support system there to make it more interesting, he is going to provide money for gymnasiums and science courses, and he is going to raise the amount of money to bursary students so that they can at least get back and forth to their permanent community, Mr. Speaker, —to visit instead of having to go away in September and not come home again until June.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the students of our Province will make some representation to the Minister of Education. I encourage them to do so, and I do hope the press is listening, because our young people are given very little opportunity to become involved in deciding their own futures. I hope the written press covers this and I hope some of the older students will write the Minister of Education and write the newspapers and give their views on how they feel about a province raising the compulsory school attendance age from fifteen to sixteen years without having any consultation whatsoever with those young people, the ones involved. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if you

were to go out into the various communities in this Province and asked the school drop outs why they dropped out they would tell you that the reasons were those I have given here.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

At this point in time I would like to welcome to the gallery Mayor Betty Gilbert and Mr. George Gilbert from Come By Chance, in the electoral district of Bellevue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

A few brief comments?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

My comments will be very noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, they will contribute to the debate and they will be of whatever length. I am sure the Minister of Forestry Resources and Lands will -

MR. DECKER:

See heed point.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

That is right.

I am sure the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands will take heed of these points and I am sure that we will see new legislation that will correct the problem. I have no problem with trying to get young people to stay in school, to

get them to further their education, but I have a problem when I see a piece of legislation that has three lines and that is going to put another rule on those young people in the Province; they have to go to school and they have to stay there. The problem is not age. Adding another year and forcing them to stay in school is not going to solve the problem. The problem is one of attitude. The problem is also one of a lack of programmes to address the problem.

I was a teacher for a short period of time and many of the students you talk to and you meet, younger people who have left, they were waiting until they were fifteen or sixteen or whatever, but the reasons for leaving have not been addressed adequately and it is time that those problems were addressed.

One of the major problems that I see with people leaving school is the lack of guidance counselling. There is a lack of guidance counsellors to address the problem. In many schools, even in the bigger towns in this Province, you still have a very hard ratio where you have one guidance counsellor for a school of 500 or 600 students. It becomes impossible to deal with people who are contemplating leaving or wondering whether or not they are going to stay in the school system. Where do they go to address these problems?

That is a problem that has been identified in many reports on education in the last few years. There are not enough guidance counsellors and a support system there for the students, especially younger people in rural communities who talk to people who

have been away, who have left school while they have stayed in school. They see their future and compared it with others, maybe some of them see it in their family backgrounds, but they find that there is not much of a future for them if they stick around in school and try to get that education when they can go out and get employment.

In the last six or eight years we have seen an unemployment rate amongst younger people who are educated, we have seen that unemployment rate pretty well skyrocket or go up very high and we have seen people with lots of education having to leave the Province to pursue employment. I think that has an affect on people in the school system who find themselves struggling along with their family background showing brothers or sisters having dropped out, and also seeing their brothers and sister who got educated and had to go away, probably seeing that, especially in the rural communities, they might figure that they may as well get an early start in trying to find some type of employment, so they leave school early. I think that is an attitude that is being created over the last number of years. We have always had the problem but the value of education and the way some people look at it is not as we used to look at it years ago. If you had your education back then you were assured of a future and you could help create that future. These days many young people wonder. It is a shame in many ways. It is an attitude problem that has to be addressed and I think that measures have to be taken to address it.

They have problems with seeing

where they are going to be if they continue onwards. While we have excellent teachers in the system, newer schools in the system over the last number of years, we have all those things but we find that the younger people in the school system who really need the help and the direction, despite all the things we have tried, are not getting it. Government has to look at it and make a decision to try and address the problem.

I suggest one or two things that the government might do, things that we have looked within our own party policy when we are talking about people dropping out of school and looking at their futures. Take, for example, the government of Ontario, the new provincial government up there. They have brought in a policy where if somebody has dropped out of school and has been out for two years or less, if they come back to school and complete their education to Grade XI or XII, they will provide them with some type of employment or training afterwards, for up to six months. So, what you are doing is, in one hand, saying come back to school and you give us a contribution and we will help you with your case.

The programme has been working, from what I have been told, very well. It is a programme that is addressing what they call a dropout ratio in Ontario, a very drastic dropout ratio. Here we are down in this Province with the highest one in the country by far, and we have not really, as far as I am concerned and many other people around the Province, addressed the problem. We can build the schools. We can put our well-educated teachers into the system. But we have also got to remember what we are putting them

all there for in terms of what the result is going to be. The dropout ratio is still very high in this Province, and it is not being addressed adequately.

Raising the age is a mechanical decision made to keep people there. The attitude problem still exists about education. The attitude problem over what results you are going to have and now far-reaching education will be and what your future is going to be, still exists. Unless that is addressed, then you can raise the age as far as you want. Again, I think it is part of a move, but it is not the move that is needed. You can raise the age as far as you want but you are still going to have the problem of people who are looking at education - that is a strong statement - with not as much value as they did five or ten years ago or ten or fifteen years ago.

I believe it opens the doors of opportunity and I tell every young person or student that I meet. But the perception, in especially the smaller rural communities, is that they have seen people who have gotten that 'education', their brothers and sisters, and have decided that they are not too sure they want to continue. They look at the options and look at getting ten weeks of work and trying to get employment for that length of time and then having UI, which has become a way of life in this Province. It is a shocking way of life, mind you, but a way of life. So it is an attitude problem that has been built up, unfortunately. It is a problem that has to be addressed, and it is something that required strong action.

I do not believe that this is the

strong action that is supposed to address the problem. I think there are other actions that could be taken to address the problem. I think that there could be more guidance counsellors in the system to deal with the problem. I think, with our big schools and our well-educated teachers, there should be a programme to get people back into the school system who have left.

We talked about a forgotten generation, in many ways, of the unemployed youth of this Province, but there are others. There are people who have left the school system and are out there and they are really very forgotten. What future do they have without an education?

I talked to a young person yesterday out in Bay St. George who told me he had a Grade XIII education and that he was eighteen years of age. He was looking for a job. That might not have been so bad fifteen or twenty years ago, but it is bad now. It is a situation that we should be addressing. We should not be letting that occur. That is a situation that should not be allowed to occur. It is a situation that every possible route should be taken to make sure that it does not happen. I do not feel that it is being addressed. I do not feel that the problem is being met head-on with the right kind of action.

I think we should be making an effort to get people to look at the value of the education that they can attain, and looking at getting back people who have left the school system, who have left at fourteen or fifteen or sixteen or eighteen years of age with a Grade XIII or a Grade IX, trying

to get them back into the system, at least get them back and get them educated. If we do not educate our young people for the future, we are going to have major problems. I think we are seeing major problems in the last five to ten years of not taking on the problem head-on. I think it is time that options were looked at, that newer ideas were being implemented, instead of raising the age.

There are a lot of other ways, as far as I am concerned. There are a lot of measures that should be taken to address the problem. It is not something that is going away. It is shocking that in this day and age you can talk to a young person who does not know if he wants to go back to school after he has dropped out or he is just contemplating dropping out. I find it very difficult in this day and age. Twenty years ago you could find work. Education was valued a lot more I think, but to find these days a young person contemplating leaving school before he actually finishes is shocking. I think it is a sad statement on our system that we have created. We have not put in the support system that is required to get people interested again in taking on their own initiative to build their own futures. If we have taken that away, we have taken away our own futures. We are taken away their futures, but we are also taken away the future of this Province.

A one-line explanatory note on a Bill talking about raising the age, without any support systems, is not going to solve the problem. Being aware of all the financial considerations that this Province is in, being very aware of the amount of money that we

have to work with, being very aware of the bankrupt state that the Premier said we are in, I think it is a shocking statement to see that we do not have at least a plan of action to tackle the problem. I have seen too many reports talking about the problems.

I was down to the University library a few weeks ago reading reports on dropout situations in Newfoundland and Labrador for the last fifteen years. Action, unfortunately, has not followed these reports. I think it is time that we woke up and said, 'This is 1987, it is not 1967. We have made progress, but we have not made progress we still have an unfortunate and a wick problem out there for young people.' I find the value of education has gone down. A lot of them do not think it is of much value, that their futures will be good and will be ones that they will be able to create without an education. While that syndrome is around, while that type of feeling is around, then we have major problems and we have to deal with them.

You just do not increase the age. You have to do other things. You have to bring in programmes. I find the programme that Ontario has brought in to be a good, new initiative. You are trying to get people back into the school system to deal with their lack of education, and you are not just going to give them anything, you are going to ask something from them.

Unfortunately, around this Province you hear some people say some young people do not want this or they do not want that, and they do not want to work hard any

more. Well, I think that is the opposite of the case. The problem is that we have to have a support system set up because we have a different type of youth now and we have greater numbers than we used to have. They have also seen a lot more and they have been affected by a high unemployment rate that has existed in this Province for the last eight or nine years. So you are dealing with a different type of attitude; you are dealing with a different type of mentality that still much the same as the people wanted twenty years ago, but they are looking at people who have done all of that, who went away and got their education, but find that they have to go away again. They find that their futures are not as bright as they could have been or as they could be and we have to wake them up, but we have also have to wake ourselves up and we have to say, let us put something in place. Let us deal with the problem instead of making one amendment or an amendment here and an amendment there that deals with some of the mechanics, but it does not necessarily deal with the problem.

While I welcome anything that will help with keeping people in the school system, I would prefer to see something that deals with programmes that can help change the attitudes of some of the young people of the Province. I am sure that the minister is aware of those types of attitudes that exist with some young people. I say we have to work a lot harder to address the problem. I think we have made great strides over the years in many ways with the credible teachers that we have, the good qualifications that they have, the schools have improved and so on.

However, we cannot forget that there are a great number of people out there who feel that their futures are not tied to an education. If that is the way it is, if that attitude still exists, we have got to deal with the attitude. You just cannot say it is going to go away. It is an attitude that is there, and it is an attitude you have got to address.

I just gave one example of an initiative that could be taken. There are other things that could be done. I hope that the minister will direct his officials to get more legislation on the books that will deal with the problem, that his government will deal with the problem. I look forward to seeing those initiatives. Any other types of amendments that he will bring in on that type of thing, I am going to be getting up and I am going to keep putting the pressure on him, Mr. Speaker, because the pressure needs to be applied. It is something that is not going away. It is something that has to be dealt with. Unless we get very serious about it and start dealing with it, then we are going to have it here for a long time to come. The future will not be as bright for many young people as it should be, and the future will not be as bright for the Province as it could be.

If we let younger people in this Province just drift away, then we are losing our biggest asset. We have been losing people for a long time. We have lost a great number of people. The going away from the Province syndrome has become a syndrome now with educated people. Once we get to that point, we really have to take a serious look at where we are going and what we are doing.

While I hear all these big figures being thrown around about how much money we spend, I have to wonder about the money and the results for these groups of young people who are out there with that problem, with that attitude which we have got to correct. They can correct it but they need a lot of help in correcting it. It is time that we dealt with the issue and dealt with the problem. There is no problem with that amendment but I would like to see a whole list of others that deal with school attendance in this Province and the drop-out problem.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. the Minister of Education, I would like to welcome to this hon. House the former member for Naskaupi, Mr. Mel Woodward and M.P. Brian Tobin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I must say, if the two gentlemen who spoke on the bill were trying to impress the possible future leader of the party, I am afraid he is on his way back to Ottawa right now.

However, I will make a few remarks on some of the points raised because some people might think

there will be a tendency to get up and to tear into suggestions made by the Opposition. The hon. gentlemen raised some good points, and some of the positive suggestions that they are made are certainly a vindication of the things that are happening in the Department of Education, which they know very little about, however.

The member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) reminded me of the NDP. He had a speech in both pockets. He started off, for the first twenty minutes he spoke, talking about the positive side of the amendment and how he thought it was a good thing. Then he automatically switched in midstream and he starting talking about the other side of it. So he had two speeches. As I say, that is a typical NDP tactic.

However, when he spoke he did raise several points which, I think, need clarification. He talked about the declining enrollment and about the high drop-out rate, especially as it applied to small schools. He is very right there. Even though our drop-out is declining, and declining rapidly, because of a number of innovations in the educational structure, the highest rate which exists still, generally speaking, not specifically, exists in relation to areas serviced by small schools.

When I came to the department a little over a year ago, realizing that small remote areas were at a disadvantage in several ways, we instituted a small schools study to look at, not the problems necessarily because we are pretty much aware of them, but this was a task force to recommend possible solutions. We have come under

some criticism lately for not making it public. The study, as members are quite well aware, is an in-house study, a study set up by our own department for our own information really.

However, I said from the beginning it would not be a study which would gather dust. I have no intention of wasting time, effort and some money, even though it was not very much, on a study to gather more dust. We were looking for sound recommendations upon which we could build an approach to attack the problems faced by small schools and people associated with small schools.

The study was passed into me the latter part of January, which is a little less than two months ago. It has since been assessed by the department because of the financial implications and other things. The study has been released for some time to all the school boards throughout the Province. The school boards are made up of people elected locally by people in every community around the Province so the public has access to the boards. I have even met with boards and discussed the small school report. They had it with them at the time. Other agencies in the Province have also copies of the small school study and, undoubtedly, when they get a chance to assess it, the report, which is really public right now, can be provided I presume to anybody who shows an interest.

As I mentioned, the study was set up not to gather another list of problems but to recommend solutions to the problems and many of them we have already moved on because I do not think we had to have a small school study to emphasize to anybody who has been

involved in educational circles the need for doing things in the smaller, remote areas of Newfoundland.

The member mentioned that in order to encourage students to stay in school our curriculum should contain more relevant and more interesting courses. I am not sure whether he was around long enough to read the Throne Speech or not but, if he did, he would realize that one of the objectives of the department is to include in our curriculum just that, courses which are more interesting and more relevant to the Newfoundland student so we have moved there.

He talked about the need for doing things for the rural areas and I agree wholeheartedly. That is why we have taken a number of initiatives. Certain suggestions have come in that we have brought forth ourselves, such as distance education, the use of itinerant teachers and so on, all hold possibilities for the smaller areas, all of which we will be working on in time.

He mentioned boards taking money from general revenue to pay heat and light. Unfortunately, in many cases, that is so. A lot of the money that goes to school boards because of the increase in the heat and light costs, a lot of the funding goes to pay heat and light.

MR. HISCOCK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HISCOCK:

Seeing that the Education Minister is speaking now to this House and to the public, will he announce

when is he going to table the small school report by Professor Riggs?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the hon. member that he read Hansard. I already covered that topic when I stood up to speak.

On the matter of boards taking money from general revenue to pay heat and light because of the escalating heat and light bills, a number of boards find themselves in severe financial straits, in particular, smaller boards and these would be boards that would cover a lot of the small rural areas which is a sort of double whammy for people who attend small schools. With that in mind, we introduced last year what has been considered by most people or all people in educational circles a very positive move and that was the introduction of the tax equalization grant which has been a tremendous boost to a number of boards in rural Newfoundland.

He mentioned no gyms and we do have a number of schools throughout the Province, small schools and sometimes big schools, that do not have proper gymnasiums. One of the things that has upset me tremendously, and I have met with my colleagues the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) and Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), is an attempt to try and coordinate facilities, especially in smaller areas. In many of the districts served by all members, quite often we will

find in a small community three or four half completed facilities. There might be a school has a small gym or no gym and it is trying to build a playground out back; the Kinsmen Club is trying to build a softball field in the centre of the community, probably not having funds to finish it; and the council is building another field on the other side but also do not have enough funds to finish it. What you have is probably a half a dozen incomplete facilities. There has to be a lot more co-ordination at the local level and co-ordination of both provincial and federal funding activities to provide in a central area facilities that could be of benefit to all the students, and all the people in the community, but particularly the younger people who get a chance to use the facilities more than the others. If the school is, as it should be, the center of the community, then a lot of the activity could center around the schools. Schools should not be white elephants. They should not be 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. buildings. They should be there to be used by all the people in the community whenever the need exists.

Discipline problems, he mentioned the need for counsellors. Certainly we are well aware of that ourselves and we have already taken positive moves in that direction.

In relation to busing, he criticized the move of boards to take over busing but, on the other hand, he goes on to talk about students who go on buses not being able to participate in extra-curricular activities. It is hard to have it both ways. Many of the small schools where we cannot offer the programmes

necessary for a well-rounded education, students come into larger schools. If they come to larger schools, then they should be able to participate in all activities, including extra-curricular ones. Sometimes when boards operate their own buses, they make provision for this. It cannot easily be done when it is done through a private busing contract unless some other arrangements are made. There is no way that you can have gyms and other facilities in the smaller areas. So if the kids stay at home, they cannot participate, if they go to a larger school on the bus they cannot participate unless there is a good coordination of effort. That should be able to be handled by the board and by the school at a local level.

The other points mentioned, the lack of science teachers in remote areas, this could be a problem. In fact in some small schools you only have two or three teachers quite often and you may not have specialist in certain areas. This can be solved to some degree by itinerant teachers and distance education, both of which we are looking at.

He mentioned the meeting in Cape Charles and Lodge Bay. We certainly we intend to have that meeting. We have had it on our agenda a couple of times, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and myself just could not coordinate it and had to cancel out, but we certainly will have that meeting.

The member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) talked about the need to bring students back. I am not sure of whether he is aware of how much it is going on in this Province. Just a while ago I

participated in the opening of the Brother T. I. Murphy Institute downtown which has encouraged a lot of drop-outs to come back. The YMCA has a tremendous programme going to help our youth. Boards are encouraging people who have dropped out to come back into the regular classes. The Green Bay Board this year alone, I think, has over 150 students who had dropped out, back in the system. Others have also encouraged people to come back. So a number of initiatives are taken.

We have more and more graduates than ever, higher enrollment at university, we have the Marine Institute overflowing, trade schools filled, a number of private colleges and, as I mentioned, a much higher graduation rate than ever before, despite the fact our school population is dropping. So it is not all gloom and doom out there, Mr. Speaker. We have made tremendous strides, there is a long way to go, especially in relation to rural Newfoundland, and we intend to go every step of the way with time and finances on our side.

The retention problem, I would mention, is not just a problem for government. The retention problem is a problem for the home, the school and the community also because without the encouragement of the home and the backing of the people in the community, then the students involved just cannot get the incentive that is necessary.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to one other comment made by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) concerning a proposed cut in the Department of Education in a statement by the St. John's

School Board. I refer now and I will table an item from the Evening Telegram which says, 'The Roman Catholic School Board for St. John's has been told it will lose ten teaching positions this year as a result of a proposed \$8 million cut in the upcoming education budget and says it cannot continue to provide existing services unless provincial government reverses its proposal.'

Number one, I would like to know who told them, and number two, any cuts that may or may not take place in the education budget has absolutely nothing to do with the loss of teachers by the St. John's Roman Catholic School Board or any other school board. Any loss of teachers will be simply because of the declining enrollments. We allocate teachers to boards based upon the enrollment and as the enrollment has been dropping over the years, our teacher numbers have gone up considerably. The drop-out rate or the school leaving rate has dropped by something like 14 per cent, whereas we have increased our teachers by something like 26 per cent in the same time frame. So even though we have fewer students, we have more and more teachers.

Teachers will be allocated to the boards based upon the allocation formula we have at present. If all the agencies agree this is not a good formula then, perhaps, they should come and discuss it with us because we have our own plans along those lines for making moves that are necessary to make sure that we can deliver the proper programmes throughout the Province. But this statement here is a complete fallacy. Any cuts in teachers would simply be

because of declining enrollment and not any cut in the department budget which, of course, we will not know until Thursday when the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) brings down his budget.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The School Attendance Act, 1978". (Bill No. 5), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion, seconding reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Unimproved Lands (Redistribution) Act." (Bill No. 7).

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker:

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I will just give a brief outline of this particular amendment. First of all, I want to tell hon. members that the purpose of the Unimproved Land (Redistribution) Act is to allow government to obtain ownership throughout expropriation of specific undeveloped parcels of private land in order to enable a narrow range of developments to occur. The act applies only to eight grants of land that were issued between 1886 and 1895. They are identified in the Schedule attached to the act, not to this amendment, but to the act itself. Those grants contain a total of 37,104 acres. This is for the information of hon. members, perhaps.

Unfortunately, because of the unusual expropriation powers that are conferred upon the government under that act, i.e., the government can acquire possession of any of these lands for a maximum of \$1 per acre, the current legislation, therefore, constitutes a deterrent to those owners of those pieces of land who want to proceed with any major development activities on their land.

One such owner is Newfoundland Colonization and Mining Company Limited. Currently this company has a proposal before government to develop a portion of Grant No. 56 - 46 which is located in the Port au Port area for a limestone aggregate production plant and an ocean shipping terminal. The proposed plant, for the information of members, will have a production target of 4 million tons per year, and will create approximately thirty permanent jobs. In addition to that, of course, there will be other jobs created within the construction of the plant itself.

The company proposes to raise the necessary capital for the project, I will not say what amount, but it is in the millions of dollars, by offering a share issue on the London Stock Exchange. Unfortunately, raising capital on the stock exchange is not very easy as long as the land is such to expropriation under the act.

So I hope that is a clear explanation on the act itself. The amendment, of course, would resolve this dilemma by giving the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or the Cabinet the right to remove parcels of land, such as this one, from the Schedule where a development proposal put forward

by an owner meets with the approval of the government.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to add that there is some urgency in having this amendment passed. I have heard from the company personally and in Telex form. They want to proceed with site preparation starting in April, this coming month. Two million tons of material have to be moved to prepare the quarry for this season so that the equipment and the terminal can be installed next year. If they miss this particular season, then the whole project will slip by a year and, I am sure, in view of the economic boost that it will give to the constituents of my colleague, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), and to the Province, in general, of course, I do not expect that anybody would want that to occur.

So I hope with those few brief comments that that explains the act and also explains the purpose of bringing in this particular amendment so that we can get on with a development in this Province that will create some badly needed jobs in an area where they are badly needed.

I move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, we welcome the measure, especially in the Port au Port area, to create employment.

If approval for this amendment is going to help create that employment, then we have no problem with that.

The member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), my colleague, the Forestry critic, is not here today to address this, so I have just one or two quick comments. I appreciate the minister's explanation of the amendment. At the first reading it looks very, very confusing as to what reasons they would have for doing such a thing. But we welcome the move to bring in the amendment that will help create employment in the area, and I look forward to seeing the announcement by the minister responsible that this business venture will have been able to go ahead and will be able to proceed as quickly as possible so that the Bay St. George - Port au Port area will see another development.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:
Just to put the thing in perspective a little more perhaps, the Port au Port Peninsula is the largest block of limestone on the Eastern Seaboard of Canada or the United States. The whole peninsula is basically one large block of limestone. This particular area, which the bill refers to here, is a very small area. It was, I guess, was given to the then known Anglo-Newfoundland Mining and Colonization Company when they put the telegraph through the Province in the late 1800's. Sometime in

the 1950's, I understand, this act was passed, the one which we are dealing with now, in an attempt to start expropriation of the particular lands owned by this company.

Lately, in the last four or five years, the company was acquired by new owners and they saw the opportunity to sell aggregates to the United States. It might interest hon. members that along the Eastern Seaboard of the United States that there is a great shortage of aggregates which are used for sea walls and for bridges and that sort of thing. As a matter of fact, at the present time there are Scottish interests who bring granite from Scotland, down around the Florida Peninsula, and into Houston. The easiest way to transport this type of material is by ship, which is cheaper than by rail or by truck or any other way. Of course, the Port au Port Peninsula is in a very good geographic position to get their limestone down to the United States.

This company has tested the product. They have done a lot of diamond drilling out there. They have taken it to the United States for analysis as well, and they have found customers in the United States. At the present time they have asked for an environmental assessment. One of the problems that they have had is that they are listed on the London Stock Exchange and they have been trying to raise money. Of course, it is very difficult to raise money when the mine, on which you are trying to raise the money, has been encumbered by a piece of legislation which threatens expropriation. So, it is my understanding that this bill will take that threat away, which the

government had indicated to the company earlier.

Mr. Speaker, the company also hopes to build a wharf in Lower Cove on the Southern side of Port au Port. That wharf is perhaps more significant than the thirty or forty jobs that will come from this particular project because, as I said, it is a very large block of limestone and there are also dolomite deposits up there, and there has been a company that has been looking for dolomite. There were two places, I understand, that they were interested in, one of them being Port au Port.

Apparently, the dolomite reserves, as well, are on the fringes of their concessions. The same process will have to be used. Of course, that makes the wharf even more important because it makes any minerals on the Port au Port Peninsula, including the large limestone deposits and the dolomite, more accessible to market. Also, on the top of the Peninsula back in 1972, Lee-High Cement, an American company, had a proposal in to start a cement plant which is a very labour intensive thing. I think a cement plant probably uses as many as 200 or 300 people in its operation but, due to market conditions at the time, not because of this particular project, they withdrew because of problems they had in the seventies with their parent company. These concessions are still there. It has nothing to do with this particular company but with a wharf there it means that all of these limestone concessions become much more important and more accessible. I understand that the wharf will cost some \$3 or \$4 million and will be of the type where the ore can be loaded

on ships right there and taken away very cheaply.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the Port au Port area has one of the highest unemployment figures in the Province. It is perhaps not the highest but we certainly have one of the highest youth unemployment problems. There was a study done there a couple of years ago showing that there was an 89 per cent youth unemployment rate. The unemployment rate for those in the work force is much less and not quite as high but it is certainly one of the areas of Newfoundland which has very high unemployment.

It is my hope that this company will proceed. Certainly this government will do everything that it possibly can, and it is doing this today with this bill, to make sure that no stone is left unturned to entice the company to start work. We are hoping that next Summer we will start to see some construction. There should be a fair amount of construction taking off the over burden and then the following Summer, I think it is proposed that a \$2 or \$3 million wharf will go there. I think the next Summer they are hoping to sail their first ship down into the States.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say about it.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, I think you are a few hundred miles out but we are in the same party anyway, so that is

close.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure if this bill is passed it will not have to much affect on whether or not the Western world is going to sleep in peace tonight. I do not think it is going to be a major piece of legislation but it will, I believe, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:
I think I should correct that. The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Well, Mr. Speaker, it was close enough. I understand the mistake. It is quite easy to confuse the Strait of Belle Isle with St. Barbe. It is a very easy mistake for anyone to make.

As I was saying, Sir, if this bill is passed through this Assembly today it is not going to have any great affect on whether or not the Western world sleeps sound. I certainly am not going to try to delay this bill. I will be glad to support it. If Your Honour will allow, there are a few other points, as long as we are discussing Crown land. This is probably an appropriate time to bring them up.

Now, I have already discussed with the minister what I consider to be an inequity in the way Crown land applications are being administered in this Province. As the hon. minister must know, I am sure, in many of the outports around this Province the only land that is available is usually Crown land. If a person living in St. Julien's, for example, and I use St. Julien's because I have had opportunity in the last little while to deal with a family in St. Julien's who ran into problems

with trying to get Crown land on which to build a house. This is the case in many of the Newfoundland outports. The only land that is available is owned by the Crown.

Mr. Speaker, when a person wants to build a house in an outport, like St. Julien's, he has to go to the local unit of the Department of Forest Resources and Lands and ask for an application form. Now, there is a block of land that he has looked at and he has discovered that there is no claim to this land. As far as he is concerned the land belongs to the Crown. Nobody else wants it. So, he fills in an application form which comes to the hon. minister's department and the application is processed. Now, he has to pay a fifty dollar deposit fee. This is to cover the administration. He has to enclose with his application for Crown land, fifty dollars. Now, Mr. Speaker, fifty dollars to a person living in St. Julien's, whose average income is somewhere around \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year, is a considerable sum of money. It is not, in any sense of the word, a small amount of money. It is not to be laughed at. Fifty dollars is a considerable amount of money. So he puts his fifty dollars in his application and he submits it to the Crown Lands Division of the minister's department.

If the application is processed, there is no great hardship. The fifty dollar deposit is forfeited, of course. It is not forfeited, it goes for processing the application. But the problem arises when the application comes to the minister's department. For some reason, whatever the reason, it could be that the Department of Environment is not satisfied to

allow a house to go on the piece of land or it could be that the Department of Health is not satisfied, or it could be that the Department of Transportation is not satisfied that the house go on the land, whatever the reason, the application could be cancelled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have our couple, a young family, in St. Julien's, who are looking for a place on which to build a house or to put a mobile home, as the case might be. Their first application was turned down for whatever reason. So, they go back to the local unit of the Department of Forestry and they ask for another application form. They look all around St. Julien's and they find another piece of land which would be suitable for them to build their house on or to put their mobile home on. So they go through the process again, and they enclose another fifty dollars.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they have already spent fifty dollars on the first application form, which was turned down. They apply again for a second piece of land. It comes in to the minister's department. It goes through the process. It is in there for a month or whatever the case may be, only to find that the Minister of the Environment over here, this great, loveable, honourable, gentleman, the Minister of the Environment, says, 'No, we are not going to allow any mobile homes or any houses on that particular piece of land.' So, the Minister of the Environment passes the word down through his civil servants and, by golly, they say, 'No, Sir, there is no way that the people in St. Julien's are going to be allowed to put a mobile home on that particular piece of land.' So, the application is refused. But,

the family in St. Julien's are still looking for a place on which to put their mobile home or to build a house, whichever the case might be.

They have been turned down twice, Mr. Speaker. Their income is somewhere between \$6,000 and \$7,000 a year. They have already spent \$100. They are still no closer to having a place on which to put their house. So they march back again to the Department of Forestry, and once again they get another application form, and again they fill it in. Mr. Speaker, they have to enclose another fifty dollars. This time my hon., jolly, good friend, the Minister of Health says, 'No, I am not going to allow a house or mobile home to go on that piece of land.' So he says to his deputy minister, 'You go up to Croque or St. Julien's and you tell them there is no way that I am going to allow them to put their house on that piece of property. No, it cannot be done.'

So, Mr. Speaker, the family back in St. Julien's in a little while get a letter from the hon. minister's department saying, 'Dear So and So, We are sorry but, after processing this application, after looking at the pros and cons of this application, we almost allowed you to have this particular land, but the hon. jolly, good friend of the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, the hon. the Minister of Health, says no way, this cannot be allowed.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, the family in St. Julien's has already spent \$150, and they still do not have a piece of land on which to put their mobile home or on which to build a house. So, Mr. Speaker, what I would like for the hon.

minister to do, Mr. Speaker, what I would like for the hon. minister to do today is to realize the hardship his department is putting on the backs of the people of Newfoundland because, believe me, Mr. Speaker, for a family whose annual income is somewhere between \$6,000 and \$7,000, \$150 is a week's groceries, \$150 is a new suit of clothes, \$150 is a lot of money, Mr. Speaker. It might not be a lot of money to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), himself, because of the income he is getting. The minister, I suppose, is entitled to an extra \$6,000 a year just because he has some sort of a shack, a run-down building out in his district.

MR. SIMMS:

I have not applied for it yet.

MR. DECKER:

The minister has not applied for it. There is an hon. man, a man who is not going to take advantage. I would not doubt but the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) is taking advantage of having a shack out in some district so that he can claim the per diem.

MR. BUTT:

I cannot afford it.

MR. DECKER:

Well, if the Minister of Environment is not doing it, I bet the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is doing it. Because he is so good, Mr. Speaker, at handling financial matters, he is so good at balancing budgets, for sure he is taking advantage of that loophole. I know my friend the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) is not doing it because he is far too upright and too outstanding a man to take

advantage of it.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that this \$150 is an immense amount of money to a person who lives in St. Julien's or lives in Croque or lives in Conche and who has to take that \$150 to make three applications and still not have the land, still not have anywhere to build his house.

Now, what I am hoping the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands is going to do today is give a commitment to this hon. Assembly, and in so doing give a commitment to the people of Newfoundland, that he is going to eradicate that inequity from his department so that the person in St. Julien's who applies for a piece of land and the Minister of Health says he cannot have it because it interferes with the health of the people in St. Julien's and the first application is turned down, then, Mr. Speaker, his second application should not require an additional \$50, nor should the third application require \$50, nor the fourth, nor the fifth, and we can go on, because in theory, Mr. Speaker, the man can spend up to thousands of dollars, he can be applying forever and still not get a piece of land.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Move the adjournment.

MR. DECKER:

It is not time to adjourn debate yet, and I am not ready to speak on the next bill.

The other little matter which I would hope the minister will address when he gets up, Mr. Speaker, is what I refer to as the curse of the Newfoundland outport, the sixty-six foot building lot. This is something that I am hoping

the hon. minister will address when he stands up to speak to this bill. I said earlier in this address that the only available source of land to many Newfoundland outport people is Crown land. Now, Mr. Speaker, if a person is building a house - I have used St. Julien's. I will use Goose Cove this time because Goose Cove had this problem - in Goose Cove he goes to Crown lands and he applies for a piece of land, but there is a limit to the frontage he can apply for. Now, what is the limit, you say, 500 feet. This would be a logical number for Newfoundland outport people who are used to living on big spreads of land, who have a place down by the waterfront for their boat and their wharves and their stages and what have you. So a logical assumption would be that 500 feet would be a nice frontage for a person in a Newfoundland outport. No, Mr. Speaker, it is not 500 feet. We have only ten minutes left and the House is going to close, so if the hon. minister of Finance would just try to stay awake. Maybe the hon. gentleman behind him could just pinch him. Just pull on the short hairs on his neck, that usually works to keep the hon. gentleman awake. It is not 400 feet, nor is it 300 feet, nor is it 100 feet. Would the hon. minister know what the maximum frontage is you can have for a building lot in a Newfoundland outport if you apply for it through Crown Lands? No, the hon. member does not know. Nor do I expect him to know, because he this lust for freedom that we have and he thinks it is 100 feet or 200 feet. Mr. Speaker, it is 66 feet, about the size of four postage stamps. Can you imagine our forefathers who escaped from Ireland and England coming over

here to try to find a place to build a new home and being put on a 66 foot building lot? You might as well move him to downtown Toronto, Mr. Speaker, or send him into Boston. I am telling you it is an insult to the Newfoundlander who grew up with the freedom of this country to be confined to a 66 foot building lot. It is a downright utter disgrace. It takes away our freedom, Mr. Speaker. And today, on behalf of the people in Goose Cove, I am calling on the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), when he stands up in this House, to give a solemn commitment, Mr. Speaker, that as of now, as of this very minute any Newfoundlander who wants to build a house in Conche or in Goose Cove, or whatever the case might be, will not be confined to 66 foot lot. Mr. Speaker, talk about your six feet! To confine a man to a 66 foot lot is like telling him that all he can be sure of in this life, when he finally gives up the ghost and leaves it, is that he is going to have six feet in which to bury himself. A 66 foot building lot is a total disgrace. It is an insult to this government, and only an uncaring, callous generation of men would think about bringing it forward.

So I am hoping, I am counting on the minister to stand up in this House today and say, Newfoundlanders you can build on a 100 foot building lot or a 200 foot building lot, because that is the freedom we came here for.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point I want to bring to the hon. minister's attention. There is another little problem in that Crown Lands Department and it has to do with one person, one family owning more than one grant for

Crown land. I am going to have to go back to Roddickton for this illustration, Mr. Speaker. The department the minister represents, and I am surprised that he is not ashamed to represent it, will not allow one man or one woman to own more than one grant for residential purposes. Is the minister going to deny that? He is not going to deny it because he knows it is true.

MR. SIMMS:

Is the member going to sit down?

MR. BAIRD:

His time is up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, here is what happened, here is the implication of this: There was a family in Roddickton who, when they were younger, when they first got married, the man and his wife applied for a piece of Crown land and they built a house on that land; the house had four bedrooms because they were going to raise their family in Roddickton on this piece of Crown land which they surveyed, which they developed and finally got a grant for it. However, Mr. Speaker, when their family was grown up they decided it would be nice to build a smaller home for themselves, a very normal, logical thing for a man and woman to do once their family had grown up. They picked out a site and they applied to Crown Lands to get a second piece of land on which to build a smaller house - eventually they would have sold their old house, or they would have given it to their grandson, or whatever the case might be. But when they applied to Crown Lands, paid their \$50 deposit or whatever he had to pay, word came back, Sorry, boys,

you cannot have two grants at the same time. You have to sell the piece of land your house is now on or we cannot give you another grant. Now, have you ever in all your days heard such preposterous nonsense?

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are the only one who ever heard that.

MR. DECKER:

I mean, it is foolishness. You never heard of it before? Did the hon. minister say he never heard of it?

MR. YOUNG:

You must be running for the leadership.

I am showing the bagman out there what I can do. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is silliness. So I am hoping that when the minister stand up today that he is going to say that disgrace will be removed from the act, that Newfoundlanders who want to apply for a second piece of land, and if they want to keep the first piece and rent their property, so what? If they brought it from a private person they could own a dozen pieces of land, so why can they not buy it from the Crown and build a second house on it, Mr. Speaker?

So, I am hoping that when the minister stands up he will remove forever that inequity from his department, so that Newfoundlanders, who find that they want to build a second or a third or a fourth house, can go to the Crown Lands, and as long as they pay for their land, then let them build their house on it.

Mr. Speaker, there is a fourth point that I want to draw to the minister's attention, and that is

going to be my final point. Now, there are hundreds of other points that I could bring to the hon. minister's attention, but I am not going to bore this House much longer. I am only going to deal with one more point and that is Crown land for cabins.

Now, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is having an awful job containing himself now. I am sure that Newfoundlanders have noticed what is happening. You see those little advertisements, this little amnesty period. People who have cabins in various parts of this Island are being told, 'Rush in in the next sixty days and there will be no fine. We will let you measure your land and pay twenty-five dollars for it or whatever the case might be, \$100, whatever.' The amount does not matter. There is a amnesty. This was in the paper a little while back.

MR. SIMMS:

Was my picture in it?

MR. DECKER:

Yes, with his picture in the ad. That is the best of it all, just an excuse to get his picture in the paper to get some free advertising for the next leadership campaign, whenever it comes up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Dagger Decker.

MR. DECKER:

I will adjourn the debate in a minute, Mr. Speaker, but first let me tell you what is happening. Here is what is happening, Mr. Speaker: The minister, in cahoots with the Minister of Finance, is

trying to get a record of every piece of property in this Province. What for, Mr. Speaker? Is it so that he can find them in the event of a forest fire? Is it so that he can put roads in to those cabins? No, Mr. Speaker.

They are trying to find another source of taxes, Mr. Speaker. The jig is up, and the hon. minister knows the jig is up. But, Newfoundlanders are not going to be deceived. All this big racket about getting your Crown land registered, getting a grant for your cabin, they do not care about your cabin or your land. They care about their taxes, Mr. Speaker. Mark my words -

MR. SIMMS:

There are no taxes on cabins.

MR. DECKER:

There are not yet, because you do not know who owns them all. The problem is there are so many cabins in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that they do not know where they are.

I will now adjourn debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before recognizing the hon. member I would like to welcome - I know it is rather belated - Mr. Manuel, the resident Manager of Kruger's Corner Brook Pulp and Paper Mill Limited, with his colleagues Mr. Kendrick and Mr. LaBoute.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I move that the House at its rising adjourn until tomorrow at 3:00 p.m. and then we will proceed with legislation.

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