



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 5

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, MARCH 30, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 11.00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees;

HON. W. CALLAHAN(Min. of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the report of the Civil Service Commission for the year ending March 31, 1970.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

HON. S. NEARY(Min. of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 310 on today's Order Paper, asked by the hon. member for St. John's East Extern, and the answer is no.

MR. HICKEY: A supplementary question Mr. Speaker. How many homes are presently under construction, could the minister inform the House?

MR. NEARY: I suggest to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that he place that question on the Order Paper.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. T. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, before we move to Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Minister of Highways. Is the Hon. Minister aware that at the intersection of the Trans-Canada Highway and the new road to Come by Chance, some person or persons, in open violation of the law, are erecting a large sign? Will he assure the House that this sign will be removed and the law breakers prosecuted forthwith.

HON. H. STARKES(Min. of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I did not take notice of the question. I am not aware of the situation at the present moment.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, before we get to Orders of the Day I have a question for the Hon. Minister of Community and Social Development. I wonder would the minister advise the House as to when the DREE Agreement is to be signed?

HON. W. ROWE(Min. of Community & Social Dev.): Mr. Speaker, I only returned to the Province after being away for a week or so. I do not have all the information necessary to answer that question at the present time. I do hope

though, Sir, to be able to make a statement on the present DREE Agreement and NEW DREE Agreement early next week, if the hon. member does not mind waiting that long.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labrador Affairs. Will the Minister give the House information what the total number of persons are, now employed at Churchill Falls and the Churchill Falls Project, and how many of them were residents of Newfoundland and Labrador, before the work commenced, as compared to how many are employed there, who have come there from other Provinces? There are many reports that the percentages of non-Newfoundland workers are very high. Could the Minister give us that information?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I believe that this question is already on the Order Paper, if I am not mistaken.

HON. E. WINSOR (Min. of Lab. Affairs): Mr. Speaker, some one asked the question orally the other day but he did not put it on the Order Paper. I take notice of it now and, if it appears on the Order Paper, I will endeavour to answer it.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the question I asked the Minister for Community and Social Development; in view of the fact that there seems to be a lot of concern on the part of municipalities that DREE might not be covering street paving programmes, can the Minister indicate to us what the prospects are for street upgrading, streets paving assistance?

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I suggest he put it on the Order Paper.

MR. V. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Minister of Fisheries. Has the Minister received any representations from the inshore fishermen, on the west side of Fortune Bay, concerning the present operation of herring seiners in that area to the extent that the resource of that area is being rapidly depleted? Over fishing on a very extensive scale is taking place and the fishermen are in dire danger of damage to their gear, in fact some damage has been done, Has he been notified and has he taken any action?

MR. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman knows, this is entirely a Federal matter. If the question is put on the Order Paper, I will endeavor to get the answer for the hon. gentleman.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, I know that this is a Federal matter, but it is of great concern to the people of this Province. The minister should take action.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. minister of Health. Could the minister inform the House whether the Government plan to have a plebiscite on the West Coast of the Province to decide where the regional hospital should go on the West Coast and whether a plebiscite is planned to decide whether or not a regional hospital should go in Twillingate and whether or not a plebiscite is planned to decide whether a new general hospital should be built on the Memorial University campus or not?

MR. ROBERTS: Does the hon. gentleman know full well or should know full well that that is an appropriate question for the Order Paper? If he would be good enough to honour me by putting it on the Order Paper, I will endeavor to get the information for him.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister tell us when it is planned to commence the holding of the plebiscite in Conception Bay North to decide the location of the hospital that was supposed to go in Carbonear?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is trying to trick and mislead in his usual fashion. No Government decision has been taken. When it has been taken, it will be announced in due course and in the proper manner.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Does the hon. Minister of Health not realize that the Premier announced on March 22nd., that a plebiscite would be held in the Conception Bay area? Would that not be Government policy?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any announcements by the Premier on behalf of the Government. Of course, if the Premier makes an announcement or any minister makes an announcement, on behalf of the Government, it is Government policy. The hon. gentleman should know. He left the Government on what purported to be a matter of policy and has since wandered far and wide.

MR. CROSBIE: Was the hon. gentleman watching on television, March 22nd?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: When the Premier announced there would be a plebiscite?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! These are questions. The question should not contain information. They should not be done by implying nor referring to certain matters that have taken place or have not taken place. In answering the question, we must not have speeches.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Education and Youth. I wonder would he inform the House what plans he has to cope with the serious unemployment problem among students, which will soon be upon us?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Health, I wonder would he advise the name of the construction company referred to in paragraph 59 in the report of the Auditor General and the nature of the hospital construction projects referred to therein?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity to see the report of the Auditor General as yet. If the hon. gentleman wishes to add that to the seventy-three other questions that he has on the Order Paper, they will be answered in due course. Perhaps, he could phrase it a little more accurately than he has been phrasing his questions.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Labour. Would he tell us or give us any information today on when the report of the Royal Commission on Labour will be tabled. Can he give us some information?

MR. NEARY: If the hon. member would put the question on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to endeavor to try and get him the information.

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker, left the Chair.

MR. NOEL CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON SUPPLY

The Resolution, before the committee is that it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 31st day of March, 1972, the initial sum of \$99,780,000. The committee has passed item (5). Shall Item (6), Education and Youth, \$26,895,000 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, before we start to discuss this item, could we have the minister give us the details of the \$26,895,000 expenditure in accordance with your earlier ruling so that we know what the breakdown is?

HON. F.W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, the Department of Education is responsible, I think, as the Committee knows for spending the largest share of the budget in any one year. Consequently, we are compelled to ask for the largest share of Interim Supply. The total amount being asked for the Department of Education here is \$26 million. That figure is not one that was pulled out of a hat. It was the amount that our officials, in consultation with the officials of the Department of Finance, estimated we would need to cover our vital needs, spread over a period of two to three months, and which is, I might point out Mr. Chairman, the traditional amount. I think only in one year, in one, since I have been a member of the House, have we asked for anything less than approximately three months supply. This again is in the pattern this year.

I do not know that the officials have calculated it to the last cent for three months, but I think that this amount that they are asking for is designed to cover any probable cost and probable expenditures by the Department of Education, spread over roughly a three month period. I have even suggested, Mr. Chairman, that if we did not need, even if long before or sometime before the three months expired the full budget is brought down, it is a precaution which I think the Department of Finance and the Department of Education would like to take anyway because, a number of these cheques, a large number of them have to be issued in advance, so to speak. I think that the date that our department issues cheques in respect of any month is the fourth day of that month, although the cheques are not designed to be in the hands of, say, the teachers, until the latter part of that month.

These cheques have to go through certain processes and they have to be sent out to Boards of Education, in some cases, boards that are in remote parts of the Province. Consequently the Department of Finance insists and rightly so, of course, that before the cheques are issued, that there be necessary authority there. I would suggest to you that even if, in respect of two months period, we would need a three months supply, in order to be covered legally and constitutionally in the issuing of cheques for teachers' salaries and also operational cheques for the Boards of Education and also operational

cheques for transportation and so on. I am able to give the committee a breakdown of the major items of expenditure here. I could I suppose, get a breakdown for the last cent for the maybe six or seven hundred items there are under the estimates of the Department of Education. I do not think anybody would want that. I do not think that that would be reasonable to expect. How much, for example; of the Department's estimates we will spend on postage alone in respect of any single item over the next two or three months.

By far the biggest item in the Education estimates is the vote for teachers' salaries, and consequently the biggest item here, in the vote for the Interim Supply, is the vote for teachers' salaries which we estimate, and I might say I did not estimate this, the department of Finance estimates, taking into account the increase which the Government is pledged to give starting from the first of April an increase of which the minimum is twelve. I do not need to go into the figures now. Taking that into account, it is estimated that we would need \$11 million for teachers' salaries approximately. The actual amount estimated is \$3,000,670.00 a month.

If we have to be constitutionally covered and legally covered for a three month period, we would, even for two months, we would need to have a three month supply there. That is the largest single item.

Another item which is disproportionately large in the month of April, is that of the mothers' allowance. The mothers' allowance which hitherto has been \$1.50 a month per child attending school for ten months, has now been raised or is about to be raised by Government policy, and we expect and anticipate with the approval of this House to \$2.00 a month, and these amounts are sent out to the parents, to the mothers, in two installments, one in the fall for seven months and one the first week of April for three months. The estimate is that we would need \$950,000. for those cheques, which will be going in the mail, we hope, next week. \$950,000. almost \$1 million, that is for April.

I might point out here again, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot talk about

a thing like ten percent in respect, for example, of mothers' allowances for the very simple reason that we send out thirty percent of it in the month of April alone.

Another large item is the operational grants to school boards. The estimate is that we will need \$3 million for that. These operational grants are standard grants based on a per capita enrollment of pupils in the schools. Transportation of school children, again these are payments that have to be made regularly to Boards of Education and the estimate is that we would need roughly \$1.1 million for that over the next two or three months.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are these paid monthly or in a lump sum?

MR. ROWE: This goes out monthly now.

For the College of Trades and Technology, we estimate we will need to operate that very large institution, something in the order of \$750,000. over the next two or three months.

Our training and manpower program, I do not need to elaborate on these, the committee is quite familiar with those programs, \$600,000. Our grants-in-aid to the university, which are also spread over the twelve months of the year, work out at roughly \$1 million a month or a little better than that. We estimate we will need \$3 million for that. These again are - some of these grants I want to point out again, Mr. Chairman, are paid in advance of the month, so that even though you - over a two month period you would have to make three payments if you were making a payment on the first of the month.

All the other subheads, several hundred of them, the Department of Finance and our officials calculated we would need roughly \$1.5 million for all the other estimates that the committee are familiar with.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE: That would include all the others, but not the capital grants. I think under Physical Education and Youth, the hon. member is probably thinking of capital grants as well. Under capital we would hope to - we would expect to pass out about \$2 million roughly on the erection and equipment of school buildings. Again, these payments are made regularly to the Denominational Education Authorities, who in turn pass them over to the various boards, where

relevant, about \$2 million for that.

Vocational Schools, the construction and equipment of vocational schools about \$660,000. and a few other subheads, small subheads under capital roughly about \$180,000. You can think of for example, public libraries, and a few other thing of that kind.

AN HON. MEMBER: What was the last amount?

MR. ROWE: About \$180,000.

I left out one large one, and I mention that and I think it will complete the list of the major items, that is the provision and distribution of school supplies. We hear again, we cannot restrict it, here again we have the falacy of advocating say a ten percent payment. The truth of the matter is, that in respect of school supplies, the bulk of the expenditure takes place in the month of April and May.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE: Not at all, where does September come into the picture? We have to order the books from Gage and Co. and Ryerson and so on in February and March. We have to pay in April and September.

MR. ROWE, F.W. In September, we have to pay for them.

MR. COLLINS: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F.W.: We make our payments regularly, as we do to all the others. It is not a question of trusting anybody, it is a question of making the regular payments.

MR. MURPHY: If we do not send the money with the order, we have to wait to get the goods in C.O.D.

MR. ROWE, F.W.: These goods come in during, these have to come in during the months of April and May, then they are processed so to speak, \$1.5 million worth of books, supplies. Anywhere from \$1 million to \$1.5 million in inventory has to be handled, processed, then segregated, then orders have to be checked from, literally thousands of orders have to be checked against that and the supplies have to be made up and mailed to the schools or shipped freighted to the schools and be out into the schools well before the first day of September. I do not need to go into that surely.

Well the amount involved here is roughly just over \$800,000 for that item as well. And if these are all added up, I think, it will come to approximately \$26,895,000, which is the amount we are asking for Interim Supply.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we congratulate the minister on being the first one to date anyway—because even to attempt any kind of explanation of what he wishes the money for. His explanation of why his department wants three months supply, I do not think it is very convincing. The minister's total vote last year, on Current Account last year for education, was \$82,405,000. So that the minister is asking now for the House to vote about thirty percent of the total amount that the minister was voted last year to carry on for twelve months.

We do not see why the minister should ask for this amount of money to be voted like that. Ten percent of what the minister was voted last year, was carrying for a month and a-half, and we see no reason why the detailed estimates of expenditure should not be before this House before another

MR. CROSBIE: month and a-half has gone by, or the budget brought down.

Mr. Speaker, in the famous Conference that was held in January, the minister said there would be a substantial increase in the Mothers' Allowance, that is, that appears in the estimates as Parents' Subsidy, at \$1.50 per child per month for each child at school. The minister says in a newsletter that he sent out in February, an increase in Mothers' Allowances of thirty-three percent would start on the 1st. of April. Thirty-three percent sounds very, very convincing, like a very tremendous amount of money, Mr. Chairman. But, the thirty-three percent in this case is fifty cents per month per child. So that, if the House approves, and the minister is going to pay it out anyway before the House does approve it, the minister is going to send out these cheques in April, without first asking the approval of the House on this. That it is the custom of the Government. If the House does approve, the Mothers' Allowance is going to amount to the magnificent sum of \$2.00 per school child per month for each month the child is at school. Now what kind of an increase is that?

In my view, Mr. Chairman, if the Government is going to have a Mothers' Allowance Program, if the Government have got the hundreds of millions that they say they have, that they stated at the Economic Development Conference, then why are they not raising the Mother's Allowance to something substantial, not \$1.50 per month per child, \$2.00 per month per child, but something that will do people some real good, a real basic transfer payment, not an increase of fifty cents per child per month. That means the increase will be \$5.00 a year for each child at school. That is what the increase will amount to: \$5.00 for the whole year. If this is a good programme and there is certainly nothing wrong with transferring money to those most of whom will need it. No means test or anything else. If it is a good programme why is the minister only increasing it fifty cents a month. If the minister has unlimited amounts of money to spend in this field of education, why is not the Government giving this a decent boost? To call it thirty-three

MR. CROSBIE: percent is only to try to make it look impressive, when it is not impressive. It is piquant, \$1.50 per month per child was piquant but now the \$2.00 per month is not much better.

Some of the money the minister is asking for here is for free textbooks. Is it not the case that in the Budget Speech of 1969 the Government decreased the subsidy on school supplies? That the Government before 1959 was paying seventy-five percent of the cost of school books?

MR. CROSBIE:

and that in the Budget Speech of 1969 there is an economy measure, the Government reduced the subsidy from seventy-five per-cent to fifty per-cent so that the parents of school children in Newfoundland had to pay in '69 and '70 and this year twenty-five per-cent more for school supplies than they had been paying, and now it is announced in the Speech from the Throne. But before the Speech from the Throne it was announced by the Minister, at this Conference in January and before the Speech from the Throne it was announced by the Minister, in his Department news letter, the increase of free text books from kindergarten to grade three and seventy-five per-cent Government subsidy for all text books above grade three. Why did the Minister and his Government reduce this from seventy-five per-cent to fifty per-cent in 1969 and now, two years later change it again? What has happened to change the Government's mind? Where has the sudden influx of money come from that permits the Government to change this policy? What kind of a Government is it that reduces a subsidy in '69 and reverses it again in '71? Why has the Government not explained to the House where this windfall of money has come from? Where have these hundreds of millions been discovered that the Government did not have in '67 and did not have in '68 and did not have in 1969 and did not have in '70 and now apparently have in 1971? Would the Minister explain that?

MR. CALLAHAN: It is just that the economy is stronger this winter.

MR. CROSBIE: The economy is stronger this winter. Yes and the Government's tax revenues are up that much. It is a funny thing that the Minister of Finance will give us no information on this at all and he will not explain why we have that \$103. million dollar deficit this year. Does that show a great increase in the economy?

The Minister has not told the House anything. The House has been open now since March 22nd and we have not had a word from the Minister on what exactly the status is of the Government's relationship with teachers. We know from the teachers that they have said that further negotiations with the Government were fruitless and that negotiations are broken off again. The Government is asking now for \$11. million dollars to pay teachers salaries,

MR. CROSBIE:

the Minister says that includes a twelve per-cent increase. Is it not time the Minister explained to the House what the status of the affair is? Has what the Government offered been accepted by the teachers or not accepted by them? Have negotiations finished on all the other matters that are involved, apart from money? What is the status of the teachers negotiations with the Government?

Surely when the Minister asks for \$26. million dollars, it is time for the Minister to give us a few words of explanation. The Minister has not mentioned, Mr. Chairman, an announcement that was in November 1970. It was announced then by the Premier, who usually makes these kind of announcements, that thirty-two portable classrooms, designed to eliminate overcrowding at the College of Trades and Technology and the eleven vocational schools throughout the Province, were under construction by Atlantic Design Homes Limited, to be completed as rapidly as possible. The Premier announced a \$640,000. expansion to the Trade School and the eleven vocational schools, there would be sixteen classrooms added to the Technical College. What has happened to that programme? What is the status of it? Have these portable classrooms been completed? What is it costing the Government? Is it \$640,000. or more than that? Is there any contribution from the Government of Canada for these portable classrooms? Why was Atlantic Design Homes awarded the contract? Were proposals asked for? Were tenders called? On what basis did they get the contract? How much is it costing us per portable classroom?

The Premier said an agreement between the Province and Ottawa whereby each of the Governments would pay for the additional classrooms had not yet been reached. That was November 1970. He said, "It is the Province's hope that Ottawa will pay more than fifty per-cent of the cost of the expansion programme." Well, did Ottawa agree? Did the Premier's hope turn out to be correct that Ottawa would pay? Could the Minister give us some information on these portable classrooms?

The Minister announced at the Development Conference and he is asking now for \$3. million dollars, operational grants for school boards, announced

MR. CROSSIE:

and gave the impression that the Government was going to do away with the school boards and churches having to spend any capital monies on school buildings. He gave a completely false impression to the public at large, that the school tax and school fees were going to be eliminated as had been promised in 1967 or 1966-67 in the Throne Speech.

The Minister after that changed his wording, to say that it would take two or more years before the final steps could be taken.

Mr. Crosbie.

There will be a very comprehensive enquiry. Well, Mr. Chairman, in 1966-67, the Government announced that school fees and school taxes were eliminated. It then had to change its position in midstride and come into the House and leave school fees and school tax assessments in being so that the school boards could raise money for capital purposes and for specialist teachers. That was in 1966-67. That was five years ago. Certainly, it was four years ago. Surely, the Government must have been investigating the business of the capital cost of schools for the last four years. It was four years ago it announced that it was eliminating school fees and school taxes and did not do it.

Now the minister says that, at the Development Conference, the Government intend to conduct an investigation into the possibility. Why did not the Government conduct an investigation before saying in 1967 that it was going to eliminate all these fees? Why has it not investigated it since? It has had four years in which to investigate this. Why mention this investigation at all? Except to give people the wrong impression, that they were no longer going to have to pay tuition fees and school taxes. The minister has since had to correct it. Untold damage was done to the school boards of the Province, in collecting their school fees and taxes by the minister's premature announcements and by the way he worded it and by the false impression that got out. Who has been appointed to undertake the very comprehensive enquiry? March 4th., 1971 the minister said, "this matter would call for a very comprehensive enquiry which, in all probability, would take a year or more." Yes, it will be after the election before this enquiry is finished. It will take a year or more. Who is doing the enquiry? Who is being appointed?

When the House opened on March 22nd., the hon. the Premier spoke for a few moments on that subject. He made a most peculiar statement, Mr. Chairman. He said that the Government would take over all capital costs of building schools

Mr. Crosbie.

in this Province, if the churches agreed, if the churches agreed to the method of taxation that would replace it. That, in my view, was an insidious attempt to put the churches of Newfoundland in the position where they will have to take responsibility for the tax system or the taxes the Government impose, if it does take over one hundred per cent of the construction cost of schools. I can only hope that the denominational authorities in Newfoundland will not be unwise enough to allow themselves to be put in that position. If the Government take over the payment of one hundred per cent of the cost of constructing schools in this Province and imposes new taxes or a new tax system to raise the revenue, this will not be the responsibility of the churches of Newfoundland. This will be the responsibility of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, if this is done and the Government pay one hundred per cent of the cost of constructing schools, how can the Government allow title to those schools to remain in private bodies? How can title to these schools remain held by the churches of Newfoundland, if one hundred per cent of the funds are public funds? Can any Government do that? Can they spend public funds on assets which will become one hundred per cent owned by private denominations? I fail to see how the Government can do it. But, in any event, for the Government to suggest that the Government will do this, if the churches agree to the tax system that is to replace it, is dangerous and farcial. I hope that the churches of Newfoundland will avoid that trap so that they do not be blamed for the tax system that the Government impose, if it does take over one hundred per cent of the cost of construction of schools. So, I would like to hear more from

Mr. Crosbie.

the Minister of Education, as to how this is being investigated? Who is doing the investigation? What the probabilities are and what taxes might be imposed, if the Government do this? We all remember the Government increasing the S.S.A. tax one per cent, in 1967 to replace school fees and assessments. We all remember that we are still paying school fees and assessments, despite that one per cent increase.

If the Government take over the cost of construction of schools, I venture to say that the S.S.A. tax will go up another two or three per cent, at least. So, there are a lot of problems there. This appears to me to be a cheap attempt to make people believe that they no longer have to pay school fees and assessments. The Government is just going to find the money somewhere. Perhaps it will come on a rocket from the moon and take over this system. If the Government take it over, the public will pay, the people will pay. You can believe that. There is no way of not believing it.

The minister said in early February that the Government school construction was doubled, to \$8 million this year, as compared with \$4 million last year. This must be a wonderful year for money. They had to borrow. They had a deficit of \$103 million last year. The school construction grants did not double last year. What was the deficit of \$103 million spent on? What was \$125 million borrowed spent on that was not spent on school construction? That did not double this year. What kind of a deficit will we have next year, when the election is over, if we have \$103 million this year, without any election? Will it be \$200 million? Will it be \$250 million? Will it be \$300 million? Only time will tell. But the minister, this year, says he is going to double school construction grants.

Mr. Crosbie.

Recreation: The minister is promising now to finance recreation facilities all over the Province. Something the Government did not do last year. It did not do it 1969. It did not do it in 1968. It did not do it in 1967. It promised it in 1967. In 1967 the great recreation programme was promised, when there was a by-election on in Gander. I remember it well. The member for Gander got elected. The Government announced a tremendous recreation province. There were going to be grants to every community in Newfoundland, every municipality that would put up so much. The Government would provide the rest. This House, to date, three or four years later, Mr. Chairman, has not spent a cent on that recreation programme.

Now, with an election coming up, the minister is going to start this programme and finance recreation facilities and hockey rinks and stadiums and stadia all over the Province. He did not do it last year. The Government had a \$103 million deficit. He did not do it last year and the Government borrowed \$125 million. He is going to do it in 1971-72. Where is that money coming from? Why did not the minister do it last year? Why did he not do it in 1969-68 or 67? The magical answer we get is tight money. The tight money has now become elastic money. Now money is growing on trees for this Government. It has to appear so, because there is an election coming. Perhaps, the minister will explain how many recreation centres he is going to finance this year and where he is going to get the money from to do it and why he did not do it last year or the year before or the year before that or the year when it was promised?

Transportation: School bus transportation. The minister announced in that famous conference, and in his news' letter that he is going to spend a lot more on school transportation. I believe the minister has said that he is going to take over the costs entirely, one hundred per cent, Government responsibility for transportation of all children, qualifying under existing formulae. That is what the minister has announced. The minister

Mr. Crosbie.

last year refused to assist the parents down in Wabush or Labrador City with their school transportation problem down there. In the cold of the Labrador winter, it did not fit in. The Government did not have the money to do it. It did not come under Government regulations. It did not come under Government formula. There were a hundred reasons why the parents of Labrador City were told their children could walk a mile or two to school in 30° to 40° below zero weather. But now, suddenly, at the January, February, Development Conference, the problem is solved. The Government are going to pay one hundred per cent of school transportation; a hundred per cent, not ninety per cent, not eighty, not seventy, not sixty, not fifty, a hundred per cent, the minister is going to pay now. Is the minister going to pay now for school transportation in Labrador City and Wabush? Perhaps he might give us a few words on that.

Vocational Schools: The minister is going to build five new vocational schools: Bonavista, Placentia, Springdale. He is so anxious to build them that the tenders are called now for the foundations, before the plans are ready. The detailed plans are not ready yet. Architects have been starving. They have been just about starving for the last three to four years without work to do, while the Government were in the throes and horrors of tight money, nothing to do. Now, in the last two or three months, they are working night and day whacking out

plans and designs and so on for the Government in this election year. The Government cannot wait to get the plans off the drawing board, they are down there pulling them out, As soon as they are finished with the pencil and the pen, the Government pulls out the plan and calls a tender and rushes it off. They called tenders for the foundations of these five schools. The Minister -

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. minister permit a question on that?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: The statement that plans are being prepared. The story is that these schools have already been let without any tender called, Lundrigans - I do not know if this is true or not perhaps -

MR. CROSBIE: Well, perhaps the Minister could explain that, I thought I saw tender calls in the paper there a few weeks ago.

MR. MURPHY: It appears that - the schools have already been -

MR. CROSBIE: I do not think that that can be so, the Minister of Public Works would not have that. He has met with the construction association and discussed how the tender system is going to work. So I do not know, perhaps the Minister could tell us that, but in any event, five foundations are going to be started shortly. Well, would the Minister explain, is the formula still fifty-fifty with Ottawa or do we have to pay all the costs ourselves? What will the five schools cost? Give us a bit of information on them. I am sure they are badly needed, but we would like to know just how the Minister plans to raise money for it, and when he anticipates they might be constructed and whether construction will be completed after the election is over, These are all questions that naturally reach one's mind.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister did not mention what used to be one of the favourite subjects of the Government when it came to Education, - Free tuition and salaries at Memorial University. The Government started that programme before 1966, it was free tuition for every student attending Memorial University,

salaries to be paid, \$100 a month if you lived outside of St. John's, fifty dollars a month if you lived in the city, for third, fourth and fifth year students, fourth and fifth year was going to be extended to them all. That was in the halcyon days of 1966. The Premier remembers the days. "That was the day, my friend, dah, dah, da, da," You had to listen sharply, the Premier is trying to obfuscate, Has he looked that up yet? That means confused. "Those were the days my boy, boob, boob, boob, boob boo, boo." We are thrilled. We are thrilled with the wit, the likeness and wit.

MR. ROBERTS: What is the rule about using foreign languages on ---

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is it not bilingualism?

SOME HON. MEMBER: We are bilingual.

MR. CROSBIE: Listen to the cuckoos. The last time I heard anything like this was in an old watchmakers shop. Cuckoo. Now where was I, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 6, Education and Youth.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, but where was I, oh yes, Memorial Students. Well that got changed Mr. Chairman, the last four years. There is now a means test for free tuition. There is now a means test for salaries. Never mind if there is a good programme or not, that is changed. Why has not the Minister told us about his great new free tuition and salary programme for students at Memorial, not a word about that. What has happened to that? How does the hon. Minister know what is what wiped out? I heard members of the Cabinet want the Mothers Allowance wiped out. But I am not allowed to say who.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order Please!

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, our free tuition programme for the very simple reason that the payments are made, the payments are not in the Interim Supply Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we can hope that, if the hon. Minister is in the House for another nineteen years, he may know what a point of order is. There is money being requested by the Minister for Memorial University. The great Development

Conference about the free tuition and salaries. The great News Letter of February 1971, summary of the statement of the Hon. Dr. F. W. Rowe, good thing it is a summary - the whole page that summary - if the whole speech were given it would have been a book that went out. That did not mention the free tuition and salaries. If tight money is over why has not the Government gone back to its promise to institute free tuition for all, and salaries for all at Memorial University? Will the Minister explain why that has not been done? The money is no longer tight for all the other programmes the Minister is engaged in, why is it tight still for students at Memorial University?

Well, there are so many other things, there is a miscellaneous at \$1.5 million. Miscellaneous, \$1.5 million whatever that is.

MR. MURPHY: Pencils and erasers.

MR. CROSBIE: Pencils and erasers, we are told, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister had to have \$800,000 for school supplies because he has to pay for them in September. He orders them now and pays for them in May or June or July or August or September. The Government has never been known to have a bill outstanding for an excess of thirty days. Surely the school supplies are purchased for this year. The Minister does not need \$800,000 for school supplies for the next couple of months. What a fairy tale, the Minister does not need that money until the summer. I could say more but I know there are other people who want to speak on this subject. I think that will do for the preliminary Mr. Chairman, as a preliminary skirmish, skimming on the surface. There is a bird that skims along the surface of the water and then it goes down and comes up again - we are only skimming the surface here. The Minister has been a skimmer in the information he has given to us this morning. I would like to have his comments on some of the points I have - I know it is too much to expect. I know the order is gone out from up above or down below, in this case the eighth floor, that no time is to be spent giving any information, or as little as possible, But perhaps the Minister could treat us with some of

these subjects. I think they are of some importance to the people of the Province
We do not even get water here today - get our own water - Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKMAN: No, the staff is not on this morning. Mr. Chairman, I would like
to restrict my comments to the items that have been elaborated on, with some
information from the - by the Hon. the Minister, in presenting this motion and
request for the amount sought in this Bill. In his opening remarks

MR. HICKMAN: The minister expressed some concern and almost some amusement over the suggestion that the amount requested should be restricted to one month supply, and drew the attention of the committee to the fact that in previous sessions Government have come into this House and asked for up to three months Interim Supply.

Well, may I remind this committee, Mr. Chairman, that this request for Interim Supply is coming within two days of the end of the Government's Fiscal Year. This is a far cry from asking for Interim Supply in February, to take Government through to the end of its Fiscal Year. This is simply asking Government -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Interim Supply?

MR. HICKMAN: Supplementary Supply, to take Government through to the end of its Fiscal Year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are entitled to assume that sometime during the month of April Government will bring down its budget, and if it is going to bring down its budget in April, we are entitled to assume that Government with its majority will see that the estimates contained in the budget will be voted during April. If this does not occur, if because of the lateness of the budget insofar as the month of April is concerned, we have to go into May, then it is a very simple thing for Government to ask for Interim Supply for May. The members of this House will be in a much better position to judge the reasonableness of the request, because this House will then and this committee will then have before it the detailed estimates for the Fiscal Year 1971 - 1972.

So there is nothing peculiar, nothing unusual nor nothing unreasonable in suggesting that this Bill should deal with one month's Interim Supply rather than three or more, We do not quite know how many, but the implication is that it is for three months.

Mr. Chairman, the minister, in giving us some details of the department requirements, refers to \$2 million on Capital Account, to be passed to the Denominational Education Committee and that, in turn, will go to the school boards for construction grants.

MR. HICKMAN: Now, Mr. Chairman, that comes with a bit of surprise to members of this committee, I am sure. Because hon. members will recall that only three days ago, in answer to a question on the Order Paper, this House was advised by the hon. minister that he does not know how many schools have been built or how many new classrooms have been opened in Newfoundland. That question properly belongs to the churches. Now are we being told today that the \$2 million that the minister is asking this committee to vote, that he does not know where that \$2 million is going, that he does not know what classrooms are being extended or built or enlarged, nor what schools are being built in Newfoundland this year. Are we to understand that the Government of the Province, that the Minister of Education has no control over the building of schools? If such is the case, then what is the use of the provision in the Schools Act, I think it is Section 35 of the Schools Act which imposes upon the authority the obligation to approve the signatures or the borrowing by school boards. What is the point in having that Section in the Act? Obviously, the whole intent of the Schools Act was to give the Government of this Province and to give the House of Assembly some control over establishing priorities in the spending of the education dollar.

Mr. Chairman, recently there appeared an editorial in a very good Newfoundland publication called, "The Educators' Gazette," which dealt with this very problem, and it is very apropos the \$2 million that the hon. minister has asked this committee for now. And it was talking about this very question that Government falls back on when it is in an embarrassing position. I quote, "the churches ownership of schools have long been used to the hilt by a Provincial Government, when it has been convenient to do so. There have also been times when it has been just as convenient for the Government to forget the churches' role in education. In both instances, the Government have been equal to the task. Thus for instance, when the House of Assembly receives a petition whose prayer is better and/or additional school facilities in some part of the Province, where the need is clearly obvious, one hears, at once,

MR. HICKMAN: the best oratory and the lousiest logic from the Government bench.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I think, the hon. member is out of order in reading from the editorial of the newspaper.

MR. HICKMAN: I feel reasonably certain, Mr. McCurdy has nothing to do with the "Educators' Gazette."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! I think the rule is based on the fact that the opinions of others is not really material for a debate in the House. The rule says that the members are not permitted to quote from newspapers in their debate. Not opinions.

MR. HICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, may I express my own opinion? The opinion that has been voiced by many concerned school board members and many concerned parents and many concerned educators in this Province, when they draw attention to the fact that was so vividly pointed up by the hon. minister, in his answer to the question last week, that when the petition is for the improvement of school facilities and this petition is presented on the table of this House the reply always comes back; "we do not build schools, the churches build schools. They build them, not the Government."

But, Mr. Chairman, let us take it a step further and when the churches have built the schools then there is an amazing transformation, Government officials suddenly move in to cut the ribbon. They say we have built the school. Now I do not take any issue at all with a Government saying, "we have built the school." Because that is precisely what Government is all about. But I do take strong issues when the Government uses the denominational authorities and the churches as a shield to protect them from the requests of concerned parents and concerned school boards and concerned educators in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, again, under the items that have been dealt with in limited detail by the hon. the minister when introducing this motion, we are told that \$3 million will be required for operational grants to school boards.

MR. HICKMAN: I think what would be far more relevant and which is far more essential to this committee is that, if the minister would give an indication as to the financial position of the various school boards in this Province at this time. Because, Mr. Chairman, a survey, conducted of the school boards in the Province of Newfoundland, indicates that most, if not all of them, are in very, very serious financial difficulties at this time.

There is not much point in standing in this House and talking about the magnificent grants being given to school boards, and then you go and talk to the administrators in the various integrated school boards or the Roman Catholic Boards throughout the Province, and you are told that they are running from pillar to post trying to meet the reasonable demands of their teachers. Quite recently I was discussing this with the administrator of one of the larger rural integrated boards, and he poured out his frustration to me, the operational grants that come from Government are barely sufficient to pay the salaries of the caretakers, to pay the cost of heat, to pay the cost of fuel, to pay the ordinary cost of operating schools in this Province. But, he says, "what do you do, when the head of the Science Department or the head of the Physical Education Department or Music Department or any other department of Government comes to you with a new programme, not a programme that is going to take a school in Burin and put it away ahead of something you will find in California, but something to try and bring the schools in Newfoundland close to the quality of education, close to the type of instruction that North American students are receiving today and that Newfoundland students are entitled to receive?"

MR. HICKMAN:

"What do you say to him when he comes with this programme and says, 'What I am asking for is really only a quality of education, a type of instruction, the imposition of a curriculum that in 1970 is already way behind that you will find in neighbouring Nova Scotia.'" You have to look them straight in the eye and say, "Your program is good but we do not have a nickle for teaching aids, think about it and maybe next year we will be able to find the money."

Mr. Chairman, this is not the implication we get. The implication we get is that Government is spending millions upon millions upon millions on education, that generosity is pouring out of the ears of Government and that; in fact the Minister went as far as to say at this recent conference that he is getting letters suggesting that school boards are extravagant.

I happened to be at a speech night of one of the larger schools under the Avalon's Consolidated School Board, the night that statement was made - and the disgust and dismay that echoed through that hall that night, over the statement that had been made that afternoon by the hon. Minister, and the implications and the aspersions cast at school board members who serve free of charge in Newfoundland today.

He made one very graphic comment and the comment was that he said; "It is a desperate situation, when dealing in millions of dollars, 15,000 children and 600 teachers, operating forty school plants, and these are very general figures, we have to consider carefully an expenditure like say \$600.00 for a few drapes or a piece of essential equipment and so on and so on." This is an extravagant school board. No, Mr. Chairman, this exemplifies every school board in Newfoundland today. They have developed, not because of their own desire but because of the miserliness on the part of Government, because of the feeling that they have that Government wishes they would go away, they have been forced to develop into penny-pinching administrators who day after day have to turn to their academic staff and say, "We cannot give you the funds to implement programs that are so long overdue in our school system."

Yet the hon. Minister says, "I get letters saying school board members

MR. HICKMAN:

in Newfoundland are extravagant." Mr. Chairman, school board members in this Province are not only not extravagant, not only are they very dedicated Newfoundland men and women serving on these boards but they are becoming more and more frustrated by the attitude of Government toward these boards. The statement that was made by the hon. the Minister of the inquiries and the negotiations that will be carried out with the churches to see whether or not Government can take over the full cost of building and constructing schools in Newfoundland.

As one very high official in Education said, on the day that this House opened, before the opening session commenced, that if Government continues its present course, no self-respecting Newfoundland will serve on a school board in this Province because, what will there be left for them to do? Their entire efforts in the field of curriculum, their entire efforts in the quality of education are being frustrated. If they are going to have nothing to say in the construction of schools, which is a pie in the sky dream everybody knows that, Why is it that everywhere else in North America the success of the school system depends on the maximum local involvement? Why is it? Are we wrong or are we right and the rest of North America wrong? Are we going to take away from the man living in Port au Choix the right of involvement in the educational process of his children? Are we going to suggest that doctrines can be laid down and curriculum dispensed with and decisions made within this Ivory Tower that will be so all-embracing that it will take care of the peculiar needs of every community in Newfoundland? Of course we cannot.

Our educational process, Mr. Chairman, cannot survive unless we have more and more local involvement. It cannot survive unless there is close consultation with the school boards of this Province before weird and wonderful announcements emanate from this building. Mr. Chairman, everyone in this House realizes that the cost of education in any Province in Canada and the cost of education in Newfoundland is a pretty expensive one but I challenge anyone in this House to say that as of today we are spending anything like enough money to meet the educational requirements

MR. HICKMAN:

of the students of this Province.

This House has now asked, according to the Minister, for \$11. million dollars to pay teachers' salaries and this takes into account the new increase in salaries that we hear will be paid come April 1st and the increases that have been negotiated by the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. I think it can be safely said that certainly not since the coming of Confederation has the educational process of Newfoundland gone through such troubled times as it has during the past six to eight months. We witnessed not too long ago a withdrawal of services of many of our teachers in several towns in Newfoundland. We also witnessed something, which in my opinion was even more disastrous, and this was the "work to rule" that was prevalent throughout this Province. People found themselves forced in the position where they had to take sides; is the Government's offer adequate? Are the teachers being unreasonable in their demands?

What was completely overlooked, Mr. Chairman, what was completely overlooked was the disastrous effect that this totally unnecessary controversy was having and will have on the educational process in the Province of Newfoundland. Does anyone in his right mind really think that because the regrettable dispute was solved, temporarily at least and I hope permanently, a few weeks ago, that now everything has been erased, that we are now going to get back to normal teaching, normal instruction, improved quality of education in this Province? Does anybody really believe that? Do they really believe that when the Newfoundland Teachers' Association found themselves faced with the bludgeon that was being thrown at them by Government and had to go back to the classroom and when they thought that they had found at least a face saving formula and when they announced that they were instructing or requesting their teachers and members to return to the classrooms because here is all we can get for the first two years but we are going to negotiate a three year contract, a third year, and out the same day comes the Minister of Education and says, "No." Does anyone think that this is going to mean peace and harmony in the teaching profession in this Province? Does anyone think that this will not add to the already

MR. HICKMAN:

burdensome troubles and tasks the school boards have and the Denominational Education Committee has and everyone else connected with the school boards? No, Mr. Chairman.

A concerned Government, a concerned Minister, whose real concern is with the quality of education, when they saw that this was coming to an end, when they saw that the teachers were going back to the classroom, would not have bludgeoned them on that last little face-saving criteria that was announced by the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. There could be nothing more disastrous to this Province than have teachers reluctantly performing the duties of their profession in the classroom. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that any teacher in Newfoundland today has to come to the conclusion, it is as clear as the nose on your face, that the teachers in this Province do not have the confidence of the Government, that they have been bludgeoned and bulldozed into almost losing their professional status. Yet we are going to hear, I will bet you, before this session is out, about everything we have done for the school teachers.

It will take this Province many years to recover from the troublesome times that we have just recently gone through insofar as the teaching profession is concerned. You might say, Mr. Chairman, when we are talking about teachers, when we are talking about the item on teachers salaries \$11. million dollars, you might say, Mr. Chairman, well that is only the teachers. It goes a great deal further, Mr. Chairman, than the teachers because obviously it has to reflect on the quality of education that our children receive! What our teachers need, and let us not be carried away by this nonsense of 600 applications from outside the Province to teach in Newfoundland. When I was chairman of the School Board we used to get dozens of these each year, but we still used to have to send the superintendent out to look for specialist teachers who were not available in the Province and we knew what most of these applications were. They were a passport

MR. HICKMAN:

by young qualified teachers to travel all over the world. "we will spend a year in Newfoundland and then we will go on somewhere else or we will make an enquiry to see what the salary is down there and to see what the working conditions are." You reply to these letters and it is the last you ever hear from them.

No, Mr. Chairman, what we have to recognize in this Province is that, if we have a disgruntle teaching profession, that they are going to go. Let me give you one example, while this withdrawal of services was on I know of one high school in this Province where three young, loyal, dedicated, Newfoundlanders, who had just finished Memorial at a tremendous expense to them, have all advised their board, their one board, that next year they will no longer participate in the teaching profession of this Province. One is going to Rhodesia, another is going with the Federal Department of Fisheries and another is taking a job in industry and not one of them, not one of them, wanted to leave the teaching profession of this Province, but they had come to the conclusion that they are not strong enough to fight an arrogant Government that uses a club every time they try to speak up for their rights.

This is what is happening to education. Then the Minister comes in and says, "Give me \$11. million dollars for teachers' salaries," as if this is going to cure all our ills. It is what is hidden underneath this, Mr. Chairman, is so vital to the educational process in this Province. Mr. Chairman, we have been told that we need an extra \$950,000. for mothers' allowance to increase the mothers' allowance by fifty cents a month. - commendable policy, commendable social philosophy. Well, what is the good of giving a mother in Point May fifty cents a month per child extra when the Roman Catholic School Board for that area finds that it has to increase its assessments by \$2.00 a month to find enough money to operate and to get teaching supplies? Does any Government think that any mother in Newfoundland is going to sell the quality of education of her child, or his or her child, for fifty cents a month? Does anybody really believe that? Is that the kind of leadership we expect from the hon. the Minister who is a professional

MR. HICKMAN:

educator? He knows as well as I do that the quality of education in this Province, that the gap is widening between the quality of education in this Province and even in our neighbouring Nova Scotia, He knows that.

If we can take the public into our confidence, if we can give the true facts to the dedicated Newfoundlanders who are serving on school boards, if we can -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Well, you would not recognize a true fact if you heard it. I can tell them this, Mr. Chairman, they will respond, make no mistake about it, they will respond to the educational needs of this Province but if we are going to come in and say, "We want \$26,895,000. because I have been advised that this covers three months and there is \$11. million for teachers salaries, \$3,770,000. per month and "X" number of dollars for buses and \$1.5 million for recreation," this does not give any indication of the real educational needs of this Province.

Last week we heard a glowing announcement from the hon. the Minister of Education that in the town of St. Lawrence there is going to be a recreational facility built at a cost of \$150,000. to \$250,000. The clear implication, the clear impression was that the Government of this Province was going to build it. Well, let us set the record straight, Mr. Chairman. That multipurpose recreational facility, which has been asked for and negotiated for a good ten years, is being built by Alcan. They are calling tenders, they are going to build a multipurpose recreational facility and they should, they should, they owe it to the town of St. Lawrence, every single dollar of it. All they had from Government was a letter saying - this was written a couple of years ago, two or three years ago, "We do not have the money to build a recreational facility in St. Lawrence now but if you build it and if you ask for it we will pay you back our per capita share." But let us keep the record straight, this is being built and paid for right now by Alcan, and I say they should pay every nickle of it, they should have ten years ago. They owe it to the town of St. Lawrence, they owe it to the people of that area. If that is the kind of magnificent gifts

MR. HICKMAN:

and grants that recreational facilities are going to receive in Newfoundland, then I think we better not get too enthusiastic about the announcements that we hear.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in this \$1.5 million dollars there are some current account expenditures for education or recreation and youth. I would like to know how that money is going to be spent, these small amounts because I know that the hon. Minister has on his desk now and he has had them there for twelve months all sorts of applications for comparatively small grants to athletic associations throughout this Province, "Give us \$5,000. or \$10,000. so we can complete our soccer pitch, Give us a few thousand dollars to institute certain programmes in the rinks we have today." But this money has never been available and this is money well spent, this is not going to cost the Province millions of dollars.

I am sure that many of us, when we see Canada Games starting this year and when we saw them two years ago in Halifax, we must have had a great deal of pride, we had to, when we saw the Newfoundland Contingent marching in, bright young Newfoundland athletics who went up there to represent their Province. But we also must have found ourselves, as the competitions progressed we must have found a great deal of shame on our part that we did not provide the few

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: We are not talking about big money, the few thousand of dollars during the preceeding year or years to place these Newfoundland athletics in a position where they could compete with any of those we find from the rest of Canada. But no, this all went by the board. Now we will hear the announcements this year, but again Canada Games is two years away.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I have been very impressed with the remarks by the hon. member for St. John's West and the hon. member for Burin who dealt very extensively with the position we find ourselves in with regard to education. I have a few questions mainly, which I would like to direct to the Minister, and I would hope that we will get some answers to them before the debate closes.

MR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, it will be recalled that this past winter a very important conference on education took place in Gander and it was too bad that the Premier and the Minister of Education and others could not attend and find out how a conference should be set up, how it should be held and how a discussion should take place. I have many of the names, Mr. Chairman, of the people who attended that conference, about two hundred and I will not attempt to get them all in the record but I can say that concerned Newfoundlanders from every walk of life, from almost every town in the Province, did attend that conference and a properly organized mini-conference, that is, if you want to, expound on the theories that they thought that the educational process in Newfoundland could be improved upon.

the conference was set up by Dr. Phil Warren, a noted Newfoundlander.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I am not sure now that under Education and Youth here that vote for a salary grant, you know, that we should go into this particular conference of which you have the report there.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I was only building up to - or using this information to build up to some remarks which I wanted to make, in terms of some recommendations which those people made. Certainly, if the recommendations were made by a man of the calibre of Dr. Warren and Dr. Herbert Kitchen and many of the school board members and principals of schools and district superintendents, if those people met and discussed what in their opinion should, but in their opinion, the direction which education should take in Newfoundland, certainly, Sir, I believe that that is applicable and should be admitted for this particular debate. One of the first recommendations, Mr. Chairman, which was made, was that it is recommended strongly that colleges established outside of St. John's be Regional Community Colleges. The concept of Junior Colleges is far too narrow to meet our needs and these Regional Colleges must be flexible enough to meet the changing needs of the region, and those needs should be determined in consultation with the local citizens.

We have heard a great deal, Mr. Chairman, about Regional Colleges. It was first mentioned I believe in the Royal Commission Report on Education and Youth, which was chaired by Dr. Warren. We have heard many indications from the Minister and from the Premier about the wisdom of setting up and establishing this type of college around Newfoundland. But we have seen very little action. Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit that because we do not have community colleges or regional colleges (I prefer to call them community colleges) across this Province, it means that many of our citizens are young people who are living in Gander and Grand Falls and Corner Brook and in Labrador and the South Coast and so on and so forth, those people,

whether we like it or not, are being treated certainly as second class citizens, when we compare their opportunities with the opportunities of the young people who are living in St. John's and on the Avalon Peninsula, near Memorial University.

We also know, Mr. Chairman, that Memorial University has grown to such an extent - I do not know the actual number of students attending there now but we do know that Memorial has grown probably as large as it should grow. I believe the student body is in the order of around 7,000 students and it is our opinion and certainly was the opinion of the people who attended this conference that the time has come when we must set up colleges outside of St. John's, in strategic places across the Province, so that our young people can have a better chance and not be denied their right to a good education.

I will not suggest to the Minister where the colleges should be located. I do not think this is the time or the place for that but I would presume that before any decision is made, with regard to the location, that certainly public interest and human interest would take priority over the narrow political interest, which might very well enter into that decision.

There is a lot to be said, Mr. Chairman, for the establishment of community colleges. We would like to see the colleges located, as I said, in strategic areas, where they can serve the maximum number of people and where the college can also be utilized for Adult Education, for training of citizens for leadership in the communities, and many other fields which are so lacking in terms of present educational policy in Newfoundland.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question? Would he think that Gander would be a suitable site for one of these colleges? Perhaps even the most suitable.

MR. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, certainly Gander is an ideal location for such an establishment. There was the place where this conference was held, which means that it was the best place in Newfoundland, in the wisdom of Dr. Warren and Dr. Kitchen and other noted educators. Being that it was centrally located,

being that it was near St. John's by air, We do not want to be all that near the Capital but, since we do have a very important International Airport there, the problem of bringing in professors (and it is acknowledged that the early years of operation of any college across Newfoundland it might be necessary to utilize the services of professors from Memorial) and I can think of no better place in Newfoundland where a professor can quit work at Memorial at five o'clock and go home to his residence in St. John's and eat supper and get on an aircraft and be in Gander in about fifteen minutes and do his courses during the night and fly back again by eleven or eleven-thirty. This has happened, indeed, Mr. Chairman, we have the nucleus of a junior college or a community college in Gander right now, because this past winter or right now, there are 240 students from Gander, from Eastport, from places as far away as Wesleyville, from New World Island and other places, who are coming in to Gander taking various courses, not all teachers, mind you, Mr. Chairman, either, A lot of them are teachers upgrading themselves, improving their qualifications but a lot of people in business are also coming in and taking various courses which are being supplied by professors who are indeed flying into Gander early in the evening, giving their courses and returning back here in the later hours of the evening.

So certainly, Sir that is one good argument why Gander could be a location for a college. A good argument Mr. Chairman, since this was mentioned, is that if we take a set of dividers and place one end of the dividers on the town of Gander and we make a circle a radius of about fifty miles we can, by doing that, encompass enough communities, the population of about fifty or fifty-five thousand people. Certainly that, in my opinion, is adequate numbers to support a college of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, it was also recommended at that conference that schools in the Province be encouraged to introduce at least a first year university programme, as a temporary move while awaiting a decision on community colleges.

Now, when we talk about community colleges, a lot of people immediately get the impression that we are talking about large buildings, about big pieces of real estate and I do not like, Mr. Chairman, to think of it in that way. As I mentioned a little while ago, we do have the nucleus of a college at Gander right now. I believe that as that grows and the need is proved and as more and more people become interested, then and only then shall the college be built, the actual buildings built. I remember that conference hearing from a professor from Alberta, who said that this is a course that we should certainly follow, because the record has been in Alberta that many colleges has been built around the Province, mainly I suppose again for the political impact of vote getting appeal of them, and they found out, after a few years, that the colleges were built in the wrong place. So, Mr. Chairman it is essential, I believe, that we do insure that the colleges are built in areas which are easily accessible and in areas whereby they can serve the maximum numbers of people and in areas where the proper municipal services etc. are readily available.

Mr. Chairman, so much for regional colleges.

MR. COLLINS: The hon. member for Burin mentioned a little while ago the importance of building the proper type of school. I remember some years ago when I was active on a school board in Gander, where that board, and I know that other boards recommended to the minister since the desirability of establishing a central architectural division in the department.

If one were to travel across Newfoundland Mr. Speaker, you will find a great number of schools which look like bale boxes. You will find some schools which are reasonably functional, we will find some schools which are really functional. Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the time has come if not long passed, but there is no sense in going back to the past, but the time has certainly come now when we must be thinking in terms of divising the maximum benefit from the dollars which we spend on education, certainly maximum benefits from dollars which we spend in erecting buildings, and we must insure that those buildings are the best possible type and not - the design of which is not left to people who might not know what is really needed.

I believe that this is a job for professional people, Of course, since school boards across the Province cannot afford to engage such professional people, then the responsibility must rest with the central headquarters here in the department, to come up with a proper division, employing specialists in this field, so that we will come up with the right type of school to ensure maximum utilization, not only by our students, Mr. Chairman, but by the adult population as well.

I do not know how many members opposite have ever seen "Sesame Street" on television. I did not see too many programmes myself, but I did see one or two and I was impressed and I am sure other hon. members were impressed, if they saw them. I would like to direct a question to the minister, and ask him to indicate to the House what studies have been made by the department with regards to educational television? What the prospects are for introducing this means into our school system? We all know of the great possibilities here. We are also aware, of course, of the possible costs, but I would like to know, as I am sure most people would like to know, just what the views of the minister and the Government are and what plans they might have to introduce E.T.V., if for no other reason than for just a trial period in some of our areas.

Perhaps the minister might also like to comment on the fact that 400 students were barred from the lower university after Christmas. Maybe that is too strong a term, but that is the term that was given to me. Perhaps the minister might indicate to the House what happened, that 400 students were refused admission to Memorial. Was it because of lack of space? Was it because of some other reason? What ever the reasons were, I would suggest that the minister might inform the House just what did happen there.

I remember last year also, in our discussions on the estimates with regard to education, some debate took place with the need for the introduction of safe driving courses in our schools. I recall that three or four years ago the Gander board, of which I was a member at the time, we did introduce a safe driving programme in the school. There were about 100 young people who registered and graduated. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the course is really worthwhile. It was dropped then because of lack of finances and lack of support from the department. Last year the minister did agree that the programme was a very worthwhile one. I am wondering what plans he might have this year for introducing safe driving courses in the schools across the Province.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal about the needs of or in the field of physical education. We have heard promises down through the years

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman I am almost finished now.

MR. ROWE: I was going to ask the hon. member if he would mind repeating his question about the university. I missed it, part of it.

MR. COLLINS: Well, it is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that 400 students were - and the term I used was, "were barred from entering Memorial University after Christmas." Now, I said at that point that maybe barred is too strong a word to use, but whatever word we might use, 400 students were denied the right to get into Memorial after their last Christmas exam. Now do not think it a case where they all failed, there were other reasons. Obviously, there were other reasons. I do not know what they are. This is why I am asking the minister to elaborate on that for us, so that we will know exactly whether the students were barred

because of lack of space, whether they were barred because of lack of staff, or whether they were barred for whatever reason.

With regard to recreational facilities, Mr. Chairman, much has been said already. We have heard promises down through the years. I remember in the by-election in Gander in 1967, when Mr. Ottenheimer and myself were coming out of the Atlantic Hotel in Botwood, when the Premier made a statement that we were going to get 108 or 113 stadiums and recreation centres across the Province. We all know, the record is there, I am wondering what the minister might have in mind, because Mr. Chairman, many municipalities and Boards of Education have spent considerable amounts of money in the intervening years. They were required, I believe, to contribute about twenty-five percent of the cost of the stadium or whatever the facility might be, with the understanding that the Government would provide the remaining seventy-five percent.

A lot of those municipalities and boards have already invested their twenty-five percent and in some cases thirty-five or maybe fifty percent. I would like for the minister to indicate to the committee just what those councils and boards of education can expect this year in terms of monies for stadiums and recreation centres, and auditoriums and what have you.

Mr. Chairman, there are a great number of other good sound recommendations coming from this conference which I referred to earlier. We have not heard the end of it yet. Certainly there is another debate coming when we can use them. I would suggest to the minister that these are questions which are really important to all Newfoundlanders, and certainly before we vote any monies in Interim Supply or any other type of supply, the people of Newfoundland and indeed, the members of this hon. House have the right to know what Government plans are for this year.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak as eloquently on this matter as the hon. member for Burin did a few moments ago, but there are certain points that must be brought to the attention, I feel. When we come to the situation, first of all the remarks of the Minister of Education concerning this matter, when he led in giving information with respect to the Interim Supply here, as he mentioned

the fact that it was traditional in this Province to ask for three months Interim Supply. The only comment I would have to make to that, Mr. Chairman, is that what is traditional here in this Province is not always traditional in other democratic societies. It is not a traditional and proper use of Interim Supply to come to this House and ask for one-quarter of the estimated budget for the next year and for \$100 million, and that is what is being asked for.

When we look to the whole vote of \$26 million, there are certain things that merit comment. The first, Mr. Chairman, is the situation with respect to the school boards themselves. Now, I was somewhat alarmed to hear the Minister of Education, and I do not believe he seriously meant it when he was answering questions a few days ago, he mentioned the fact that the Government has no control with respect to the construction of schools. The money is given to school boards, and they are responsible for the school construction. This is a situation that should never be allowed to stand. It is untenable. The Government obviously has overall responsibility for education, to see that the youth of this Province are properly educated, that schools are proper and adequate and situate all throughout the island, everywhere, so that our young people can take advantage of them.

With respect to this grant to school boards for school construction, I should like, Mr. Chairman, to also advert to a comment made by the Minister of Education, with respect to the ratio of students to teachers in the Province. He very proudly gave a list of ratios, varying from twenty-eight pupils to a teacher, down I believe to twenty-three or twenty-four per teacher, or somewhere in that vicinity. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that in the City of St. John's, anybody, who has young children going to school, knows so well that the classrooms in St. John's itself, as well as I suspect in other larger centres, are crammed to their capacity, to such an extent, that we had the rather unenviable situation occur, a few years ago, where classes had to be staggered. The situation perhaps has gotten a wee bit better since, somewhat better. It has been alleviated somewhat, but it is still certainly not a

desirable situation.

You have young people in the schools nowadays Mr. Chairman, where the pupil - teacher ratio is very, very much more than twenty-six to one, and it is an alarming proportion. As a matter of fact, most young parents, in the larger centres anyway, are very much alarmed and very much concerned with the ratio of teachers to students in the schools where their children attend. It is a matter that has to be brought forcibly to the attention of Government. Government cannot absolve itself from the responsibilities by saying that it is for the school boards to determine where the schools go, how many schools are going to be constructed, what facilities are going to be there. At all times and in all places, it is up to the Department of Education and the Government to assure that there are adequate facilities available for the education of young children.

Another point Mr. Chairman, that we have, is that we have an amount in that vote with respect to the operational grants to school boards. Now I notice that this does not appear to be a proportionate increase over and above -

INTERRUPTION:

MR. MARSHALL: Perhaps Mr. Chairman, I may appeal to you that I may have the floor, I seem to be interrupted. Thank you.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): The hon. gentleman has an audience of one.

MR. MARSHALL: Well obviously Mr. Chairman, I have no more audience on the other side either because, the hon. gentleman on the other side do not listen anyway.

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying. I was talking about the abolition of the assessments. There is an amount here for the operational grants to school boards. We all recall that at the development conference a hint was made, a mention was made about the fact that school assessments in the future -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, may we have a little quiet.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Could we have a little order too, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MARSHALL: Perhaps Mr. Chairman, thank you!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. no. 3, could get away a little from the hon. the Premier, the person whom he hopes to succeed...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. MARSHALL: Anyway, on the abolition of the assessments, Mr. Chairman, there was mention made at the development conference about the possibility of abolition of the assessments to school boards. This was mentioned some years ago. We got in a problem, the Government got itself in an unenviable problem with the school boards, by talking about school fees being abolished, and school fees as such were abolished, but they came to light again as assessments. Then we were told at the development conference that assessments may be abolished, then, subsequently, after the parents of school children indicate to the school boards that they are not going to pay the assessments, in view of this premature announcement by the minister, the minister is forced to make a public statement, to the effect that the Government is only looking into it. He gave an entirely different impression, to the general public, and farther created difficulties between the school boards and the general public.

MR. MARSHALL: Well further if you come from St. John's, farther perhaps if you come from Jolly Old England. But, anyway, Mr. Chairman, this is the situation, it has farther aggravated the situation or the relationship between

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: It has farther aggravated the relationships between the general public and the school boards. This situation is very, very bad. We also know that investigations are being made -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. No. 3 please put his mouth where his brains are and sit on it, I would be very obliged.

Mr. Chairman, the assessments; that this has caused a great aggravation again between the pupils and the school boards, and, Mr. Chairman, now we hear talk about a school tax assessment, a property tax assessment that may be put on the people to pay for education. But, our whole point of the matter is that this school tax will substitute for school assessments. So the Government are from time to time saying that people do not have to pay it in the present form, but are making them pay it in another form.

Now, I know that the school tax assessment would be spread over a greater number of people than the parents themselves, which would probably be a good thing. But, it is also to be remembered, when this particular item is being considered, that there are a lot of elderly people in and around Newfoundland and a lot of them living in the City of St. John's itself, in houses where the cost of living is very, very high, while they may own their own houses, their income is very, very limited and if there is consideration, as there is going to be, for the impose of school tax by this Government, full consideration ought to be given to allowing the people over sixty-five years or sixty-five years and over to be exempt from the imposition of this school tax. Years ago, perhaps, the ownership of property indicated wealth, but it does not so in this day and age.

But I would appeal certainly to the Minister of Education and to the Government not to make the job of education more difficult, vis-à-vis the school board, school boards with the teachers, school boards with the students

MR. MARSHALL: and school boards with the parents themselves. Do not use the school boards as scapegoats for your own misgivings. It is absolutely and completely necessary for the Government of this Province to realize that it has a responsibility for the orderly direction of education in this Province.

The hon. the member for Burin has already spoken about the relationship of the teachers in this Province. Here we have \$11 million in this Interim Supply for teachers salaries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Yesterday the galleries were going to be cleared because there was a titter up in the gallery, and there are about five conversations going on in this hon. House now, among hon. members, and it is making it very difficult to hear the speaker. So, I would ask, Mr. Chairman, to keep it in order.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There is \$11 million here voted for teachers salaries, in Interim Supply. The hon. the member for Burin has gone into it in great detail, into the recent unfortunate events which occurred. But I point out respect to the school boards, the Government relationships with the school boards, its whole attitude towards the teachers is the same as ^{it} was towards the school boards, and it is absolutely a tragedy for education in this Province, where you have the Government attempting to beat and subject a group of professional people, such as the teachers, so that there, in an attempt to make them lose their dignity, nobody gains.

It is most necessary, also, Mr. Chairman, when you are speaking of teachers salaries and this whole vote on education, that consideration be given to upgrading the curriculum much more than it is now. A consideration should be given to making it mandatory that Grade XII be instituted here in this Province, the same way it is in most other provinces of Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! There is quite a hum coming from my left here, I can hardly hear what the speaker is saying.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MURPHY: They will get their supply and that is it.

MR. MARSHALL: Anyway, with respect to the teachers of this Province, there is nothing short of a complete and absolute disaster. And I would appeal to the Government, in this area and of all other areas of relationships between the Government and the persons who are recipients of money by way of salary from the public purse, to realize the wants and aspirations of these people and to realize that public servants and public employees are very necessary and vital to this Province, and that their good will is absolutely essential.

The Government have done nothing towards fostering this good will, and the result of the teachers situation of a few months ago will be felt for years and years and years to come.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are another few points that I wish to make as well. I would have liked to have seen, in this particular vote on education, more money devoted to the primary and secondary schools. There is need of much more money. Any educator, any teacher in the Province of Newfoundland will tell you that, that we are suffering in this Province as a result of the necessity of diverting more of our educational funds towards primary and secondary education. And that there has to be a fuller screening of education, of the educational system in this Province, so that young people can get into vocational schools on a much more easy bases than they have before. There has to be then screening of education, and I do not see; I think, the Government have been lax on this.

But the main thing is, Mr. Chairman, that at all times we must look towards the relationship of the Government with the teachers and relationship of the Government with the school boards. And in this the Government have miserably, very, very miserably failed. At no time should this Government come before this House, or in any other public body, and try and cast the responsibility on the many fine men in the school boards in this Province, who are devoting their time free of charge, who are very sincere individuals but, unfortunately, are made to appear as scapegoats for the lack of funds

MR. MARSHALL: and monies which Government are giving.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman/

MR. H. R. V. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, the hour of the clock now shows 1 o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is now 1 o'clock, I leave the Chair until 3:00 P.M.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 6

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, MARCH 30, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The Committee of Supply resumed at 3 p.m.

MR. EARLE: It seemed from the atmosphere this morning, particularly towards lunch time, that this particular vote was not being taken too seriously by the other side of the House. After all, it only concerns about \$26 million or \$27 million. The conversation and laughing that was carried on, on the other side, I do not think they felt that this was even worthy of consideration. It showed the typical, complete arrogance and indifference to the way in which the people's money is being spent.

I do think, however, that an amount of \$26 million or \$27 million is worthy of some consideration and considerable debate; particularly, as this may well be one of the last opportunities we get to do it, because we are told that all of this is so much nonsense and a waste of time, because it will be discussed in the estimates and so on. Well that may or may not be so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That may or may not be so?

MR. EARLE: No, because what had developed from last year after the estimates were brought down and the budget speech had been read, the facts which transpired afterwards throughout the year showed that to be so completely out of line with what actually happened. It does rest upon us very, very responsibly indeed, to question each and every item of the Government's proposed expenditure. This is our job on this side of the House; that we must be in a position, at every opportunity, (I stress every opportunity) to question the expenditure of the Government so that what may transpire, after, can be shown to the people as being action or behavior, on the part of the Government, which does not bear out and many times in the past it has not borne out the information which has been

Mr. Earle

given to this House. I think Mr. Chairman that, therefore, the discussion of this particular item, under education, is very appropriate indeed. Perhaps, education is required of all of us in this House, particularly to some of those on the other side.

One or two items I should like to refer to in particular which come under this vote, first of which is the vote for Physical Fitness and Recreation. This has, as we all know, been a sort of leading platform of the present Government for some years. It has been talked about as to what is going to be done but, unfortunately, very little has been done. Up to this point, of course, in the present debate, there has been no indication of what will be done. No one will dispute the need of a great Physical Education and Recreation Programme in this Province. The fact is that in so many parts of our Province, young people do not have any equal chance of opportunity, an equal opportunity as compared with fellows of their same age in other parts of the Province. I travelled recently to the Mainland. I was very pleased that it so happened that I was on the same plane with some of these Canada Games' Delegations that were going to the Mainland to take part in the Canada Games. They were a big, fine bunch of young people. A credit to anybody in Newfoundland, and we could all be proud of them. They were well uniformed, well dressed, very attractive and very delightful young people in every sense of the word. I am sure, from all the press reports that we had of the Canada Games, that these young people did enhance the reputation of Newfoundland. But in going off on the plane and watching these young people have quite a lot of fun among themselves, and they were really enjoying themselves, it did strike me that there were so many of their fellows in this Province that had no opportunity whatsoever to participate in these things, in the same manner

Mr. Earle.

in which these boys and girls had. This stems back a long way and it is very relevant for this particular vote.

While we are spending a fair amount of money through the University and through other means, to get quite a limited number of people, a number of students and athletes and so on a fair opportunity to take parts in things (which as I say, it brings great credit to Newfoundland), the great bulk of our students do not get this opportunity and so any programme which may be designed by Government, and I hope that, in the votes for this year, it will be so designed that it reaches far down below just the University or vocational school level but gets into our elementary and primary schools and into the smaller places. This is vitally important. Just for the purpose of illustration, I will mention one particular place. It happens to be in my district. It is Garnish.

Garnish is a fine settlement, a small settlement, but the people there are of very, very excellent stock. They are very independent, straight living, clean people, a pride to Newfoundland in every sense of the word. Yet, in that place, there is a group of young fellows who have been very, very keen on football for years, and they have, out of that very small settlement, developed championship teams, teams who have won the Newfoundland Championship in Football. It is incredible, when you see the number they have to draw from. It is even more incredible when you see what they have to play on. In that place, they do not even have a proper football field, but just a meadow which has been turned into some sort of a football field.

Now these boys, without appealing to Government for a huge stadium or any great vote from education or from anywhere else, themselves, the year before last, raised \$1,800, through various means, to recondition that field.

Mr. Earle.

At the same time, they applied to me to ask Government for a small grant to assist them. So, I asked the Government for a very modest amount. That is all they wanted, a modest amount, which was \$500. They got \$300. Last year, I asked for something more. They got nothing.

Now boys who show the initiative and industry and self-independence to raise for themselves, \$1,800 or \$2,000 to provide their own recreational and athletic facilities, under very, very difficult and costly conditions, I think it certainly warrants the attention of the Department of Recreation and Youth.

Memorial University has brought great credit to this Province, as I mentioned earlier, through its participation in games. But here again, I understand that very, very large sums of money, indeed, are allocated by that University for travelling to various games and various contests on the Mainland and so on. I have heard a sum of \$125,000 mentioned. That may or may not be correct. This is good. But it is perhaps disproportionate, when you look at the other people throughout the Province who do not have five cents spent on them. Now we do not like or some people here do not like to hear talks of priorities, but the Government, whether it likes it or not, are very, very heavily involved in University affairs. All this stuff about academic freedom and all that is fine. But the Government pay the bill. The Government, I think, are duty bound to take a great interest in the activities of the University; particularly when it is finding the money. I am not saying, in what I am mentioning here, that the Government in any way should try to restrict the athletic program of the University, because it is an excellent one and does a lot of good.

But they should measure with other parts of the country what the fairness is

Mr. Earle

to all students throughout Newfoundland. This is where the Government have been so delinquent in allowing some things to go ahead at a pace, a very, very heavy pace, when other things are completely neglected. We thought that, when the great Recreational and Physical Fitness Programme was announced, that these other boys throughout the Province and these other girls would be given a chance. But it now appears to us that that, three or four years ago, was just another big political bluff. It has been put off. We hear it has been put off because of tight money. But the so-called tight money that was supposed to exist during these past few years did mean that the Government, in this period of tight money, borrowed three times as much as it had in the previous ten years - I believe it was. So, there could not have been all that tight money. The money that was obtained, in my opinion, was to a great extent misdirected, in spite of all our protestations, on the part of the Government as to the equality of all the people of Newfoundland. This is one very, very evident fact that, in this particular field alone, some people get a large slice of the cake and some people get nothing.

Now Newfoundlanders are Newfoundlanders regardless of where they live. I feel that the Government should be more cautious or diligent in the expenditures of money under votes such as this, to see that it was spread more evenly and more fairly.

I wonder sometimes,

MR. EARLE:

just to finish off on the University, how close the Government really is to that big establishment: It has a finger in, I think, the appointment of the Board of Regions, certain members on the Board of Regions. I do not think it does take a very personal or close interest in the programmes which are conducted over there. This is perhaps as it should be because a university has to be completely independent. But, to divorce the practical side of what we do as against the academic side, it is in that, where it cost the Government so much money, that the Government should be taking a very, very deep interest indeed.

For instance we heard some chat here this morning about community colleges. I think we all favour the development of community colleges but perhaps the expression of, "Let us walk before we run" is very appropriate at this present time. I recall that when I was in Government there was a great plan for the development of the university drawn up before us and Sir Frederick Gibbard, one of the foremost and most noteworthy architects and landscapers in Great Britain, brought a very large and comprehensive plan, for the future development of the university, before Government and I think Government approved this in principle, I stand to be corrected but I think they did. The university had a look at it, I believe some of the students had a look at it and generally the whole thing has been vetted and thought well of.

But that plan in its full implementation in those days, which is now four years ago, would have cost approximately \$250. million, to carry out this plan. Now a lot of it is essential, a lot of it will be done over the next twenty years but this is where the Government has to look at what they are spending on the University and what they are spending elsewhere and whether or not there can or cannot be regional colleges. It is: do we want a great and progressive University here and, at the same time, can we afford to develop these other things or should we keep this University reasonably small and should we branch out into the country to give people nearer or who will live nearer to it a greater opportunity. These are the sort of problems which the Government must and has to look at

MR. EARLE:

when it is looking at the University as a whole.

On this physical fitness and recreation bit, I feel that again the Government has been shortsighted and to some extent delinquent in not looking at what seems to me to be a very obvious way to develop the recreational facilities in this Province. I can think, particularly in my own district because that is the area with which I am most familiar, there have been built in recent years a couple of very fine high schools. Somebody said in their remarks this morning that many of the schools around Newfoundland were fine buildings but they were in, literally, in gravel pits. This is true. You find that all the school boards can do is build a fine building, put the students in it, but the surroundings of the building very often leave a great deal to be desired.

Now if, in my opinion, there is to be a recreational programme developed in this Province, it should be very closely tied to the regional and district high schools or vocational schools or places where there are large numbers of students, and a dual purpose could be arrived at by concentrating in this area. You could improve and beautify and enhance our present schools, giving thereby the students great pride in their surroundings, which is something that many, many Newfoundlanders need. It is part of their education, it is really part of their training that the surroundings in which they grow up, as young people, should be attractive, should be well groomed and should be in every possible way developed so as to give the students of that particular school a pride in it.

Now if this recreational money, which we hear is now going to be allocated in millions, is spent in the right way, it should be directed in that direction, to develop this programme through and around the elementary high and vocational schools in the area. I hope that when the Minister answers some of these questions he may refer to this and inform us that perhaps the Government policy or thinking is somewhat along these lines.

Coming down to the vocational vote, the vote for vocational schools, I think this needs very close examination also. We know here that there is to be a great enlargement of these vocational schools, new wings, new

MR. EARLE:

additions and so on, This is fine. Heaven knows they are badly enough needed. These schools are bursting at the seams and many, many students who should be in them cannot get in them. I know that we on this side of the House are delighted that there will be money available to extend these schools.

But let us think back a bit and let us examine this policy. When these vocational schools were originally built there was suggested at the time a programme of development, of prevocational training, in the high schools or in the elementary schools but, because of the cumbersome system of education, that is the denominational system under which we operated, it was not found feasible to develop that sort of a programme. Well, I feel quite sure that, and it seems to be hinted at now and strongly indicated that the co-operation of the denominations can be obtained. The denominations are not here to bar educational progress. They have showed by their actions right through the history of Newfoundland how they have encouraged and sponsored and fostered education in this Province and they have done a good job and it is not through any desire on their part, to block progress in education, that things have not been done, but it may possibly be through lack of understanding and lack of co-operation between Government and the denominations, on these particular projects.

I feel that the vocational schools, as they are set up, I think it is twelve schools that we now have, are certainly a credit to this Province. When I was close to them, at the time I did discover that many of them were built at an outrageous cost in their day. I think money was wasted, very badly wasted, extravagantly wasted in the construction of these schools and they could have been built to serve an equal purpose, equally as good, at a lot lower cost, if it had been carefully checked. Now we may today, in the rush to prove to our people that we are going to do great and wonderful things, this is the terrible problem of this Province that we are always operating under a theory of excitement, of dramatics and of big things going to be done. If we can take the thing and approach it levelheaded, coolly, without the thought of having to use these schools politically to help win

MR. EARLE:

an election, (and well they may be used for that purpose) we could build these schools probably a lot cheaper and a lot better than some of the work that has been done in the past. I hope that the hon. Minister under whose department it comes, in co-operation with his colleague, the Minister of Public Works, will listen to what I am saying very carefully, because this Province cannot afford to waste one ten cent piece.

This comes down to the fact that in the Department of Education, up until recently, there was not a proper division of planning and design. Now this, in my books, is one of the most essential things that any Government should have in such a large spending department.

MR. EARLE: It does spend, and this year we are told something upwards of \$100 million. And, yet, we all know, we would have to be blind if we did not know, if we looked around the Province and saw many atrocious mistakes that have been made in the construction and location of school buildings. The Government may brush this off and say; "well, the denominations control this." That is not a good enough answer, Mr. Chairman. That is by no means a good enough answer. The Government pays out the peoples' money, it must be responsible to see that it is spend properly, and if mistakes are being made by the denominational people or anybody else, it is the peoples' money they are spending.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: If the hon. Minister of Social Services, if he does not want to listen to what I say and take it in and learn and digest it, he might be well advised if he would go back to his favourite pastime of drawing cartoons. Did you see this on T.V. the other night? This depicts the thinking of the hon. minister, a couple of black ants chasing a couple of white ants. I think, this is excellent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. EARLE: I am sorry about the interruption, Mr. Chairman, but I get side tracked by these silly remarks.

MR. CROSBIE: He has got blinkers over his ears.

MR. EARLE: That is it, exactly.

Anyhow when I was quite foolishly interrupted a few moments ago, I think, I was talking in a fairly serious vein about the vocational system and how it could work and so on.

My main thought at this time was that in the future programme, which is now going to get into high gear, that for heaven sake, if possible, that this be divorced from political expediency. There are great crying needs in this Province. The people of the Province need the best that they can get with which the money they have to spend. But do not let us just put a vocational school somewhere, because it is going to get the member for that

MR. EARLE: district elected. Let us give it where it is most badly needed

I think, the Government would be well advised and could take the advice of the people in Education, who know the answers to these questions. And I hope that the Government are consulting with them.

On the additions to present buildings, and this applies to the University as much as to the Vocational Schools, we have gotten into an error because of this so-called tight money, that we have been forced to building temporary classrooms and temporary additions to schools and so on, which at the best are generally an eye sore. They fill a purpose, but I am very much afraid that they will become permanent. They will become permanent, these temporary buildings have a habit of becoming permanent. And, unfortunately, again under some of the ways in which Government business is allocated and given out, then the cost of these temporary buildings is very often very, very close indeed to what a permanent building would be.

MR. CHALKER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: I would question the hon. the Minister of Public Works on that. He is not the one to answer this particular question, I am talking on the education vote now. But, when his turn comes, I would question very much indeed, with all respect to his long years in that particular post, if he knows what he is talking about.

I remember when I was in education, I had an astounding thing brought before me, this is just for purpose of illustration, but there were hangers at the Torbay Airport which were vacant, large buildings, and it was suggested at that time, because of the over-crowding of the Vocational Schools, that, we could well use some of these by reconditioning them and so on, and we could use some of these to make temporary classrooms and so on for the Vocational School. Well, I questioned my Deputy at the time, as to what the cost would be? And he showed me, for the reconditioning and changing around of one building at Torbay Airport, an estimate which was about to be accepted, I might say, of \$750,000. I nearly had a fit. Because this particular job which we want to do,

MR. FARLE: in that case \$750,000 could build a new building. I stopped that one.

But this may be an illustration of how the things are not looked at carefully enough.

I do hope, as I stated earlier, that these temporary buildings will not develop into permanent buildings because the plans, particularly for the University, if they develop and can develop along the lines which were drawn for them, would certainly improve the whole City of St. John's. I hope we will be able to afford to proceed, even if it takes twenty years, that we will be able to proceed along these lines.

In connection with Vocational Schools and again the Fisheries College, hear again the Fisheries College is an institution^{of} which all of us, on this side of the House and on the other side, are very proud indeed. And we give the Premier full credit for having built that institution and created it. I have no hesitation whatever in giving him credit for it. But, there is the danger here, and it is already patented, that some very expensive and costly mistakes have been made. For instance, in the Vocational Schools certain courses are taught and certain operations are undertaken, which to a greater or lesser extent are being duplicated in the Fisheries College.

I remember looking at equipment, which was bought, very, very expensive equipment which went into the Fisheries College; which was duplicated in the Vocational Schools, at that particular time. And they were teaching virtually the same courses, in other words; what difference is there in training a marine cook, then a cook who operates on land? He cooks. He cooks food, he prepares food.

Why do we have these tremendous courses in one school and then in another? There is a duplication of staff, of equipment, of everything. I suggested at the time, and I note the Government are now using the same suggestion, that we tried to aim towards what would be known as a large polytechnical institution. The polytech. This is a great word it almost sounds as good these days as pollution. You get certain words which are used

MR. EARLE: in education, where you use polytechnical and/or pollution or something like this, it has a nice ring to it. So this will be heard, I predict, a good many times in the months to come.

But a polytechnical institute, which could encompass a lot of the work of certain segments of the Vocational and Trade School and the Fisheries College and in conjunction and fairly close to the University, would, in my opinion, save this Province millions and millions of dollars over the years. Because we could have an intertwining and a use of the facilities of the different branches moving together, so that, the same students could revolve, in a sense, and use many of the same institutions.

Where I got this idea was, some years ago, I was in British Columbia. I was Minister of Education here at the time and I took a trip across North America to see what was going on. In British Columbia, in one particular city, one area, I saw a very magnificent polytech with all the things developed around it on a beautiful site. And it immediately occurred to me that - at that time we were just getting into the acquisition of the Pippy Park complex down here, which the late Mr. Pippy donated so generously. We were getting to that stage that it did occur to me that, this was the pattern in which we should go, this was the path which we should follow. That, in that area there is plenty of room, there is ample acreage to develop a full scale polytechnical institute. It would not in anyway hinder the future development of the University and it would certainly enhance and improve our present Fisheries College facilities.

Now this comes back to what I started to say a few minutes ago, that through the stress of tight money or whatever the reason may be, I do not know, we have been forced into temporary buildings and provision of buildings and all this sort of stuff. There is at the present time a tremendous amount of money going down the drain on poor construction and poor building, which, with proper planning some years ago and proper planning now even, could be directed into the type of thing which I envisage, which would

MR. EARLE: be a lot less costly to operate, a lot more efficient in its operation and would give the students who attended far, far better opportunity than they are getting today. This is the sort of thinking that I feel our Government should be directing towards, at least that segment of education in our Province.

There is in this vote, of course, vote for transportation. Here again, Mr. Minister, I am quite sure that you are as well aware as I was at the time that I was there, there is a great, great waste of money, in many ways, in the transportation system as it is operated in this Province, the school bus transportation system:

I did hear, and I thought it was going to be carried out, it is since I left Government, there was a plan of a transportation commission or a board or something to look into all of this and correlated and draw together. Now what has happened to that, I do not know why this is bogged down and has not progressed I have not the faintest idea. But there is tremendous room. There is astounding room in this transportation system to pay thousands and tens of thousands of dollars.

The school bus system is in some cases beyond thinking about it at all. I know there were cases where school bus routes were overlapping, one bus would be passing going this way and other that way. There is one with sixteen children in it, the other with five. And you had all this kind of stuff going on. You had stupid things with certain grades coming here and certain grades going there, and the whole thing is just of all kinds of crazy complexes where money is just being dished out for this particular service which is beyond praying for. This is the sort of thing that this Government must look at in education and save its dollars.

MR. EARLE

I have a feeling that the hon. minister will say we have that all under control. This is the sort of thing we are doing and this is why we are building up the staff of the Department of Education. Maybe so, but I am talking back four or five years ago now, when I left the Department of Education. There has been plenty of time to develop some of this since. Yet, there has been very, very little done indeed. But yet at the same time, this Province has borrowed tens upon tens of millions of dollars.

Now we are told that we are getting good value for our money. It is the biggest joke and biggest farce this Province ever faced. We are not getting good value for our money. Our money is being dispensed in education, as in other things, in ways in which many, many millions are being spent extravagantly and unnecessarily.

I just want to refer, for a few moments, to teachers' salaries and the deplorable situation which arose in the recent teachers' slow-down and walk out in certain instances. My colleagues have mentioned this and there is not much more that can be said. But the only thing that I feel - I feel this very strongly indeed, because I was in a somewhat similar position when I was minister of that department. It came very close, indeed, extremely close to a teachers' strike, when I was minister. It was only just the turn of the hair and we would have had a strike at that particular time. But we did not have a strike. The teachers were satisfied and went back to work for three years, with no ill feeling whatsoever towards the Government.

Now in this particular instance, which has developed recently, here again I think, perhaps the climate that we are in at the moment and by climate, I mean the political climate that we are in. Everything is shaping up to an election. There must be, unfortunately, even if it is at the expense

Mr. Earle.

of the teachers, dramatics and propaganda, all sorts of stuff so that somebody or other gets credit out of this. Somebody is the saviour of the country. Guess who? Guess who that is going to be and why all this is being shaped towards that? This is the deplorable tactics in which education has, everything else has been used today.

Now I think it is absolutely disgraceful, and it will be forever a lot of shame upon this Government that this particular situation was brought to the high point where the Premier had to go on the air and defend the Government. The teachers were going out defending themselves in the press. The compounded insult upon injury. The Government issued all these huge statements and so on and spent money. I would like to know, incidentally, where that money came from. What vote it was covered under? But they spent thousands of dollars in trying to get across to people their point of view? In my opinion, it was not justified, under any circumstances, and all it did was to arouse the animosity, the indignation and the bad feelings between one of our most respected segments of our people, the teachers and between the Government. We are in an area that there should be the fullest and greatest possible co-operation, where the very future of our children depends on it. This is an area where politics are now entering into the picture, and who are the ones that are suffering? The Government may get re-elected. There are a few that may not get re-elected. We are all not too sure about this. But in the meantime children and teachers and those who in future will be governing the destiny of this Province are the ones who are being let down. I hope and pray that these people will not forget it. They are the ones that have been made the pawns of this political game, the ones that have been made pawns of this political game in Newfoundland for far too many years.

Just one more item, Mr. Chairman. Maybe, if the hon. minister encourages me, I might go on indefinitely. Thank you very much indeed! The other minister, sitting next to him, yesterday could not bear to listen to me. In fact, he can. At least, I have one listener on the other side. This is wonderful.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I hear every word the hon. member is saying.

MR. EARLE: I may carry on. This is excellent. Are there any others going to follow me over there? Hello boys, there is lots of room over here on this side. Come on over here. There are lots of seats.

MR. CROSBIE: Throw out the life line, Val.

MR. EARLE: Yes, well..

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. BARBOUR: The boss for Bonavista South says he would go over there....

MR. EARLE: Thank you, the boss of Bonavista South. I always respect him. Mr. Chairman, one of the most despicable and deplorable things which I have ever heard in connection with education in this Province. It was a statement which was made at the great Economic Conference. This, in my opinion, was hitting below the belt in no uncertain terms, when the gentleman who said it should forever hang his head in shame. Because,,

MR. CROSBIE: His collar is too high.

MR. EARLE: Well that may be. It would not matter much. But to use a plan or even a proposed plan and this had not even reached that stage, it had not much gone beyond the stage of a suggestion - a suggestion that perhaps the Government were considering, the taking over of the capital cost of all schools. Now this sounded great. It sounded beautiful at that conference. The mothers who were sitting around the fire were finding it hard to provide clothing and so on for their children; finding it hard to pay these school assessments and so on; these mothers and fathers in the outports, who were scratching to the very depth to try to make a decent living; these very people would say; "my gosh, this great and wonderful Government are going to relieve us of another responsibility. They are going to take over the complete cost of the schools." Now that, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, was why that remark was made. It was completely and absolutely political. There was

Mr. Earle.

no other reason whatsoever. At that particular conference, this was stressed to appeal to the people. But surely in so doing the people of the Province cannot but be insulted - to feel they are so dumb.

MR. CROSBIE: Would the hon. member permit a question ?

MR. EARLE: Of course.

MR. CROSBIE: Could he tell the House who made that statement at the conference? Surely, it cannot be anybody in this House, in this Chamber today. Was it somebody in this House today?

MR. EARLE: I think the hon. gentleman and perhaps all Newfoundlanders know who made that statement.

MR. CROSBIE: Who? I do not know. I was not there.

MR. EARLE: Well we are talking about the particular minister's vote. So who else could it refer to.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. EARLE: Of course.

MR. CROSBIE: No!

MR. EARLE: However, ..

MR. CROSBIE: He said that.

MR. EARLE: Please do not distract me. I find it hard enough to cope with the other side. Mr. Chairman, may I have the floor? Anyhow, as I was referring to these particular despicable remarks which were made at that conference, for the purposes which I have outlined, it must have surely gone home to the people of this Province that they get from Government exactly nothing which they do not pay for. The Government have no magic amount of money. There is no way the Government can put its hands in its pockets and say, "we will pay the cost of your schools without going back to the people and say, you pay us." It is just as simple as that. This money, whether this plan was undertaken or not, has to come from the people. The people, whether they sit back now and smile and say, this great and magnificent government are going to take this load off our shoulders. They could very quickly wake up and find that they, themselves, will be the ones that

Mr. Earle.

are paying for it and paying very heavily, because Government, in the administration of such programmes, are not noted for efficiency in spending the people's money. It would invariably end up that it would cost the people far more.

I remember a tactic of this sort, which did great harm to the education of this Province. It was in this semi-sort of block, if you would like to call it that, that the replacement of school fees - they cancelled out school fees that were immediately replaced by assessments, because the boards did not have the money to carry on.

Now, at that time, this was done perhaps without the fullest consultation with the officials in the Department of Education and those who were responsible. This was one of my worries at the time, because I was greatly responsible and in that position at the time, I do not think it was explored and developed along the lines that it should have been.

Now, I admit a certain fault

in this because I was minister, But, in all fairness to myself, I can say that I struggled with all the ability I had to point out these weaknesses at that time, but they were not listened to. Now, what happened? The school fees were replaced by assessments. This was one of the greatest blows that was ever aimed intentionally or otherwise by Government at the system that was then improving, of raising school taxes in places. Because the people reacted immediately and said, "well, all right, the Government is going to take over something else, why should we pay any school taxes?" This in itself defeated the very objective which the Department of Education at that time was trying to build up and sponsor, and that was the responsibility of the individual communities and the people therein, to accept some of the burden of the cost of education. But this particular item at that time dealt it almost a death blow. Now we have another even more fantastic and far more reaching suggestion than what the Minister proposed at the great Economic Conference. Because we got an immediate reaction on that, where some of the school boards found that parents and those concerned were not even then beginning to pay assessments they thought, right immediately they heard this that here again the Government is going to lift this burden off our shoulders, why should we pay anything?

It is the silliest, most foolish kind of thinking that can be sponsored. But unfortunately it is being sponsored and it is being sponsored for one reason only and that is political gain. It builds up the image of this Government, that they are doing something with the people's own money, and I repeated this at the Economic Conference. They are doing things with the people's own money for which they are taking credit and which rebound to hurt the people who are contributing this money. This is exactly what is happening and this is what will happen in this case because, has anybody stopped to think, with all the educational institutions, buildings and so on that we have in this Province, has anybody stopped to think what it would

cost this Government to take over all of that? Not only the running of it not only the carrying on of the thing but just to take over the physical plant, after all most of it is owned by the denominations. If they were to take this off the shoulders of the denominations and take it over, how many millions upon millions would be required to do this? I know that when I was Minister in this particular instance, the figure at the time I am trying to recall now, but in one particular period the Roman Catholic school boards of this Province has spent, for that particular period, \$28 million as against \$5 million which they received from the Government. This was \$5 million to \$28 million. So what is happening in all these years since and before that? This just gives you some very sketchy views of what this fantastic scheme would cost .

Now I contend, Mr. Chairman, that if this sort of thinking dominates the preparation of these estimates and the votes on which we are asked to vote \$ 100 million recklessly, here is time for us to get up and say something and we are saying it because it is this type of thinking, which I repeat and repeat and repeat, is being emphasized and sponsored for political gains only, is what has got this Province in the hole that it is in.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to keep the Committee too long. It depends of course on how much guff I get from the other side. It is always that way. One is led to conclude they can get through whatever they have to say very quickly. It is hardly necessary to say this, but in the light of how some hon. gentlemen on the other side misinterpret what comes from this side, I feel it is necessary for me, just in case there is no other speaker on this side, to say that the Opposition is in no way interested in reducing the vote for the Department of Education. It will be said that there is not one in this Chamber any more interested and in favour of Education than ourselves, always interested, always prepared to support anything that will further that cause. Just in case our actions of yesterday and today may be used in a

political sense, that the Opposition would like to have the vote for Education decreased, would like to have some of the services curtailed, never let that be said. What we are interested in is in obtaining some information attempting to justify that, a strange request for such a large amount of money for such a short period of time. While the Hon. the Minister tells us that the amount of the vote is to cover three months, I recall a couple of days ago that we were told that he could expect the budget and the estimates in four to six weeks. From past experience, Mr. Chairman, I for one do not anticipate the budget debate, running for a month and a-half or two months. In the light of certain statements and certain actions on the part of the Premier yesterday, I should think that that would not be allowed, if it were to be indicated. So that really what we are tempting to do is to get the information we want to attempt to justify our supporting this Bill, if that were possible. Mr. Chairman, there is no way, no way that any hon. gentleman on this side and I fail to realize how any hon. gentleman on the other side can support the passing of this Bill for this large sum of money. When, as it has been said so often to day and yesterday, when we are prepared readily prepared to agree to one month's supply, when this House, we know, would be open, the Government can come back for another month's supply if the need should arise.

Why is it necessary to cause all of this debate? For surely Government have to realize, when they introduced this Bill, the Opposition could not possibly go along, they would be failing in their duty if they did - or anyone who approves a blank cheque for \$100 million.

SOME HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. HICKEY: I am not too interested in what the hon. gentleman across has to say, and especially as it applies to this vote because, really, he has shown me in recent months he can do - could be said, Mr. Chairman, that I am particular about where and when I use that - one should abide by the rules, so I will and

I will say that the hon. gentleman, the hon. Minister and the hon. member, now that will cover it - has shown me that he could do with a little education himself. He has trouble interpreting letters - plain, black and white letters - Queen's English. - do with a brushing up on that. However, Mr. Chairman, to get back to something more serious. Government knew full well it was not possible that the Opposition could go along with this Bill, this present form. I wonder why they look for this kind of debate when they knew it had to come. It was forthcoming, or it is the duty of the Opposition to obtain the information that is necessary in a case such as this.

MR. HICKEY:

How are the people of Newfoundland going to hear both sides of the story? How are they going to know, if they just hear one side? Mr. Chairman, they would not even have heard one side because there is no debate on the other side of the House. So it is easy for people to talk and say that, 'we, on this side wishes to prolong the sitting of this House and drag out the debate.' That is not so, we get the information we want. If we are not bullied and pushed, it is surprising what can be accomplished.

The Minister said this morning that an amount of \$1.1 million of the amount in question that we are asked to vote on right now was allocated to transportation, school bus transportation. I recall, Mr. Chairman, at the recent conference there was an announcement to the effect that parents would no longer have to pay for bus transportation of their children to and from school, the Government was to pick up the full tab. This brings to mind a problem which many hon. members of this House have, certainly many more than I, and that is that of transporting children to and from schools from within the one mile radius. If the Government follows out with their plan, their promise, and I am prepared to reserve judgement, I am prepared to assume that they will, that they were sincere when they made that announcement at the conference, that they are going to pay all the costs of school bus transportation. When they do that, one section of a community or one could say certain sections of the whole Province will get their children to and from school for free while other sections will get nothing, the children will have to walk, walk on some of the most treacherous, hazardous highways. In many cases the very smaller children, five and six years of age, have to walk those highways. I realize that it is difficult for Government to sort out this particular aspect of the problem and what I mean is where those little tots have to walk while the larger children, the older children of fourteen and fifteen and indeed high school, regional high school, university students are riding the buses.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, I realize that this is not an easy matter to sort out, where there are young and old children, if one can use that

MR. HICKEY:

phrase, in all parts of every community but certainly the way around it and it has been suggested here, Sir, many, many times, the way around is to change this policy of this one mile radius. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, if that policy were wiped out for that matter and no dividing line were used, just wipe it off the books, as it were, I do not think that the bus service would be abused. I do not think, for example, that children who live a-tenth or two-tenths of a mile from school would crowd the bus, I really do not. I believe that, for that matter I do not think this problem would exist because the bus would be filled to capacity before it would arrive at that particular point.

So, Sir, in my view and while it is not my place to speak for any hon. member on either side but I am positively sure the view of many members of this hon. House, for they have expressed concern over this matter time and time again. I am sure I speak for a lot of people and a good many members of this House when I say that it would serve a greater purpose if the Government were to first of all sort out this matter and wipe out this business of a one mile radius and then, if they have the finances to foot the bill by all means, but I would suggest that they should do something with this problem before they pay all the cost of providing transportation for the other sections of any given community.

As I have said, Sir, on numerous occasions I have brought this to the attention of the House. I felt it my duty to do so because I am continuously receiving representation of this very matter and all one can do is continue running the risk of repetition, continue to bring it to the attention of the Government. I can only repeat what I have said on a number of occasions in debating this subject that we are very fortunate there are not more casualties, very fortunate indeed. I would say, Sir, that it is going to be too late when there are casualties because those small children are forced by a policy which can only be classed as stupid, they are forced to walk those treacherous roads.

This problem, Mr. Chairman, becomes even more aggravative in winter time with the snow piled up on both sides of the road, they are out in the

MR. HICKEY:

middle of the traffic for most of the time. I am wondering if the Minister would give some serious consideration to this matter. I think this is an appropriate time to bring it to his attention, in view of the fact that part of this vote is being used to pay such bills, that possibly he might be able to convince his colleagues in Cabinet that a change is necessary and that there is no better time to bring it about than right now.

This being an election year, Mr. Chairman, I should think it might well be very beneficial.

Another item I wanted to touch on, Mr. Chairman, was vocational schools, I suppose I could say vocational schools and the technical college. Again before I say what I have in mind I would like to reiterate again that hon. members on this side of the House are obviously in favour of and support to a great extent our policies in terms of educating by way of trades our unemployed and our young men and women generally. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is

MR. HICKEY: necessary for the Government to take a look at their policy with regards to vocational schools. I am not sure that in too many instances they might well be used as a place to go while a man or a woman is waiting for a job.

It is a wonderful thing for a person to have two, three or four trades, if it is possible, but at this stage of the development of our Province I think that we have to be careful that our monies are spent properly, are put to the best use, and that we get the greatest return that is possible. People question the unemployment figures, Mr. Chairman, well, under the heading of vocation schools and the technical college, I can assure hon. members that the unemployment rate in this Province would be much, much higher if we were to take the people out of our vocational schools and technical college. A good many of our people are there solely and only because they do not have a job to go to.

I am not quarrelling with this, for in a good many cases this enables that person to get themselves a job. I feel Mr. Chairman, that the number who do get settled away into a trade, and follow up that trade is not high enough in terms of the expenditure, and in terms of what the Government have in mind when they set up those vocational schools in the beginning.

Another item Sir, that is worthy of comment is this one. It concerns me personally. I feel very strongly about it. I raised it in this House before but I feel that a clear cut explanation should be given, or a clear cut statement should be made by Government as to just what the situation is. I refer to the free access school that is planned under the DREE program in my own district, in the Kent's Pond area. The school Mr. Chairman, is termed a free access school. As far as I am concerned Sir, a free access school is a public school. I do not think we should be using this fancy phrase whether it was created Provincially or Federally, it does not matter, I do not think we should be using it. A lot of people are confused as to just what kind of school it is. I have had a number of people in my own area who have inquired just what is this school.

Mr. Chairman, if I were just strictly interested in publicity, I suppose that I would make a charge that the Government is hiding behind this

name rather than use the term public school. I am not going to make the charge Mr. Chairman, but I will say this, that if they do not want this impression to be given they had better say something about it publicly, they had better explain it. We all know that the public school system verses the denominational school system, it is a hot potato as it were. Everyone seems to want to sidetrack it. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to sidetrack it, that is fine as long as there is no school in our midst, under another name. But, when a school is about to be constructed under a name which means the same thing, then this is another matter.

It is my understanding that the Federal Government are paying part of the cost, a great portion of the cost, under the DREE program, of this school. It is also my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the Federal Government will not involve itself in such a project unless pupils of all denominations have access to that school. This is only fair, it is not for me to say that there is that much wrong with either system. But, sooner or later, the Government is going to have to come to grips with the matter and determine what route they are going to go. A lot of people are confused and I would suggest, Sir, that it is a good time for Government to make a statement on the matter and clear the air.

Mr. Chairman, the minister told us that the amount of money that was being requested for the Department of Education and Youth covered some three months. In his view, it was approximately three months. I would just like to raise this question, which will probably indicate one way or the other. If this is so, our budget for education and youth for this year will be well over \$100 million. Is that a fair figure, well over \$100 million.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): The past year was over \$100 million.

MR. HICKEY: The past year, I see, well we overspent.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKEY: I thought the estimate for last year was eighty some millions.

MR. ROWE: \$104 million

MR. HICKEY: 104 eh! my figures are wrong somewhere.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKEY: Somebody else did this morning too.

MR. MURPHY: Current account \$77,928,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt my hon.friend..

MR. HICKEY: No problem at all.

MR. ROWE: I think you were leaving out capital account. The eight odd million was current account and you are leaving out the capital. The total was \$106 or so million or something of that order. That was the total voted by the House, about \$106 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will explain where I got that figure and probably clear the air. I was not taking into account the capital account.

MR. MURPHY: Current \$78 million, Capital \$8 million.

MR. HICKEY: I just made the assumption that if we require almost twenty-seven million for three months, that we would go near four times that in twelve months, for the same things that this \$26 million are presently required for.

Mr. Chairman, the minister said that this is the largest amount of the budget. As I have already said, no one quarrels with that, for it is in education that our future lies

MR. HICKEY:

We have been told from time to time that we are intellectually bankrupt, some of us on this side but maybe we can take advantage of some of those benefits. But, Sir, I would think that if Government had approached this matter a little differently than they did, a lot of this hollering and a lot of this interrupting for that matter, some of which we are getting right now, would not have come about.

I was of the opinion that we on this side had something in mind with regards to reducing the amount, Mr. Chairman, but I am not full sure that we should do that because it might even take more money than has been allocated to teach some people on the other side some manners and in that case it might even be necessary to increase it. I think, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friends on the other side really believe that I am trying to kill time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no, nothing like that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a valuable contribution to the subject on education.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, you know that does my heart good because I would not want anyone to think that I am capable of standing up here and wasting time, I am really not. I was quite serious and if anyone on the opposite side doubt me

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: What was that? I could not have been worth too much as the hon. gentleman does not care to repeat it.

MR. HICKEY: No, Mr. Chairman, I am quite sincere in my remarks. I hope that the Government can see fit to take account of some of the things that hon. members on this side have put forward. Because there is always a danger that hon. gentlemen on the other side, some of them at least are of the opinion that from this side comes nothing but criticism, destructive criticism.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKEY: That is right, no.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKEY: One, all one has to do is be honest with themselves, and answer that question. And they will say "no," we do not just criticize for the hell of it." If I were to begin to list the number...

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. member is learning.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted the hon. the Premier mentioned that word "learning."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Move along with this.

MR. HICKEY: I am trying to move along, Sir, but when I am interrupted I have to answer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is trying.

MR. HICKEY: The hon. Premier is very generous now. But he hit on a very important -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Inaudible.

MR. HICKEY: That is right! He hit on a very important word, Mr. Chairman, "learning." There is none so blind as they say, as those who will not see. And I might add, there are none so dumb, as those who will not listen, for fear they may learn something." We are learning over here, Mr. Chairman. We are learning fast. What is even more important, the people of Newfoundland are learning. And they are learning even faster. If we were not interrupted so often, the debate would be a whole lot -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I wonder if we could move on. Education is the topic.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman that is the topic I am on.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. HICKEY: Can you not see, Mr. Chairman, what a great audience I have over here. Like I said, Sir, I cannot continue, if I am being constantly interrupted and agreed with, because when someone agrees with me from the other side I get nervous.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. HICKEY: Would the hon. minister like to repeat that, I did not get it.

MR. ROBERTS: I said, if I were on that side I would be nervous too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! If the hon. member does not intent to proceed with the item I will have to ask him to sit down. So please carry on.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, in all fairness and in all sincerity, I have been attempting to do just that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is not successful.

MR. HICKEY: Would the Chairman tell some of his colleagues on the other side to be quiet, and to give me an opportunity to continue and finish because you know, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Does the hon. member intent to adhere to the subject or not?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman I am going to stick right to the subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. gentleman please be seated?

MR. HICKEY: I have to justify some when I am charged with something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. gentleman please be seated. Does any other hon. gentleman wish to speak?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, just a second. I understand that the hon. member has been forced to sit down and, in view of all the interruptions and the gestures and the jokers on the other side, has he not got the right to be heard in silence?

MR. HICKEY: I am finished. I rise on a point of order now.

MR. MURPHY: A great joke see! Wonderful! A big deal!

MR. HICKEY: Very funny.

MR. MURPHY: A big deal.

MR. HICKEY: Very funny, we will have a go at this point of order for an hour.

My point of order is that, since when did we start abiding by the rules and enforcing them, so rigid here, that only I must stick to the subject at hand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

MR. HICKEY: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman, I am not finished with my point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not the concern of the Chair what other members of the House may think or may not think or whether they may be enjoying the debate or not. It is the duty of the Chair to see that the rule of relevancy is kept. The Chair asks the hon. member, on at least four occasions, to direct his attention to the item, The hon. member refused to do so, but continued to discuss other matters and the Chair, therefore, ordered the hon. member to be seated, to give some other hon. members a chance to speak on the subject, and now the hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I have to ask the Chairman,

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: I would like to speak, well okay, Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to another point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Would the hon. member for St. John's West -

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I am standing on a point of personal privilege. I am just getting a little fed up with this. What am I suppose to be around here? I would like to inform the Chairman that I represent a number of people around here. Is that being questioned too?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Would the Premier be ruled out of order when he called somebody a liar?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order, please!

MR. HICKEY: That I was thrown out for three days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order, please! Would the hon. member please take his

MR. CHAIRMAN: seat? The hon. the member for St. John's Centre has the floor.

MR. HICKEY: I will debate it a little later on.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, in view of your rule, I must agree that the hon. member has as much right to be heard in silence, and yesterday the Chairman said he was going to strictly enforced the rules. And here you have in this hon. House a bunch of jesters trying to make a farce out of \$26 million Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: There you go again. Why do we not give them a quarter each and let them go out and see a movie? They might enjoy themselves better. Power! Power! No doubt about it!

Mr. Chairman, we are discussing now a grant of \$26 million of the peoples money. The peoples money that this Government come in here and ask us to give to the Department of Education to spend, in our opinion, as they dare well please, and to what political purposes they want it. Now this is a joke. It is time the people of this Province realize that this House of Assembly should be serious business.

We hear over radio and everything else where this Opposition is using this for political propaganda. I hear the Premier make a statement that they are looking for this and we have only agreed to give him ten percent. Let the Premier finish his statement. Ten percent of last year's estimates that is what we are giving, not ten percent of this \$100 million. If the people are going to know the facts, let them know the true facts.

The hon. minister gets up, he gives us a breakdown, and we appreciate the breakdown he gave us to this. This is what we are here for. This is what we are here for, to get the breakdown of \$26 million. And I will repeat myself, as I have done during the past three or four days, we are not intending to refuse this Government any supply. We will give them one month's supply. We will give them one month's supply, which we consider sufficient, if they are

MR. MURPHY: not capable to bring in the estimates and the budget in that time, we will give them another month's supply. But under no condition will we give them \$100 million to go out and spend hither and yon to promoter the picture or the image of the Liberal Party. And this is what this is for.

The first item in this breakdown, Mr. Chairman, was -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: Teachers salaries is right, \$11 million for teachers salaries. There is no teacher in this Province will be deprived of his salary in April, \$11 million right?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: Well it could just well be, as far as the other side was concerned, what is another \$100 million anyhow? Small change. This seems to be the amusement hour this past three days in this House. We are hanging up the House. We have been up to this time, we have been given something like five and a-half or six hours to debate this. Am I right or wrong? One hundred million dollars and we are interfering with the business of this House. We have the Premier flying all over the world the past four or five months when he should have had been home looking after the interest of the people of this Province.

Seven Cabinet Ministers in New York over the weekend for what? One of them open his mouth and the other ones clap. That is what has been happening.

For too long, Mr. Chairman, we have been bullied and threatened and abused on this side of the House. For too long. We have a case today the hon. member for St. John's East, twenty-five or

MR. MURPHY:

or thirty times he was interrupted in his speech. The Chairman made a ruling yesterday that, as the first principle of this House, a member has a right to be heard in absolute silence no matter how good or how bad a speaker he is. But there is only one in this House, Mr. Chairman, allowed to say anything, only one who feels he is allowed to say anything and that is the gentleman opposite me, occupying that seat, and I am getting a little bit fed up and poisoned with it to, quite frankly. The jester snaps his finger, everybody laughs. This is the peoples' House, this is where we decide the affairs of the people of this Province and no-one else, not any particular Minister, all of us here, we represent people.

As far as the teachers salaries are concerned, Mr. Chairman, I must agree with the hon. members who spoke here today on this very, very, very serious situation that was created in this Province a few short months ago, where hundreds and thousands of our children were deprived of many hours of school through the arrogance, the absolute arrogance of this Government who refused to mediate or bring in another party to decide this issue. We ~~is~~ a party kept out of this dispute. We did not want to make it a political issue. The hon. member for Burin was our spokesman on education during all this and time and again we stressed, if two forces cannot resolve what does this Government do? Someone appeals, send in a third man, a conciliation or whatever you want to call it. Day after day the Department of Labour does this, but not with this Government, Mr. Chairman. There is only one ~~man~~ speaks and everybody bows, "This is the word of their master," and that is what is wrong with this Province. That is why we owe hundreds of millions of dollars, that is why the Budget last year was brought in here for a certain amount of money that we passed, after due consideration. What was our deficit? \$103. million dollars over and above. Now we have Interim Supply, \$100. million. How do we know but this will be \$200. million in the next two or three months that will be spent?

So let us not laugh ^{it} off, I know I do not intend to, I do not intend to treat this as a joke. There are too many poor people, people wanting to get benefits in my own little district of St. John's Centre without me

MR. MURPHY:

laughing at \$100. million dollars. Education, we have some of the kids going to school that would tear your heart apart to see the struggle parents have to put them in school and try to get a decent education. These are the things, Mr. Chairman, we should be talking about. Not making great jokes, by all the brains on the other side of the House, the fountain of wisdom and on all the rest of it. Let us sit down and talk as ordinary common people and ninety per-cent of the people in this Province are ordinary, common people trying to eke an existence and a living and bring up their families decently in this Province of Ours.

Well, let us not joke about this amount of money. If this Government is so anxious to bring closure on this House, to give us a few hours to discuss this. Where were they last month, the month before and the month of January that all this did not come in here? What are they all doing? Holding great conferences so they can tell the people the wonderful things we are going to do this year, sods flying everywhere, hot asphalt going everywhere, buildings going everywhere, millions and millions, untold millions of dollars. No, Mr. Chairman, we will discuss this and we will get the answers, what answers we can get, not for us but for the thousands of people outside this House who we represent in this House, who own this House. They are the people we are looking for answers for, not for ourselves.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. member looking for information or wanting to make speeches?

MR. MURPHY: The hon. member can make all the speeches he wants or ask all the questions he wants because I am sent here, elected by the people to do just that thing and when the hon. Minister's turn comes we will ask questions of him also.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member will get the answers

MR. MURPHY: Yes, about the great fuel allowance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Could the hon. gentleman confine himself to the subject matter?

MR. MURPHY: I would like now, Mr. Chairman, please to continue on uninterrupted and if anybody interrupts I am going to request the Chairman

MR. MURPHY:

to have him removed from the House, as he ruled yesterday that would happen. Not because there are twenty-seven over there and only eight or nine over here they have the right to laugh and scoff.

MR. CALLAHAN: (Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: The hon. parrot from Port au Port is on again. What about it? I asked to be heard in silence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I think now the hon. member has made it quite clear that he does not wish any interruption while he is speaking and hon. members know what the rule is and some action will have to be taken if these interruptions continue.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What about the galleries, Mr. Chairman? If we cannot interrupt can the galleries interrupt?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Would the hon. member for St. John's Centre please continue.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, let us show some example, if we are going to start dealing with the galleries.

MR. MURPHY: I was referring, Mr. Chairman, to the first item on this, that is \$11. million dollars, teachers salaries. I will say, as a parent whose son was out of school for one month, that this Government will have a lot to account for in the final reckoning. I do not wish to go into all the ramifications of this teachers' strike or walkout, I think the hon. member for Burin, the hon. member for St. John's West and all the rest of the gentleman who spoke this morning put it in its proper perspective. We are a great professional body, like our teachers. All I have heard in this House of Assembly in the last eight years is what a wonderful educational system we are building here, the great statements, our teachers, our great teachers, our this and our that, when it benefited this Government to mention education but when it came to the showdown, where these gentleman wanted to be treated as professionals, they were treated as jokes. They came out, everybody knows how this strick was settled. The teachers got back in the classrooms, they figured they had an interest in the kids, they got

MR. MURPHY:

back, they took backwater, no-one here can say anything otherwise. I think this was said again today and I will repeat it that they came out and made a statement about the two year contract, hoping to have a three year contract, and the words were no sooner out than the hon. the Premier and the Minister of Education came right behind them and said, "No such thing, what we said on January 8th." (or whatever day it was) "that still goes, that still goes."

I think it was 'a nasty, nasty thing for this Government to do at that particular time, where we had the situation well in hand, the teachers could have gone back to their classrooms, carried on where they had left off, but today, I wonder what their feelings are and who is to blame? Not the teachers, Mr. Chairman, not the teachers but this arrogant Government we have. It brings to mind, if I may, a few years ago, when we had poor kitchen help in the hospitals being branded as murderers, murderers because they dared to look for more than twenty-eight or thirty dollars a week. What a shame, what a great shame that our fellow Newfoundlanders have the guts to stand up and demand their rights. What a shame, we do not want that in this Province. No, that is not allowed, Mr. Chairman, in this Province. Do what we tell you and that is it, but I believe and I firmly hope that the end is in sight for this type of administration.

There is another matter, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to discuss and to ask the hon. Minister of Education if he would answer ^a question I am about to ask and that is with reference to these five vocational schools that the hon. member for St. John's West spoke about this morning. I notice that at least one tender has been called for site clearance and erection of the basements. Is it true, Sir, is it true, Mr. Chairman, that the contracts for these five schools have been given to a contractor, that these buildings are now in the process of being fabricated in Stephenville without any tenders or anything else called? I would like to put that question there, Sir, if it is not answered now I will put it on the Order Paper. I have it from very good authority that this is the case. The people's money again, who cares, who cares if we get a hundred cents worth of value for the dollar? It is not the Government's money, it is the people's money.

MR. MURPHY:

This Government has been on a course the past few years as far as money is concerned, no sweat, let her go! Borrowings, spending of money, statements, the hon. Minister of Education has spent about \$25. million now, before the Budget is even brought in, and it has to be approved by this House, \$4. million here and free transportation on school buses, great ice stadium here and great recreation centres there. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, is that proper for any Minister of this House, to go outside this House and disclose matters that should be properly put in the Budget and the estimates? I wonder is it done in any other Province or is this the only one where we have to listen to this daily, daily, daily repetition of promises and this, that and the other thing, millions of our money

Mr. Murphy.

given away. "Hoist your sales and run." Not very tight. Free school buses - the hon. member for St. John's East (Extern) has raised the matter about transportation of children. A school bus comes down the road, with twenty-five or twenty pupils in it, and passes kids walking to school. True the law says you must live at least one mile outside an area. But can we make this a bit more humane? Can we look at this thing, study it, so that we can look after some of these kids in the rain and the snow and the sleet? In addition, it is costing a lot of our parents a lot of money, out of their pockets, if they have three or four kids going to school that do not come under this subsidized bus system. I think someone brought up this morning about Labrador. I think it was the hon. member for St. John's West. In 30 to 40 degrees below zero children had to plow along the roads in drifts and storms.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, before we talk about this \$1,100,000 for school buses and I do not know if this includes the great brain storm of the hon. minister, when he came out and announced to everybody that everything was going to be paid for now one hundred per cent. I do not know if that amount was included, but I would say, before we spend that extra twenty-five per cent, that we look at areas of the Province where we might do more benefit, to transport other children to school rather than making it absolutely free. It may be not as politically sound as perhaps the minister thinks, in making that statement. It may be. It might get more votes in different areas of the Province. Who knows? That seems to be the only object in view. We talked about \$950,000. Mothers' Allowances - an extra fifty cents. If we read the great prospectus of 1966, the great Liberal Platform, that was going to be doubled in two or three years, from \$1.50 up to \$3.00. But we just could not manage it. So, "let us give them something. We will give them another \$.50." It was a wonderful thing. Mothers' Allowances are a wonderful thing. It is a wonderful thing for the mothers who need it. I think some of them should

Mr. Murphy.

be getting \$10 a month, not \$3.00 a month. But just to give it out, no holes barred, I cannot agree with it, quite frankly, when I know there are so many people in my own district that I would like to see getting an extra \$5.00 or \$6.00 or \$7.00 a month, to help to put their children through school.

But, it had to be reached somewhere. It had to be touched this year, this great Mothers' Allowance thing, so we will give them an extra \$.50. We could not very well say \$.40 or \$.45, but \$.50 sounds a bit better than \$.40 extra a month.

Trades and Technology: We got the announcement that there are going to be great extensions made to a lot of our vocational schools. I think this comes under Federal, so it will not cost this Government anything. The five new schools have a grant of something like, I believe, \$12 million, that was left over from an old vote. The deal use to be seventy-five Federal and twenty-five Provincial. That deal has been discontinued now, I think, it is something like \$12 million that is coming to Newfoundland. I think it receives something like \$8 million now and the balance to be paid.

But, because we get this windfall that we use to hear so much about from Ottawa, there is no reason why this Government should go out to their friends and say; "here is \$12 million, boy. Go out and build five schools. We are not worried, if it costs us ten per cent or twenty per cent more than the other fellow." Spending money is not the art. There is no art in spending money. I think spending it wisely, to the best advantage of our people, I believe is where the art comes into this.

There has been some reference made to Physical Fitness, which now comes under this great Education Department. Great artificial ice centres

Mr. Murphy.

so on and so forth. I think something like \$750,000 was spent by the hon. minister the other day, in about three minutes. I would like, Mr. Chairman, sincerely like this Government to sit down and really assess where Physical Fitness money should be spent. In the great urban centres, they need it. They already have a certain degree of these great facilities. Let us go throughout the Province, where they do not even have a playing field to play on. What do the kids do? How do they spend their time, particularly, summertime? We talk about our young people going on dope and many other evils of the present age. I never believed, Mr. Chairman, in curing these things with medicine. I think the prevention is what we are mainly interested in, and if we spent some of the money, that we are now spending for political gain, to keep our kids occupied, I do not think we would have half the problems that we are facing today in trying to keep our young people happy and satisfied. We can get a chance to speak about that a bit later on. I am not planning to make a full-scale speech this afternoon. There is only about an hour and fifteen minutes left before 6 p.m. and then I suppose we come back tonight. But I do not want to bar other speakers, because I know on the other side that there must be many members who are just as interested as I am in the Government spending \$26 million without a question asked. The hon. member for Hermitage is nodding his head. The hon. member for Bonavista South, I am sure, will want to know what is going to happen to all this, Mr. Chairman. He is one of my best constituents in St. John's Centre, and I want him to stand up and display himself as a true Newfoundlander and question some of these items.

There is \$800,000 for school books. Is this now the free text books? Does free text books come under this or are we operating under the old system, where I think we subsidize? I think the last figure was fifty per cent. It came down from seventy-five per cent to fifty, I believe. Is this \$800,000 now? Does this begin now this free text book thing and will the students, when they

Mr. Murphy.

go to school and be asked to pay for a book, will there be a minor revolution to say that the hon. Minister of Education said that all text books are to be free?

I remember during the war, people were warned not to be making statements that could be picked up by people that could misinterpret or give away secrets against security. I think our minister certainly put his foot, perhaps put both his feet in his mouth, when he made these statements, at this great Economic Conference, about the Government taking over the operation of schools. I suppose half a minute after or ten minutes after, every educational institution in the country was deluged by people saying; "well, we have done away with the school fees and the school assessment again. Here we go!" I think he had to come out afterwards and correct it, that it would take some time to set this in. But we had to get the word in before the election. I mean the election is this year, so we have not time to really frame it up before whenever the election will be, September or October. But we are going to do this. This will be done. This will be done!

Libraries: \$180,000. I think there was a substantial cut in the library grant last year. We are asking our people to read more, to study, to learn. We went the wrong way about it last year. I had many complaints from different parts of the Province about the cut in the library grant. Someone has mentioned the \$3 million to use for University grants-in-aid. These are grants that we do not even question. I think we gave the University something like \$17 to \$18 million last year in the budget. How these monies are spent, it seems to be none of our business, but I think the time is now coming, with this great sprawling institution that is catering to so many of your young people, the people should be made aware of how their monies are

Mr. Murphy.

being spent. It is rather frightening, when you hear the students' union talking about buying, building or selling a building or trading a building for \$750,000; that is three-quarters of a million dollars. So, there is a lot of money somewhere in the University.

MR. EARLE: Would the hon. member permit a question? In connection with the students' building, does the hon. member know why the students purchased that building?

MR. MURPHY: I am afraid I must plead ignorance to that, sir. I can follow it up, but I guess I can look it up and find out just what the story is. Perhaps the hon. member might know. I am not quite sure. I am just saying - you just read the paper. I know several people who called me on this particular thing. I was not in a position to give the answer at the time. Possibly the Government are not either. It may be purely an internal matter with the University. I am not blaming the Government for this. I am just talking about the huge grants that we give to the University and we do not know just what a lot of these monies are used for.

MR. MURPHY: There is not too much else Mr. Chairman that I have to add to this. We look forward to going through the estimates, which by the way were tabled yesterday afternoon. If we meet morning, afternoon and night we might get a chance to look at them and study them, perhaps sometime next month. These are some of the matters that we raised, Sir, when we talked about trying to do the business of the House. I am sorry we did not get the estimates - the public accounts and the Auditor General's report. We are prepared Mr. Chairman to discuss as intelligently as we can these amounts and to try again to project to the public that we do not want, we have not been appointed watchdogs for the public, for the general public of the Province, but we like to feel that, as an Opposition, we have a duty to question any expenditures in this House or any other matter that arises. This is our duty to do. Perhaps we have no more right, as elected members, than any of the other twenty-seven or twenty-eight members in this House, who apparently have such great confidence in their Government that they do not need to question. Perhaps they are all cued in on this stuff and we do not get the same chance to be made aware.

I know there is continuing discussion, I presume there is Sir, where all these backbenchers, so called, are kept up-to-date on all these expenditures and so on and so forth. But Mr. Chairman, as I say, I have not too much else to say on this education request for \$26 million, only to say, that it is an awful lot of money. Last year we were discussing the estimates, for last year in education, the total for current account was \$78 million and capital was \$8,022,000. I am referring mainly now to current account, that is the money Government needs to carry on the business of the department, which covers salaries, mothers' allowances so on and so forth.

In keeping with what we suggested to the Government earlier in the debate, that we are prepared to grant supply in the amount that we in our wisdom deem necessary to carry the department for the month of April, which was ten percent of the current account, but, in view of the hon. minister's statement this morning, about mothers' allowances, that these are not paid monthly, they will have to be paid for three months, I move Mr. Chairman, that

the amount of \$7,802,710. plus \$950,000. mothers' allowances, making a total of \$8,752,710, that the amount of \$26 million be reduced to \$8,752,710. which is in our opinion sufficient to carry the Department of Education through the month of April. If, after the month of April, we find that the estimates and budget are not approved, we will again be too happy to consider granting further supply for the month of May.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that the item 6, Education and Youth be reduced to \$8,752,710. Those in favour please say "aye," contrary "nay," I declare the amendment lost.

MR. MURPHY: Count

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those in favour please rise. Those against please rise. The motion is defeated. Shall the item carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the minister I think, wishes to speak.

MR. ROWE: I have listened patiently and with some interest to all that has been said for nearly four hours on this part of Interim Supply. Perhaps the committee would be interested to know that this is a longer time of debate than was spent last year on the entire Education Estimates, totalling \$106 million I believe. I do not know the explanation for that, but it is a fact.

I said I listened patiently Mr. Chairman, and I would perhaps - I do not need to remind these gentlemen opposite that I did not once during the four hours interrupt one of them, except to ask questions in one case, and except to draw attention to an obvious error, when one of the hon. gentlemen was referring to the amount of money that was being asked for teachers' salaries. If I were to try to deal with all the points and all the arguments that have been brought forth here today, to deal with them logically and effectively, and with the degree of attention that these matters warrant, I would be speaking here for the next six days and longer. The hon. gentleman from Burin was kind enough to refer to me as a professional educator and to intimate or perhaps I should say insinuate that I know the difference of all these arguments that the Government is using from time to time, and that I - in effect, I think the implication was that I should have more honesty and more integrity than to try to defend the Government's position in these matters of

education.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my pleasure here to introduce estimates on Education for I believe a total of seven years, not consecutive years, and in that time I have never tried to hide or to hold back any information on education. As a matter of fact, I think perhaps the one thing that I have been criticized for is, that I have been a bit too long-winded in giving explanations. I am not going to try to deal with all these arguments today, financial arguments, administrative arguments, philosophical arguments, because we could debate

AN HON. MEMBER: Legal arguments.

MR. ROWE: It goes without saying. We could debate those, we could debate those from now till the judgement day. As a matter of fact, even Plato, even Plato's famous essays on education, in which he described the conversation - or at least he is supposed to have reported the conversation that Socrates had with other interested people in Athens, twenty-six hundred years ago, was not the first to dispute on educational matters, and the very arguments that he brought forth have been in dispute ever since.

I will however, try to set the record straight in respect of a few of these points here, and I know in doing so all I am doing is giving occasion for further speeches, further arguments, and for further delays in consideration of Interim Supply. I was interested though to hear, (and I will start and deal with just a few specifics, and very few at that) the hon. gentleman for St. John's West get up here and in effect, in effect, belittle the amount that we are giving the mothers' allowance. An hon. gentleman who got up here and voted against mothers' allowances in this House, he has changed his mind apparently. This would not be because he might think that it is an important election issue; This might not be because he is concerned about what the great mass of the mothers of Newfoundland feel about these mothers' allowances. The hon. gentleman from Burin said I knew something about education. I do know something about education, I do know something about Newfoundland education, and I do know something about the mothers of Newfoundland and their feelings about these allowances.

I have not had any cheques sent back to me.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Not even from some of the people who could afford to do it. We have raised this amount to two dollars from one dollar and fifty cents a month and it is not very much. There are hundreds and thousands of mothers, next week or the week after, when they get those small cheques, who will feel a sense of gratitude because they are getting that money. It will help them. Thousands of them here in Newfoundland, it will help them. It was meant, it was meant from the beginning to help them defray some of the costs of education. Incidental costs, extra clothing they have to buy in the spring or in the fall. School fees or what ever you want to call these things, assessments or anything else. The various charges that children going to school are called on to meet. That is what these are for and we do not apologize for them at all.

My hon. friend from St. John's West passed ridicule on the idea that now we are going to change our policy in respect of text books again, as if there is something nefarious about changing your mind. The Commission of Government introduced here a policy of free text books, completely free text books in 1936, September 1936, and two years later they backtracked on it, reversed it and brought in a subsidized system. This House here, has on four different occasions changed its opinion, unanimously, in respect of text book subsidies, from as much as ninety percent back to seventy-five percent, back to fifty percent and so on.

What we are doing here, what we have done here or decided to do, and are going to ask this House to do, is to give free text books to the children up to grade III, and this is in line with what has been done in recent - in the last year or two in several Provinces of Canada. We have also changed the subsidy to seventy-five per cent because, we feel we can afford to do it better this year than we could three years ago. It is as simple as that.

The hon. gentleman said - from St. John's West said, that I had nothing to say about teachers' salaries. I had plenty to say about teachers' salaries, and what I had to say is contained in the public record. I made my position clear, and in doing so I happened to be making the position of the

Government clear. Rightly or wrongly, we stated that position, and we adhered to that position, and the people of Newfoundland will have a chance to make up their minds as to whether or not we took the right position, in the proper time.

The hon. member for St. John's West, and in this he was supported by the hon. member for Burin, referred to a statement that I made at the development conference. He said later, they both said, that I had to correct that statement. Mr. Chairman, I am not allowed to accuse any hon. member of lying, and I do not think they are lying. I do not think they know what they are talking about. I did not correct any statement that I made at that development conference. I did not correct one word of any statement that I made, but, because that statement was twisted and distorted and misrepresented, and because some parents, not very many, but a few, two boards, to my knowledge got the idea that perhaps their financial position might be jeopardized, not by what I said, but by what I had been represented as saying, I came out and made a second statement. Here is what I said at the development conference. This is a copy of it, a verbatim copy.

" we now come to the conclusion, we being the Government, that without in any way infringing on the constitutional rights of the churches in educational matters, we should examine the possibility of having the Government assume the full capital cost of building and equipping schools of all kinds, everywhere in this Province. Because of the many complexities inherent in our system of education, it is a step which must not be taken hastily, and in any case, can only be taken with the full approval of the churches, and with the full cooperation of the Boards of Education. Even if (I am repeating my exact words) discussions are initiated at the earliest possible date, it is clear that no final decision is possible for the next financial year. However, in the months to come, the possibility of full Government responsibility for the capital cost of schools will be actively explored with the denominational authorities concerned."

Mr. Chairman, I did not backtrack on that, I did not retrack one word of it, and I did not have to correct one word of it. It is the statement I made, and I am prepared to read the second statement as well, if the committee wants it read. The statement I read was merely to confirm what I had said, and to point

out that some of the implications and some people, for what reasons God only knows, have drawn from that, possibly because it had not been properly presented to them, or because they had read some summary or an extract. I had to correct any impressions and I was only too happy to do so and I did so at the specific request of two Boards of Education here in Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE: No

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, who said this is being investigated?

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. minister did, he said it was the Government's intention to conduct an investigation into the possibility.

MR. ROWE: Ha, ha, the Government intends to conduct an investigation.

MR. CROSBIE: Right.

MR. ROWE: The hon. gentleman is able to read english as well as I can, or he should be.

MR. CROSBIE: I just read it.

MR. ROWE: The Government intends to conduct an investigation, that means the same things as, so I am told, that the Government is investigating. That is what my hon. friend said.

MR. CROSBIE: Not at all, not at all.

MR. ROWE: I have a strong reason to suspect my hon. friend is not interested in getting the truth of what is said anyway.

MR. CROSBIE: It is difficult.

MR. ROWE: He says here, the same hon. gentleman says, "what has happened to the extensions to the vocational schools? Who is going to pay for that?" He must know the answer to that. It is made clear in public statements.

MR. CROSBIE: Where?

MR. ROWE: When I announced on behalf of the Government that we were going to build five vocational schools, and enlarge the college of trades here, and enlarge the school at Gander, and the one at Burin, and do one or two other things, and do other things in connection with enlargements and equipment, in addition to the

five schools, when I did that, I pointed out, it was pointed out repeatedly, a fact of public knowledge as has been stated in this House here, that we had, to our credit in Ottawa, something of the order of \$12 million that we were going to use.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE: Not at that particular time my hon. friend, I did not have to repeat it over and over. It was a well known fact that we had that money to our credit in Ottawa. Yesterday, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, my secretary came up here and handed me a registered letter, addressed to me. It was from the hon. Otto Laing.

MR. CROSBIE: That is a good Laing, not Arthur, that is a good Laing, is it? Not the jackass.

MR. ROWE: It is not a private and confidential letter, it is from the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, and he says, "Thank you for returning the signed copy of the letter of agreement regarding the capital assistance agreement." He is speaking of vocational schools. "I am pleased to enclose a cheque as the initial payment of your remaining entitlement under this agreement." The cheque which was attached to the letter, (and I have a photostatic copy of it) the cheque is for \$8,535,000. It was taken down immediately of course to the bank, because, a sum of money of that kind can earn interest in a hurry.

MR. MURPHY: If the hon. minister put it under his pillow.....

MR. ROWE: Yes, well I did not put this under my pillow, this went down to the bank. The bank was asked to open up and take it in at five o'clock in the afternoon. That is what happened here. Further on this letter, the minister says, "the final payment of approximately \$4.1 million will be made during the 1971-72 fiscal year."

MR. MURPHY: That is for the five vocational schools.

MR. ROWE: The hon. gentleman for St. John's West refers to our text book subsidy programme as a fairy tale.

MR. CROSBIE: No, I did not say that.

MR. ROWE: No I correct myself on that Mr. Chairman. I said that we needed

"X" dollars in order to meet our payments in respect of our text book inventory. No matter what our system is for the parents or the children, no matter what our subsidy is, whether it is free textbooks or seventy-five percent, we have to buy the textbooks. We have to order them in some cases as much as twelve months ahead, and once they are placed on order we have to make payments. My hon. friend over there called that a fairy tale.

Mr. Rowe (F.W.):

over there called that a fairy tale. He has had more business experience than I have had. He knows very well that when these orders are placed that there are certain set times, if you are going to get the prices that have been quoted to you, on which you must make payment. This is what this Interim Supply is for here in respect of text books. My hon. friend knew that. He knew that, of course, just as well as I did.

I want to make one or two references to what the hon. member for Burin had to say. By the way, the hon. member from St. John's West, I want to thank him for educating me on the matter of standing to points of order. I want to say this that in my experience in this House, I know of no man more competent to advise other members on points of order. He has been called to order more often by the Speaker and the Chairman than any other man who has ever sat in this House. I will say this also and add to that, that he has broken more rules in this House, in my opinion, than any other man that I have known here in the last twenty years.

The hon. member for Burin has had a few words to say here, a few impassionate words. Among other things, he has chosen to completely misrepresent something that occurred on the opening day here. I will quote his exact words. He looked across here, when he was speaking this morning and he said, "The minister said that he did not know what schools had been built in Newfoundland." (I am paraphrasing now) No person worthy of the title of Minister of Education has a right to that position, if he has to make such an admission." Mr. Chairman, I did not say that at any time. The question that my hon. friend asked: "Give the location of new schools, indicating in each case the number of classrooms which have been put into service since the 1st. January, 1970? The second part: Give the location of rebuilt schools, indicating in each case the number of additional classrooms

Mr. Rowe (F.W.).

put into service since the 1st. January, 1970?" I made the point that this was the type of question which properly should be addressed to the Denominational Educational Authorities. I made that point. I did not refuse to answer the question. I also, in the same breath, said that I was getting that information from them, because it is their information. I did not say; "I did not know." I did not say; "we do not have that information in the Department of Education." The point I made was that this was a type of question which should be referred, in the first instance, to the Denominational Educational Authorities, not necessarily by my hon. friend, but certainly by the Department of Education, before we answer questions which relate properly to the Denominational Educational Authorities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on that very point..

MR. HICKMAN: On that point, before you leave it. If you already have the information, why do you have to get it from the Denominational Educational Authorities?

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Because I had made a point here that whenever I have been asked a question in respect of, i.e., the University, which in theory comes under the Department of Education, or in respect of the churches or boards of education or the Denominational Educational Authorities, if it is a matter that properly comes under their jurisdiction, I refer it to them in the first instance. I have done this as a matter of principle.

May I say, Mr. Chairman on this, and this applies to some matters raised here by the hon. member for St. John's East over there, who, I do not think (He is a lawyer) has read the Education Act, the Schools' Act for the Department of Education, which were adopted unanimously here two years ago. The two great Acts which govern education in Newfoundland were adopted unanimously in this House. Now we modified them. We amended them, but they were adopted unanimously by this House two years ago and every member now

Mr. Rowe (F.W.)

in this House, with the exception of the hon. gentleman from St. John's East, was here and voted for these two. I refer to this deliberately, Mr. Chairman, because every now and again, it is thrown back in my face that I am trying to use the boards as scapegoats or the churches as excuses for not doing this or doing that.

Mr. Chairman, I am not responsible for these two Acts. This House is and if this House wants to change them and wants to change the prerogative of boards, it has the right to do so. If this House wants to change the privileges and the rights of the five churches in Newfoundland, it has the right to do so. I challenge now. I challenge this gentleman, who in my view, the member for Burin who is the master-fence straddler, the master-fence straddler in this matter of education in Newfoundland today, if he wants to introduce any motion here taking back some of the rights that the churches have, he has the right to do so. Nobody is stopping him. Let him do that instead of implying that I, when I say that it is boards of education who have the right and not only the right the responsibility for building schools and for deciding when or where these schools are going to be built, in the broad general sense, whether or not the school is to be built, a particular high school is to be built in Notre Dame Bay, by the integrated board or whether it is going to be put on the Burin Peninsula. It is the boards of education, acting on the authority of their churches, who decide that and not the Department of Education and not this House of Assembly and not the Government.

Now that is the law. I did not make it. I am part of it. If my hon. friend wants it, I tell him now, if he wants that change, then cut out the hypocrisy and bring in a motion here, taking away the rights of the churches.

Mr. Rowe (F.W.)

Bring it in here. He can do it.

MR. CROSBIE: The Government wallows in hypocrisy.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Sure, Sure.

MR. CROSBIE: Whipping boys..

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Let him do it.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): My hon. friend, by the way, quoted from that great impartial educational authority, Mr. Roger Simmons, who issues, as part of his extra curricular duties, a little newspaper or something of that kind. He quoted that. It is about as impartial as my hon. friend was in the first two or three weeks of this teachers' strike, when every morning I turned on the radio on these "open lines," I heard his voice coming out appealing to the Government. He, the political spokesman for a party in Newfoundland, appealing to the Government, not to make this a political issue. "I urge the Government not to make it. It would be tragic for the Government, if it became a political issue." He, a political spokesman and a known opponent of the Government, day after day making that statement there that we not make it a political issue. There is a word for that, too, Mr. Chairman, and the simple word for it - I am not going to try to cover it up at all. The simple word or the simple matter is sheer....

MR. HICKMAN: Hypocrisy.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Sheer hypocrisy.

MR. CROSBIE: Right. The Government made it a political issue.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): The hon. gentleman made another interesting statement here, ^{he} said; the Government try, to hide behind the boards in the matter of building schools and hide behind the churches and so on. Then he said that

Mr. Rowe (F.W.)

when the schools are built, the Government move in. "Government officials" are his exact words. I wrote them down. "The Government officials," meaning, I presume, ministers, seeing that I have not heard of many officials doing it, the Government ministers move in (to use his words) to cut the ribbons.

MR. CROSBIE: Right.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): My hon. friend knows as well as I do that no Government official, as he called it, and no minister can ever move in and cut the ribbon for any school in Newfoundland, because the Government do not build the schools. The Government do not operate the schools. The schools are not owned by the Government and any school I have ever opened and any school my hon. friend opened, and he has opened one or two of them, and any school that the Premier has opened, and he has opened dozens of them, has always been on the invitation of the heads of the churches concerned and no one else. If that is not a proof, positive, complete, then it is the churches who will - I went down to Port Union a few months ago, last Fall, to participate in the opening of the Roman Catholic School there. Did I move in to cut the ribbon? Why did I go there? I went there because I had an official invitation from the Bishop of Grand Falls, under whose diocese that school came, inviting me to come along to participate with him. My hon. friend knows that as well as I do.

MR. HICKMAN: I have heard it made so often. "Next year, we are going to build thirty schools."

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Mr. Chairman, just one word with regard to

the teacher salary matter that has been raised by three or four hon. gentlemen over there who, among other things, said that I had gone out of my way to come out and browbeat and I think one of the expressions he used, he used a club or bludgeoned the teachers when they announced that they were going to seek a three year agreement. Mr. Chairman, I have all these documents here, they are public documents. I state once more that I came out and announced and repeated and reaffirmed Government policy. Not changed in one wit or tittle from that which had been expressed by the Government's letter which I signed on behalf of the Government and which was sent to all the churches in Newfoundland, when they came to us to ask our views on the matter.

Because we had some fear at the time, when it was announced that the teachers were going back, there was some fear that some teachers would think that they had been called back, induced to go back under false pretences. It was because of that, that I and the Government deemed it absolutely imperative that we come out and immediately make our statement, our position clear, and we did so, merely by reaffirming what had been said in letters to the N.T.A. and in our letter to the Denominational Educational Committee.

Somebody described us, one columnist writing about this said that Rowe had gotten vindictive on the end of it. How stupid can anyone get. I was speaking for the Government and when you come out and reaffirm a position which the Government had taken nearly two months before you are not becoming vindictive about it you are simply repeating and reiterating what you had said before. Not a matter of malice or vindictiveness, it is a matter of making absolutely clear, sure, absolutely sure, that the teachers of Newfoundland knew what the Government's position was. They know what that position is and, rightly or wrongly, we are prepared to stand by it.

There are so many other matters I could deal with here. My hon. friend even referred to a specific matter in connection with our recreational programme. The recreational centre at St. Lawrence in the Town of St. Lawrence, he accused

me by implication and the Government of resorting to a little bit of deceit on this thing. Resorting to a bit of deceit because we had given the impression, he said, that if we were going to build it - and we had not by the way - when he knew that it was the company down there who were going to build it. Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend is going to comment on public statements I make I hope he would do me the favour of at least reading them, at least keeping them before him. I have the public statement that I made. I know what that statement was. That statement is the same one which the Hon. the Premier made in respect of Wabush, which I made in respect of Springdale and Lewisporte and then of St. Lawrence and which I hope to make in the weeks to come in respect of eight or ten or a dozen other communities or collection of communities in this Province.

That statement was simply an elaboration of what I said at the Development Conference. "That we intended to embark on a programme of capital aid in respect of recreational and sports facilities in this Province." This is not new, incidentally. This is, to hear the hon. gentleman on the other side, one would get the impression that we had promised such a programme for the last twenty years and that we had reneged on it every time. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that there are I believe it is thirteen stadiums or stadia, or whatever you are going to call it, in the Province of Newfoundland, which would not be there but for the help and the assistance and the co-operation and the financial obligations that the Government of Newfoundland assumed. There was an interregnum. There was a period when we said we have this programme but we are going to suspend it - as simple as that. We were not alone in that. I repeated here before and I say it again, every Province in Canada had to do the same thing. Of course, we are accused of making up phoney excuses. There was no such thing as tight money. The City of New York did not have to restrict this educational or recreational programme, did it? The State of California, the wealthiest state in the United States

did not have to do it either. The fact of the matter is that we did it. Now we are beginning again with another programme and that programme - it has been misrepresented right here today - in respect of St. Lawrence for example - what we have done is simply to tell them, tell them that we approve in principle and, assuming that the money is voted by this House here, and we have no reason to think that it will not be, we approve in principle their plan, the Town of St. Lawrence, to build a stadium, and we will give to them seventy-five per cent of the cost of that stadium, up to a total, up to a gross of \$200,000, if it goes over that, then it is their responsibility.

Now where they get their share of the money is their own business. If the company wants to give it to them and if the company wants to finance it and build it that is all right, I understand that that is what is going to be done. Just as I understand, in the case of Springdale, they will get help from the Mining Company. In the case of Wabush they will get help from the Mining Company. The Town of Lewisporte gets its help from other ways, and so on. But we will give seventy-five per cent - this is what I said at the Development Conference - seventy-five per cent of the cost, over a five year period, in five equal annual installments, that is what I said in respect of St. Lawrence. That is what we are going to do, assuming again this House votes the money. We have approved it in principle, as part of Government policy.

I want to congratulate the Hon. member for Gander because of all the speeches that were given here on the matter of Education, I believe that his - I do not like being too invidious, I believe his was the most sincere of the lot. I agree with most of the points that he made there, I am not going to deal with them in any detail. He advocated for his district, he has every right to do that. If there is a community college established, there are a series of them in Newfoundland, one of them should go in Gander, that is his business and I would say his responsibility, as a member, to do that, to advocate that. Nobody is going to quarrel with him on that. I would say

March 30 1971 Tape 101 page 4.

on the matter of community colleges, I would say this, that a programme - to embark on a programme of community colleges would be a very serious matter, a very serious matter. Before it is done it should be examined and all its implications, Very few, very few parts of Canada, that I am aware of, have felt that they can get into, at this point, a programme of community colleges. I would not say either at this point that our University has reached the size where community colleges become imperative. I would not say that, I do not think that a full-time student population of 7000 is a point where we should get into the business of building community colleges. I do not know what the most desirable point is, but I would say that certainly we should not embark actively on such a programme. I am not saying that we should not look into the possibility of it, but we should not begin such a programme until such time as the University has reached at least a population of perhaps eleven or twelve thousand.

Not that I would not like to see Junior Colleges established in Newfoundland, including them in my own district and certainly one on the West Coast and perhaps eventually one in Labrador too, but, because I know something of the financial and other implications that are involved when we get into this matter of Junior Colleges.

The Hon. member for Fortune Bay had some comments on education too, most of them were critical. As I listened to him I wondered two things. I wondered frankly how come he could ever tolerate this Government, for several years he was over here on this side of the House, when every thing that we did, apparently, was wrong. How come he could have stomached us at all while he was here? The other question in my mind was, "why was it that he wanted to stay on in the Government if it was so bad as he has made it out to be?" He talks about Transportation and he deplores the overlapping there is in our transportation programme in Newfoundland, School Transportation Services. He deplores it. He is like somebody deploring the abuses in able-bodied relief.

How many times have we heard this happen? "Hundreds, thousands of our Newfoundlanders are too lazy to work, they are on relief. Should be stuck in jail or they should be booted out, they should be starved to death, or something." But nobody ever comes along and pinpoints them and says: "John Brown, living in Twillingate, and Fred Smith, living in Bonne Bay, is getting relief today and is not entitled to it." Now, I challenge my hon. friend, He has stated here that there is serious and grievous overlapping in ^{the} transportation system. He obviously must know about this. He must have some accurate information, some definite information, if he does that, I challenge him to produce it. Either to give it to me as the Minister of Education or produce it in this House. I would like to have it, I would like to have it.

I would like for him to tell the boards and the churches concerned that there is serious overlapping, here, is a criminal waste of public money here, there and there and somewhere else. Name them, instead of getting up and making these anonymous charges. I am accused of, in a sense, of making charges against school boards because I referred to, not what I thought myself, to the fact that I have received and every member in this House has received letters from constituents alleging that some school boards have been extravagant. I happen to refer to it incidentally. Incidentally, in answer to a question at the Development Conference. Because of that I have been accused of castigating the School Boards of Newfoundland.

MR. ROWE, F.W: If my hon. friend is charging that school boards are operating bus services unnecessarily. What is he doing? Especially, when he makes that charge anonymously, I suggest to him, if he is sincere on this matter, produce the evidence and let it be gone into. Give it to the boards, give it to the churches, give it to us in the Department of Education.

Then the same hon. gentleman, in referring to my statement over here at the Arts and Culture, he refers to it as the most, he said it, the most despicable statement ever made. And he said; "the man who said it, should hang his head in shame." And he also said; "it is completely political." The statement that he is referring to is the same statement that I made in respect of the capital cost of financing schools in Newfoundland. Incidentally, he is all wrong on his figures. Wherever he got the idea that we would have to buy the schools, and this is the implication that, if we took it over, we would have to buy the schools. That is the only implication I could gather. The fact of the matter is that, if we took it over, what we would have to do is simply to find that share of the money that the boards are compelled to find now, which, by law, is ten percent, but which in practice is often more than ten percent. Sometimes as much as thirty, forty and even fifty percent. But, if it were fifty percent that the boards were finding, and they are not. but, even if it were. I know what the boards are collecting right this year in school tax-assessment. But, even if it were fifty percent, then the total cost could only be, in any one year, \$12 million or \$13 million a year, on an average. That is all it could be. Why he is frightened to death over that, and why this statement that I made, Mr. Chairman, why this statement that we are now coming to the conclusion that, in anyway, without infringing on the Constitutional Rights of the churches in education matters, we should examine, we should examine the possibility of having the Government assume the full capital cost of building and equipping schools. Why ^{is} that should be termed the most despicable statement ever made, that, "the minister should hang his head in shame, that it is completely politically," is beyond me. I must confess it is completely

MR. ROWE, F.W: beyond my comprehension. I thought I knew a fair amount about education in Newfoundland, but it is obvious that I do not know enough. I would not for one minute suggest that the statements the hon. gentleman made here this afternoon was political. They were not politically motivated, of course.

There is just one final point I hope, Mr. Chairman, the member for St. John's East Extern here, he came up with what to me was the surprising recommendation, surprising suggestion, he suggests in effect that, the Government of Newfoundland should take over one hundred percent responsibility for transporting all children to school, irrespective of where they live. Now this would be a very desirable thing - well most of us have children or grandchildren going to school. Most of us have to pay for it. Most of our children do not live within a few minutes walk of the schools. We either have to put them in buses or we take them their ourselves or we have to arrange with neighbours or friends or somebody to do it. But he recommends that, instead of our present policy, and our present policy is to take children to central schools, who live more than a mile from that school, in different communities, to take them free of cost - that is what we hope to do. Right now we are paying seventy-five percent and ninety percent of the cost for our two programmes. In September we plan to take on a hundred percent responsibility. But he is asking us to take on the responsibility for taking every child to school and home. Now this would be a very nice thing to do, the only think that I can say is that, no city, no province of Canada, no city in the United States, and no state in the United States considers itself wealthy enough to do that. Not one. In respect of Labrador, for example, that my hon. friend, who, I am sure without any political motive in mind, just raise Labrador West.

Last year the Premier and I we investigated, we interrogated. I met with my nine colleagues, who were ministers of education, on several occasions, and at my request the matter was raised and I got information there from them and from their officials for every province of Canada and for the

MR. ROWE, F.W: territories, as well in the Yukon and the Northwest. There is not one part of Canada doing what the member for Labrador West asked us to do for the people in Labrador West. How could we do that? I ask simply, on the grounds of thirty or forty below zero, thirty or forty degrees in White Horse, it is thirty and forty degrees below zero in Edmonton and Calgary, and they do not do that. And it is thirty or forty, for that matter below in Buchans. And the weather is hazardous. The price, the price that we have to incur for travelling in Newfoundland, under our climatic conditions, is risk, the price of movement is risk for that matter, you cannot get into the bathtub without running the risk that you are going to break your skull open. People do break their skulls opened every year from falling in a bathtub. The trouble is, we do not stop bathing because of that. People, we know by the law of averages, that people are going to be killed out here on Elizabeth Avenue, we do not stop driving because of that. Perhaps, we should, I do not know. I merely stated a fact. We do not stop. We do not do that. We do not stop driving on our highways because we know that on an average, between now and next week this time, there will be two or three people killed. And so to argue that we should, because it is hazardous going back and forth to school, that we in Newfoundland should do something that no province, no city in Canada has done, no country in the world, that I have heard of, has ever done to argue that is, well I do not think that it can be taken seriously surely.

I resent, Mr. Chairman, the implications that have been given here that we have asked the hon. gentleman for St. John's West to go back to him for a moment got on T.V. the other night and he said, we are asked to vote \$100 million without any explanation. I do not think that is fair to hon. members in this House, to say that at a time when most of the ministers have not had a chance anyway to give any explanation or to refuse to give any explanation. I surely have nothing to hide in this matter of the education vote here, we are asking for \$26 million. It is not, I made it clear

MR. ROWE, F.W: this morning, approximately one-quarter of all what we had for Mother's Allowances is three-tenths. And in respect to book supplies it may be as much as fifty percent. And in other of these grant as well. I do not know what proportion it is, it is what the Department of Finance and the officials of the Department of Education think. I did not put in one figure on paper. I did not make any recommendation on it. This is what I am advised, and what I in turn advise my colleagues that we need over the period for the next two or three months and there is nothing to be ashamed about it. There is nothing to hide about it. We are not asking you to give us a blank cheque. You know very well, Mr. Chairman, everybody on that side of the House knows very well we got to pay the teachers. And we are going to pay the teachers. And the money that is voted by this House for teachers is going to be spent for that and nothing else. It is not going to be spent in Come-by-Chance. It is not going to be spent in Stephenville. It has got to be spent for teachers salaries and money that is voted here for grants, for operational grants, for boards of education have to be spent for that and nothing else. No matter how much is voted here, if you voted \$1700 million here tonight for operational grants for boards, we can only spend that money for grants to boards and in no other way. So you are not giving us any blank cheque. You know what the rates are. Everybody in this House knows what the rates are. You should know if you are going to debate it. And everybody knows roughly what the salaries are, and these amounts that we have asked for here are reasonable rational amounts designed to meet the cost of education in Newfoundland for the next two or three months. And I move that they be adopted.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman before

MR. CROSBIE:

the vote is carried, presumably it is going to be carried. I have to say this about the hon. gentleman who just sat down; He is the first Minister who has attempted to explain or defend the request that he is making before the House and for that he deserves credit and I think he made a very good job at something that really is very difficult to defend.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that I was outside the House the other day, saying that the Government had asked for \$100. million dollars without any explanations. That is exactly what the Government has done, until the Minister got up to speak about three quarters of an hour ago, because the Minister is the first one, number one to give us a proper breakdown of what the \$26. million was, he was asking for, and number two to try to answer any questions or explain any points that were raised in the House. This debate, Mr. Chairman, has only gone on one hour last Thursday afternoon, about one hour and a-half Friday afternoon, two and one-half hours yesterday afternoon and today and we are on Department number 5, so it has taken the Opposition three days to get one Minister who will attempt to give the House any proper explanation at all of what the money is to be spent on. So until now there has been no explanation and we can only hope that the fifteen Ministers that follow, or at least fifteen headings that follow, that we will get some information out of those Ministers too.

The hon. Minister, unfortunately, surrounds himself, as this topic is so often surrounded, Mr. Chairman, in hypocrisy. This business about the churches and education here in Newfoundland, the churches are used for nothing but whipping boys by this Government, in relation to education in Newfoundland. Everything that is good that happens in education it is the Government, everything that comes up that presents difficulties or questions or causes a crisis it is the churches own the schools, suddenly they own the school. When school taxes are talked about or school fees it is the churches own the schools, it is the school boards who collect it. The Premier the other day attempts to pin the responsibility for a tax system, that the Government might institute for school taxes, on the churches and says that, if the churches agree to our instituting some new kind of

MR. CROSBIE:

school tax we will pay one hundred per-cent of the cost to the schools, what a rotten position to take. The Government should have enough decency and responsibility to say, "We have made a decision that from now on public funds will create and construct and pay for one hundred per-cent of educational facilities, we take the responsibility. The only way we can do it is so and so, we will eliminate school fees and taxes, we have another education tax we are bringing in to pay these costs and it is our responsibility and we are not going to try to hide behind the R.C. Church and the Anglican Church and the United Church and the Pentecostal Church and the Salvation Army." Not be trying to confuse the public and hide behind, as we have heard in the House time after time, session after session, this hiding behind the churches, when there is something difficult that faces the Government, and then claiming all of the credit otherwise. We are sick of that.

School bus, the Minister says no city in the United States is wealthy enough, no state in the United States is wealthy enough, not one part of Canada is wealthy enough to have school buses operating and taking pupils to school who are in excess of one mile away from the school. Is that supposed to sound convincing to us, when we see a Development Conference, that no city in the United States, that no state in the United States, that no Province in Canada, that no country in the world would put on such a performance as that Development Conference, where there was hundreds and millions and billions that the Government was going to spend? Now the hon. Minister asks us to believe that there is not enough money to pick up school children and drive them around Labrador City and Wabush. It will not wash. You cannot have it all one way or the other. You must either be honest with the public and with people and give them the facts or pretend, as the Development Conference pretended, that there is all kinds of money for everything, that tight money has disappeared, it is elastic money now it will stretch anywhere this election year. We are not going to believe both stories.

Now if the Government has its hundreds and millions of dollars, I

MR. CROSBIE:

say provide school bus transportation for them all and do not give us this pitiful junk that no city in the United States can do it or no state, The Government can do it because the Government, according to it, has the money to do everything that anyone could possibly want done in this Province. Hypocrisy, we are sick of it.

Recreation programme, the Government instituted a recreation programme policy in the fall of 1967, as a vote catcher, knowing it had no money to pay for the programme and, from 1967 and 1968 and 1969 and 1970 pleaded tight money, and that is why one dollar used to appear in the estimates. Election dodge and, now that the election is coming this year and cannot be avoided any longer, the Government is going to provide some money for that recreation programme. Where will that recreation programme be next year, when the burden of what we borrowed this year and the previous four or five years catches up with us, the \$600. million that has been borrowed during that period of tight money? Recreation programme, an hypocrisy. The whole atmosphere is full of it and stinks with it.

Mothers' allowances, yes I voted against those two years ago on the very grounds of hypocrisy and now I say this, that if that is a valuable programme and if the Government has the money make this worthwhile, not this little sop of a dollar fifty a month, if the Government has the money that it pretends to have, why increase the mothers' allowance fifty cents a month per child, \$5.00 a year per child? What is that going to cover for her? That will not cover school fees or school taxes. If the Government has the kind of money it says it has, if the Government is so humanitarian as it says it is, if its hearts is bleeding for the thousands of mothers around Newfoundland that need things for their children to go to school, increase it a lot more, put it up to \$5.00 per child per month or \$10.00 per child per month and make it a decent social welfare programme. If tight money is gone, let us do it.

When the Government introduced fee tuition and salaries at Memorial in 1965 and 1966, it was proud to point out, "No state in the United States has done this, no city in the United States has done it, no Province in

MR. CROSBIE:

Canada has done it but this Government is doing it." It was proud to make that comparison. Now the Minister gets up and makes the other comparison, "We cannot have school buses driving all within cities and towns and villages because no state in the United States has done it, no city, and so on." You cannot have it both ways. Be pioneers. We were pioneers in the field of student salaries and free tuition, why not pioneer now in the field of school buses for everyone or at least in Labrador, at least in areas where the temperature goes thirty or forty below zero, do it?

Do not give us that sob story that no other city, state or Government does it. That has never stopped this Government before, this bold, venturesome Government that has introduced so many revolutionary programmes. That does not impress us. "He thinks he doth protest too much," the hon. Minister, in his reply to the points raised today. Why would the Minister say at a Development Conference in January and February, "We are going to conduct an investigation and possibly take over all the construction aspects of schools," when, as he says in his later statement, a couple of weeks later, when he says it may take two years to look into it? This matter which would call for a very comprehensive inquiry which in all probability would take a year or more and that even, if the Government and churches reached full agreement on it, it would undoubtedly require a considerable additional period to implement. Dr. Rowe said it would undoubtedly take two or more years before the final steps could be taken and, when the hon. Minister is asked today, "Who is conducting the inquiry, who is making this very comprehensive inquiry?" we are laughed at, something to do with language. But if the inquiry is underway somebody, who, is inquiring? The Minister is inquiring. Well, the Minister has been Minister for two or three years, the Government promised in 1966 and 1967 that school fees and school assessments were being done away with, it has had five years since then to inquire.

I thought that perhaps the Government was appointing somebody to make the enquiry and to make a report but not according to the Minister. No, this enquiry is just under way by the process of osmosis. Someone is

MR. CROSBIE:

seeing around the Department of Education inquiring into this, apparently nobody that the Minister can name and tell us. It is not serious, it is just designed to try to make it clear to the public that all schools are going to be built without their paying anything.

Grants from Ottawa, the Minister explains the five vocational schools. He has not answered the Leader of the Opposition's question, "Are these five schools at Bonavista, Placentia, Springdale, St. Anthony and Baie Verte, are tenders being called for the schools, the Leader wanted to know, or is it true that all five schools are being built by some company who has been given the contract? The Minister has not bothered to answer that. He said that there was \$8.5 million came from Ottawa yesterday and \$4. million more to come next year. It is still public funds. He has not answered the hon. Leader's question on that. I ask him a question about the, not about those schools, about Atlantic Design Homes, who the Premier announced, on November 3rd, 1970, were being given an order for thirty-two portable classrooms, the trades college and the eleven vocational schools. I ask who was paying for that. At that time the Premier said, "It is the Province's hope that Ottawa will pay fifty per-cent of that." The Minister has not answered that. Did the hope come true or did it not come true?

We asked, did Atlantic Homes get it, after tenders were called or did Atlantic Homes just get an order? No answer to that.

Mr. Crosbie.

an important little item. We do not want to carry education too far, although I do not believe that two hours this morning and three this afternoon on education is too much by any means. So, I..

MR. MURPHY: \$5 million an hour .

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, \$5 million an hour, is it?

I think that we can justify an hour on every \$5 million that the Government ask for in this Committee of Supply, which means that we got a good few more hours to go yet. So, I would just like to say this, Mr. Chairman: The minister has certainly done the best job of any minister yet to give us information. But when he made his speech, he protested too much. There are still a lot of other things on Education, that need a lot more clarification than they are getting from this Government. What they really need is an honest approach to our problems in education, with an end to the hypocritical talk about the churches and who owns the schools and who do not. If we are to pay in the future a hundred per cent, the public is to pay one hundred per cent for the operation for schools, for the life of me, I do not know how the problem is going to be overcome of allowing them to be owned by private denominations or groups.

The minister has not even attempted to answer that problem. So, I hope that the other ministers will do, at least, as well as the hon. Minister of Education. But that is still not good enough.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I listened with tremendous interest to the speech of my honoured colleague, the Minister of Education. I listen always to him with tremendous personal interest; especially, when he talks about education, about which he knows more, I think, in Newfoundland than all the rest of the membership of the House put together. He is the historian of education in Newfoundland. He is the one author, the one person in our history who has written the complete history of education. He has practiced education

Mr. Smallwood.

as a teacher. He was the principal of the largest school in Newfoundland. Up to that moment that he became principal, he was a school inspector. He has been Minister of Education longer than any man in the history of Newfoundland. He knows more about the subject than all the rest of us put together. So, I listened with immense interest and pleasure to his speech.

I wonder what the result would be if ever minister, in all these departments; Finance, Provincial Affairs, Education and Youth (We are still in Education and Youth) Justice, Mines, Agriculture and Resources, Public Works, Health, Social Services and Rehabilitation, Liquor Commission, Municipal Affairs and Housing, Fisheries, Economic Development, Labour, Highways, Supply and Services, Labrador Affairs, Community and Social Development, were, all of them or all of us were to do what my colleague has done. Begin the presentation of the request for Interim Supply, something on account, with a speech outlining what this money is for and then, having heard the debate from all over the House, get up and speak for three-quarters of an hour or an hour. If the Minister of Education required three-quarters of an hour, I am sure that the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, a far more diversified department, and other ministers would need very much more, each of them, than three-quarters of an hour. I wonder how long the House, the committee, would be debating the Government's request for something on account? I wonder would it be three weeks, two weeks, three weeks of debate on Interim Supply - Interim Supply, something on account, a cash advance! Well, if it took two weeks or three weeks...

MR. MURPHY: Is the Premier giving us a general speech now or is he referring to Item (6)?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, this might be a useful thing to do, a very useful

Mr. Smallwood.

thing to do, a very useful thing to do. But, I cannot help remembering that in two or three or four weeks from now, anything from two to four weeks or five weeks from now, the Minister of Education will have to be on his feet again answering questions not only with regard to the \$25 million or the \$27 million, but \$120 millions, including this \$25 million or \$26 million. Every question that has been asked here today on the Department of Education and this \$25 million, every observation made will be made again.

MR. MURPHY: So what!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will be made again, so that we will have two entirely different debates on the same thing. Remember, Mr. Chairman, if the committee votes this \$26 million or \$27 million for education, this does not mean that, if you take \$27 million from \$120 million (Let us assume that the estimates for Education will be \$120 million) would leave \$93 million. But, sir, it will not be \$93 million that will be brought here in the estimates. It will be \$120 million. In other words, it will be \$93 million and this same \$27 million. All of this will be open for debate for questioning and answering. If it takes a couple of weeks, let us say, to do Interim Supply, how long will it take to do Supply, full Supply, the whole estimates? That is why I hope that, although the Minister of Education, felt under terrific human pressure, hearing what he conceived to be misrepresentation of the Government's position and his position, hearing that endlessly repeated here today, he felt under irresistible impulse to answer these accusations now.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. I was told to sit down this evening and could not finish my speech. Now, the hon. the Premier, I am

Mr. Hickey.

sure he means well, but do not the rules apply to both sides? The Premier is not on this particular item. He is all over the place. He is talking about the speech the hon. Minister of Education made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think what we are hearing now is in order. All hon. members who have spoken so far have raised the point of having received no explanation and having been asked to vote \$100 million, without adequate explanations, and so on. I thought the hon. the Premier was getting a little bit far away there a short while ago, but I do not see any objection to it now.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, the information was provided by the Minister of Education. I am not quarrelling with what the Premier is saying. What I am quarrelling with, sir, is that I was not permitted to finish mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Actually, the rules of debate, do not mean that one member cannot say what another member has already said. In other words, if one member says something, every member of the House can say the same thing. If they do not mind repeating what other members have said, there is nothing wrong with that.

MR. HICKEY: I agree, but I did not say anything...

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Mr. Chairman, the point I am making, and in doing it I am replying to a point already made on the other side of the House, I am now rebutting, and I hope that an hon. member of this House, if he has been elected to the House to represent the constituents and has taken the oath, and is a fully qualified member of the House, has the right, within the rules, to make a speech and has the right to rebutt the speech of another hon. member, and that is what I am doing at the moment.

What I am saying is, that throughout the world, when a Government wants money, in the democratic system, at any rate, and certainly in the British Parliamentary system, when a Government wants money, in other words, when the Queen wants money, Her Ministers come to the elected representatives of all the people, to the House of Assembly, or the House of Commons, or whatever it may be called, and request money for the Queen. That is what the Governor meant when he said ; "You will be asked to grant supply unto Her Majesty." Her Majesty's Ministers are asking the House to grant supply, but it is not supply, that is not happening yet. The Governor has not asked this House yet or this committee for supply. This will be done when the budget is made, brought down here and the estimates are brought down. That is a document an inch thick, with thousands of items in it. At that stage, the members of this House, on either side, not just the Opposition, any member of the House has the right to ask of the ministers whatever information comes in their minds to ask. It is the duty of the ministers to answer.

What will turn out to be what? I have not seen the budget, but I would imagine it would be \$400 million we would be asking the committee to vote.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is this a point of order?

MR. MURPHY: This is a point of order. Mr. Chairman, are we receiving a lecture on how to deal with the budget and estimates? I think we are dealing with paragraph (6). The Premier is roaming now and talking about the budget and how thick it will be. I think we all know how thick it will be when we

receive it. I do not think there is anything relevant to this topic we are discussing in this vote for Education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is in a situation where the Chair has permitted all hon. members to speak to exactly the same point as the hon. the Premier is addressing himself to now. I think everybody in the House has heard this same argument being used not once, but several times during this debate. Since having permitted hon. members to proceed on that basis, I have no alternative but to allow the hon. Premier^{to} proceed.

MR. MURPHY: But Mr. Chairman, the hon. Premier has yet to mention the vote for mothers' allowances or anything else. He is just up now, lecturing the House on the budget, how big it is going to be and what we do. We are all aware of that, what happens when the budget comes down, we will discuss it. How thick it is, we can all judge ourselves whether it is as thick as that or that or this. You know, I think it is entirely irrelevant to this number (6) Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: With due respect Mr. Chairman, your making a ruling, is it of any use?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The ruling I have made is that I have seen nothing out of order with what has been said.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am rebutting, that is what I am doing. I am rebutting or trying to rebutt, some of the arguments on the other side.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well the hon. gentleman is a fine hon. gentleman. The less he says, sometimes, the less trouble he will get into.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Shall the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again?

Mr. Speaker returns to the Chair:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole considered the matters to them referred, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report adopted, committee ordered to sit again presently.

It being now six o'clock I do leave the Chair until 8:00 p.m.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 7

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, MARCH 30, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

The Speaker in the Chair.

MR. A. J. MURPHY (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, if I may at this time, I would like to address a question to the hon. the Premier, in reference to a statement by the hon. Arthur Laing this afternoon in the House of Commons. I wonder would the Premier have anything to add to it re: the Come-by-Chance wharf.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD: (PREMIER): If I have the permission of the House Your Honour I would say that the Government of this Province have not been asked to guarantee the payment or to make the payment of the cost of the wharf, or the repayment. And that we have no intention of doing it. We have not been asked to do it.

I say now, carefully, with my words carefully chosen, the Government of this Province have not been asked to pay or repay the cost of the wharf at Come-by-Chance, as I have said repeatedly, and we are not doing it.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: A supplementary question, has Provincial Building Company, Limited or Provincial Refining Company, Limited or any of the Newfoundland Crown Corporations involved, been asked to repay the cost of the wharf or guarantee a repayment to the Government of Canada?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The wharf will cost something of the order of \$16 million, maybe \$17 million. The Government of Canada have put a ceiling of \$20 million on it, and if it costs more than \$20 million, they will not pay anything above that figure. But, the estimated figure is \$16 million or \$17 million, with a ceiling of \$20 million on it. It will be paid by top wharfage and side wharfage, over a period of years, by the users of the wharf, which is a normal procedure.

MR. CROSBIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Premier tell the House why Mr. Arthur Laing, the Minister of Public Works of Canada, has made a statement in the Parliament of Canada that the Government of Newfoundland has been requested to guarantee repayment of the cost of the wharf, either the Government of Newfoundland or the companies that are going to be involved in the project at Come-by-Chance? Why would he make that statement, if it were not so?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know, if he said it. God may, and those in the House of Commons who were present, no doubt, if they happened to be listening, would know what he said. And if not, those who read today's Hansard of the proceedings of the House today will undoubtedly know. But, I was not present, and I did not hear him. I do not know what he said nor why he said it.

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Interim Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, pursuant to Standing Order 50, I hereby move that further consideration of Resolutions, clauses, preambles, schedules, heads of expenditure, or titles in relation to Interim Supply shall not be further postponed.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman on that Resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No debate on this -

MR. CROSBIE: Well on a point of order on this Resolution, I realize, Mr. Chairman, that this closure Resolution cannot be debated under Standing Order 50. The Resolution, as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, is for closure that, from henceforth in this debate that each member is limited to twenty minutes debate on each topic that comes before the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: I am coming to my point of order, I do not need the Premier's help. I can come to it myself.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to submit to you that this motion is out of order in the circumstances that it is presented to the House, and that it should be ruled invalid. I refer to Beauchesne, Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition 1958, page 139. Section 167. Standing Order 33 which, is the closure rule, that is, the Rule in the House of Commons of Canada, similar to our rule, does not exempt from raising the points of order. There is not in it a single word denying a member's right to call the attention of the Speaker or Chairman to any irregularity which might spring up in the course of its operation. And the next page 140,

MR. CROSBIE: "the phrasology of Standing Order 33 shows that closure was imposed on the House of Commons as a check on protracted discussions. It provides that a minister, who has previously given notice of his intention, may move that the debate shall not be further adjourned or in Committee of the Whole that further consideration of Resolutions, clauses or preambles or title shall not be further postponed. And that one o'clock in the morning (that is in Ottawa, two o'clock under our rule; "these questions shall be decided forthwith." Then the learned author goes on, note the emphases of the words "further" in this rule. "If under this Standing Order the notice applies to several proposed resolutions, the whole of the sitting allowed for discussion may be engaged in only a part of them and the remainder have to be voted on without the House having them debated at all. The right of free debate is thereby abolished insofar as those proposed resolutions are concerned."

"The House, therefore, should be chary in applying closure to matters which have not been and may not be debated."

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order now?

MR. CROSBIE: I am just coming to the next couple of sentences. Standing Order 33 must be interpreted as meaning that, "the House did not intend to impose closure on any Bill or Motion that had not been previously discussed." The ending of protracted debate, not its abolishment, was the main reason why closure was established. In this situation, Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with an interim supply bill, on which there has been no debate on items (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), (13), (14), (15), (16), (17), (18), (19) and (20). In other words, fourteen of the items still before the committee, adding up to approximately sixteen odd million dollars, have not been debated at all. I would submit to the Chair, to Your Honour, that the rule cannot apply because there has been no debate. The rule of closure is invoked when there has been protracted discussion. There have been no discussions, protracted nor otherwise, on items, Justice, Mines, Agriculture, Resources; Public Works, Health, Social Services and Rehabilitation, Newfoundland Liquor Commission, Municipal

MR. CROSBIE: Affairs and Housing, Fisheries, Economic Development, Labour, Highways, Supply and Services, Labrador Affairs, Community and Social Development.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, my submission is that closure cannot apply until these items have been discussed and then it applies to stop protracted discussion. There has been no discussion on these items, so how can we stop protracted discussion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What the hon. the member for St. John's West has said is quite correct, but, I think, his point of order arising out of a misunderstanding of what is now before the Committee.

The Resolution before the Committee is; that it is expédient to introduce a measure to provide for the Granting to Her Majesty For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Services For The Financial Year Ended The 31st. Day Of March, 1972. The Initial Sum of \$99,780,000.

Now the practice in the House of Commons is; that the Schedule is generally typed or affixed to the Resolution. The practice in this House has always been to affix the Schedule to the Bill itself. The matter before the Committee now is the Resolution. We are referring to the Schedule, as a matter of fact, to show how the money is made up. The Resolution, which will eventually be put to the Committee, will be the Resolution. We are simply dealing now with the Schedules and they are really part of the Resolution. In other Legislatures these Schedules would actually be attached to the Resolution itself. I think, the point is not well taken.

MR. T. A. HICKMAN: On another point of order, Mr. Chairman, and I would direct Your Honour's attention to Order 50, Rule 50 of this House. It reads; "immediately before the Order of the Day for resuming an adjourned debate is called, or if the House be in Committee of the Whole, or of Supply, or of Ways and Means, any minister of the Crown, who, standing in his place shall have given notice, etc."

I submit,

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Chairman, that you must read the first five lines of this order together as one. What it means is this, at least I submit that this is a valid interpretation, that if the hon. the Premier or any Minister of the Crown wants to move closure, then he has to do so immediately before Orders of the Day were called. It does not make any difference whether we are in Committee or whether it is an adjourned debate, the time to give the closure motion is immediately before the Orders of the Day. Now Orders of the Day were called, we then moved into Committee and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this motion is now completely out of order and cannot be dealt with by the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think the hon. member's point of order is a good one because we do not have Orders of the Day in Committee and the section reads, "Immediately before the Order of the Day for resuming an adjourned debate is called, or if the House be in Committee of the Whole, any Minister of the Crown may." So we do not have Orders of the Day in Committee and this section (50) specifically says that if the House is in Committee of the Whole, then any Minister of the Crown may rise and make the motion.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, that is not the point I am making, that the refinement or the qualification insofar as the House being in Committee of the Whole or of Supply simply means that, if instead of, say, the debate on the Address in Reply, this House is dealing with estimates, that no matter what is before the House, what business is before the House, that immediately before the Orders of the Day, so that when Mr. Speaker took his seat and called Orders of the Day, this was the time to give the motion, not after once we moved into Committee. I challenge any hon. member of this House to find any precedent anywhere where a closure order has been moved in Committee, successfully moved in Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe that there must be something wrong with the hon. member's reasoning because the situation is this, that each sitting of the Committee of the Whole is a separate sitting. The Committee sits and rises and reports and then that is the end of that particular sitting. We do not keep minutes and nothing is carried forward, we sit again as a new item

MR CHAIRMAN:

of business. I feel that the rule here is quite clear. As I read it, it simply says: "If the House be in Committee of the Whole any Minister of the Crown who, standing in his place shall have given notice..."

I think the Resolution is in order, and I now propose to put the question.

Those in favour please say "Aye".

MR CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I wish to appeal the ruling. At this point, "Nay". "Nay". We wish to appeal the ruling. We, us over here. We. w-e.

MR MURPHY: Yes, absolutely. We are all with it on this.

HON. MEMBER: Tories.

HON. MEMBER: Dirty Liberals.

MR HICKMAN: At least it is not synonymous with closure.

MR. SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR:

MR. NOEL: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have directed me to present to Your Honour an appeal from a ruling of the Chairman. In Committee of the Whole the hon. the Premier moved, pursuant to Standing Order 50, "I hereby move that further consideration of resolutions, clauses, preambles, schedules, heads of expenditure or titles in relation to Interim Supply shall not be further postponed." An hon. member raised a point of order to the effect that it was not in order for the Chairman of Committees to receive such a motion, as it ought to have been made, while Your Honour was in the Chair of the House. The Chairman of Committees ruled that it was in order for the Chairman of Committees to receive this resolution and an appeal was made to Your Honour from the Chairman's ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: I may point out, before I put the motion, that the appeal is to the House and not to the Speaker. I do not think any further explanation is necessary, all members present are acquainted with the facts of the case and I therefore have to put -

MR. HICKMAN: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, has the request of the Committee been put in writing, in accordance with the procedures laid out

MR. HICKMAN:

on page thirty-two of the Standing Orders? Does Mr. Speaker have before him?

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that the ruling of the Chairman be sustained. All those in favour of the motion please say "Aye," Contrary "Nay." It is my opinion that the "Ayes" have it.

Let the House divide. Will all those in favour of the motion that the Chairman's ruling be sustained please rise.

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. Mr. Lewis, the hon. Minister of Highways, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Noel, Mr. Smallwood, the hon. the Minister of Labrador Affairs, Mr. Hodder, the hon. the Minister of Education and Youth, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, the hon. the Minister of Community and Social Development, the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the hon. Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, Mr. Barbour, the hon. the Minister of Health, the hon. the Minister of Supply and Services, Mr. Lane, Mr. Moores, Mr. Saunders, Mr. Wornell.

Will all those against the motion please stand.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hickey, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Collins, Mr. Earle, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Myrden.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON INTERIM SUPPLY:

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no need for this question again, the Resolution was moved and carried - I declare this motion to be carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: When the Committee rose at 6:00 p.m. I was addressing myself to a rebuttal of some of the fallacious arguments that had come from the Opposition. WE have been hearing all morning and all afternoon on this one, this single vote on education, arguments from the Opposition that were, in my view, quite fallacious, quite erroneous and unfounded and untrue. Now by untrue I do not mean that they were lies. I mean that they were untrue, that they were not so. That they were inaccurate. That they were not factual.

First I want to speak of the argument they have used about school fees. The practise in Newfoundland, until two, three or four years ago, was for school boards all over the Province to charge fees to the students. Actually this meant, of course, that they were charging their parents. All these school boards in Newfoundland except a few, one in Corner Brook, one in, I think, Lewisporte and in a few other places where they had a school tax of their own, a local school tax. Except for those few places, every school board in Newfoundland collected a school fee. The bill was given, I think, to the children, the students, who would carry the bill home to the parents. The parents paid the school fee. These fees came to a total, in a year, the last year they collected them, of something up close to \$2 million for the year, not quite \$2 million but almost. Now the school boards took that money, \$2 million of it almost, and spent it on two things, two separate purposes, one was to pay the cost of running the schools, operating the schools, the other was paid toward the cost of building entirely new school buildings or enlarging school buildings that already existed and otherwise improving them and, of course, equipping them. I say this money was used in the second place to help pay the cost of school construction and expansion. Because, of course,

the Government were giving annual grants to the school boards to help them to build new schools or to enlarge old ones. Therefore, when they collected the best part of \$2 millions a year, from all sources in Newfoundland - do that, include the school tax - school fees and school taxes, where there were school taxes, and contributions that they might have received from various sources, when it was all put together it came to less than \$2 million a year.

The bulk of that was taken by the school boards and used to run the schools. But some of it was taken and put, together with what they got from the Government each year, to help build new schools.

The Government came before this House with a piece of legislation, asking the House to outlaw school fees, in this Province. To outlaw them. To make them unlawful. To make it unlawful for any school board in the Province to collect school fees or any one to pay a school fee for the purpose of running the schools, of operating the schools. Now, of course, the House passed that law and when you pass a law stopping the school boards from collecting a school fee, to raise money to run the schools, you have to put something in its place, and we did.

We put on a new tax and made the new tax of general application. That is to say it applied to everyone in the Province, bar none. No exceptions at all! The school fee had been collected from the parents of children in school. If you did not have children in school you paid no school fees. So the full burden of running the schools fell on the parents of children in the schools. Those whose children were too young to go to school or who had left school paid no school fees.

In lieu of that we put on a tax of one per cent, of one percentage point on the sales tax. Where it had been six per cent we raised it to seven per cent and that one percentage point was earmarked to be passed over to the school boards. We passed it over. What happened? What happened was that the tax, the one percentage point tax on the sales tax, brought in more than the \$2 million,

that the parents of children in school had been contributing to the school boards. It brought in the \$2 million. It brought in \$3 million. It brought in \$4 million. It brought in \$5 million. It brought in \$6 million a year. The \$6 millions a year, more than three times as much as the parents of those children in school had contributed in school fees, the \$6 million was passed over to the school boards. So where they had lost \$2 million a year that they had been collecting in school fees, they now received \$6 million a year from the Newfoundland Government.

Not only that, but, the \$6 million had to be used, by law, only to run the schools, not to build schools, not to equip schools, not to enlarge schools but just to run the schools they had. That is what the \$6 million had to be used for, whereas before, under the school fee system, they collected \$2 million and some of that \$2 million had to be spent toward the cost of building schools.

So, obviously, the school boards were enormously better off. Where they had collected \$2 million, now were given each year by the Newfoundland Government a total of \$6 million. That is not all. Because in addition to the \$6 million the Government collected through that one percentage tax, on the sales tax, the Government gave another \$4.5 million. In this present year, which comes to an end, Wednesday night, in this present financial year, the Government are passing over to the school boards \$10.5 million to run the schools, not to build schools, not to operate schools, but just to run the schools they have, \$10.5 million where four years ago they were collecting, from the parents of the children in school, a total of less than \$2 million. They had to use some of that \$2 million to build schools with. Now they get this present year, school boards of Newfoundland, are receiving this year from the Government \$10.5 million, in the coming year it will be more.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): That begins on Thursday.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SMALLWOOD: It will be \$12 millions in the year coming up now. It is ten and a-half in the year just dying. But Sir, never were there reform brought in by any Government in this Province or any other Province, so misrepresented, so twisted, and distorted, so falsified, so lied about, and made so much the victim of vicious, lying propaganda as this very reform.

This was one of the great liberal reforms in Newfoundland's history, to shift the burden, the financial burden of running the schools, to shift that burden off the shoulders of the parents who had children in school, of school age, shift it off their shoulders and spread it over the shoulders of the entire population. Obviously, obviously, the people of Newfoundland, those who are married and have children, those who are married and whose children are too young to go to school or too old, those who are not married, the young and the old, the rich and the poor, everywhere throughout the Province, they are better able to bear that burden than are just the parents of the children in school.

This is a mighty liberal reform. Brought into this Province by this Government, and we are eternally proud of it. But Sir, the school boards had two great expenses. One was running the schools. The other was building new schools. Because the Government poured this money in upon them, five, six, eight, ten, ten and a-half millions a year, because we did that, that they had to spend, remember, by law they had to spend, on the running of the schools, and were not allowed to spend on building schools, because of that, they were still left with this great problem of building schools.

Why? Because, our population is growing fast. Our juvenile population is growing fast, because there is a rising standard of living in Newfoundland, and a rising demand for better schools for the youth of this Province, because of that, the burden that still remained on the shoulders of the school boards, to raise money for that, was a grievous burden indeed. The Government helped. We were giving a-half a million dollars a year to the school boards to help them to build schools. We increased it to \$1 million,

to one and a-half million, then we increased it to \$3 million. We finally raised it up to \$4 million a year, we gave the school boards to help them to build schools.

This year, we are giving them in the present year \$8 millions, cash, to all the school boards. This present year the Government are giving \$8 millions cash to help them to build schools. \$10.5 million we are giving them this year. Tomorrow night at midnight, \$10.5 million to the school boards to run their schools, and \$8 millions this year to build new schools. That is \$18.5 million. As against a total of half of one million, and then one million, and then three million, and finally up to a year or so ago, four millions a year, we are now passing over to the school boards a total of \$18.5 million in the present year, and that will rise to over \$20 millions in the year that starts on Thursday.

Now Sir, where do the school boards get the money that they get but do not get from us. That this House does not pass, that this House does not authorize the Government to give them? Where else do they get it? They get it in this way. That where they were stopped from collecting the school fee from the parents, to pay the cost of running the schools, where they were stopped from doing that, they brought in a new tax, a new assessment for a new fee, which they call a school assessment.

AN HON. MEMBER: You only have two minutes left.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right. Now, we now wish, this Government are now most anxious to relieve the school boards, and to relieve the parents of the children, to relieve them of the burden of meeting the cost of building the schools, just as we have relieved them of the burden of the cost of running them. We want to do that, my colleague the Minister of Education announced it at the Development Conference. He is providing for some of the cost in this Interim Supply. But before this is done, before it becomes a law of the land, before we do it, we must have the approval of the owners of the schools. And who are they? The churches. Every school in the Province is owned by some church or other except the trades schools, and when we get the ready approval of the school boards and the churches, when we get that we will bring in this

last great reform, latest great reform where education is entirely free so far as the parents are concerned, as parents, so far as the school boards are concerned, as boards, and so far as the churches are concerned, it will be a burden on the population of the whole Province, which is where the burden should lie. The whole population shall pay the full cost of education. Pray God that this will come and come soon. This is what we want, this is what we preach, this is what we intend to do as soon as it can be done properly and lawfully.

Now I think my time is almost up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Five minutes left.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Five minutes left. I want to say this, since I became Premier of this Province, this Liberal Government have brought the annual contributions in cash to the schools, have brought it up from \$3 million a year, which is what we gave the first year I was Premier, from \$3 million a year to \$120 million in the year that begins on Thursday morning. From \$3 million to \$120 million. But Sir, that is not enough. Our policy as a Government is this, it is a Liberal policy, it is a Liberal philosophy, it is the concept and the philosophy and the belief of Liberalism, that education, from beginning to end, in the elementary school, in the high school, in the trade school, in the technical school, in the Fisheries college, and in the university. education in Newfoundland ought to be free. The full cost to be met by all the people in the Province and not be a burden on the parent, as parents, or as citizens, they pay like all other citizens, but as parents they would pay nothing.

This is our policy, now, God in heaven knows, we have many things to do in Newfoundland! As well as that, we have hospitals to build, we have roads to build, we have paving to do, we have water and sewer systems, we have a hundred things to do. This is not the only thing, but as fast as we can find the money, as fast as we can raise the cash that we need to do it, it is our firm intention to make education in Newfoundland completely free, from beginning to end. That is our policy.

We have been talking here, on Interim Supply, from ten o'clock this morning until now, with a break for lunch and a break for dinner, on education.

Not one word of it is wasted. There were some foolish observations. There were some silly questions, there were some silly statements made. They were made, in my view, for purely political reasons. Partisan, election year reasons, nothing else, nothing else, that is the only reason they were made. Apart from those silly, foolish statements that were made, I am delighted, I am highly pleased with the speech of my hon. colleague the Minister of Education. I have heard him always with great pleasure, but never with more pleasure than I did here this afternoon. This was a magnificent speech. This was a great and noble speech in the cause of education, and I was so happy and so proud to hear him. I hope that this committee, Your Honour, will vote this money, will vote this money to my hon. colleague the Minister of Education, \$25 million on account, \$25 million out of \$120 he is going to need for the coming year.

Give him this \$25 million now so that there will be no hitch and no delay in his work.

On motion, item (6) Education and Youth, carried. (Standing vote)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall item (7), Justice, \$1,335,000. carry?

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKMAN: At least it is not closure number three, Mr. Chairman.

One thing that we will never have to take credit for is being the first party to introduce closure in this Province since Confederation.

MR. CROSBIE: Shame!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have no idea what this \$1,335,000 that is being asked for the Department of Justice, is to be spent on?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down and the minister will get it right now.

MR. HICKMAN: I will be delighted to hear it.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, the vote last year for the Department of Justice was a little over \$7 million. Of that, \$3.5 million went for wages, that is the staff, magistrates, Supreme Court, police, the firemen, the wardens, etc., and the St. John's firemen. About half the vote went to them. We are asking now for the monies to pay these people for April, May and June, roughly \$355,000 each month, that is roughly \$1 million. The balance of \$240,000 represents three months operating expenses at \$80,000 a month. Now ordinarily the cost is about \$300,000 a month, but we are only asking \$80,000 which, in other words is less than one month's vote last year.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKMAN: What do you mean I cannot speak again? I am allowed to speak for twenty minutes.

MR. ROBERTS: Not more than once.

MR. CROSBIE: This is indeed very humorous, Mr. Chairman. That is very humorous. The hon. member sat down to permit the minister to give his explanation and now the...

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will allow it...

MR. CROSBIE: Is the Chairman....

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the rule will permit it, I am sure the committee would wish to have the jewels of wisdom from the hon. member.

MR. HICKMAN: There will be no jewels of wisdom from this hon. member, of the courtesy of the crowd over there, Mr. Chairman. You can take it from me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There will be no jewels, period.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The rule clearly states that a member may speak for twenty minutes and only once. In this particular case, the member sat down and yielded the floor and that would mean that he could not rise again to speak on this particular item. On the other hand..

MR. SMALLWOOD: He yielded the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, he did not. On the other hand, if the committee wishes to give the unanimous consent, we would go ahead.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, there is not much to be said about this department. There are other departments' estimates coming up for which there is a lot more to be said than the Department of Justice. In any event, this is not the night in this House to discuss Justice, because there is no justice in this House tonight. This is the night the Government brought in closure. That great, powerful Government for the last twenty-two years that has not had to use it, tonight is brought to its knees, to use the foulest Parliamentary rule there is, that of closure. There is not much to discuss about Justice, very little. There might be just one or two comments made. We had last year a great fanfair, when the ombudsman legislation was passed. We have not heard one word about the appointment of an ombudsman or the activation of that legislation since. But this is a Province that if we ever have an ombudsman who carries out his job to look into injustice will be busy twenty-four hours a day. What has happened to the ombudsman? That is one of the questions. In fact, it is difficult tonight, Mr. Chairman, to discuss anything seriously about the hon. gentleman's department. I do not know if there is much point in trying.

There is an item in the hon. minister's estimates for references to the Supreme Court of Canada, on offshore minerals. It might not hurt this Province to know just where we are on this question of offshore minerals. We have the hon. the Premier and four or five other Cabinet Ministers

Mr. Crosbie.

all taking another jaunt next week, down to Louisiana, to do what? To look at offshore oil rigging drills. For what purpose? For no reason except for a trip to the South during the Easter week. What other purpose could there be? A visit for these hon. gentlemen to investigate offshore oil drilling rigs. What could be more feable? What could be more silly? We had five of them up in New York over the last weekend. We do not know why they were there. As the hon. the Leader of the Opposition said this afternoon, four went up to clap the fifth and give him an audience.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!. It seems that possibly visitors to the galleries have not been told by the sidesmen that when in the galleries, they are not to make their presence known to the members of the House by laughter or by applause or anything of that nature. I thought it was the rule that the sidesmen would tell visitors when they came in that they were to be quiet. Carry on.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the galleries better be careful or the great dictator will have the galleries cleared. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is an intelligent remark that we have had all week from the opposite side, "mutton cheeks." Just listen to it. Just listen to it. This is the Premier of our Province that is getting on with that childishness. Just listen to it. Listen to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. CROSBIE: Whiskers.

MR. HICKEY: I will continue this for the next two months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hon. member has objected to the interruptions. Would you please continue?

MR. CROSBIE: I have no objections to these interruptions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Some other hon. member has.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, yes, I quite agree that the subject is not my whiskers but the whiskers that are on this Government after twenty-two years. If anyone ever looks behind these whiskers to see what is down at the roots of them, God help them. God help the whole crowd.

MR. CALLAHAN: You were there for a while.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, I was there for two years and I know. That is right.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne that we are now going to have ladies on juries in Newfoundland. But with one peculiar twist that the women of Newfoundland are not going to have to serve on juries, if they are called to serve on juries. The present law is that if a man is called for jury duty, he must serve. We would like to know why the hon. the Minister of Justice proposes to make a distinction for the ladies? I could discuss more on Justice. There are seven or eight suggestions in the Speech from the Throne that I think I can claim to be the author of. The hon. the Premier even admitted that two of them were taking from my suggestion. The first admission that has ever been made by the Leader of the Government that anyone else ever suggested anything that was in the Speech from the Throne. So, we are making some progress this year. Two Opposition suggestions in the Speech from the Throne and one closure to date. What other surprises will we have, I wonder?

Mr. Chairman, the way I feel about the Justice estimates is that they are unimportant. We have other departments coming up that we are very anxious to discuss: Economic Development, Municipal Affairs and Housing, Newfoundland Liquor Commission, Labour. So, we will not belabour the Justice estimates. That is all I care to say. I do not know whether my hon. friend had any suggestions that he wants to pass on. He is not

Mr. Crosbie.

allowed to speak here.

MR. HICKMAN: What has happened to legal aid?

MR. CROSBIE: Legal aid, my hon. colleague here from Burin would like to know what is happening with legal aid. When does the minister propose to commenc his new programme? Other than that, we are prepared to pass the Justice estimates for the firemen, police and the rest of it.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, there is one other brief point tha I want to mention with respect to legal aid itself. This Interim Supply will have a provision in it for legal aid. Now legal aid, as envisaged in the Throne Speech, is not the type of legal aid which is the legal aid of universal application, to put the poor people of this Province, the poor person who cannot afford legal assistance, in exactly the self-same position with somebody who has. The proposal is that there be one person appointed by the Government to look after legal aid - one lawyer, and I feel that the person who cannot afford legal services, if you truly want to have legal aid, should be put in exactly the self-same position. He or she should be able to choose the lawyer of his choice. Not every solicitor or lawyer has equal competency in all fields and it

MR. MARSHALL: is not really of the ultimate benefit to the people of this Province to have legal aid practiced where a permanent solicitor is appointed who looks after everything.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, for the estimates of my colleague, the minister who put the vote, presumably carried or not, as the committee wishes, perhaps we could take a few minutes from this very important question that the hon. member for Burin raised, through his proxy, and that the hon. member for St. John's East has just raised; I think it is worth some time by the committee, Mr. Chairman, because it is a most important subject and one on which a number of us who, at least officially for the record are called "learned", in the parliamentary usage but, as citizens of this Province, one which we are very interested in.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way in this society, and it is not just in Newfoundland, but generally throughout Canada, and although I do not know too much about the American system, in many of the fifty jurisdictions in the United States. We have come along way in fields, we recognize the principle, medical field, in Medicare. We recognize it in the hospital field, through hospital insurance. We recognize it in the field of those in need, through such things, as the social assistance programmes administered by my friend and colleague, the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation. We recognize it in such fields as the Unemployment Insurance Legislation of the Government of Canada, the Old Age Security Legislation and what have you.

The principle, Sir, is a very simple one, it simply stated one that is the bases of much of our whole way of life. That is the one, I think, perhaps the Biblical reference of Bethlehem, and "Man is his brother's keeper." I think every member of the committee, Mr. Chairman, would agree that this must be the basic principle, it is the only way that we can function in society. But, I think, my hon. friend from St. John's East, and he and I do not often agree on a great number of things, but, I think,

MR. ROBERTS: we would agree on this that principle has not been accepted anywhere in Canada to the extent that it should be. It is a matter that should be pushed and must be pushed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Province of Ontario probably has the best legal aid system in Canada. In the Province of Ontario any person who is charged with any criminal offense and any person who is involved in a great variety of civil suits, non-criminal action, can go to the legal aid office and he is granted a certificate, a certificate of need. There is a form of needs test, it is much similar to the Canada Assistance Plan, needs test. It is not quite the same, but the same idea. And, if he is granted that certificate, then he can go to a lawyer of his choice. I think, as the hon. gentleman has just said, that is a good principle. We follow it in the Medicare, a person goes to the doctor of his choice. That system has been now in effect in Ontario for two or three years, three years, I believe, Sir. It has now risen to a cost of a little over \$12 million, the last estimate I have - twelve million dollars for six million people. We have in Newfoundland about 500,000 people, one-twelfth of the number, so it will cost us at least \$1 million a year in Newfoundland, on the same bases.

Now, perhaps, we do not have as many lawyers, per capita, as they do in Ontario, and certainly we do not have lawyers as widely available. But, it would cost at least \$1 million a year, we have done some estimating on it and we have done some looking into it, if we were to adopt this principle, I, for one, intensely regret that we have not been able to adopt it yet, to put it into practice in this way. The reason is simple, we just have not been able to find a million dollars free, a million which could be made available for this programme. There are so many other things that we need even more importantly.

I realize that people will say that access to lawyers is pretty basic. So it is, Sir, of course, it is. But so many other things are pretty basic too, keeping our schools going, and the Lord alone knows, we are not able to

MR. ROBERTS: give the schools enough money or the hospitals or, for that matter, building roads. Some of my constituents still do not have electric light, you know, so on and so forth.

But, while we are on it, and the hon. gentleman in his private life practices law, being a member of the Bar of this Province, perhaps, he could also take this matter into consideration and see what can be done about it. Because part of the problem, in Newfoundland, is that most people in Newfoundland cannot get to a lawyer. As always, Sir, the people in St. John's come off with the cream.

I had a letter, oh about seven or eight weeks ago, from one of my constituents, a lady who lives in the northern part of White Bay North District. This lady had a problem with land. She claims she owns a bit of land and one of her neighbour's, he owns it. And there is really no way the two of them can find to resolve it. The magistrate is unable to do so, and the R.C.M.P. Police really are not courts, their job is to safeguard the peace and to enforce the law. So the lady wrote to me and I gave her the names of a half dozen lawyers in St. John's and in Corner Brook, who I thought might be of help to her, and suggest that she write to one of them.

The other day I got a letter from her, almost in despair, Her neighbour continues to drive his car on what she considers to be her bit of land. He will not stop. I suppose from his point of view, he is entitled not to stop, because he feels that it is his bit of land. But, she said she wrote not one of these lawyers. but to each of these lawyers, to come six in all, And as of a few days ago, she had not an answer from any of them. Not one of them was able to take her case. I suppose, from a lawyers point of view, you can see it. L'Anse-au-Meadows is not really the metropolis of Newfoundland. It is 300 miles by road, My hon. friend, the member from Trinity North, knows the community well, because he represented it for seven years in the Legislature? He still has many friends there. It is not the exact center of life in the metropolitan Newfoundland. It is 300 miles by road. I have no idea what the fee would be in acting for one party to

MR. ROBERTS: dispute a bit of land that might be worth \$225.04. But this woman cannot get a lawyer, Sir. She is willing to pay. It is not a matter of lack of financial means, which is a problem I do agree.

So, Mr. Chairman, when we look at this set-up of the legal aid, we should look at that as well. We have got to have lawyers spread around this Province. We now, I am told, we will be having lawyers shortly setting up, a second lawyer will be setting up in Stephenville. There is one gentleman now, a second one will be. I understand there may be some lawyers setting up permanent practice in Gander, and not this commuting for half-a-day, for once or twice a week, that has been going on. There is a hope that lawyers may be establishing practices in areas like Labrador City and perhaps the Happy Valley/Goose Bay area.

MR. HICKMAN: There is one there now.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, there is, Yes, in Labrador West. There is a hope that in Marystown, which is close to the Sovereign district of Burin, that lawyer will set up there, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, this is essential because it is no good just to bring in a legal aid system. That is only part of the problem. Another part of it is that, in this Province, only the rich get access to legal services.

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. member yield for a question?

MR. ROBERTS: I will yield for a question, of course.

MR. MARSHALL: If he would yield for a question, that would be fine, because I understand I am not allowed to do much more than nod my head. But, to frame the question this way, is not the hon. minister aware of the fact that there has been a legal-aid system, a voluntary legal-aid system?

MR. ROBERTS: I will come to that. I will come to that.

MR. MARSHALL: So does not the hon. minister think his observation is a little bit invalid then?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the system. I was going to come to it in a minute, and my hon. friend and colleague, the senior member for Harbour Main, has made the same - what I said that in this Province too often

MR. ROBERTS: only the rich have access to the legal services.

Now I will grant willingly and happily, I think, the lawyers in this Province should be congratulated for running the free legal-aid system that they have run. I was reading last night the minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Society, I do not think, are they privileged? They are not a privilege document are they?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. I believe, from memory, 103 people were able to avail of these services.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two hundred and sixty.

MR. ROBERTS: Two hundred and sixty, 103 in criminal matters, and the number in civil matters. Okay, 260

MR. ROBERTS:

In addition, Mr. Chairman, as any member of the Committee will realize and as really anybody active in life in Newfoundland realizes, people who go to lawyers looking for help, many lawyers, like I am sure my hon. friend, have acted, I am sure the gentleman from Burin has acted, I know that my hon. friend and colleague from Harbour Main has acted, free of charge. You know it is an obligation, it is a duty that one takes on as a member of the bar. Mr. Chairman, lawyers should not have to be expected to do that and people should not have to rely upon lawyers doing that out of feelings of charity or feelings of respect for the profession. The problem still is that we do not have wide enough access. My colleague, the Minister of Justice, hires, we spend far more than \$10,000. or \$12,000. a year on legal-aid. We spend, I do not know how much it is, hiring defence council for the more serious criminal trials, the cases of non-capital murder, I do not know, do we do it in cases of rape and other serious offenses?

AN HON. MEMBER: We have not been asked.

MR. ROBERTS: We have not been asked but we do pay for lawyers often, defense lawyers. This does not come out in the press, There is no reason it should. While we are on the subject of legal aid -

MR. CURTIS: We just sent a man down to Labrador to defend a defencient.

MR. ROBERTS: We just sent a man to Labrador to defend a defencient in a case paid for, that is a form of legal-aid. So, Mr. Chairman, before I have used up all my twenty minutes let me make just a few points. We need a full and better legal aid-system in this Province. It would cost around a million dollars and I would hope that before much longer the Government and the people of this Province can find their way through to pay the money for that. But we need more than just a system of legal-care comparable to medi-care or what have you. We also need more lawyers and we need them more widely spread out, we need them more widely available.

MR. HICKMAN: Will the hon. Minister permit a question?

MR. ROBERTS: If I may, of course.

MR. HICKMAN: Does he agree that apart from the various problems that he has just outlined, that another real need is a change of policy which will

MR. HICKMAN:

bring the courts to the people rather than the people coming to the courts, rather than the Supreme Court on circuit, that is restricted to Grand Falls and Corner Brook, that circuit court should also, at least once a year, have to go to other large centres throughout this Province?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I agree and I cannot say too much except that I know that my colleague, the Minister of Justice, will be laying before the House, I think we referred to it in the Throne Speech, Legislation that will amend the Judicature Act in these respects. If I say anymore I think, Mr. Chairman, I will perhaps be out of order. We will have a debate on that a little later.

Also, Mr. Chairman, there is need to have even more magistrates and perhaps to have legally trained magistrates instead of lay magistrates and again we are working towards this. Mr. Chairman, there is just one other thing I would say, the hon. gentleman from St. John's West spoke about this amendment to the Judicature Act that was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne and that is the amendment that will permit women to sit upon juries. Now I have an interest in this, it has to be very remote, I realize but I have been after this for some time, as has my colleague, the Minister of Justice, as have numerous members of the Government. I think the hon. gentleman leaps to conclusions, something he should not do when ladies are involved, when he comes to speak of why -

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Did the hon. gentleman from the Centre burp?

MR. MURPHY: I said; good advice from a bachelor.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. Mr. Chairman, I am the only one in the House who can speak with the clear conscience on this one, I have not been lucky enough yet. Well, my mother is hoping, even if the hon. gentleman is not.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, I am an experienced gentleman -

MR. ROBERTS: One does not have to be a hen to tell a bad egg. Now, Mr. Chairman,

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am always very careful, perhaps too careful, perhaps that is

MR. ROBERTS:

why I am still unattached at my old age, you know.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, really whoever is writing the hon. gentleman's lines should coach him a little more in reading them.

MR. CROSBIE: Watch out for the leap in the dark.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the only dark that scares me is the darkness of the hon. member from the West. But to come back, Sir, there is a perfectly valid reason for this. The perfectly valid reason is that women are not quite like men and it is like the old saying, "Vive la différence." I am sure there is no dissent on the point. We will go into it in detail when the Bill is brought before the House, I am sure, but the point is that there are many cases where a woman would not be available for jury duty and where it would be a grave hardship to ask her to take jury duty. So we have put the same requirement in our Legislation that we will lay before the House, as is in a number of Provinces across Canada, nothing unusual, nothing different.

Mr. Chairman, I could talk about a number of other items in these estimates but perhaps I am close to using up my twenty minutes and, therefore, I will merely say that, for one, I will take great pleasure in voting for them and I hope that next year, when my colleague is back asking for more estimates of the Minister of Justice, he will have even more of his little goodies of reforms ready to go.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, if I may and if time permits, I would certainly like to say a word or two about the items now before us because, unlike the hon. member for St. John's West I do think that the Justice estimates and the Department of Justice are very important to this Province and to all the people concerned. While I am as anxious as my hon. friend, who just spoke, the hon. Minister of Health, concerning the need for more lawyers in this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, while this is a fine thing and needed, no one will doubt this or argue the point, the fact is that we must all realize that, in spite of the knowledge explosion, one of the

MR. NOLAN:

great problems that exists, not only in Newfoundland but in many parts of the world, is letting people know what is available to them. I mean, I would venture to say that my hon. friend has many constituents in White Bay North, who have no idea of what legal-aid is -

MR. ROBERTS: Or even what their rights are, I am sure.

MR. NOLAN: What their rights are, who to see, how do they go about applying for it. I mean these are the things we have to get to. We can have the finest system of justice in the world but, unless we have it set up so that people know what their rights are, that they know that there are lawyers who are available to assist and help them in any way that they can. Many people, and this, believe me, is no way a derogatory remark about the legal profession in this Province, have the feeling that if you write a letter to a lawyer and you get a reply that a bill follows. I know this is not true but I am sure my friends in the legal profession will agree that there is some suspicion or feeling within the population. While I refer to the fact that this maybe the feeling to some extent in the constituency of my friend from White Bay North, make no mistake about it, it is a problem in my constituency right here in the city of St. John's too. I am sure that my hon. friend from St. John's East can verify this.

We have to attempt in some way to convey to the people just exactly what is available to them, not only under legal-aid but under so many other things; but since this is on the carpet at this moment I thought I would say a word about it. I know that it is not possible for a member of the profession or perhaps for the legal society to take an ad. in the paper and say what is available or to put an ad. on the radio or television. Perhaps that is not permissive but the thing is this has to be done in some way. Perhaps the legal society is not, in fact, telling their own story - because this has been pointed out and rightly so. With the limited forces available and the resources and the number of lawyers, taken into account, they are doing a very, very good job under legal-aid as it presently exists.

Again, I say that while it is fine to mention it here in this House with forty-two members and, of course, for the benefit of those in the galleries

MR. NOLAN:

and with what attention it will receive in the press, the fact is I do believe most sincerely, and I have said this on more than one occasion to my friends in the law society, that they themselves have to let people know exactly what is going on, that they are there to help, that they are not in the business merely to collect money and for conveyances and so on and to buy or sell property. This, I believe, is a great injustice to the legal society and I think that they owe it to the Province and to themselves to tell their own story and tell it in a way that they know best. I would certainly suggest that perhaps the Legal Society and perhaps too the Department of Justice can do more to see that more people in this Province are informed of their rights in the matters to which I have referred.

Therefore I have much

much pleasure in supporting the passing of these estimates for the Department of Justice.

Expenditure 7 carried.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, before we carry that I would like to make a few remarks. I notice among other things, under Heading 7, that we are voting monies for the St. John's Constabulary, for the St. John's Fire Department, for Magistrates, these are the three most important ones, as far as I am concerned. I think enough possibly has been said, Mr. Chairman, in this House, about the need for extending either the Newfoundland Constabulary to other areas of the Province, giving them jurisdiction in protection of persons and property, and not leaving the cost for such work with the municipalities. Certainly the municipalities are overloaded in terms of the amount of work which they are required to do, bearing in mind the small tax base in which they have to collect revenues. However, Sir, I think it is worth saying again that a great number of people outside of the St. John's area are of the opinion that this force must be, the jurisdiction of this force must be extended, if not, then alternative means must be found whereby the Provincial Government bears the cost of providing protection to persons and property in areas outside of the Avalon Peninsula and the immediate St. John's area.

Certainly, Sir, the same can be said with regard to fire-fighting. Mr. Chairman, I have a copy of a letter here which the fire chief in Gander wrote to the Mayor and Councillors of the Town, and gave me a copy of it. If I am permitted to read it, Mr. Chairman, it certainly is an eye-opener, when we think of the lack of proper equipment for fighting fires in many of our larger towns. We all know that, whereas in St. John's the firemen are paid (and we do not begrudge them that, I think the firemen should be paid and paid well) we do know that across Newfoundland all the fire brigades are volunteer groups, volunteers, men who work their day, whether it is eight to five or nine to six or

four to midnight or midnight to seven whatever it might be. Those men do volunteer services, to operate trucks and pumpers and hose and everything else, in the worse kind of weather, sometimes, risking their lives; all for free, and certainly the responsibility rests with this Government now to pay them. Many of them are satisfied to work but certainly they deserve the best of equipment - that is the least we can do for them. This letter was written on January 4, and it says that on November 23, 1970, it is to the fire-chief in Gander to the Mayor and Councillors. We sent you a letter requesting another fire-truck for our brigade, mainly due to the fact that our old international pumper is no longer serviceable and is in fact obsolete and has been for the past twenty-two years.

Mr. Chairman, we have two pieces of equipment at Gander for fighting fires. One piece is a 1969 turbo-triple combination pumper. The other unit is a 1938 vintage decco, seagrave pumper, which was donated to the Department of Transport by the United States Airforce and eventually deeded over to the town and their work. Certainly, Sir, if we can find it in our wisdom to pay the total cost of fire-fighting in the City of St. John's, then certainly volunteers across Newfoundland, who are called upon sometimes to fight fires in hotels and schools and hopefully never in a hospital but the possibility is there, certainly these people deserve to be equipped with the best possible equipment. It is not enough for this Government in an election year to promise fire-trucks here there and everywhere else. We need them, we have needed them for years, we need them immediately, and I hope that the Minister will take this into account and see to it that funds are made available for the provision of such services to all the municipalities across the Province.

I know in another small area in my district, where the firemen got together and ran Bingos and sold moose hamburgers and things like that raised about \$1500. For a year they had been requesting a similar amount from the Department of Justice. They got nowhere with it. They have gone to a garage and purchased

a truck and are continuing their Bingo game and what have you and all the efforts which they have, the means at their disposal to raise money, and still have received nothing from the Department of Justice.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, the Department of Justice does not look after the outports.

MR. COLLINS: That is obvious, Mr. Chairman, there is no department looks after the outports. This is supposed to be the outport Government.

MR. CURTIS: The Department of Provincial Affairs does -

MR. COLLINS: The Department of Provincial Affairs does, Mr. Chairman - better get their wires straightened out, because they have been writing back and have referred the municipalities to the Department of Justice, now who is passing the buck to whom?

MR. CURTIS: We have trained firemen -

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, regardless of the confusion which exists in here the need still exists across Newfoundland and I would hope that the Minister will take this into account and take steps to remedy it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there is scarcely a day goes by in the Department of Social Services & Rehabilitation but one of our clients is in need of legal aid. We do the best we can to counsel these people, refer them to the legal aid office downtown when it is open. But I have to say Mr. Chairman, that the legal aid that is presently being provided is inadequate. Therefore, Sir, I want to support an announcement that was made by my colleague, the Hon. Minister of Justice I think about three weeks ago, that his department would, in addition to the legal aid that is being provided by the lawyer's union that his department would hire the services of a full-time lawyer to assist people who could not afford to employ a lawyer. This is a very good move Mr. Chairman and I would like to say to my colleague tonight that if one lawyer is not sufficient to provide people with legal service then employ two and if two is not sufficient

employ three, employ a dozen if necessary Mr. Chairman. Employ a dozen if necessary because I think that people are entitled to their rights and this is the only way that I see Mr. Chairman, that it can be done. It has been pointed out that we do not have enough lawyers in Newfoundland to go around: They just do not have the time to devote to providing free legal advice to people. Therefore, I think that the Government is the proper one to do it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise another very touchy matter as far as the lawyers are concerned. About three and a-half years ago I raised the matter of legal fees charged for Real Estate transactions in this Province. That started off, Mr. Chairman, I suppose one of the biggest controversies that we have had in recent years in Newfoundland. It brought the wrath of the lawyers' union right down around my ears. I found myself debating publicly on T.V. and every other place with some of the best legal brains in the Province. Ultimately, Mr. Chairman, a Royal Commission of one person was appointed to investigate the cost of Real Estate in Newfoundland, including the legal fees charged in Real Estate transactions. I was very pleased Mr. Chairman, to learn that Mr. Kostaszek, who was the one man Royal Commission, confirmed my beliefs that charges for Real Estate in Newfoundland were the highest in Canada. Mr. Kostaszek recommended, Mr. Chairman, that the lawyers clean their own house and that they get their Real Estate, their fees charged for Real Estate, in line with the rest of Canada. To my knowledge, to this day, Mr. Chairman, this is not being done. If my hon. and learned friend from St. John's West, my hon. and learned friend from Burin, and my learned friend from St. John's East are genuinely and conscientiously, Sir, and sincerely interested in the people of this Province, Mr. Chairman, here is one good thing that they can do. Bring down the cost of legal fees and Real Estate transactions in this Province.

March 30 1971 Tape 113 page 5.

Mr. Chairman, if they want to play politics, this could be one of the most popular moves that they could ever make. But, Sir, I doubt very much if we will pick up the newspapers tomorrow morning or will see these three learned gentlemen stand up in this House and make an announcement that they are going to lower their charges for Real Estate transactions in this Province -

MR. ROBERTS: I cannot lower mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I am not quite sure how this relates to the heading that we are on.

MR. NEARY: I would like to..

MR. HICKMAN: It takes two to tango, does it not?

MR. NEARY: I would like to appeal to the lawyers in this House to follow out the recommendation of the Kostaszek Report and reduce legal fees that are charged in real estate transactions in this Province, Mr. Chairman. Now let us see how conscientious and how sincere these hon. and learned gentlemen are. They want to do something for the people in this Province.

MR. CROSBIE: There are seven of them on the other side.

MR. MURPHY: I had a few words to say but I am almost overcome to hear the great defender, the great defender of the rights of people, who stood there, unashamedly and committed perhaps the biggest crime against the rights of people which has ever been known in this Province, to almost forbid us here on this side to debate a Bill, that is giving this Government \$100 million, and not ask any questions about it. We should hang our heads in shame. We should all stand here tonight and observe one minute's silence in mourning for the death of democracy, and justice went out the window. The hon. member gets up and makes a plea for legal aid. God help us how stupid can we get to listen to that kind of tripe. The great defender of civil rights. What solicitude. Here is this House which belongs to the people...

MR. BARBOUR: I know he is doing a good job in his department for the people of Newfoundland, for these who need help. He likes helping people who need help and he is doing a darn, darn good job.

MR. MURPHY: Who is making the speech, Mr. Chairman..

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: Is the hon. member for Bonavista South permitted to speak or is that his speech now?

MR. MARSHALL: That is his twenty minutes.

MR. MURPHY: He is doing a great job. As I was saying, before I was so rudely interrupted (pardon the expression), I was going..

MR. BARBOUR: You were not rudely interrupted.

MR. MURPHY: I was going to say a few words, Mr. Chairman, on the matter of my hon. colleague from Gander with regard to the expression he used; "the St. John's Police Force." We call them the Newfoundland Constabulary. The great occurrences of crime here in the City of St. John's, I think have become frightening: The attacks, the stabbings, the muggings, the assaults on policemen. I think it has reached the stage, Mr. Chairman, where some drastic action will have to be taken pretty soon or otherwise the citizens of this City will not be able to walk the streets. A few years back, in this hon. House, I made a speech with reference to setting up precincts in the City of St. John's. The police force divided into different areas of the City. Has Corner Brook got a city police? Well it could apply to Corner Brook. I am just referring now to the City of St. John's here, where the policemen would not only be an enforcer of law and order but he would also be in a position to become familiar with the people residing in the particular area that he would be serving, in the precinct.

I believe that our policemen, today, we have a fine group of young men, I believe they could serve a great social purpose in our City, working with the younger kids, instead of having the kids run around the corner and say; there is a policeman coming; walk up to the policeman and they would know him because he has been in their area. The policeman would, in the end, get to know people residing in that particular area. He would know who is a stranger to that area and who is not, different hours of the night. If he saw someone going around that particular area, he would know if he were a stranger and perhaps up to no good in that particular area.

Mr. Murphy.

I think the people, when they come to know the policemen will regard them as a friend, and I think that the policemen would be able to do a tremendous job, to work with our youth. In my opinion, our police force is not being given the opportunity to perform this type of work in our City. In many other towns and cities on the Mainland, there are usually police associations. They get the kids and go out and play softball or soccer or whatever game is on the go, with the kids. I think the kids grow up to respect the policemen for that. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is time now for the Justice Department to give this very serious thought. The City of St. John's today is about three times the size it was ten years ago. We are spreading out into the suburbs. We now have a fire station in the extreme West. We have one over in this area. Why not attach some of our policemen to these fire departments? As I say, you could set it up with a head constable or whatever type of officer you would like in charge of these precincts. I believe that it would really cut down the occurrence of crime that we are having in the City. As far as our ladies are concerned in walking the streets, I know they must be in fear and trembling to have to be out at night time; particularly unaccompanied. I believe, Mr. Chairman, quite honestly and quite sincerely that with a setup such as I have just suggested, I believe we could work it, properly and have the police force a very effective force to upkeep law and order in the City. Also, as I said earlier, a great social benefit to our younger citizens.

I believe this would be worth a try. At the present time, I think more of our policemen are stationed in Fort Townshend, That is the headquarters. They meet there and go to different beats through out the City. But with a breakdown, I think, they would be far more effective and do a far better job

Mr. Murphy.

than they are doing at the present time, not through any fault of their own, but because of the setup that they are working under.

With reference to the fire department, travelling throughout the Province, the lack of fire fighting equipment is a great injustice, if you like, to a great many parts of our Province. I noticed that in the great Economic Conference we held a few weeks ago, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I think, promised fire trucks, fire buses of different kinds to various areas. Now, I certainly hope that these fire trucks are equipped with the proper type of pumps, so on and so forth, to really fight a fire, because you hear of tragedies. It was only the day before yesterday we had one in Petty Harbour, I think, where someone was burned to death. Apparently, the reason was that there was no water supply available nearby. You had to go to a river or something like this.

Now that is very difficult for me to understand, because if there were a pumper with a few hundred feet of hose, I imagine they could get to the salt water that is if we can use salt water in the pumps. So the matter of fire fighting equipment and the policing of the City and also as my hon. colleague again brought up, the need in the larger towns in the Province for an up-to-date police force. Here in St. John's they are just labeled as giving out tickets, parking tickets. It has been suggested before that with a properly trained group of men, why should we waste their efforts on issuing parking tickets? There has been some question for a great many years that the City of St. John's should take over the police and fire departments. I think it might be a good idea for the City of St. John's to take over their own police department, give them their own traffic court and so on. As far as the force is concerned in St. John's, I think, we can truthfully say that not all the force works for the municipality. I think there are a great number doing other work for the Province. I think the C.I.D., actually, are more of a Provincial

March 30th., 1971

Tape no. 114

Page 5

Mr. Murphy.

responsibility. We have guards at Government House. They are not doing City work. In the past week, we have had ten or eleven or twelve policemen around here protecting

MR. MURPHY: Our Premier, I do not think the City of St. John's should be charged for that. I think that is the responsibility of the whole Province. Just with these few thoughts, Sir, on this Bill, which is a minor department in a great many respect. the vote is not too great, but I do not see the reason why the Department of Justice at this time should look for three months supply. I will repeat again our suggestion to the Government, that we here in the Opposition would be quite agreeable, without any further debate, to grant all departments one months supply, for the month of April, to pay wages and so on and so forth.

I move Sir, that the vote be cut to \$738,600. which is ten percent of the current account estimates for the year 1970-71. \$738,600.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is, that item (7) Justice, be reduced to \$738,600. Those in favour "aye," contrary "nay," I declare the motion lost.

Shall the item carry?

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Mr. Chairman, before you carry it, there is something that I feel I ought to bring before the committee. Although I agree that a better time to do it would be when the estimates of this department are brought before the Committee of Supply, some weeks from now, nevertheless, it seems to be established here today that if there is a vote on account on Interim Supply, a vote for Justice, then anything goes if it has to do with Justice, and police, and magistrates, and courts and matters of that kind.

I have become aware, in recent months, that one of the great evils of our modern civilization of which I fondly thought we were free in this Province, has indeed come to this Province. I refer to the invasion of privacy, electronic invasion. I have come to the point where I am half afraid to use the telephone. If I call a minister from my home, at night time, or Sunday or Saturday, my practice is to talk to him for a minute or maybe two minutes and say nothing that anyone hearing would understand very well, and then hang up and say "I will call you back." Five or ten minutes later I call him again, or I ask him to call me. We talk a bit more, and then I hang up again, and then I will call him. The call which ought to be a simple thing of just three or four or five minutes, has to be split into three separate

calls and sometimes more.

My reason for that is twofold. Number one, that it may just be a simple crossed wire. I remember in my office one day calling Sir Eric Bowater at Corner Brook, before he died. It was a matter connected with the development of power in Bay D'Espoir. I was trying to get enough customers at the time to justify the beginning of the development of the Bay D'Espoir power, and I wanted Bowaters to take 60,000 horsepower a year. I had a long talk with Sir Eric Bowater, half an hour on the phone. Later that day, some hours later, a well known reporter on a radio station rang me and told me the whole conversation. He had put a call into me, asked for my number and the next thing he heard me talking, and he heard someone answer, so he listened. Now he did not listen throughout, or at least he said he did not listen throughout the whole conversation, but he was able to tell me what it was about, he heard enough to know.

Commonly it happens that you take down the receiver and you hear a conversation going on. If you like you can stop and listen, if you have the time or the curiosity. You might even recognize the voices. Now that is one danger and that is a danger that perhaps is not deliberate, not intentional, but the other danger is bugging. I invite the police into my office and into the Cabinet Chamber periodically to search the offices and the Cabinet Chamber, to see if they are bugged, electronically bugged. They have done this a number of times, and I will continue to do it. I understand that there could be a car parked down in front of the building now, and listening to every word spoken in this Chamber.

Why they would want to do it, as the Minister of Health says, he does not know but, nevertheless, if they can listen thus, to what is said in this Chamber, can they not listen similarly to what is said in other parts of this building? Bugging has been made unlawful, by all but the police, and in some cases by the police too. The police are not allowed, in a great many jurisdictions, to bug, to put in electronic bugging of telephones, but it has become a universal practice up and down North America. I am told that any company that wants the trade secrets of another company, of a rival company, can hire a company, experts; pay them a big fee and they will bug the offices

or the homes of the rivals of this company and report to them every word that is uttered.

This is happening in Newfoundland. I do not know if there is any way to stop it, I do not know enough about it to know whether it can be stopped. I am told, that it is expensive to do, and expensive to prevent.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The rule has been in this Committee of the Whole, that we were to discuss the departmental items, the breakdown given by the hon. the minister who introduces them, but there is no item in these estimates for bugging or eavesdropping or anything else of that nature. I suggest that this is irrelevant, it is wasting the time of the House, it is not germane to the Department of Justice estimates.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is a vote for the police Mr. Chairman in the.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I see it, the hon. the Premier is talking generally of what the police should be doing. It is something the same as what was said before. I do not see any objection to it.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. When we were discussing Consolidated Debt Services, we were told we could not discuss the Government's debt, or what it had to float in the next year or what it floated the year before or its interest or the rest of it under Consolidated Fund Services. Now the ruling apparently is, that under the Department of Justice, we can discuss anything in the world that relates somehow to Justice.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, another invasion of privacy, with which perhaps the police might deal or perhaps some other division of the Department of Justice, or perhaps this House, takes the form of spying on people. Spying, spying on people.

AN HON. MEMBER: Spying?

MR. ROBERTS: S-p-y-i-n-g.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Going up to a house and inquiring about the person who lives next door, or across the street, and accumulating information about that family or that person.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SMALLWOOD: The only thing I am expert in is politics.

MR. CROSBIE: And spying.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not spying.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible)

MR. SMALLWOOD: I look upon a spy as almost the most contemptible human being alive, even when he is employed by a Government in time of war. Perhaps it is necessary to have espionage, but the kind of spying I am talking about is not for great and patriotic purposes, when a nation's back is to the wall, and when the lives of all the citizenry are at stake, I am talking about spying for profit. I am talking about business agencies, commercial agencies, hiring people, hiring people to find out about people, other people, about families. Where they buy, what they buy, whether they are in debt....

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. That particular item clearly comes under the Department of Provincial Affairs. That is what the Consumers Affairs Legislation is all about. That is why we have set up the Consumer Division Branch at Provincial Affairs. Now if you want to talk about bugs, or people who bug. I do not know how you would describe a person who bugs, I can think of a word but it is not Parliamentary.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I do submit that this is a long, long way from the item before this Committee.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman,

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman has no right to say what is relevant and what is not. But in this particular case the hon. the Premier is talking about what the police should be doing, and they are under the justice grant. I think similar latitude has been allowed to others.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, if what I am saying is irrelevant, then since we began to discussing Interim Supply every word that was uttered from the other side of the House has been irrelevant. It is completely beside the point.

There are officers in this town today where there is being built up a volume of information about one family after the other.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The peculiar thing is quite often the members who are most persistent in demanding that the Chair prevent interjections, when they are speaking, are the very members who make the most interruptions when others are speaking. Now I have spoken today, several times, for the right to speak uninterrupted, and one would think, where a member is limited to twenty minutes that there would be very few interruptions.

MR. CROSBIE: The discussion would be kept relevant to the estimates which we are now debating, it is not.

MR. HICKMAN: There is only one and a-half minute left.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I would venture to say that there is scarcely a member of this House here present tonight or citizen or visitor or stanger in the galleries about whom there does not exist a dossier at this moment in some office downtown.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They do not care whether you want to hide it or whether you have anything to hide or exposed, that is not their purpose. They are

MR. SMALLWOOD: not out to protect the hon. gentleman. They are out to get all the information they can lay their hands on. It is a form of industrial or a form of commercial and financial espionage that is going on in this town today. And I suggest that this is a matter, together with electronic bugging, these are two matters that deserve the attention of the police in Newfoundland.

Now a word on the police: I have recently, for about the fifth or sixth time since I became Premier of this Province, being the recipients of careful solicitous attention by the police, both our Newfoundland Constabulary, within the borders of the city and the R.C.M.P. outside those borders. I have had substantial numbers of police in my home, twenty-four hours a day, and in this building and in this very Chamber, and I have come to have enormous respect for those police. Enormous respect indeed!

If two or three policemen are sitting in your home with you and it comes dinner time, they join you at the table. They have a meal with you, and the same thing for breakfast in the morning. They get up and come into the dining room, in my home, and the police join me for breakfast. They have been there all night. They have been up and awake all night, and I have had a comfortable sleep. So the least we can do is to have breakfast together. Drive across from Roaches Line to here, drive from here back to Roaches Line and, for weeks on end, I have been accompanied day and night by police, either the Newfoundland Constabulary or the R.C.M.P. And I have had a better chance recently, in recent weeks, to get to know them, than I ever did before. I want to pay tribute here tonight to these police. It is only when you need or think you need them or someone else thinks you need them, that you begin to understand their value.

MR. CROSBIE: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: Would the hon. the Premier now permit the Newfoundland Constabulary to have more than pop guns? Just a few months ago, you would only permit them -

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. I do not believe in our police carrying guns. I do not believe in it. I do not believe in it. I just simply do not believe in it. That is that. If the hon. gentleman believes in it, that is his right. It is also my right not to believe in our police carrying guns. They have been operating in Newfoundland for well over a century now, a hundred years. They are perhaps the oldest, they are certainly among the oldest police forces on this Continent of North America. They have had a magnificent record. They have gone for a hundred years without packing a gun or a revolver. It is not part of their training. It is not part of the practice of our police. The R.C.M.P. are a different kind of force altogether. They are a different kind of police. Their training is different, and almost you might say, their purpose is different. It is their practice to carry arms with them, small arms, at all times. I do not think ever you see an R.C.M.P. man, I do not think you do, who is not carrying small arms. And I have seen them with their coats off, and I have seen two revolvers, with the holsters under their armpits.

MR. CALLAHAN: Inaudible.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, my colleague, the Minister of Mines, Agriculture, and Resources, reminds me that those police, the R.C.M.P. are the only ones who do get shot at. Perhaps, that is true here in Newfoundland, I do not know about other places.

However, I could not let this opportunity pass without expressing a word of appreciation of clearer understanding than I ever had, I have heard the Minister of Justice and Attorney General repeatedly speak in the highest terms of our police. And it has not been until quite recently that I understood the full meaning of his praise, and I must say I join heartedly with him in praising our police, both Federal and Provincial, both forces.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry? Carried.

Shall item eight, Mines, Agriculture and Resources \$4,680,000 carry?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I can give what might have to be a bit of a lengthy explanation of the item. The Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, Mr. Chairman, which also includes the Division of Co-operatives

MR. CALLAHAN: and The Cleaner Water and Soil Authority, probably more than any other department of the Government operates on a seasonal bases, and that is to say, begins to gear up its activities at about this time of year, particularly in the area of forest protection, in the area of agriculture, in the area of forest accessroads construction, in the area of mineral surveys and the area of land and control surveys, indeed virtually every aspect of the department's responsibility. This is the time of the year or very shortly now is the time of year in which the department -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Could we have it a bit quieter here?

MR. CALLAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CALLAHAN: This is about the time of the year when all these programmes have to get going. And for a number of reasons, it is important, I did not mention Provincial Parks. This is an area in which after Thursday the Department will not be operating, because the parks are to be transferred to the department that has the responsibility for Tourist Development, and it is appropriate and the Government have decided, in view of the appropriateness of it, to bring these two divisions together under the single minister, so that they may be better coordinated, the Provincial Parks being perhaps the backbone of our Public Tourist Plan in the Province. But, even there, the rule and the practice apply, Mr. Chairman, in that the Provincial Parks, as well as the Forest Service and other divisions of the department, are required to make commitments very early in the year in order to get their programmes underway in time to catch the spring and summer season.

MR. CALLAHAN:

So that, Mr. Chairman, commitments have to be made. For example, in respect of the parks, which we are now losing, but it is a good case in point, we got authority and, in fact, began to advertise for summer students for summer park assistants, I think, towards the end of January and actually did the advertising in the month of February, in order to ensure that students could qualify themselves in life-saving, in water safety qualification and, therefore, meet the principal requirement that for the past two years we have been laying on in respect of these summer assistants.

In the field of mineral resources virtually the same thing applies, although at the moment we do not have finalized the agreement with the Government of Canada on mineral resource programmes, a three year agreement that is under negotiation and it is towards the completion of negotiation at the moment. Nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, it is necessary to know early in the year what work will have to be done and what numbers of people are required so as to get our bid in before the industry generally takes up the available people. Precisely the same thing applies to land surveys, although these are contracted out because the Government got out of direct survey work several years ago and the Newfoundland Association of Land Surveyors now do the work that has to be done for public purposes, under contract. Nonetheless, it is necessary to make commitments early in the year and to be in a position to carry them out financially in order to get the work planned and to get it started as quickly as possible to take advantage of good weather. So in the month of January, in fact, the department began to call tenders for controlled surveying under a new programme, a new agreement with the Government of Canada, under which in the present year there is available to us one hundred per-cent of Federal funds, \$1.3 million dollars for that work.

These things have to be gotten under way early in the planning and in the preparation stages and so we have to have the assurance, early on, Mr. Chairman, of funding to carry on these various programmes. Even though the control surveying work is done under contract, the specifications have to be set, the tenders have to be called, the checking of the

MR. CALLAHAN:

specifications must be done by our division of Crown Lands and Surveys and they must have the where-with-all to carry out that work.

Mr. Chairman, to give the Committee some indication of the needs in respect of the supply that is requested in the Bill under Mines Branch, which includes Crown Lands and Surveys, general administration, the total amount I do not have here, Mr. Chairman, but it is in four amounts and this refers specifically to internal operation; general administration \$15,000.; Crown Lands and Surveys \$35,000.; Mineral Resources \$15,000. and inspection of mines \$16,000. Now these are amounts necessary, as I have said, for internal operation, to carry on really routine work which includes the setting of specifications for control surveying and which includes setting up the major mineral resources programme, that will be funded by the Government of Canada under the agreement that is now being finalized. There also will be some preparations for printing of reports of other seasons work, which are published and tabled in this House from time to time. These, of course, are necessary in order to put on the record, for the purpose of letting those who are interested know what, in fact, the mineral resources of the Province are, as they become known in particular field seasons.

Under the heading, Mr. Chairman, of agriculture, as I have said; this is the time of year when we begin preparing regional pastures to go into operation. Funds are required in that area for some \$40,000. over the next six to eight to ten weeks, simply to begin taking on pasture attendants, to repair fences and prepare pastures to receive cattle about the 15th day of May.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. When the Minister, before this closure motion was brought in, when the Minister was giving his details of his headings he gave it in amounts, very, very briefly and under pressure. Now he is going into a long discourse and, Mr. Chairman, I feel that surely the Government, in the very limited time it has given us to discuss the whole of the estimates, is not so afraid of its programme that it cannot stand up to another four hours of discussion, that he has to go on and perpetrate the

MR. MARSHALL:

rules even further.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not really think the hon. member is trying to make a point of order.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, that was a curious attempt, in view of the fact that we have heard from the other side so often that there has been not one word of explanations. When someone on this side does rise to give it, there is immediately an objection to it. Now I will be quite prepared, Mr. Chairman, if the Committee wishes me to merely recite a number of dollar figures and sit down, but this is not what we have heard over the past several days. We have a requirement, Mr. Chairman, under a programme, to subsidize limestone for farmers, which is needed, of course, in early spring. We estimate the interim requirement to be \$15,000.; to prepare pasture land for the opening of the community pasture or regional pasture season \$130,000.; for feed and supplies for the swine station and to continue it in operation during the interim period \$40,000. The importance of that, of course, Mr. Chairman, is that this station supplies specific passage in free hogs to farmers in this Province for raising and breeding purposes and this programme is extremely vital.

I might say, Sir, as a matter of interest to the Committee that hogs supplied from this station and raised by farmers in this Province have graded out at the highest grade average of hogs in all Canada, consecutively for five years.

MR. MURPHY: Five years.

MR. CALLAHAN: For the past five years and the highest grade average.

MR. MURPHY: In all Canada.

MR. CALLAHAN: In all Canada including the North West Territories and St. John's Centre. Under standardization of marketing, Mr. Chairman, this is the capital amount \$150,000., this is for the start of construction, hopefully, of the complex at Corner Brook. Without going into very much detail, we believe that the delay in this project which we were ready to call tenders for in December, the delay will in fact accrue to the benefit of the Province because of negotiations that began, a door opened in December

MR. CALLAHAN:

and we saw the opportunity of creating a much more comprehensive complex in Corner Brook, with Federal help and this accounts for the delay. We expect any day now the finalization of an agreement in that respect. The planning has been done.

MR. CALLAHAN: As to whether they in fact will participate to a very large degree. We also have to get started on site preparation for marketing facilities in Robinson's, Harbour Grace, St. Anthony, in the Clarenville area probably at Lethbridge and also in the Winterland area. I might say also, Mr. Chairman, we are looking at a site on the Labrador Coast, probably in the Goose Bay area to see if we can develop a medium or intermediate size facility in that area as well. We are holding various kinds of foods in control temperature facilities. That would be \$150,000. Capital.

In bog land development Mr. Chairman, we require various supplies. Seeds, fertilizers, limestone, in time to begin no later than May 1st. with that programme, the physical programme. The interim requirement there is \$20,000.

In the blueberry development programme, which, Mr. Chairman, last year resulted in I think over a period of twenty-five years, a record harvest, I am subject to correction from the hon. the member for Harbour Grace, but I do think that that is an accurate statement. The record harvest over I think in excess of twenty years, and we expect to do very much more this year. We need \$20 thousand to get going early with that programme

Land clearing, and this is the bonus programme. We require \$40 thousand. In the interim, in travelling expenses for field men, who do very much more travelling during the spring months than at any other time of year. We need an Interim Supply of \$15 thousand.

Under health of animals, the salaries and travelling expenses of four veterinarians - - -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CALLAHAN: They could do, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. gentleman wants to go farming on the moon we will send a field man to get him started.

Under health of animals Mr. Chairman, the salaries and travelling expenses of four veterinarians during the interim period \$15 thousand.

The improvement of livestock, this is a bonus program \$10 thousand.

Newfoundland Marketing Board, salaries and operating expenses of the board from April to June \$7 thousand.

Maintenance of equipment, this is our own equipment used for specialized work on regional pastures and bog lands, \$10 thousand.

Canada Land Inventory, so far as it applies to agriculture, salaries of soil surveyors and equipment to start summer soil survey work, \$10 thousand.

Grants to organizations, this amount of \$10 thousand is required for the Newfoundland Cooperative services, to enable N.C.S. to maintain operations during April and May, or until the estimates are brought down.

In the Forest Service, Mr. Chairman, and here again I think I mentioned earlier, but possibly I did not, we are embarking this year on a very large scale, we hope, a ten year forest improvement programme which is made possible, in any sensible way, in any comprehensive way, as a result of the indication and principle of the major operating companies in this Province, to vest effective control of their limits in the Crown, for the purpose of public control. This permits us, with public funds, to undertake, on what normally would be regarded as private lands, programmes of forest improvement, afforestation, reforestation, salvage, controlled burning, and all the various, other activities that can be wrapped into the general description of forest improvement. That, Mr. Chairman, we expect to be a \$10 million programme, and we are now (and have been for some time) in the process of preparing the detailed work plans. We have to undertake training of supervisors, and generally gear up for what will be a brand new programme in this Province.

The amount, Mr. Chairman, generally will be in our own salary votes which I will come to, because, obviously the preparation for this work is being done by normal forest service staff. Once the preparatory work is completed, and once the weather factor improves, and conditions get to the point where work can start, then we will, of course, begin operationally to expend the amount of money that we intend to provide. There is not in the Interim Supply vote, any money for the operational programme. What is important is that the salary votes and the present requirement of funds, in terms of preparing the actual work plans, are in the salary votes of the department, and we would not like to think that the salaries and expenses, travel expenses and other monies required for that would be less than would be sufficient to meet the purpose until -

not until the main estimates are brought to the House Mr. Chairman, but until the main estimates are, in fact, approved and the appropriation Bill given the Royal Assent.

Under the Forest Service, wages and expenses of present, permanent and seasonally employed staff - employment of seasonal staff for forest fire protection during the months of May and June, this will probably amount to about \$50 thousand and will be included in salaries. We do not expect to need very much of it, Mr. Chairman, but this is an area in which we really do not know.

MR. HODDER: I would like to remind the hon. minister that his time has expired.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, it is now ten after ten, Mr. Chairman and this debate has to end at 2:00 a.m. three hours and fifty minutes, because of moving the closure. We still have thirteen headings and \$69.4 million to discuss. We know what the people on the opposite side are up to. They spoke not at all in this debate, Mr. Chairman, until closure was moved.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): That is not so.

MR. CROSBIE: The only people in the debate before the closure was moved was the odd minister. The only one who said very much at all was the Minister of Education. Now closure is moved, the clock is running out, and from the other side we have already had six speakers, all attempting to use twenty minutes so that the people on the other side can make no point because the time is running out.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is a good audience tonight.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh sure, certainly you have. You moved closure, and you have the same, you have the right to use up the time so that it goes harmlessly to the Government. That is right, move closure, cut off debate, then use up the time. We hope that we are going to come to the estimates of the hon. Minister of Health. We will keep him busy when we do. We have a lot of questions and points for him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The minister is now shivering in his shoes. Look at him. He is shivering there now.

MR. CROSBIE: What can you do? You just have to laugh, grin and bear it

Mr. Chairman. Now, Mines, Agriculture and Resources. The hon. Minister has been up for twenty minutes, diddling along, telling us nothing. This recital of blueberries, land clearing, travelling field men and health of animals, and then he spent five minutes on the forest service and said no money was being asked for this vote for the forest service. That was very informative after five minutes on the forest service.

Now Mr. Chairman, that is a pattern of how the minister answered the questions in this House. Here was a question asked last year, no. 338. During the financial year ending March 31st. '70; "what was the amount of expenditure for the purpose of surveying mineral resources in the area of the proposed Bonne Bay Park, and how many persons or firms were engaged in such a survey?" That was a question to the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources.

MR. CALLAHAN: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: No, Mr. Chairman

MR. CALLAHAN: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do not allow a point of order?

MR. CROSBIE: Oh no, huh! huh! waste time go ahead.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, has the examination of mineral resources anything to do with the forest service.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we are now on the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources. There was a question asked - asked about Bonne Bay National Park and what was spent on surveying mineral resources. You know what the answer was, Mr. Chairman. "Information not available in the Department of Finance." Here was a question, addressed to the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, about the Bonne Bay National Park, and what was the cost of mineral surveys in that park during the year. The informative answer was, "information not available from the Department of Finance." The Department of Finance was not asked for the information. The minister in charge of the department was asked. Here, tabled on April 1970, that is the kind of information we get from this hon. gentleman.

Now, there are so many points to discuss in this department, that 493

it is hard to do it all in twenty minutes. Let us just take Liechtenstein. Questions were tabled last year, "Does the Government keep a record of who has mineral concessions in this Province, and who has forest concessions, and who has timber concessions, and does the Government keep a record, does the department keep a record? If somebody gets a mineral concession or a timber concession and they transfer it to some other person, sublease it or sell it, does the Government have a record of that? We are told that the Government does not know. The Government does not know, Mr. Chairman, whether there is a Liechtenstein company that has large forest concessions in Labrador. The question was asked last year; information the Government did not know, it was not available.

Is it possible, as was reported in an article in MacCleans Magazine two years ago or a year and a-half ago, that a company, incorporated in Liechtenstein, has tremendous concessions in the forest rights and the timber of Labrador and the Government does not know it? Apparently it is. We were told that they did not have the information. We are told apparently that mining concessions and timber concessions are granted to concessionaires by the Province of Newfoundland, and they can sell them or transfer them to whom they like and the Government does not know who now has them, according to the information that the hon. the minister gives.

A large part of our forest in Labrador can be controlled by a Liechtenstein company, without the Government knowing whether this is so or not. We have never had a denial from the Government that the company incorporated in Liechtenstein, mind you, has got half the forest of Labrador somehow, through Mr. Doyle and Melville or Canadian Javelin or somebody. That was the story. Never deny it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is that?

MR. CROSBIE: Liechtenstein is a little principality in Europe where the hot money goes, or some kind of money goes. It is not as big as the Avalon Peninsula but it controls half the forest of Labrador, some company incorporated in Liechtenstein. The minister, when he is asked a question about it, says the Government cannot comment on it, the Government does not enquire into these companies, the Government does not know. Well if our Government does not

record

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: The minister, when he answered the question last year. There is nothing about the Liechtenstein company, and the minister does not know anything about anybody who has mineral concessions or forest concessions. The Department of Finance does not know, - that is the answer to this question about minerals in Bonne Bay Park. I knew the Department of Finance did not know, but I thought the minister of the department might know, but he does not know. He does not want to know.

Broilers, there are so many topics in the minister's department.

MR. COLLINS: It is a case where he might know but does not want to say.

MR. CROSBIE: Pardon? He might know, exactly, but he might not want to say.

MR. HICKMAN: What is the name of that Liechtenstein company?

MR. CROSBIE: I cannot remember the name, it is some Liechtenstenian name that I could not remember. The hon. minister might remember it.

The eggs or ham policy of the Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is the other way round.

MR. CROSBIE: I have a suspicion that it is going to be changed to chicken and chips. Broilers, we have an Egg Marketing Board, I do not buy the eggs but I hear rumors that eggs are going up and up, instead of coming down and down. The egg Marketing Board is doing nothing to lower the price of eggs for the consumers of Newfoundland.

Mr. Crosbie.

Newfoundland. Broilers, I believe are chickens in the pluck state. We are getting plucked here tonight for \$100 million. You might call this the broiler debate. We are getting plucked for \$100 million and by 2 a.m. it is all over and we cannot ask anymore questions.

Here is the broiler policy. The broiler producers of Newfoundland, The Newfoundland Broiler Producers Association want a protective tariff on imported poultry meat. They suggest a grading fee or an inspection fee, whatever we can get by with under the B.N.A. Act. Why? Fifteen per cent of the broilers that we consume here in Newfoundland are produced in Newfoundland. But according to this "Evening Telegram" editorial, and who am I to doubt them. It says; "one of its functions apparently (this is a Marketing Board) is to protect the producer at the expense of the consumer". This may well be, while the wholesale price of broilers, in St. John's, is eight to ten cents a pound higher than Halifax. It is forty-two to forty-four cents against thirty-four cents. The aim of the Newfoundland Broiler Producers Association and the Marketing Board is to force up the price of poultry meat to a level that is considered proper by the Newfoundland producers, at the expense of the consumer. Well, one would expect when the minister asked for \$1 million - what is it? Ah, it is poultry, \$1,680,000. He might just give us a word on broilers and how far the consumer in Newfoundland is going to be roasted to benefit the broiler producers of Newfoundland. The minister, well we will have another chance later on, if there is no election before the budget is brought down.

We have the egg policy and the ham policy. We heard about the swine breeding station. We got the egg policy, the chicken policy. We have no chip policy yet. The potato farmers of Newfoundland can get precious little from the minister. Why is he discriminating against the chips. Is he a chicken eater and not a chip eater? We have just had a report, a momentous

Mr. Crosbie.

report, Mr. Chairman, the Royal Commission on Forestry. What a flop? It was appointed in 1967. This Royal Commission laboured practically three and a half years, and what a mouse it produced. Three and a half years to produce the Royal Commission on Forestry that was tabled here two or three days ago. What a disappointment! What mediocre results! A report that one can read in an hour and a half, with recommendations that any member of the House, who practically knows nothing about forestry, could have made the same as that commission made. What a waste that has been!

I do not have the figures here of what they were paid. Up to last year, it was a considerable sum. We will know what the total sum is later in the year. Compared to the Royal Commission of 1955, what a miserable specimen of an investigation and a report that was. That is the same commission that gave an interim report of a page and a half at the request of the Premier, recommending that all the forests of Newfoundland be taken over by the Government. At that time, it was thought that the Government of Canada - there was a great big board down at the end of this Chamber and the Premier spoke on it hour after hour. Those were the days when he did not agree with closure. He spoke for hours on a resolution that we take over all the forests of Newfoundland - interim report on that Royal Commission. The final report recommends against it. The money did not materialize from the Government of Canada. We can discuss that in more detail later, but that is one of the major disappointments, Mr. Chairman, of this session. That spavined, week, strained, not thorough, that surface report that was filed by the Royal Commission on Forestry. What a major disappointment. What a chance they had to recommend something. Do they say a word about the woods in Labrador? Do they say a word about the third mill? Do they say a word about the fourth mill? No! How can a Royal Commission on Forestry report without discussing the concessions of what the third mill has gotten and the fourth mill and the rest of it? What a paltry excuse for a report? The gentleman that signed it - there

Mr. Crosbie.

was a report here on the Royal Commission on Economic Prospects that, two or three years ago, the Premier described as ninety per cent trash. He was one hundred per cent wrong when he said it. But, if he said that this forestry report was ninety per cent trash, he would be well on the mark. We do not have time tonight to discuss that in any detail, but it is a major disappointment.

Bonne Bay Park: The Bonne Bay Park. I should leave to my colleague here. In fact, I will leave it to him. But where are we on the Bonne Bay Park? A private members' Resolution was moved here at the first session last year. The Government kept it up and kept the debate up week after week after week. Where are we now on this great Bonne Bay Park? We had a document, signed last September over in the Bonne Bay area - heads of agreements, September, October. What has happened to the Bonne Bay Park? Are the boundaries agreed? What is it going to cost to purchase the land? What is going to happen there this year? Nobody can get through the fog of confusion that the minister has created on that Bonne Bay Park situation. Where are we on that? We do not have any information from the minister on that.

Forestry Concession and Mineral Concession: In the Speech from the Throne it was suggested, Mr. Chairman, that the Government want to extend some mining concessions to certain promoters. Why? We have concessions here on forests that were given to Mr. Shaheen and his company twelve years ago. Nothing has been done at Come-by-Chance, on that third mill, despite the fact that the people of Newfoundland, through their Government, have advanced \$2.5 million that was spent at Come-by-Chance three years ago, and that is still not the fruition. Instead of cancelling the concession and doing it ourselves, having the Government do it

Mr. Crosbie.

or get somebody else to do it, what happened? Last year the Government extended the concession for Mr. Shaheen again, after ten or twelve years. What sense is there in that kind of policy? There is \$2.5 million gone in buildings and so on down at Come-by-Chance. In 1967 in this House, in the Speech from the Throne, we were told Litton Industries had signed a turn-key contract to put up that mill and it was going to be finished by the end of the year. It is not there yet. What happened to the Litton Industries turn-key contract? What happened to the two pulp and paper machines that were said to be ordered in 1967, four years ago? Surely, they are finished construction now, if they were ever started. How can the Government expect us to believe a word they say with that kind of a record:

Pollution: Pollution - this Government are not too much concerned about pollution, despite the odd palaver we hear about it because now it is a popular, public topic. What is happening in Labrador with the mining tailings that are going into the lakes of Labrador, ruining the lakes and water of Labrador? The minister said last year that the Federal Government, the Department of Fisheries, occasionally does a survey and report on that. What, are we going to allow the waters of Labrador to become polluted with the tailings from these iron-ore mines? What are we doing to prevent it? It is all going right to those waters now. The minister has not done anything to stop it. The minister, by the way, we should say a good word about the minister. He was vindicated today about the wildlife, when he ordered the wildlife assassinated or disposed of there a few months ago, during the summer, because it had parasites. They carried parasites. All the parasites in this Province were disposed of. But anyway the minister has been vindicated by the O'Dea Commission. We have to congratulate the minister. There will be no Government left either. There would not be a person left in this Chamber.

But we have to congratulate the minister on that. Apparently, he did something right. We have to say, apparently, he did the right thing, when he had those poor birds disposed of. How did I get in birds? I thought I was on pollution.

We would like to hear a bit more from the minister (I think he is the minister in charge) of what active steps have been taken to ensure that the lakes of Labrador are not being ruined by the dumping of tailings up in Labrador? There was a question asked last year: Under the mining legislation, there are supposed to be reports given to the Government, Mr. Chairman, as to what has been spent on those concessions. Naturally, you would expect that the mining promoters are given concessions and they have to agree to spend so many dollars a year. Last year, the minister did not answer the question. There was one, I was thinking of, I think it was in Parson's Pond and so on. What had NALCO spent under their legislation? The answer was that they did not have to make a report until June and June had not arrived.

Now June has arrived. June of 1970 has arrived. We are now anxiously awaiting the minister's word on whether NALCO lived up to its obligations. NALCO used to be a Crown corporation, Mr. Chairman, owned by the Newfoundland Government. But the Newfoundland Government gave it tremendous concessions. But it was afterwards sold to Mr. Doyle or a company he controlled. We would like to know whether NALCO has actually spent the money it had to, under these agreements over the last ten or twelve years on these concessions or not? We would like to know whether other mining companies have done the same. We still do not have that information from last year. We still do not have that information from last year.

The minister gave an answer, yes. He refused the answer. He refused to answer it. He said it was not public information, not in the public interest.

Mr. Crosbie.

In the case of the NALCO business, he said the report was not due until June 1st., 1970. Well that date is now past.

I believe the minister is making a note there now. We can expect the information tomorrow. Offshore minerals, tomorrow and tomorrow, from day to day, we expect it tomorrow - offshore minerals. In 1969 the hon. minister's Government said that we had no rights to the Continental Shelf. Newfoundland had no legal or constitutional rights, but we might expect that if oil were found off our shores, we might get a little benefit, if they brought the oil into shore. Now, since then, the Government have gotten a bit more backbone. It now says that we do have a right. The minister is the minister in charge. The Minister of Justice would not comment on what was happening. How do we stand

In relation to that issue: A year and a-half ago Prime Minister Trudeau offered a deal to the Maritimes and to the governments involved. He offered them that they would share the revenues from these things with our Government. Premier Smallwood immediately said - did not have to hesitate, made his mind up immediately - that it was wonderful, what Prime Minister had offered. It was wonderful. Now, something happened between that first reaction and when the House next met, because when the House met, it was not so wonderful at all. What is the position, are we taking our claim to the Supreme Court of Canada? Have we rejected Mr. Trudeau's offer of eighteen months ago, to share the revenues from oil and gas that might be found off our shores? Or have we packed it in altogether? The hon. Minister is going down to Louisiana on a very dangerous trip, next week. It may be after he visits the oil rigs in Louisiana he will visit the beaches of Florida, or one of the condominium down in Florida, with his colleagues, and get a few days respite in the sun, from the onerous duties of not providing information in this House.

Does not the Minister feel that he might give us a bit of information on our own oil and gas resources? We know they have oil rigs in Louisiana and the fact, if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and I were invited, we would make it an all-party trip. AS long as we did not have to sleep with the Hon. Minister, We could have our own room. So, when the Minister comes back from Louisiana, could he just bring us up-to-date on our own little oil business off the coast of Newfoundland? We have heard that the Minister performed a duty beyond all comprehension. He went to Nova Scotia and looked at something they were building in Halifax Shipyards, for AMICO, one of the big oil companies, and has reported to AMICO that it is safe enough for them to put off on the Grand Banks. Could I just cease, with one final wish? That the Minister not spend a month on that oil drilling platform. It might be a bit too dangerous, we do not want the Minister to guarantee, we just want the Minister to give us some information. The Minister is looking so pleasant this session I think he is going to provide us with a lot of delightful information, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, just two points arising out of the Minister's information and comments; I would like to draw to the attention of the Committee. First, under the heading of Mine Inspection. This House and this Government has had before it now, for two years or it will be two years September coming, the Report of the Royal Commission on Radiation and Safety in the mines at St. Lawrence. That is a pretty far-reaching report. It is a report that has running through it, all the way through it, one very simple theme. A theme that the Government of this Province is not prepared to accept. That is a theme that St. Lawrence has to be treated and must be treated as a special area, that no Government or no Minister should hide behind the shield or protection that anything we do in the mines of St. Lawrence will create a precedent in mining operations in other parts of this Province. This has not been accepted. Ever so often we hear in this House another statement, from some Minister, that would give the indication that, the recommendations of this Commission are being accepted or considered or, if somebody else will help us, we will take the next step. But it is nearly two years, Mr. Chairman, since this report was filed. It is not a report that is hard to comprehend, the recommendations are straightforward. The findings cannot be contradicted. But, still today, a year and a-half later, we find ourselves in a position where the Minister of Mines is not prepared to go all the way with the recommendations of that report, in so far as the monitoring of the mines in St. Lawrence are concerned. This Committee will recall that the Commission, in its report, recommended that there be two permanent civil servants trained as monitoring technicians in the mines at all times.

Not, to quote the Commission's Report, that the company and its employees are not competent to monitor but rather because the people of St. Lawrence, after enduring thirty years of appalling and criminal neglect by the Government of the day, are entitled, morally entitled, to reassurance that whoever is doing the inspection will be absolutely free from any outside pressures. The Trade

Union in St. Lawrence, the St. Lawrence Workers Protective Union, still are not satisfied, as of March 1, 1971, at least they were not satisfied. Again we have had a halfway measure, we have had an undertaking from the Minister that he will keep the one technician there now. That now after two years - not two years, four years - because he was appointed at the time the Commission was appointed - after four years he is now going to be a permanent Civil Servant and that he will supervise and will train the other monitors and technicians who are employed by the company. That Mr. Chairman, points up to me very clearly that there has been no change of philosophy, no acceptance by Government of what that report is all about. That report, as I said earlier, simply means that St. Lawrence must be regarded and must be accepted as a special area, with special circumstances, entitled to special treatment. This is not the kind of treatment that we expect this House or Government to accord the people and the miners in St. Lawrence.

Last week we had a statement from the - a ridiculous statement - a foolish statement - from the Hon. the Acting Minister of Labour, with respect to St. Lawrence. He said, "the Government of this Province will not wait any longer to hear from the Seibert family in New York as to whether they will contribute to a fund that was recommended by this Commission on the safety in the mines at St. Lawrence."

We will now go to the Government of Canada and, if the Government of Canada is prepared to contribute then we will contribute. Eighteen months later the Government of this Province is about to get around to writing a letter to the Government of Canada, and saying, "will you contribute." Pure, simple, unadulterated bluff, an attempt to lead the people of St. Lawrence further down the garden path, Mr. Chairman, and they are not going to be led and they deserve better treatment. They deserve something better than an occasional smile from the Minister and an occasional attempt to visit St. Lawrence or a cursory visit to the mining industry in that area.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister, in itemizing the estimates or the requirements for this particular vote, referred to the Clean Air, Water and Soil Act that was passed in this House last year. That was supposed to be the beginning of the end. That was going to clear up the pollution in Newfoundland. As one of the senior officials, responsible for the administration of this, told me recently, the preamble is great. It makes fine reading. It is probably the most ineffective piece of legislation that has been passed in this House in a long long time, because here is what happens, Mr. Chairman. A community suddenly finds itself with a serious pollution problem. It finds that an industry or it finds that a hennery or a piggery or something is plunked down smack in the centre of a community. It is obvious that this is an offensive and unnecessary industry, placed unnecessarily in the centre of a community, when it can be put outside.

So, you make application to the Minister or you make application to the Clean Air and Water Authority. You say, "here is an element of pollution, here is something that is offensive, will you take the necessary action to prevent this from coming to pass in the community? Or, if it is already in operation, as it is in many cases, will you order it stopped? Will you order the owners to desist? Will you tell him that he has to take this hennery or this piggery and put it outside of the boundaries or put it out in open country? But what is the procedure that has to be followed? The procedure that is followed, Mr. Chairman, is that this is referred to the Department of Health. The Department of Health has to send out its inspectors and find out whether or not this is a health hazard. If the report comes back that this is not a health hazard but that it is very offensive, it may be as offensive as the problem that existed in your district Mr. Chairman, two years ago, in Isle au Morts, where people were actually getting sick, but it was not a health hazard. They were throwing up, they could not breathe. Some of them had to move from their homes that were close to the plants. But it could not be defined as a health hazard. Therefore

MR. HICKMAN: if it is not defined as a health hazard, then it is not the one at Isle aux Morts, then it is not pollution. Then it cannot come out of the control of The Clean Water and Authority Act, or Soil Act. Now what is this clean air? When it was introduced in this House we were told this is going to purify everything. This is going to prevent the fellow from putting the henery in the middle of town, and polluting the air and being offensive to his neighbours. But none of this is happening. There are no teeth in that Act. What teeth are in there, the minister is not prepared to use them. And this piece of Legislation that was passed last year, Mr. Chairman, and the publicity that ensued therefrom has turned out to be a great disappointment to Newfoundlanders.

You know we have long since passed the stage where a community in Newfoundland is going to be so anxious to get an industry, be it a henery or a piggery, that they will put up with anything just to get it. This sort of thing no longer prevails. People want the right to live with comparative purity in their own community, and we look to the minister to protect us. His failure has been abysmal. There has been no action taken to enforce the Act, if it is enforceable. But, still we hear again tonight that monies are needed to curb pollution.

The hon. minister, in his address to this House tonight, gave us no indication as to what steps are being taken by the Government of this Province to prevent pollution in the refinery development, if and when it is built at Come-by-Chance. Last year, when this was raised in the House, we were told that as far as the pollution of the bay was concerned and the waters around it, and there was some doubt about the air, this came under Federal jurisdiction. And that the Government of Canada was going to look after, but we were not prepared to sit back and wait until the Government of Canada slowly, but surely got around to passing the necessary Legislation. We had this Bill here now. We were going to do something about it. Now what has been done? What has been done by the Province at Come-by-Chance? What has been done by the minister in Stephenville to

MR HICKMAN: prevent unnecessary pollution of the land? As far as I know nothing has been done. There may be a very good reason why nothing has been done insofar as the waters of Come-by-Chance are concerned because, despite what the hon. Premier told us earlier tonight, as late as ten o'clock tonight, the hon. Arthur Laing has once again come back and confirmed that the Government in Newfoundland have to guarantee the cost of that wharf at Come-by-Chance. Maybe the problem will not arise, because maybe the wharf will not be built.

But surely, Mr. Chairman, we learned a pretty expensive lesson in ERCO. We learned a lesson, we learned how to avoid a problem that was avoidable at the time, if this House had been prepared to put into legislation what was intended to go in it at the beginning, and that was to impose an absolute obligation on ERCO to use all modern methods to curb pollution. But this did not suit the company, so it did not go in.

Hon. members will recall when we were debating the Shaheen Bill here, during a special session in July, that during the second reading debate I gave notice that I would ask leave to amend that Bill, when it went into Committee stage, to put in anti-pollution clauses. And there was great nodding of agreement from the Government side. Then we adjourned for the night. And Mr. Shaheen took hold, and the next day, when we came in, the marching orders had been given. No anti-pollution sections went in. The motion was made. It was defeated by Government. And now are we going to sit back and rely on the assurance from the hon. minister that it has all been taken care of, taken care of the same way that ERCO was taken care of? Is that the way it is been taken care of?

No, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. minister is going to come in here and ask this House to blindly vote him Interim Supply, and if he is going to tell us he needs some of the money in connection with his pollution control and clean, air and water and soil Act, then this committee is entitled to some

MR. HICKMAN: explanation, to some assurance that what the minister is being paid to do is being done. So far every indication is that nothing is being done. So far every indication is that we have a piece of useless legislation on our Statute Books. It is not being enforced and, even if they try to enforce it, it is not capable of effective enforcement in any event.

Mr. Chairman, this is why we on this side of the House believe that we are not being unreasonable. That we are not being inquisitive just for the sake of being inquisitive, when we say that a minister comes in and looks for, I do not know how much the Minister of Mines is looking for, but whatever it is, a great deal more than he is entitled to. That whatever he is looking for that we are entitled to have something better than a rough outline of what his department is doing. We can find that by looking in last year's estimates. We know the various headings that are contained under Mines, Agriculture and Resources. But, this House is entitled to know more than that. It is entitled to know how this money is going to be spent. But, the hon. minister sits over there smiling, protected under the cloak of closure, knowing that when it comes two o'clock he can walk out of here, Nobody can say anything about it. The debate is over. Freedom has been destroyed, and he has got his money in his pocket and he can spend it the way he wishes. This is not what parliament is all about, Mr. Chairman.

MR. H. R. V. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, just a few words on this particular vote. I would like particularly to refer to the Division of Mines. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that mines in this country and this Province have a peculiar ability to arouse a tremendous amount of interest at the time when they are required to do so. What I mean by that is that this Government and those with whom it is associated have a great habit of making tremendous announcements about mines which are going to be developed here, there and everywhere, just at crucial times to take peoples minds of other problems which the Government would rather that people were not aware of or not

MR. EARLE: thinking of.

I recall, for instance just as an illustration, a few years ago, there was a super, great announcement about a mine in a little settlement in the district which I represent, a place called Rencontre East. This was suppose to be a great discovery and the Premier came out with a tremendous announcement about how that was going to be something tremendous. It so happens that, that day in this House Mr. Doyle, who controls the mineral concessions in that area, was in the House. And as it was going to effect my part of the Province, I went outside these doors and spoke to Mr. Doyle and asked him: "Is there any real truth in these statements and these announcements that have been made?" The hon. gentleman told me outside of this House, "yes, this is no exaggeration whatsoever, that particular part of Fortune Bay, around Rencontre East, will be bigger than Corner Brook." And I was fool enough to believe him, at the time. I thought this was just a tactic which was used. Now the unfortunate sequents of this sort of think, and this pretains to a lot of the nonsense which the Government have made, that the people in that particular area were becoming despondent and may well have gone somewhere else to seek gainful employment or at least in their own settlement would have had gotten down to the fisheries. But, they were built up with the expectation that this mine would develop and they have been living in hopes (this is now four or five years ago) that this would come. And they stay in this place, and they hope and hope and hope that these promises of the Government will come about. I think it is the most dastardly and disgraceful thing of which this Government have been guilty, to build up peoples hopes on false promises, which they know themselves at the time will never materialize. This thing was a complete fiasco and should have never been announced.

This sort of tactic is going on right up to today. There was another instance when the whole Cabinet en masse went down to inspect the oil well at Parson's Pond, I was one of the party. We went down at quite a lot of expense and carried into the interior by helicopters and so on, we saw an old fellow with a little rig that I think must have had come out of the

MR. EARLE: Arc. And, believe me the oil that we saw there that day would hardly grease the monkey wrenches that was hoisting the drill. But, this was built up as being the great discovery, the great thing that - I do not know what the shares of that company went up over, all these announcements, but still this was going to be the future of Newfoundland.

Now not so long ago in the same dramatic trend and in the same dramatic way of trying to fool our people, you get great announcements about the uranium discoveries on the Burin Peninsula. There is a chap called "Happy," apparently his picture was in the paper and so on. He has gone down there and this was tremendous, his name was "Happy," I do not know why, but he looked most unhappy in his picture. But anyhow he went down there and he made a tremendous discovery, so this was built up. The Mayors of the town down there got all excited, this is the coming industry for that part of Newfoundland and they were oh! delighted and

MR. EARLE:

delighted and charmed about it all but now recently Mr. Happy apparently is not quite so happy because he is beginning to blame his failure to be able to do anything in that area on Ottawa but apparently there is something in a White Paper or something that prevents him from going any further. So this sort of tactic, build people up to great expectations and then let them down, pull the rug out from under their feet. Why on earth announcements have to be made, particularly in connection with mines and so on in this Province, to build up peoples hopes, when this is only being done for pure political purposes, I can never understand. It is the most cruel and deceitful outrageous tactic.

The same thing, of course, applies to other segments of the hon. Minister's department, the forestry programme which, of course, is associated with the mills and so on. We heard so much a few years ago about the Third Mill, my hon. colleague, who is not here at the moment, the member for Burin, and I drove out the Trans Canada Highway the other day and, out of curiosity, as we were going along where these three signs said, "Newfoundland Refining Company, Newfoundland Chemical Company" and so on, there is now being erected a super-duper colossal sign. This is great tactics. It is quite close to the highway, it is probably within limits that the Trans Canada does not permit, but still there is a tremendous sign going up there and this, I imagine, will be painted in gaudy colours and it will predict the great things that are about to take place here. This will all be done nicely, just before the election. They might as well write across the bottom of that sign, "And vote Liberal" because this is the purpose of all this build-up.

My colleague and myself went down the road, at that time, to see what was going on down there because we had heard that there was some activity stirring in that area. There were a few fellows on bulldozers, pushing some bog along. There was a barrier across what I believe was a public road and the chap on the gate sort of looked at us rather suspiciously because he probably thought we were some of these spys, the type of spys that the Premier referred to, but he looked at us and thought that we might be spys

MR. EARLE:

and so on, But, regretfully, I suppose, he felt that we did not look to sinister so he let us through. Now we drove down the road and we saw a bit of bog being pushed around and so on, and possibly there are a few men working there at the present time, a long, long way from the thousand or so that we are going to get there but still there are a few men working. So we went on a little way and I had not been down there before but there is a concrete building. This I understand is what there is of our \$2.5 million dollars that was supplied for the Third Paper Mill.

Now this concrete building, I will venture to bet anyone, did not cost \$2.5 million, It certainly does not look like it. It is a shell, I think, and it is probably not finished inside, but it is a concrete building.

This is the Third Paper Mill that we were told so much about a few years ago. Now this is all very fine tactics and very appealing when people are trying to fool other people but what we have to remember is we are now talking about sums of money which the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources is asking for, and in that mill itself or the pretence of a mill there was \$2.5 million of our peoples' money invested four, five or six years ago. The Government has been crying about tight money. They did not have this to do the meagrest little things for our people. There is \$2.5 million sitting out there, which at the present rates of interest which the Government has to pay on money which is borrowed since then and at that time, is probably close to being worth \$4. million. An awful lot could have been done for our people with that \$4. million that is now sitting idly out there, and there does not appear to be any likelihood in the conceivable future that anything else will happen for some time to come.

I think there is enough trouble, as has been evidenced by remarks that have been passed in this session of the House, to get the oil refinery off the ground - well, the same people are involved. So there is certainly no indication that until the oil refinery gets launched, and gets going, and that is a pretty big project, that there is going to be anything at all done about this Third Paper Mill. So here we have now probably what is

MR. EARLE:

worth \$4. million of the peoples' money sitting out there at Come-by-Chance, just eating up its interest and so on, with no value whatever to the Newfoundland people. It maybe a nice looking monument but monuments we can do without.

The subject of clean air and the avoidance of pollution and so on, I think is a very interesting subject today, to most people. There is an awful lot said about it, probably a great deal said by people who know nothing at all about it. It is again built up into a dramatic sort of thing, which interests people, and everybody gets excited about and so on. But if the stories that we hear and if the predictions that we get about the oil drilling rigs which are going on the Grand Banks, and so on are anywhere near the truth, there is every need that we watch these developments with the closest possible scrutiny because we have seen what has happened in other parts of the world, we have read about them and know what terrific danger there is in this, when these huge multimillion dollar rigs get going.

Well now we are told in this House that this is all under control, because the Premier and his party have been asked, they have been invited by the oil barons to go down, off the Gulf of Mexico or somewhere down in New Orleans, and have a look at these things. Well, when I heard the Premier make this announcement it struck me, "Oh, boy here we go again." The way it was built up I am sorry that more people did not hear it because this was; "I have been invited to go by these fellows, these biggest company in this, the biggest company in that, they are going to send their own jet planes, they are going to take us out, we are going to see this, that and the other thing." It is the typical approach that we have had so many years, to industry and development in this Province.

As I said the other day in this House, a group of Cabinet Ministers going down there will have a lovely holiday, they will be entertained, wined and dined and they will not know an oil rig from a post-hole digger by the time they are finished. What this Government should do, if they were serious about this matter, we have people here in this Province who know something about this particular project, we have pollution people at

MR. EARLE:

the University, we have people who are very familiar with the progress of the oil drilling programmes, the Government could quite well stay home and attend to the business which is necessary to do in this House. Send these people who know far more now than the Government will ever know, if they make fifty trips to this particular area, and take their advice, but our Government does not do things that way. Oh no, they have to go off down to the Gulf of Louisiana or somewhere, you will see the Premier coming ashore with a helmet on and the bags and a pair of overalls and oil spattered all over the place. This will be wonderful stuff. He really knows the answers to the thing but, in the meantime, the people who could know and could advise will not be listened to.

These are the sort of tactics, in the approach to new industry, which are such a false and misleading way in which we have approached everything in this Province. So, Mr. Chairman, I have nothing more to say on this particular vote. We have already used up a lot of time but I can only appeal to the Minister, the hon. Minister, that when he gets this vote, which is going to go through tonight because we have no means of stopping it. The most dastardly thing which ever has taken place in the history of Newfoundland took place in this House tonight, and it is all tried to be covered up by nice, polite, little speeches from the other side. This is a tactic which these people are using, your Government is using. Before this closure measure came in, there was almost stony silence on the other side, for the last two or three days. We could not get a beep out them, except the Minister of Education who did give a reasonable explanation of his votes, but we could not get the others on their feet.

But now tonight there is a good audience, the deed has been done and you see the Ministers and the men on the other side rising. This is all done for the purpose of camouflaging what really has been the most dastardly action in the history of this House, the vote of closure which means that debate has been cut off and limited to twenty minutes each, to people on this side. We still have \$60. million or \$70. million dollars to discuss but no, we will not have time to discuss this. This will be

MR. EARLE:

closed at 2 o'clock the coming morning, What has been talked about has been talked about and the rest will pass. As I started to say the Minister will, because of this vote of closure, get this money there is no doubt that this has to go through now. All that we can urge upon him from this side of the House; that he look a little bit into the record of the past, of how the money of this Province has been spent and how so much of it has been wasted and how so much of it is still being wasted. This Province is in a state financially where it cannot afford to squander one dollar and yet the Government will carry on, merrily on its way, as if there is no end to it. Of course the end of tight money has come. It was tight for three years and we borrowed three times as much as we did in all the time since Confederation, but this was tight money. What will it be now? Now that money is loose how much will they borrow, how much will they spend and how much will they squander?

May I urge upon the particular Minister of this Department, who has a grave responsibility for the development of the resources of this Province, that he look at each one of his votes very carefully, if he will not permit the Opposition to do so, and spend it

MR. EARLE: with the utmost care. It is the money of the people of this Province, not his own, not the Government's, but the money of the people of this Province of Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is true. It is perfectly true, I am going down to Louisiana next week. I will be there I think on Wednesday and Thursday and part of Friday, and I will be accompanied by a number of my colleagues in the Cabinet, and a number of Deputy Ministers, and a number of others as well. For example, the dean of engineering, Dean Bruno of the engineering college, the university, is coming, Mr. Oakley, the general manager of our anti-pollution organization. Mr. Oakley is a Newfoundlander from Greenspond. He was, I believe, the superintendant of some 2,000 producing oil wells and gas wells in Western Canada, for Imperial Oil. He is now our general manager, in charge of our board that is organized to prevent pollution or to end it.

We are bringing with us also the Deputy Minister of Mines, Mr. Dover. One of our top ranking officials in fisheries, Mr. Rupert Prince. We are bringing with us also Mr. Etchegary, representing the whole frozen fish trade and industry of our Province. He is going along as well. We are going, I think, about fourteen in all, and we are to be the guests of a number of companies in Louisiana, and I am to be the guest of the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor of Louisiana, and the Mayor of New Orleans. They are sending their planes for us, and we are to be their guests in Louisiana, and they are going to send us back in their planes.

Why have I invited, it is obvious why I would have invited some of my colleagues, but why have I invited Mr. Prince? Mr. Rupert Prince of the Fisheries Development Authority of this Province, one of the greatest fishery experts we have in the Province, indeed, in all of Canada. Why have I invited Mr. Etchegary? And why have they so gladly accepted the invitation? Because, because of two things. One, Louisiana is a coastal state bordering on the ocean, and it has a big fishery, a big fishery, one of the biggest fisheries in North America. They have another thing, which we are getting to think in Newfoundland just does not fit into a fishery, namely a great off-shore oil industry.

How do fish and oil drilling rigs, and oil producing rigs mix? How do they mix together out on the ocean? We are having one oil rig being towed now to be moored off the shore of Newfoundland, one hundred and twenty miles from Cape Race. One, one rig, cost fourteen or fifteen million dollars to build, and to tow it out slowly and moor it, anchor it, and then start drilling for oil and gas. One, one rig. Off the coast of Nova Scotia at the moment there are I think three, three rigs operating, drilling. Off the coast of Louisiana there are four thousand rigs, about half or more than half of them drilling to try to find oil and gas, and rather fewer than few of them having found oil or gas are now producing wells. Four thousand.

When you look out, at night, and see those four thousand platforms out to sea, lit up, it is like a city lying off the coast of Louisiana. There you have that enormous oil drilling and oil producing activity going on twenty-four hours a day, never stopping. There in the same water precisely you have one of the world's biggest fisheries going on night and day. Together, side by side, simultaneously. Does that interest us in Newfoundland? Does that interest us? Should we ignore that? What would be said of me if I had said, "I do not think so, no thank you very much, no I will not accept your invitation, no I will not go down there." What would I deserve as the Leader of this Province? What would I deserve? I would deserve to be kicked out. So I did accept, and gladly accepted the invitation, and I am going. I am not going alone, there will be thirteen others with me from Newfoundland, going down there. Now what are we going to do when we get there? We are going to do two things. Number one, we are going to find out about oil rigs, platforms, operating off the land in the salt water. Number two, we are going to find out, in connection with those oil rigs, four thousand of them, we are going to find out what exactly do they do to prevent pollution.

On the "Crosbie" the other day last week, there were two men, two scientists on board....

AN HON. MEMBER: The boat?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The boat "Crosbie" yes. There were two scientists on board from AMICO, This is the company that is now towing the oil rig, to go 120

miles off shore. These two men were there doing scientific research, hourly, every daylight hour of the day, from dawn in the morning until dark, testing ice and experimenting on ice, because they are going to have to deal with ice. What happens if a great iceberg comes along? Is it possible to throw a cable around an iceberg and tow her 100 feet one side, so that she will not run into the oil rig? What is the weight of an iceberg? How porous is the ice? What is the character of the ice as it comes farther south? They are making this research.

I talked to them by the hour after dark at night, and I said, "You put a drill down, it goes down, fifteen, eighteen hundred, three thousand feet from the ocean floor down, and you find oil, and the oil comes up through the pressure, the pressure drives it up, when you puncture the earth, the oil squirts up and you cap it, you put it in a pipe, and the pipe comes up through the water, to the surface, whatever is the depth of that water, 100 fathoms, 50 fathoms, or what ever it is." I said, "Suppose now an iceberg does come along and sheers off that pipe above the land, down at the bottom of the ocean, are you not going to have millions of gallons of oil gushing up into the ocean and polluting the oceans and ruining our fishery?" He said "No." "Why not?" He said, "Twenty or thirty feet below the land there are valves and pipes which are automatic, and if it is sheered off, automatically they close." We are going down to see how four thousand oil rigs can operate without polluting the ocean. We are going to find out. We are going down to find out what has happened to the fishery down there. I am told by people from Louisiana that there is more fish now than there were. That the presence of the rigs seem to have increased the number of fish, seems to have increased the number of fish, and the production of fish.

I have heard it said that when a ship sinks, if it is in waters where there are fish, any, that when a ship sinks that that ship becomes a sort of clustering spot for the breeding of fish.....

Mr. Smallwood;

I am told that the same thing applies to the oil rigs. But somehow the oil rigs which go down to the bottom, the oil rigs attract fish for breeding and there has been a great increase in the yield, in the growth of fish in Louisiana. Now, I do not know, but I will know. When I come back to this House, after Holy Week, I will know. There will be other ministers here who will know, because we are going to deal with the heads of the fishing industry of Louisiana. We are going to meet with them. We are going to meet with the heads of the anti-pollution people of Louisiana of the Government of that great state. We are going to meet with the head of the Conservation Organization of Louisiana. We are going to meet them. We will bring back an enormous amount of information and it will not cost the people or the Government of this Province one nickel. Now should we have gone or not? I will leave it to the committee to decide.

Now it is true. I will only want to deal with one other point and that is the third mill. or would you call it the fourth mill? The third mill, I prefer to call it. I call Stephenville the fourth. The third mill - it is true. It is undeniable that there has been considerable delay in getting it going, as there was considerable delay to get the oil refinery going. There were people who were willing to swear by Heaven and Earth that it never would get going. A good many of those who so swore hoped desperately that their prophecy would come true, that it would never get going.

In 1909 an effort was started to get a big paper mill built in Corner Brook. In 1909 In 1913, four years later, this House passed the Newfoundland Products Act, giving the concessions for the starting of a great paper mill and other things in Corner Brook. In 1923 the mill was begun to be built. In 1909, 1913, 1923 - it took a long

Mr. Smallwood.

time to get that paper mill in Corner Brook - a good many years. Fourteen years it took. It is taking about the same amount of time to get the paper mill in Come-by-Chance. The hon. gentleman from Fortune Bay says he was there the other day and he saw a concrete building. He should get glasses. He should get new glasses. He should get his glasses attended to. I do not see how it was possible for him to see that big concrete building and not see the other one that lies immediately beside. It is not one concrete building. It is two that are there as part of the paper mill.

This mill has been delayed for the last three, four years by the fact that the promoters of it, the Shaheen Organization, in New York, have devoted their time exclusively to getting the oil refinery going. God knows that never in Canada's history, never was any industry started against such obstacles, such vile and villainous opposition, such traitorous and treacherous opposition as there was to that great oil refinery project. The efforts, the time and the energies of the Shaheen Organization for four years have been devoted exclusively, until very recently, to getting the oil refinery going. Because they had to make contracts. They were making contracts month after month slowly, painfully building up their contracts with the consumers. It was no use producing 100,000 barrels of oil a day, 100,000 barrels, 365 days a year, if you have not got customers to buy it. That is what they set out to do. Everyone they went to would look at them in astonishment and say, "you are not talking about that notorious oil refinery that has been knocked and condemned up there in Canada are you?" "Yes, that is the one I am talking about."

Now the oil refinery is off the ground, and do not sneer at the handful of 100 or 120 men working there today. Do not sneer at that. You will

Mr. Smallwood.

not sneer a month from now, still less two months from now and far less three months from, and four months from now you will be ashamed you sneered today.

Now that the oil refinery is off the ground, the Shaheen Organization, with a tenacity that defies defeat, with a tenacity that invokes every instinct of my imagination, are endeavouring to bring to final fruition the great new paper mill in Come-by-Chance. Now their present planning and efforts are directed to a paper mill in Come-by-Chance, making 600 tons of newsprint paper a day - 600 tons a day of news, newsprint paper. The kind of paper the "Evening Telegram," the "Daily News" are printed on - newsprint paper. Also, 600 tons a day, also in addition to the 600 tons of paper a day, another 600 tons a day of fully bleached - fully bleached, not semi, because there is a semi-bleach but this is fully bleached sulfate pulp - not sulfite. Sulfate, which is in substantial demand in the world and it commands a good price and without which, I am told by the Shaheen people, without which it might be considered to be hazardous today to build a paper mill alone, without the fully-bleached sulfate pulp mill as part of the same enterprise. This will amount to 1,200 tons a day production, which is almost exactly the same as the production of the great mill in Corner Brook, except that the division would not be the same. In Come-by-Chance, it would be 600 and 600 - 1,200 divided in half. In Corner Brook it is more, I think, the case of 1,000 tons a day of paper and a couple of hundred tons a day of pulp. I do not think it is fully-bleached sulfate pulp. Is it all paper now? They are not making any pulp. So, it is all paper - 1,200 tons a day. Whereas, in Come-by-Chance, they will start off with 600 tons a day of paper and another 600 tons a day of fully-bleached sulfate pulp.

That will require each year 500,000 cords of pulp wood, half a million cords. In the mill and in the bush and on the roads, trucking, there will be approximately 3,000 jobs, if as and when that enterprise gets off the ground.

Mr. Smallwood.

Now, I hope there is no one in Newfoundland, I hope there is not a living soul, unless it be a couple of thoroughly narrow-visioned and selfish people who have some kind of a special stake of their own, I hope, except possibly for that, I hope there is no one in Newfoundland hoping, wishing that this will not come to pass. If it does not, it will be bad for the Liberal Government. It will be bad for the Liberal Party. It will be bad, if it does not come to pass. I hope that not for that reason nor for any reason will there be found anyone in our Island home or Labrador who would hope for the failure and the defeat of our effort to get this great enterprise going. There were those who openly, gleefully did their damdest, the most damnable, to kill the oil refinery, and they failed. Thanks be to God, they failed!

Now I hope that there is no one so miserable, so unpatriotic, as to hope for the failure of this great paper mill, because if it comes, it is 3,000 Newfoundlanders getting jobs. We need those jobs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to remind the hon. the Premier that the time is up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Time is up. Well the two things I stood up to say, actually, I have now said, and I hope that this vote will pass.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman,

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, you will notice no doubt that it seems when someone on this side of the House has an opportunity just to say something at all, that we have some indication of the arrogance that we are often accused of over here, often times, when the very same people who have made such accusations towards us.

I have listened very attentively to what has been said in relation to some facts, as stated by my hon. colleague, the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources. Particularly in reference to the possibility of the discovery of oil off shore of this Province. As a politician, as a Newfoundlander, and as an elected member of this House, I cannot possibly conceive why we can hear statements in this House that would suggest that there is some subversive, something rotten, something despicable about any group such as those that the hon. the Premier outlined, going to a place called Louisiana and for the purposes which he mentioned.

Is there anyone in this House at all, who will not admit that for God's sake, we deserve one break in this Province? And I mean one good break.

MR. CROSBIE: Do not come back! Do not come back!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: A break at least for the defeated ones, the eternal losers. The only hope he has is that I will die. For spite, I will not. I will hang her on for those four years.

MR. NOLAN: Is it not amazing, Mr. Chairman, that a man who has aspired to take over the Leadership of this Province, who wanted to be the Leader of the Liberal Party and tried to convince everyone in this Province that he was the only one to do it, can now - it is relative, as the hon. member with the whiskers was getting at earlier.

MR. CROSBIE: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Cannot take it.

MR. CROSBIE: Is this relevant to the estimates of Mines, Agriculture and Resources? If we want to move on to some other item, I do not mind debating

MR. CROSBIE: this question with the hon. gentleman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well now we are right back to the same old thing we have been on all night. It is something like Harry Truman said, "if you cannot stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen." The hon. members invite replies and then when they receive them they - would you carry on please?

MR. NOLAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: I will have to write the reply to any personal abuse, I presume.

MR. NOLAN: Surely the hon. member opposite must be an authority on personal abuse.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NOLAN: As my hon. friend suggested, no one has broken as many rules in this House as he.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Would the hon. minister please continue with his speech on the item that we have here.

MR. NOLAN: Now that we have covered one source of pollution, let me go on.

The refinery, if I may just mention it for a moment, are required, under the Law, under the Clean Air, Water and Soil Act, to submit plans for anti-pollution. We are arranging, setting up the meeting on all this, and all other industries are under the same requirement.

I rose at this time only, Mr. Chairman, because I know of the many, many efforts that my hon. colleague made in this regard, and to hear remarks such as I heard here tonight are certainly not fair to him, and certainly not fair to the people who have worked diligently and hard and for long hours in preparing the many, many studies that are necessary on this matter. For anyone to suggest that we are so madly anxious for oil that we are willing to jeopardize the fisheries of this Province, with such a history and with so many people depending on it for a livelihood, that is something hard to credit coming from an elected member of the House of Assembly.

To hear another member suggest, as the hon. member for Burin did, that perhaps the wharf will not be built. Normally I can understand it from someone who perhaps has not served in the Cabinet. But, when I

MR. NOLAN: hear it coming from people who have been there, who know the obstacles, who know the problems, on both the Federal and Provincial and the commercial levels, and who can get up and speak out of both sides of their mouths; it is a little difficult to digest.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that we will hit oil off the shores of this Province and off Labrador. I believe that during the time, hopefully, unless I drop dead too, that I may be involved as Minister of Economic Development and, as long as we have my colleague, the hon. the Premier, that in the next few years it will be, and I say it with all due respect to the hon. the Premier and the achievements that he has known in economic development in the twenty years that he has been involved, I still maintain that, when we hit the oil, as we will, the Newfoundland people -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NOLAN: The Newfoundland people, I think, this is obvious, when we hit the oil and when the spin-offs that we have already discussed in some instances come about, and I wish I could go into some detail on the meetings that we have had daily, for months and months, with any number of groups, in various parts of the world, who have visited here in this Province, and are here in this Province at this very moment and are meeting tonight. I know beyond a shadow of a doubt in my mind and I do not think I am being overly optimistic, although I have no doubt that I will be accused like anyone else who has ever tried to do anything in this Province, of being a bluff, I suppose. But, the fact is that the next few years, I think, will be the most revolutionary in economic development in all fields this Province has ever seen. And I know that while my hon. friend opposite, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, may ask questions from time to time, I am convinced in my own mind, knowing him as well as I do, that he wishes and fervently believes and hopes that this will come about, just as much as I do.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NOLAN: I have not made hardy annuals.

MR. MURPHY: No the minister is only started, he only got a big job this year. Go back to '49.

MR. NOLAN: I can go back to 1949, if you would like to go back. Mr. Chairman. I can go back to 1949. Yes, I will tell you a story, with the permission of the Chairman.

Nineteen hundred and forty-nine, prior to, I lived in the west end of St. John's. I was born in 1930. I knew something of what went on. You hear oftentimes in this House what went on in the outports of Newfoundland. My people came from the outports. When I hear the Premier talk, for example, as he often does, and which has sometimes called for some merriment in certain quarters, and I do not make this as a derogatory remark at the hon. Leader of the Opposition, of how many toilets that the Liberal Government have installed. I cannot find it very, very funny at all, because I know what it was like, as my hon. friend opposite probably remembers. In my case, for example, when we walked from way in on the Southside Road every morning, through all kinds of weather, no cars, no school buses, and the radio was turned on by your father or family to listen to the news.

MR. CROSBIE: If you had a radio.

MR. NOLAN: If you had a radio, we did because we had a battery that he brought somewhere. When the news was over you turned it off. When you went up on the Southside Hill, as I did, and chopped wood and dragged it down. So I find it a little difficult, frankly, to hear some people suggest that, because I am relatively a young man that, perhaps, I do not know what it is all about.

MR. NEARY: Born of the masses, but not the classes.

MR. NOLAN: So, I do sincerely hope that while we will always have a good, honest, frank and constructive discussion on industry, whether it is oil on the coast, whether it is the Oil Refinery, whether it is the building of the wharf, whether it is the spin-offs that I referred to that may result and will result in the discovery of oil. That we must all keep

MR. NOLAN: in mind that what we are looking for is the improvement and the social welfare of all of the people in this Province. In the discovery of oil, and as a result of the benefits that are going to come our way, that we will have the opportunity to use it in such a way, so it will benefit not just us here now, but certainly for our children and our children's children. And, therefore, I have much pleasure in supporting the passing of the necessary funds, as submitted by my hon. colleague.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I listened with much attention to the hon. minister who just spoke before me, and he talks about back in the dirty thirties, so on and so forth. We have heard that many times in this House, and there are very few of us who cannot go back to the days when things were not as we wished them to be. But, I was referring to the era since 1949, when the year was filled with great announcements, every day, every week, every month, a great industry here, a great industry there, a great industry somewhere else. And what kind of a Newfoundlander would I be, or any other member of this House or any person in this Province, who did not want an industry.

But the point, I think, we are making on this side, is the purpose and the timing of these great announcements. The hon. minister, I think, was quite sincere in his few words, as we are. But, when you go back, we talk about mills and everything else. This is 1968, the Speech from the Throne; "the people of Newfoundland in general will be happy to hear from me on this occasion that a turnkey contract entailing more than \$60 million has been signed with Litter Industries Incorporated covering the design and construction of the Third Mill to be built at Come-by-Chance for Newfoundland Pulp and Chemical Company." The contract was signed in 1968.

We have heard the Premier tell us again his favourite tale about the IPP or the Old Newfoundland Pulp Company in Corner Brook. We have heard that many times. We have heard about the great Machine Plant that was to be built at Octagon Pond. "Well we will have to import labour to staff that great Machine Plant." Contracts were pouring in, two jobs for every man. I think

the type of stuff Mr. Chairman that we discuss and criticize on this side of the House, great announcements. People filled up with great expectations. I am sure there must be many people in the area of Trinity South who have been waiting four, five, six, seven years for a job in this great development at Come by Chance. You know whether we back some of these things. We can all be enthusiastic. But enthusiasm sometimes might lead to dreaming or castles in the air or blowing bubbles in the air. I referred to this in '69, the discovery of a large deposit of salt in the western part of the Island. Then our hon. Minister of Natural Resources went on a silica kick for a few years. We had people with sawmills were crying for a few miles of access roads, to help them get in there, saw lumber, I think the figure is something like ninety odd per cent of our lumber is being imported from Nova Scotia. We brag about the great forest deposits we have, the great forest growth, the great forests we have, for a few miles of access roads, that have not come into that office looking for it, to Government with petitions to build a few access roads, with machines to get in there, bulldozer or a tractor a man can employ ten or fifteen or twenty men. I told them the great mistake they made. They only looked for eight or ten thousand dollars, why did they not look for \$50 million. This is the kind of industry we want. This great Mr. Shaheen, tremendous man who fought all resistance for this thing, we saw Mr. Shaheen in action here a few short months ago. All he did was plead the fifth amendment. Here is the type of man we are dealing with, ask a question, "Act 93," or whatever it was, "I am doing my part." At that time the great announcement was made about this wharf at Come by Chance. We are not against the wharf. God Help Us, we should be shot on sight if we do not want Come by Chance developed.

These great announcements that the Federal Government was building this wharf. Sixteen million. We went through, we boarded this big 500,000 ton ship. The captain was there and he sailed us right out through the gap how he was going to get past us, wonderful stuff, fairy tales. For Heaven's Sake, let

us get something, let us get an industry. Just one. These great men these are the great developers that we talk about. For Heaven's Sake for once, for once let us get an industry, keep it under wraps, pull the screen and say look we have an industry. But do not let us hear about it every morning on the radio or every day on television, every minute of the day.

Another great industry, another 10,000 men; take the big announcement last year fifteen to eighteen thousand new jobs in 1970. Perhaps that is what we are going to Louisiana for to look after the jobs down there. They are certainly not here in this Province, in Newfoundland. Do not ask me, ask the hundreds of unemployed that are coming to all of us members looking for jobs. A report of this great liberalism in action we hear. This great doing away with school fees. Doing away with this. The Minister stands up this evening, he tells us ten thousand here and ten thousand for this and ten thousand for something else. We hear about these great paper mills. These great mines. This is what is wrong, Mr. Chairman. That is why we object, ^{To} granting this dreaming Government this fabulous amount of money for Supply.

Mr. Chairman, if you criticize this Government on anything you are unpatriotic, you want to destroy it, everybody hates the Premier, they want him to die and somebody else says I may die suddenly, sure we may all die suddenly. This is life. We will die sometime. That is a fact of life. But we have them on that side over there - the great - oh my, all the brains - concentrated in this little small area - amazing - amazing - it is a good thing the hon. minister spends his time in White Bay North. They can have you.

We talk about these great marketing boards, Mr. Chairman, the Egg Marketing Board. The product of this great Government. You are not allowed to buy eggs any more for forty-five cents a dozen, you must pay sixty or sixty-two. This is for the toiling masses. Nothing cheap. Nothing but the best. The highest

price. Now we are going to have the broiler market.

Land Clearing \$40,000. Boglands Development, travelling expenses \$15,000, the health of animals. I do not know how many veterinarians we have now in the Province, four, That is excellent because there is quite a shortage of them. Blueberry Development, I think that is a wonderful effort, the blueberries because I think in the Trinity South and Harbour-Grace - Conception Bay area there is quite a farm over there. These are things that we want to see developed, Mr. Chairman. We are right behind this department. Right behind it. We are willing to give them a month's supply, as well as every other department. We are very generous. We figure one month's supply is adequate and then, if the Minister can come back and prove he did not squander that month's supply, we will consider giving him another vote, I think that is fair enough.

But let us no more hear this talk about without a toilet, with a toilet, the number of two seaters, or the number of four-seaters and all the rest of it. It is just a lot of bull. A lot of bull that is all. These great tear-jerky speeches.

You know we hear something, this great development in Labrador, and I hope it comes through, this further development in Labrador West. I do not think there is a welfare case, no one out of work in Labrador. Mining there, marvellous. Churchill Falls, wonderful. A great imperial concept, same as closure tonight. another great imperial concept. Swine stations. Marketing \$150,000. Nothing, a very small vote here. But still too much, three months is too long, I think. Agriculture \$40,000. Supply for eight or ten weeks, the Minister could not make up his mind just how long it was going to last him.

MR. CALLAHAN: It depends on how many people are down looking for grants.

MR. MURPHY: That is something. Only \$1,680,000 Mr. Chairman, last year's total grant Mines & Agriculture & Resources, was \$4,773,000. \$450,000 capital. we want this department to continue operating next month, the month of April, we would hate to see the surveyors and these people without their money. So,

March 30 1971 . Tape 126 page 4.

I will move that this grant be \$477,310. The vote be reduced to \$477,310.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that Item 8, Mines, Agriculture & Resources be reduced to the sum of \$477,310 . Those in favour please say aye.

MR. CALLAHAN: The question Mr. Chairman, if I could have a few words.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! There is no right to reply.

MR. CALLAHAN: Hear me, Mr. Chairman. Hear me to the amendment. To the amendment.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry? Those in favour please say, "Aye," contrary, "Nay," carried.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, to the point of order. Can we take a look at this? Surely it is permitted to speak to the amendment.

MR. CROSBIE: No, no, closure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is defeated. Shall the Item carry? Those in favour please say "Aye"

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak to this motion. We are damned if we do and we are damned if we do not. All day yesterday we had accusation hurled across here from the other side accusing us of failing to give any information, wondering why we were keeping so mum over here. Today we start out and now we are accused of monopolizing the time and, of course, we are also under the charge of trying to delay the whole discussion so that the Opposition will not have a chance to express their views.

Now there are two things that need to be said on this, Mr. Chairman, first of all this debate on Interim Supply is already the longest in the history of this House, it is the longest and ninety per-cent of all the talking that has been done in this debate has been done on the other side of the House, including tonight, the greater part of what has been said tonight, of the time spent in debate tonight, has been taken up by the other side here. Now that we are expressing our view, now we are hurling some of these things back at them, they do not like it, they find it a little hard to swallow, some of the things we have had to throw back in their faces this afternoon and tonight.

There are two or three things I want to say about this particular item, Mr. Chairman, because it concerns, among other things it concerns me, of course, as a Newfoundlander but it concerns me particularly as a representative for the district of Grand Falls, which geographically happens to be the largest district on the Island of Newfoundland, Most people do not realize that, and which population-wise is one of the two or three largest

MR. ROWE:

in the Province. This district of Grand Falls includes the first Paper Mill, the first great industry ever established in this Province in what was then the colony or the Dominion of Newfoundland. I would like to remind the Committee here and in particular to remind the hon. gentleman, who just spoke on the other side, and who seems to think that any time you make an announcement, the next day you have to find a factory in operation or a paper mill or a wharf built, I would remind him that thanks in part to the Opposition, the Tory Opposition of that day, from the time that the Grand Falls Mill, that great mill, that great idea, revolutionary idea in those days, because nobody thought that Newfoundland was fit for anything else except to jig or catch a few cod fish, from the time that that first concept was mooted until Grand Falls Mill became a reality, required seven full years, seven full years from 1902 to the time, 1909, when the plant went into production.

There is another reason too that I have a special interest in what has been said here tonight. As it happens the oldest, I think the oldest operating mine on the Island of Newfoundland and certainly the largest operating mine on the Island of Newfoundland is in my district and, of course, I refer to the mine at Buchans. A mine which incidentally has, ever since it came into being has had an eight to ten year life expectancy ahead of it, that is forty-one years ago and the life expectancy is still eight to ten years, the guaranteed life expectancy. One thing I am quite sure is that that mine will be in operation when most of us here in this Chamber tonight have gone to our final reward, whatever that is to be.

I have another reason, a very particular reason for being interested in what has been said here tonight. The largest river in Newfoundland happens to meander for most of its journey through the district of Grand Falls, it starts in the district of Grand Falls and all but the last ten miles are in that district, the last ten miles are in what is now the district of Gander. It happens to be a town which, I have a very special reason for referring to it here tonight, it happens to be a river on which there are several of the largest towns in the Province and I am thinking

MR. ROWE:

particularly of the towns of Grand Falls and Windsor, 16,000 people and also the growing town of Badger and, of course, below Grand Falls there is the town of Bishops Falls with 5,000 people and at the mouth of that great river, and it is a great river, at the mouth of that river there are several other towns including the town of Botwood, there are probably 8,000 people living at the mouth of the river as well.

So the condition, the life and the welfare of that river are all matters of vital concern to us and if that river became completely polluted, as it could in the natural course of events if nothing had been done, if that river did become completely polluted, it would be a disaster of the first magnitude for perhaps thirty-five to forty thousand Newfoundlanders. That is not going to happen, Mr. Chairman, that is not going to happen. Largely I want to say and I want to go on record now tonight, largely as a result of the efforts of my colleague, the hon. Minister who has introduced these estimates here tonight, largely as a result of his efforts and his interest and I know all about what the Federal Government is doing and I know what the industry is doing as well and I know what to say now, that it is a matter of very great satisfaction and gratification to me to know that we are on the verge of having the first agreement of its kind about to be consummated, an agreement which will control and eventually clean up that great river, the Exploits River.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who just sat down said, "We do not want to hear these great announcements. Why can we not wait? Why do you not do something about them? These announcements, all they do is raise peoples expectations and then they are left with nothing." That is right. As he spoke I started to jot down some of these announcements and you know, I could not help reminding myself and I am going to remind him now that there were announcements about a development in Labrador West. I very well remember when those announcements were made, The first of those announcements were made I think it was on New Year's Day, and we got the usual outcry. "Propaganda, Liberal promises, nothing to it, some more of Smallwood's bologna", but the 17,000 people who are tonight in the twin towns

MR. EARLE:

of Labrador City and Wabush, enjoying one of the highest standards of living in all Canada, they do not regard and are not worried about Smallwood's bologna twenty years ago, the announcement that left everybody, of course, with nothing to go on.

I remember very well the announcement that the Premier made on behalf of the Government and I was vitally concerned with it because I then occupied the post which my hon. friend now occupies, who was introducing these estimates and I was Minister of Mines at the time and I remember the fight we had in this House, this very House, to get the Legislation through here. We were giving away the Province, we were giving it away to people who were coming in here from Canada, fellows like Jim Boylen, adventurers, speculators coming here and taking advantage of the greenness of the Newfoundland people and, of course, of the stupidity of the Newfoundland Government, giving it away that Baie Verte Peninsula, while out of that Baie Verte Peninsula and out of those agreements and from the announcements that were made we have today the lovely and growing town of Baie Verte. We have 10,000 people on the Baie Verte Peninsula, tonight getting a good livelihood out of the mines at Baie Verte and the two just outside Baie Verte, at Rambler, brought into being by this Government.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): That happens to be more than two, if my hon. friend is going to count, he may as well count right. I talked about the two mines in Labrador West, not one, the two mines, Labrador City mines, Iron Ore Company of Canada, and the mine at Wabush, the Wabush mining Company. I have talked about three at Baie Verte or in the Baie Verte area. The great asbestos mine where there are tonight 500 Newfoundlanders working. Tonight, five hundred of them. The two mines at Rambler, that is five mines I have talked about, and I am going to refer to whalesback in Green Bay.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE: Whalesback mine, why is it there? It is there because this Government brought BRINCO into being. That is why it is there, no other reason. It would not be there tonight but for BRINCO, and BRINCO would not be here tonight

AN HON. MEMBER: Bunco

MR. ROWE: If the Tory Opposition of that day had had their way, we would have no BRINCO, and we would have no Whalesback, and we would have no Churchill Falls development, another announcement by the way that tired out our friends on the other side. The announcements about Churchill Falls. I can go on in my own district as it happens there is a mine tonight, today, where there are 230 men, most of them my constituents, 230 Newfoundlanders making a good decent living, at Gull Bridge Mine. A mine brought into being by this Government, a mine announced by this Government and of course castigated and described as liberal propaganda and liberal baloney.

I am talking about the mines, I am talking about the mines, all of these mines were announced, all of these mines came into being as a direct result of the policy of this Government, this administration in the last twenty years, and without that policy those mines today would not be in being. I know, and I was present when the Premier of Newfoundland invited Boylen to come down here, and I was also here, I was the one who introduced it in the House here, the legislation which gave Boylen the exploration rights there, against the Tory Opposition of that day.

MR. MURPHY: (First part inaudible) blueberry bushes over there.

MR. ROWE: So we could go on. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that we have in Newfoundland tonight - and we talk about ERCO, everything I have ever heard from the Tories over there about ERCO has been something derogatory, something that - something of a condemnatory nature, comes down on it all. I have never heard yet, one recognition of the fact that that industry is providing a good livelihood for 500 Newfoundlanders, directly and indirectly, this very day. I have never heard that referred to on the other side of the House.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE: No, no. I have heard talk about the subsidy for power, and I have heard talk about the pollution, but nothing else. I wish that when some of my hon. - some people talk about the pollution over there, and some talk about the - what they consider the detrimental effects of the ERCO plant, I wish they could keep the satisfaction out of their voices.

We do have industries in Newfoundland today. There are industries over on the west coast, for example, that are giving employment, good employment to Newfoundlanders, hundreds of them. There are industries on this side as well, on this coast as well, that have come into being as a result of this Government's policy. Yet, all we hear, from the other side, is this accusation of promises, announcements, great announcements. Sure, well there have been some great announcements, and some of the announcements, and many of them, have become reality. They are with us today and if it had not been for these announcements, these announcements from Bond and from Squires, and from Smallwood, and from the liberal administrations of the last seventy years, if it had not been for these announcements, and for the fight that went with them, Newfoundland today would be made up of probably fifty or sixty people living in poverty and jigging codfish. That was the Newfoundland that we had, and that is the Newfoundland they have to take responsibility for. You know all the shaking of my hon. friend's head over there, and all the tutting and all the come ons, cannot in any way eradicate this simple fact of history. That all of these things were brought into being as a result of liberal policy and

and all of them were opposed by the Tories in this legislature, all of them, just as every single measure that we have brought in here, designed to bring about, not designed to make me rich, not designed, as far as I know, to enrich anybody in this House, but designed to develop Newfoundland and provide jobs for Newfoundlanders. That is the basic thing.

We are on the periphery, we are the bathos of Canada. We have to face that fact, geographically and in other ways as well. If we do not make those super-human efforts to get industrial development going, we may as well move out. I say now, I had to face up to this problem, and other hon. members had to face up to this question. "Do you stay in Newfoundland or not?" When I decided to come back here and not go to California, or not go to British Columbia, or not go to Ontario, when I made that decision I made it with the expectation that Newfoundland could be something more than a fishing outpost on the outskirts of Canada.

If I did not believe that tonight, and if I did not believe that our policies are the right policies, I would urge my sons to get out of Newfoundland and take my grandchildren with them and stay out. They have not done that and I am happy that they have not. I support this

MR. MURPHY: Would the hon. minister permit just one question before he sits down, Mr. Chairman? Is the hon. minister implying that with the hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars that have poured into this Province we would be starving to death as we were in the thirties? Does the hon. minister expect the people of this Province to believe that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. If we had not gotten confederation, yes.

MR. ROWE: The Premier has answered the question.

MR. MURPHY: If we had gone into confederation properly, properly like every other thing the Liberal Government did.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I will answer that question this way, if we did not have confederation half of the members here tonight would not be in this House and would not be living in Newfoundland.

MR. MURPHY: I am talking about the millions and millions of dollars that have been poured in here through confederation. If that had been spent wisely

and sensibly by a sane Government, do you not think that we would be far better off?

MR. ROWE: The proof of the pudding is in the eating, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MURPHY: That is right and we are eating it now.

MR. ROWE: The proof of the pudding is this, that we tonight in Newfoundland are enjoying a standard of living, and we have more people, even in this month of March, in this winter when unemployment across Canada was the highest for probably one of the highest since the great depression. The unemployment in the United States, we do not hear too much about that, but it is also the highest since the great depression, not one of the highest but the highest. Unemployment in England is also reaching the highest point since the great depression, but we in Newfoundland here tonight, in spite of our unemployment problem, which did not start ten years ago or last year or twenty years ago. One hundred and five years ago, one hundred and five years ago, this month, two-thirds of all the people in Newfoundland were living on indian meal and molasses, supplied by the Government of Newfoundland. The proof of the pudding is that we in Newfoundland tonight have an infinitely higher standard of living and our prospects are infinitely greater than any of us would have dreamed possible twenty years ago.

MR. MURPHY: Africa is doing all right too.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I had not meant to speak in this portion of the debate, but it looks like it is going to be impossible to get in anywhere else but in Mines, Agriculture and Resources. I have to observe to Your Honour, after hearing the proceedings of the night, that I have seen nothing, nothing yet to equal the superciliousness and the facetiousness that has come from the other side, and serves to show tonight as a good reason of why the general public from time to time holds the politician in very, very little respect.

I have never heard the like before. The Government has not been just satisfied to impose this closure, but they also want to prevent the Opposition from talking intelligently about the topics, in the few hours that remain. Having heard particularly Mr. Chairman,

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. Minister of Education whom I am surprised at, I wonder now whether the Premier will perhaps push him down farther than his ranking as successor, from the hon. No. 5 to perhaps the hon. No. 15.

Mr. Chairman, the issue at stake here and we have heard all of the members on the Government side and on this side, but particularly on the Government side tonight, since this closure has been brought in, they have attempted and successfully so to block debate, and very important matters that are yet to come before this House on Interim Supply and will not come. Such as Economic Development, Health, Community and Social Development, etc.

Now to bring this back in, to attempt to bring this back in to some form of perspective, the Motion before the Chair, by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition right now, is to reduce -

MR. ROBERTS: The Motion was defeated.

MR. MARSHALL: The Motion was defeated.

MR. ROBERTS: We were not allowed to debate it. The amendment was defeated.

MR. MARSHALL: The amendment was defeated. The point of the matter, I believe, the hon. the Premier has already spoken. The point of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that much more is being asked for in Interim Supply than should have been asked for, the Government should have not asked for approximately one-quarter of its total expenditure. There are bringing in a mini-budget for the year, and are pushing it through with closure, without the opportunity for it to be intelligently discussed. I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I am myself rather discusted at the exhibition that has come from the Government today.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, like the hon. gentleman - Mr. Chairman, I know intimately more about my estimates than the hon. gentleman ever did or will.

MR. MURPHY: Let us see! Let us see!

MR. ROBERTS: I will be delighted to, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the hon. gentleman opposite has exposed himself to the House, to the Committee, for an innumerable, interminable and largely a relative number of hours, I think, he might at least hear some of us trying to say one or two things, We is getting as bad

MR. ROBERTS: as his new-found brother. He is getting as bad as his new-found brother and political bedfellow, the hon. gentleman who just spoke. Every time they speak it is Holy Writ, it is sacred. We should sit back and indeed give praise and give thanks that we are allowed to hear it. That is fine. I am prepared to do that, Mr. Chairman, but every time we speak we are stalling, delaying, arrogant, all the words that, and if they run short of words, I can lend them my thesaurus. The hon. gentleman from St. John's East will be able to read it, and the hon. gentleman from Fortune Bay will be able to read it. Those in between would need some help, but I am sure they will get help.

I had not intended to say anything on this subhead or head, Mr. Chairman, until the hon. gentleman for St. John's West, in launching another of his mini-budget speeches on what he describes, as a mini-budget, referred to the Report of the Royal Commission on Forestry. The Royal Commission headed by Dr. Rousseau, the Royal Commission which was tabled in the House two or three days ago, by my colleague whose estimates are now before the Committee.

Now, Sir, I hope we will have the opportunity later to debate this. Indeed, I would not have mentioned it tonight, except that the hon. gentleman, with his typical blunderbuss approach, laughing wildly out, and trying to promise, I suppose that is his job. Certainly it is his pleasure. He refers to it. He refers to it in very unkind terms, I am not going to get into sling mud back and forth with him. I do not believe in getting into arguments like that, with gentlemen like the hon. gentleman. I mean, why go up against an expert and a master?

Mr. Chairman, this report which I submit, is the opinion of three gentlemen very knowledgeable in the field of forestry and an opinion which they submitted after quite long study, (indeed, I think some of us felt that they took a very long time, an almost unconscionably long time to get in their report) this document is their opinion. I agree it has not got masses of appendices, but really nobody, except the hon. gentleman for St. John's West, ever has time to read the appendices. I will give him credit he does read them, and he

MR. ROBERTS: annotates them in the crab-like writing with which he is afflicted. I may add, with which he afflicts his successors in ministerial portfolios, who have to try and read the files.

This is their opinion, Mr. Chairman, it is their advise, it is their suggestion, it is their recommendation. The key recommendation in it, one in respect of which I understand my colleague is asking for some money in the vote before the Committee now, is for the creation of what is called, at least for the time being, the Commercial Forest Corporation. Now this is a change, the Commission's Interim Report, to which reference has been made, said that the Government should acquire all forest lands in this Province. We now own about one-third of them, and those, Sir, are subject to options, to the people who are going to build the Third Mill at Come-by-Chance, and who are building the Fourth Mill at Stephenville.

The other two-thirds of the lands on this Island, roughly speaking, are held about equally in one form of tenure, and other by the Bowater's people at Corner Brook and by the Price people, the old Anglo Newfoundland Company at Grand Falls. The A.N.D. lots, of course, are mainly freehold, in 1904, that is the way things were done. Most of the Bowater's agreements, I am told, are leasehold, long term, ninety-nine year leases, about half of the term which has expired.

Now, Sir, this report, the final report makes a change in that, it no longer says that we should take control of the forests in the sense that we should acquire a title. It does say that we should take control of the forests through a Forest Corporation, in which would be represented all the people who own them, the paper companies and us. When we got the report, my colleague in the Government were chastised for not making it public. And you know, we took it. That is the job of the Opposition, to oppose, and if they got nothing else to do they oppose us. We did not make it public, not because we had anything to hide but because we did not want to negotiate in public. So, when we did our negotiations, my colleague was in touch with the companies and they, as he has already announced and made public,

MR. ROBERTS: have agreed to accept that recommendation.

Now, Sir, I know it is ten past midnight on Wednesday morning, there is no time for great dramatic statements. Mr. Chairman, I submit that is one of the most important public developments, or developments in public policy that has ever been put in this Province. Until and unless, we can get control of the forests and have all of the forests of this Island run as an integrated and interconnected management harvesting and development operation, until that time, Sir, we will not get the maximum benefits from our great forest resources.

There are only two ways to get it: (1) is to buy the forests. We have looked at that, but that is \$20 million, \$25 million, \$30 millions of dollars. But The Royal Commission would come up with a better way than that, and that is to get control through a corporation, in which all of the forests would be vested. And the companies have agreed to this.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that is a very major step forward. I certainly do not think that this report deserves to be dismissed cavalierly by the gentleman from St. John's West. Let him debate it at the proper time, and we will gladly go into it, whatever length he wishes. We will gladly state our side and we will let the people of Newfoundland, in due course, choose what is to be the faith of the whole project.

But, Sir, in discussing it, let us remember, we are not getting anything like the maximum benefits from our forests now. I have in my constituency, it is partially in mine and partially in the district represented by my friend from White Bay South, the Minister of Community and Social Development, a large block of timber called the "Mooney Block." It is named the "Mooney Block," because the Government, I think it was a Tory Government, with Mr. Monroe as Premier, of 1924-1928, gave a lease in Quebec, to a person, a doctor, a medical doctor named "Mooney." And that lease was to cut timber and export timber and so forth on a track of land that has on it about 200 million cords of wood. At some point that lease, conditions of which I am told were never kept, that lease, by Act of the Legislature, became converted into freehold land, whereupon Dr. Mooney, or his associates or whoever

MR. ROBERTS: held title from him sold it to the old A.N.D. Company, I have no doubt for a handsome price. The A.N.D. now hold it in -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Harry Crow.

MR. ROBERTS: Harry Crow! They now hold it in freehold title, it is their land.

MR. SMALLWOOD: First it was John T. Meaney's, then he sold it to Dr. Mooney, and Mooney sold it to Harry Crow, and Harry Crow sold it to the old A.N.D. Company.

MR. ROBERTS: It sounds like, as Scott said, "Oh, what a tangled web, we weave..."

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: And statements that were made by me have more authority than the hon. gentleman's fishing expeditions.

Mr. Chairman, that 200 million cords of wood has sat there from that day, which was the mid-thirties, until this. The wood is rotting. Price, Bless them, have cut maybe 5000 cords of wood a year. There was one year they cut 10,000, Sir. It was the year when the Trans-Canada was opened and Mr. Pearson, then Prime Minister, came down to open the Trans-Canada. Mr. Pearson and Mr. Smallwood and a number of others, and I was one, were in Grand Falls House, where the Grand Falls Company, the Paper Company, were entertaining the Prime Minister and the Premier to lunch. And in the course of it, I mentioned this to the Price people. And there was a great

Mr. Roberts.

a great flap. You would not have known but the cat had been put among the pigeons. I did not think anything much of it at the time. We put it forward in support of our case for taking control of the forests. But, subsequently, a very strange thing happened. Mr. Ches Pittman of Harbour Deep, a gentleman whom I believe Your Honour met this summer on Your Honour's Ulysseslike cruise about the Province, has for many years taken contracts from Price. Mr. Pittman rang me one day. He said, "can I come to see you?" He came around. We had a talk. He said; "you know, it is strange. For years I have had to beg Price to let me cut some wood. A week or so ago, a funny thing happened. They rang me up. Damn lucky they were to find the telephone working, the way the CNT work it." They sent word. "Would Mr. Pittman come up to Grand Falls at their expense?" Of course, he got on his boat and went up to Hampton. He got in his car. He got a car and drove over to Grand Falls. He was ushered in to the woods manager's office and they were unrolling the carpet as he went, and no longer was he the humble suppliant. They said, "would you like to cut some wood? We will buy 10,000 cords from you." He said, "I would be delighted to." "Sign the contract."

Now I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that it would take a nasty-minded person to assume that there might be some relation between the sudden kindness and interest of the company in the welfare of the people of Harbour Deep and the fate of the Mooney Block timber; that and the connection with the conversation with the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premier of the Province, a month or two before in Grand Falls. My point, Mr. Chairman, is that our forests are not being used. The Mooney Block is the most flagrant example. I do not think Price give a damn for that wood. They just want to keep it and let nobody else have it. We want to try to get all this wood and get it developed. I might add, along those lines, in connection with the money to be voted, a very significant development

Mr. Roberts.

last year, in this field. My colleague, the Minister of Community and Social Development, and my colleague whose estimates are now before the House, negotiated the section of the DREE agreement dealing with forest access roads. I am told we spent about \$400,000. Much of that money, sir, was spent on privately owned lands. The first time in the history of the Government of Canada that money for access roads was spent on privately owned land, not that the Government of Canada all of a sudden changed their policy. They did not, sir. It was: It was done, because the companies agreed to bring the woods into a form of public control and this, I am told, is now in effect.

Indeed, some of the money, I believe, has been spent at Roddickton, in my own constituency, the land where we actually have the right to cut. In addition, Mr. Chairman, last year, I heard the hon. member, I believe the Leader of the Opposition, made this, but one of the hon. gentleman opposite talked about access roads. He was very eloquent in his usual rough-hewing way. Last year, we spent about \$110,000 on access road projects throughout the Province, these small access roads. We spent more money on DREE. We spent more money on major projects such as the Hawke's Bay Development, on the Western side of the Great Northern Peninsula in the district represented by my absent friend who is having a drop of water just outside (I trust it is water) the bar of the House. It is. Sorry, but it is late.

We spent \$110,000, Mr. Chairman, on thirty projects. Some of them would have been a mile of road, more would have been two or three more miles of road. Mr. Chairman, that gave work to 3,000 men, not 3,000 men per year, necessarily, but gave work to 3,000 men. The project is generated by that. There is more money in the estimates for access roads this year. I believe there is more in the DREE Program this year. There is more money, in a number of development fields, in the forestry business this year.

Mr. Roberts.

Underlining it all, as I have said, sir, is the report of this Commission. Although, it is slim and does not have a lot of bumps attached, it is not like the usual consultants' report which has heavy paper and fancy diagrams and usually ends with a recommendation that further consultants be retained. "If you want to know of a firm, we know of one." This is the opinion of men who spent their lives in it, representing the public sector and the private sector and then Dr. Rousseau, who has worked both in public and the private and the academic sectors. We think it is a very valuable document. We think it will be the foundation of a very major step forward in public policy, one that will benefit the people of this Province. As I have said; I am somewhat taken aback to hear the hon. gentleman for St. John's West cavalierly dismiss it. Then again, I should not be, Mr. Chairman, because I am afraid that we have learned from the hon. gentleman that if it is the hon. gentleman's opinion, it is sacred and superb, if it is anybody's else's opinion then it is just beneath contempt.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman has made any number of boring speeches. Mine may be boring, not as boring as his - may I finish, Mr. Chairman? Then the hon. gentleman can get up and waffle on. He provoked this, not me.

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying - Mr. Chairman, that gentleman may be the only person who will help. We will find out. He now has some Tory friends. Mr. Chairman, as I have said, the hon. gentleman's attitude seems to be that if it is his opinion, we should all say Hosanna! If it is our opinion, all of a sudden it is not worthy talking about. Let him give as good as he can take. He is pretty good at giving. He is pretty

Mr. Roberts.

weak at taking. As you said earlier in a ruling, Your Honour, the Harry Truman line; "if he cannot stand the heat, let him get out of the kitchen."

Support is a good one. I hope we will be able to debate it because we think good things will come of it. We are proud of what is going to come of it. If the hon. gentleman does not subscribe to this, let him come up Rodrickton, as he persists in calling it. Rodrickton, is called Roddickton. The people there are not impressed when the hon. gentleman calls it Rodrickton. The hon. gentleman is shaking his head. I have heard him call it Rodrickton. Of course - what they call him is not Crosberry, they have other names for him. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I think this report is a step forward and, in view of the fact that my colleague is asking for money to implement some of the recommendations of this, I, for one, will be quite delighted, when we put this item to a vote to vote in favour of it. Thank you!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, we are not going to let it carry yet. There is much to be said in terms of our forests and other items, which fall under the heading which we are now debating. The heading includes all of our natural resources and primary industries. It includes wildlife and forests and Crown lands, agricultural services, mining resources, rural development, Provincial Parks, you name it almost, and we can find it mentioned here. We have heard a great deal tonight, Mr. Chairman, about the management of our forests and the desirability of reclaiming the rights which the two existing paper companies have.

It strikes me as being a little peculiar, in this election year, after having the Kennedy Report of 1959, after having the report on The Economic Prospects For Newfoundland, all of which dealt with the forests which we are talking about now. A good report, which was done by

Mr. Collins,

the Atlantic Development Board two or three years ago, none of the recommendations were ever carried out. In fact, I doubt, that a lot of the reports were even read. Now all of a sudden, with a report that certainly does not rate with any of the ones I have mentioned - a report now by the Rousseau Commission, which is nothing more than a summary of the three previous reports, all of a sudden, we find that the Government are becoming terribly interested in our forests, in our sawmills, so on and so forth. It might be worthwhile, Mr. Chairman, to read just one section from the Atlantic Development Board Report concerning management. They suggested that changes to the present agreement with the pulp and paper companies are not only justifiable but essential to the further good of the Newfoundland Forest Industry. They go on to say that the changes, which could be brought about, need not affect the companies that were asleep, but would be in the best interest of the companies, as well as in the best interest of the forests and, of course, the Province and the people of Newfoundland.

On management, they say or they sum up the whole thing in one paragraph, actually. The report said that by assuming greater authority over the Crown lands under licence, that the Government would be able to initiate sound forest management. That must have been a nasty word for a good many years, because certainly there has been a complete lack of forest management in the Province. It goes on to say; "whether management is practiced by the companies, under Government supervision, or

MR. COLLINS:

whether the Government itself undertakes to implement a management programme, is of far less importance than that a planned management programme be inaugurated." Nothing, Sir, has ever been done about that and I have doubts whether the Government are really serious in what they are saying here tonight, that they will see that a proper management programme is introduced.

We all know of the difficulties which our sawmill operators have experienced down through the years. Number one difficulty, I suppose, has been availability of material, the raw material to saw logs, Number two has been the inefficiency of the mills, because of lack of capital, for improving them. Chances are, Mr. Chairman, they are the two most important drawbacks to a successful sawmill operation. We remember some years ago, when the great sawmill conference or the conference of sawmill operators was held, and we were going to find great things happen, but we all know, of course, that nothing happened there.

Mr. Chairman, there is also a mention made in the report about what happened in Bay d'Espoir when the power development was taking place down there. The report says that the Bay d'Espoir Power Development, on the island will cause the flooding of some 32,400 acres of productive land, 125,800 acres of land, in all, according to the Newfoundland Forest Service. Assuming an average stand volume for the Island of seven cords per productive acre, the merchantable timber volume inundated would amount to 230,000 cords, an additional 100,000 cords will become more inaccessible as a result of the flooding and, of course, it will cost a considerable amount more to ever reach that wood and redeem it.

Mr. Chairman, when we consider forest management and what this Government has been doing, certainly to permit this to happen, even though the Bay d'Espoir Power Development was so important, to permit this to happen was nothing short of criminal and certainly hon. members opposite, from the Premier down, all of the Ministers, should hang their head in shame, for ever permitting this sort of thing to have happened to the forest of Newfoundland.

To add insult to injury, Mr. Chairman, in the Bowater's Agreement,

MR. COLLINS:

which was worded and signed some years ago, there is a requirement that Bowaters are required to export 50,000 cords of pulpwood. I do not know, I trust this Government is not responsible for that particular agreement, but certainly this reflects upon the lack of management and lack of thought by the Government of the day then and succeeding Governments, in that this arrangement could not be improved upon. We find now, Mr. Chairman, that Bowaters are cutting wood on Crown Lands, rather than on their own rights, for export overseas.

So much for the forest, Mr. Chairman. Nobody has touched on wild-life tonight and the Minister has a responsibility for -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister does not know much about wildlife. He was trying to give us some experience this afternoon about married life, put his foot in his mouth as usual.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. COLLINS: Well, I am talking now about moose and caribou and I doubt if the Minister has ever seen a moose or a caribou or a rabbit.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. COLLINS: No, you will kill yourself if you keep on long enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. gentleman please continue?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, nothing has been said about wildlife and I cannot permit this debate to close without making reference to the licensing methods which the Minister has permitted. For instance, the first of this year, when it was decided to issue licenses for the caribou herd on the Avalon Peninsula, the Minister came on radio and television and issued a press release, to the effect that 120 caribou licenses were to be issued for the Avalon herd. We also found out that the licenses were going to be drawn for, and of the 120, if my memory serves me correct, 70 licenses were to be drawn for by the residents of St. John's, the other fifty were to be drawn for by residents, outside St. John's but residents of the Avalon Peninsula. No one from Clarendville or Grand Falls or Gander or Lewisporte or Corner Brook or any of those places were permitted to hunt caribou on the Avalon

MR. COLLINS:

Peninsula. Now I do not know what arguments the Minister can put up in defense of this. Certainly there is no argument for it, because I do a little hunting of caribou and moose myself and every time I have gone into Millertown or Rattling Brook or Gambo or Terra Nova, I always run into hunters from St. John's and we are always glad to have the hon. member for Green Bay come into Terra Nova and hunt moose and hunt caribou, We are glad to have any hon. member, as far as that goes, and I am sure the residents of Central Newfoundland and Western Newfoundland also have no objection to those people coming in, But why, Mr. Chairman, should people from the central area be barred from coming to the Avalon Peninsula and hunting caribou?

I would submit that the caribou would have never been on the Avalon Peninsula had not the good people of Central and Western Newfoundland been so conservation-minded and permitted the herd to sustain itself and also permit some of the animals to be relocated to the Avalon. Some years ago also, Sir, when the Wildlife Department decided, in their wisdom, and I think it was a good idea at the time, when they introduced the Management Area Control Concept, management areas were set up in Millertown and Rattling Brook and Bishops Falls and Gambo and Terra Nova and Gander areas. We thought that some worthwhile management regulations would have been introduced and imposed and enforced and so on and so forth, but we found that that has not been so.

We also found, Mr. Chairman, that the reverse of what happened on the Avalon, in terms of licenses, the reverse has been true, and we find now that licenses for those management areas, and I am thinking particularly here of the Gander management area, those licenses are put on sale in St. John's. In the first place, there were always a number available to hunters, at gates which were controlled by the paper companies, but now we find that we have to come into St. John's or mail in an application and mail in the ten dollars, this year, and take our chance with people from the Avalon, people from Boston and people from New York. We are also of the opinion that maybe this is another right which is being abused.

MR. COLLINS:

We have been told that many of the outfitters in Newfoundland and we realize the outfitters must make a living but we have been told that many of the outfitters are buying up licenses in blocks of fifty and sixty and one hundred for people in the States. I do not know how many licenses are reserved as a kickback, if you want to, for the people in Louisiana. Certainly if they are going to send up planes for fourteen people and keep them down here for a week and dine them and feed them, I would suspect that there would probably be a few hundred licenses reserved by those people as well, at the expense, Mr. Chairman, sometimes of our own local hunters.

MR. MURPHY: They maybe taking the moose with them.

MR. COLLINS: They might be taking the moose with them. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, there is a need here for a lot of consideration because, in my opinion, the local people who live on this Island certainly have prior rights to hunting moose or caribou or rabbit or whatever it might be.

With regard to our inland fisheries, Mr. Chairman, I know that this is a Federal responsibility, in the main, but certainly the Provincial Government also has a responsibility, even though they might not have the jurisdiction or control. But certainly there is a great need for more incentives here, in terms of making it possible for hatcheries to be set up to restock our streams and rivers with salmon and trout. I have not seen anything from the Minister yet which would indicate that any of this is being done and I am afraid that we will not see much of it because I am not too sure that this Government is too interested in this very valuable natural resource.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the Item carry? Those in favour please say, "Aye," contrary, "Nay," carried.

Item (9) - Public Works - \$3,520,000. Shall the Item carry?

HON. J.R. CHALKER (MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS): Mr. Chairman, this portion of the Interim Supply for the Department of Public Works is made up mostly of salaries and travelling expenses. The general administration is \$45,000. for a period of approximately three months, travelling expenses \$900. for the same period of time -

the building department of the Department of Public Works, the salaries \$370,500 travelling expenses \$12,000. I may say, in this vote Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Committee, that this vote for maintenance, in addition to the salaries, will require \$1 million for a period of three months. It seems like a lot of money but it is, we have a lot of buildings in Newfoundland, in this Province, which need care and maintenance at all times and, with the experience and the length of time which I have spent in the Department of Public Works, seems that most of this, a great deal of this money, by far the greater portion of this money is spent in the months of April, May and June.

In the rates and rentals, the rates are in lieu of taxes; that is to say certain municipalities the Government will pay a lump sum, as I say in lieu of taxes, and the rentals for various space, rented space in other buildings, not owned by the Government, require \$270,000. Cleaning for three months, \$120,000, that covers the entire Province with regard to public buildings. Light and Fuel for three months, in the vicinity of \$500,000. This is a rather large item - light and fuel - \$500,000 this is a large amount actually because our buildings are, Government buildings are increasing year by year. Naturally our lights and our fuel would be increasing in proportion. To carry on the operation of the Harmon Corporation we are asking for \$110,000. As you know, this committee is chaired by our Deputy Minister, Mr. George Warren, and it is managed in Stephenville by Mr. Alexander. They take care of all the buildings and maintenance. This will cover maintenance and wages and they also look after the disposal of the buildings and the rentals of the buildings for various organizations.

Now fixed assets, in other words, Capital Account on public buildings, we have the Science and Engineering Building at the University, will require for that \$440,000. I would like, in a few minutes time, to explain how this contract was negotiated because my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, in his speech here on opening day, mentioned the fact about this contract

and also I think on television, the same evening, he mentioned it. Also a site development on the northern campus of the University will require \$100,000. Mr. Speaker, there were several remarks made about my department when they were considering the estimates under other headings. I think my hon. friend from St. John's West mentioned the fact that up to the last three years the architects were pretty well starving here in this Province and now they are as busy as a nailer, since we started to let out contracts after they have completed the plans and specifications. I would like to advise my hon. friend that not only was it in Newfoundland, in this Province, but it was also in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec, other Provinces as well. I would also like to inform the committee, Mr. Chairman, that my office and the office of my deputy-minister, up to the last week or so, was inundated with architects from the mainland looking for work. So at least we are living in a very prosperous Province.

The Science and Engineering building - actually Mr. Chairman, we were in the preparation of plans for this building, with every intention of calling public tenders and I would like to add, at this time, that when Minister of this Department, about the easiest thing you can do is to call a public tender. There is no rebuttal about it, there is nothing said about it. One of the most difficult things you have to do is negotiate the tender, because then you are open to criticism not only on this side of the House but on the other side as well. In this particular case, Mr. Chairman, we are proceeding at an ordinary pace. We did not think it was absolutely essential to get to work on it right away, but we had other projects in mind. When I was contacted by the officials of the University, asking me if I could speed it up, I asked them why the necessity at this date why did they not let me know two months ago? Well they said; it was absolutely emergency now and that if I could cut any corners, whatsoever, to have this building ready for this coming September, it would mean a terrific amount not only to the University but to the additional students that they

could accommodate. In talking it over with my officials in my department, they informed me that if we went out on contract the usual way, after getting our plans and specifications ready, it would be well into December, of this year, before we could pass the building over to the Memorial University. I asked them then about negotiating the contract, which we have done several times, and I may say at this stage, Mr. Chairman, there are only two ways, actually (1) a minister is forced into negotiating a contract. The first one being a state of emergency, which I think everybody understands, and the second one Mr. Chairman is time.

Now it takes several months, actually, definitely, sure one month additional, to call a public tender on any type of building. As I said before, I was assured by my officials that if we could cut out the public tenders and negotiate, we could have the building by September. It was then up to me to decide which contractor I would invite to negotiate with, of several large contracting firms in this Province, and they are all good. So checking through the records of the University, the construction of the University, and I may say Mr. Chairman, at the time, that I was, I have been Minister of Public Works since the turning of the sod of the University

MR. CHALKER: I found at the time that there were several contractors who had worked on the University. But, the one who had done the most work was a company known as the Newfoundland Engineering Construction Company, Limited, who rates very highly with the Government and not only with this Government, but many other institutions. I think that company is now building the St. Clare's Hospital and many other schools throughout this Province.

After deciding this, I left it entirely to my Deputy Minister to start negotiations. And after a matter of, I think, thirty-six hours, they had agreed on a figure that our engineers and draftsmen and architects thought reasonable, with the small additions and large additions of different descriptions required by the University authorities.

The final figure was \$1,996,000 and I am happy to say that building now will be ready in ample time for the opening of the University this fall.

Now, I am quite proud of this, Mr. Chairman, because I had to negotiate it all by myself, and then actually had to sell the Cabinet on it. And that was not an easy job to do. But, I thought it was my duty, because it is a difficult thing to negotiate contracts. I have contracts opened in my department, I think, there is one every two or three days. I do not even attending the openings, my Deputy Minister attended, There is nothing, it is straightforward. As a matter of fact, I do not think, in the twelve or thirteen years I have been in the Department of Public Works, I have ever attended any openings of contracts.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: Pardon! No, no, you are quite right that is a new innovation and I agree with, I think it is a terrific thing. I am sorry it had not been done before.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: No, they are not. And I can assure this Committee, Mr. Chairman, that in no way did we lose any money on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: Oh, I know you have got to be suspicious, that is the reason why you are over there and we are here.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: That is not business. Do not be suspicious.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: Sure I have.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: I can tell you something better than that, I was informed the other day that there were tenders called on a building, under the DREE Programme and those were called for in my department, I think, the difference from the highest to the lowest is nearly \$800,000 or \$900,000. Now we do not find that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: No, no, it is not argument, because we do not know, Mr. Chairman, every project that is put forward to the Government, my engineers, in direct consultation with the architects, give me an approximate cost, pretty well close to them. As a matter of fact, in those DREE schools, which we have now under a new idea, The Project Management there are well within the budget. Now that does not mean to say that all where within, the rest, but there were some lower and some over, but we are still in our budget on those five DREE projects.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: No, No, that was my estimate. That was my estimate based on the information of a plan in progress, that has been completed.

You must remember, Mr. Chairman, there are many types of buildings, I am not referring to the ones that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was talking about a few minutes ago. We have buildings here, and I agree too, I do not know which hon. gentleman it was, with those temporary buildings. I detest having to build temporary buildings. But, still it is absolutely a must, we have an over-populated university. We have there, on the University Campus, buildings costing anywhere from \$10.75 per square foot to \$16.80 per square foot. It all depends on the type of building that was required.

MR. CHALKER: If it is for engineering, it is an entirely different building. If it is for chemistry, it is an entirely different building, it is more expensive. If it is for just classrooms, it is comparatively cheap, you could build it on a temporary bases, for about \$10.00 or \$11.00. per square foot. If you are asking me about buildings, you have got to advise me what kind of building you want. Is it going to be a science lab? Is it going to be an engineering lab? Two entirely different things.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: Oh, that is true. That is true. Well, those buildings were built for that. We can go up in those buildings.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: No, this price is not way out of line. I have not got the actual cost of the square footage here with me this evening, but our average cost in running a building of this type, now this is a most expensive building you can build, it runs into the vicinity of, on the average, around \$30.00 per square foot. Now there are other buildings; you take those buildings, if you are interested, if the committee is interested, Mr. Chairman, we are building now or about to build five vocational schools, St. Anthony, Baie Verte, Springdale, Placentia and Bonavista.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: Yes, I certainly will, Mr. Chairman. The contracts have been let, prices have been - it is a public contract, they have not been notified as of this moment, because they have to be approved by Treasury Board, that is only a matter of form, but it will be done.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: Well, if it is not a matter of form, there will be no vocational schools.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: No, there are going to be four tenders, I believe, or three tenders. There is one part of it, the smallest part will not be tendered for. There are two things we could do, Now, first of all, Mr. Chairman, anything that I can push Newfoundland's way, I will push. I would even like to pay

MR. CHALKER: for it, but I am not permitted to. I think, that we should try and endeavour, I do not want to say subsidize, but to assist to some extent, to be a little bit free with some of our sub-trades. There were sub-trades went out of this country the other day, the only thing that we will get out of it is our little bit of labour that is all. Any profit that is made remains up on the mainland and that profit, what percentage of that profit, our income tax we do not see.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: That is not written, no it is not. They may ask for a special type of brick which may not be manufactured in Newfoundland. That is true.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: No, it is not. It is not.

Now those five new vocational schools, Mr. Chairman, I am trying to give them information. They do not like to get the truth. I am giving them the factual truth. Those five new vocational schools, tenders have to be called for clearing and the slabs, because they are all on slabs. Tenders will be called, plans are just about ready. Tenders will be called for the trades; that will be mechanicals, plumbing, heating, electricity, The only part of that, that will not be called for, is the the prefab section.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: Yes the grant total is \$8.5 million and the amount that will be contracted for, or bid on, or tendered for, is in the vicinity of \$800,000. And that portion, \$800,000, is a type of building that was designed in Great Britain and have engineers from this country, and representatives from my department went over and saw them and passed them.

MR. MURPHY: They accompanied Mr. Lundrigan, I understand.

MR. CHALKER: I believe Mr. Lundrigan was there. As Mr. Lundrigan has the agency.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. CHALKER: Oh, no, no, no, there is a price on it. There is a price on it. I will give

MR. CHALKER: the price, if you do not want it, just do not waste time. This is a prefab building that can be manufactured in Newfoundland and will be manufactured in Newfoundland. It is a prefab panelling, and it will be manufactured at the Atlantic Design Homes, Stephenville. It is owned by Lundrigans sure, at least I assume it is owned by Lundrigans. It will employ approximately 150 Newfoundlanders, whereas we had the other thing to do, we could have imported our brick and our steel, and this summer, I am afraid, I am pretty well sure of the fact that we will have to bring in outside tradesmen, because, well you take St. Anthony and Baie Verte, I doubt very much if you will find brick layers down there or steel riggers. I am pretty well sure you would not.

MR. MURPHY: Not in St. John's, Corner Brook, or Grand Falls.

MR. CHALKER: I would doubt if you would get any now, I doubt very much that you would get any in the next week or so. I doubt it, with all those buildings going up.

MR. MURPHY: (First part inaudible) working on the highroads, or putting in water and sewage and that.

MR. CHALKER: No, no, no, I am talking about tradesmen, Mr. Chairman, such as plumbers is one, brick layers, steel riggers. We have now, I think it is four or five large buildings left, to start construction right away, and that will take pretty well most of all our professional people. I will not say professional, but tradesmen to construct those. If we had to build that in St. Anthony, I would not be surprised if we had to bring in steel riggers there, whereas, with this panelling type of building, you will be able to get your men there on the job. There are lots of carpenters in Newfoundland, there are lots of electricians. Only in this original bid, Mr. Chairman, St. Anthony is the only place I believe that an outside firm was low on the contract, and that was a firm here in St. John's that got it.

The others I think are people within the area, something that has never happened before, but now people are getting up to the place - However, everything is in good shape.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, may I express appreciation from this side of the

House for the minister's very detailed and explicit reply on his department's expenditures. The only thing, -I have to compliment him on it, of course the hon. minister comes from the same educational background as I did and probably we are of the same training. I must say he did an exceptionally good job on this. Unfortunately there is one thing which stands out here in his requirements, which I think is quite extraordinary. We had been discussing, in the last couple of days, the fact that the Government has been asking for three to four months supply. In the case of this particular department, if you compare it with last year's estimates, the hon. minister is asking for seven or eight months supply.

There must have been, this only indicates, Mr. Chairman, that last year the expenditure of this department must have exceeded the estimates by a tremendous amount. This, of course, will be revealed when Supplementary Supply comes down. If it is not so, the hon. minister is asking for seven or eight months supply for this year, and he has kept on saying that it is only three or three and one half months. It would indicate very, very clearly that the expenditure of this department last year must have far exceeded what was provided in the estimates.

This is not surprising because we are well aware, on this side of the House, that a great many things were done by the Government, last year or in the current year rather, that were not provided for in the estimates. I am very suspicious, in the light of these facts, that this is exactly what has happened in this particular department. We will know that, of course, when the estimates and budget are finally provided. He does give some rather startling requirements here, which make up the total of his needs. I am not entirely surprised, particularly when he mentions a very heavy amount for rent. When you think of six dollars and fifty cents a square foot being paid for liquor stores, rental of liquor stores in comparatively small towns, this is almost equivalent to the rentals charged in large centres like Montreal and certainly in St. John's.

Actually, through the Government's generosity on this type of building which the hon. minister's department is responsible for having built, this would mean that those who built those buildings will have them paid out in about five or six years. It is a very, very handsome investment indeed, when you can get six dollars and fifty cents a square foot. I am not surprised that the minister's expenses in that particular department, and in that particular aspect, are extremely high indeed.

He was mentioning, with some pride, the buildings at the university and quite a detailed explanation of the additional costs of the engineering school was given. I am afraid I am from Missouri¹ on this one. I would like to look into it very much more closely but I am afraid we will not get the opportunity. The reason I say this is, because I asked my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, today, a question as to why the students of the university turned down the purchase of the students' centre. Now boys today, as we hear continually from the Premier, are very much better educated than their forefathers and they have a means of looking at and sizing up and studying a situation far better than perhaps some of us did when we were their age. These boys at the university are not fools. They are very intelligent and very well educated, and as I understand it, it has come to me that the reason they did not buy this students building, to a great extent, was that it was of such poor construction for their purposes that they could not buy it. They preferred to go out and build a new building. The thing is a very, very shoddy building. It is built such that it cannot support other stories or anything of this nature. This was a quick, shoved-up job, at a very high cost, and it is a very inferior building indeed, and the students would not fall for that.

Now it is all very well for the minister to express great satisfaction in the beautiful buildings that are at the university, but I have a very strong suspicion that some of the buildings in appearance may look very beautiful, although that is open to question in some cases, but I am quite sure that the contracts, that built those buildings, looked much more beautiful to the contractors who got them. This is what I am afraid is happening with this engineering building now.

In any case, Mr. Chairman, the total requirements of the department are completely unrealistic, in comparison with other demands that have been made on us, and I shall certainly vote against them, because, I cannot for the life of me see any justification for any department, within a few days of the end of our financial year, asking for seven or eight month Interim Supply.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could, I realize that with this closure the minister cannot answer, but you are permitted to nod. Would the hon. minister indicate to the committee, by a nod, whether no (1) that the plans and specifications for the extension to the science and engineering building were made available, and were indeed in the hands of other contractors during the time that the plans and specifications were being prepared, with a view to meet the deadline requested by Memorial University, that there could be a short-tendered call.

Secondly, may I call the committee's attention to the fact that it took the hon. minister but thirty-six hours to negotiate what he considers to be a satisfactory contract with Newfoundland Engineering. He also admits that there are several other competent, good construction firms in the Province of Newfoundland, quite capable of performing the job that was required at Memorial. I do not think that this would have seriously delayed, or seriously handicapped, and it certainly would have avoided the embarrassment that the Board of Regents found themselves in when this became public knowledge. I do not think it would have caused a very serious handicap, if the minister spent another thirty-six hours negotiating with another competent construction company in this Province. Indeed, over a period of one week, he could have negotiated, skillfully negotiated with practically every construction company in this Province that is capable of performing the work.

I suggest Mr. Chairman, that the other construction companies in this Province, particularly last year when work was pretty scarce, were fully familiar with the specifications and designs of this building. I suggest also, Mr. Chairman, that the price for this building is considerably higher than it should have been. We are not talking about

MR. HICKMAN:

a new building. We are talking about a building that was designed and planned for an extension. That is completely different from taking a normal building and putting an extension on to it. When a building is designed, in the first instance, to take another story, then it is much cheaper to build that extension than it is a normal extension.

Mr. Chairman, the other item that obviously introduces a new concept in the construction, is the price which has now been given for the five vocational schools. It is my understanding, from what the Minister has said, that the total cost of these schools will be \$6. million -

MR. ROBERTS: \$8.5 million.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, if it is \$8. million dollars then the concept is even more unique than I had thought. Of that \$8. million dollars worth of work, or \$6. million or whatever the figure is that is to be done, only one very small section of that construction will not be subject to a tender call and that is the prefabrication of the walls and the roof and the ceiling and whatever else goes on it. This new concept indicates that out of an \$8. million dollar construction job that \$7,200,000. will go for site clearing and the sub-trades. Now this is something, I am sure, that will certainly grab the imagination of the construction companies in Newfoundland and the equipment...

MR. ROBERTS: A couple of million dollars.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, all right \$2. million, give or take \$2. million, that brings it back to \$6. million, which was the original figure for the buildings. But out of \$6. million dollars, \$800,000. for walls and steel work or structure and roof and ceilings and partitions, the other \$5,200,000. for sub-trades and for site clearing. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is certainly a new innovation, that is a new, startling discovery in the construction of buildings, that the cheapest part of putting up a building would be the walls and the frame and the partitions and roof. But if the Minister has made this new discovery and if he has convinced Ottawa, because it was my understanding, I may be wrong on this, that this is a cost-sharing programme.

MR. ROBERTS: No.

MR. HICKMAN: It is an outright grant, so that Ottawa will not impose its demand that there will be public tenders called.

MR. MURPHY: That is why they are not called.

AN HON. MEMBER: Would the hon. gentleman yield a moment?

MR. HICKMAN: I cannot yield because if I yield I am not allowed to rise again, but you can speak from your seat. The other point that I would like to draw to the hon. Minister's attention; we have heard announcements and I believe there is a great deal of urgency in this, that work must commence within the next few months on the engineering building for Memorial or buildings, I do not know if it is going to be one, two or three, but whatever it is it is going to be a fairly expensive project. To date, I believe, the Government of Canada has indicated its commitment of something less than \$1. million dollars, but their hopes have been expressed that the involvement will be considerably in excess of that amount and because of that there apparently was an assurance given in the House of Commons last week by Mr. Merchand, that public tenders will have to be called.

The work has been ongoing by the architects and by the engineering division, under the guidance of Professor Bruneau and very competent engineers. They know what they want and they have been, I know, of great assistance to the architects. So there can be no excuse for the engineering building not to call tenders and indeed it would be unthinkable that buildings of that size and with the estimated and projected cost there would not be public tenders called. But again, would the hon. Minister give us a nod that public tenders will be called for the engineering building at Memorial?

MR. MURPHY: Which way do you want the nod, up or down or across?

MR. HICKMAN: I have had the nod. For the record, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister indicates that tenders will be called for the engineering buildings at Memorial University. If we have accomplished nothing else, at least we have set our minds at ease in that respect.

MR. MURPHY: That is some kind of a record to have tenders called.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, whether it is, tenders will be called for the engineering

MR. HICKMAN:

building and that is worth staying here until two o'clock to find out.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I am now in the position to speak again, I believe, on this debate, on this part of the debate anyway -

MR. MURPHY: So the Premier said.

MR. ROWE: That was a ruling by the Chair.

MR. MURPHY: But the Premier made the motion that -

MR. ROWE: The Premier did not make any motion, that was a ruling by the Chair.

MR. MURPHY: Well, the closure is not in.

MR. ROWE: But on a closure motion you can only speak once and then for twenty minutes.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, that is it.

MR. ROWE: All right, but it was not the Premier who decided that.

MR. MURPHY: Who decided it?

MR. ROWE: The rules of this House decided it.

MR. MURPHY: Who made the motion? I did not.

MR. ROWE: It was made here before the hon. gentleman ever became a member of the House.

MR. MURPHY: What the closure was in then? I never heard of it before, not on this side of it.

MR. ROWE: The regulation regarding closure, of course it is. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak and I will only speak for a moment, but the hon. member for Burin has raised a point there which I think should be known to the Committee and to the House. I said today that we did have, and I used the past tense, we did have \$12. million dollars or so to our credit in Ottawa for Vocational Education and I said that, yesterday afternoon late, I had received a cheque for, and this is the photostatic copy of it, the official one given me by the bank, by the way, for records, of \$8.5 million

I read part of the letter from the Minister of Manpower in the Government of Canada. I did not read the whole letter because it was not relevant at the time, but there is one short paragraph which bears immediately on what the hon. member has referred to.

MR. ROWE:

In the past, under our various agreements with Ottawa, we had to submit plans for the building of vocational schools and get approval and if we wanted to enlarge them we had to submit plans and so on. That is no longer the case in respect of the \$12. million dollars we have, and here is the paragraph, the exact words from the Minister of Manpower. He says, "I am pleased to enclose a cheque for \$8.5 million and so on. The final payment of approximately \$4.1 million will be made during the next fiscal year, following verification by our respective departments of the exact amount owing to you." Then he goes on: "With this current payment, (that is this payment of \$8.5 million) we shall cease our normal procedure of requiring project submissions and claims. Any submissions or claims which we have on hand will be returned to you."

So this answers, I think completely, the point raised by the hon. gentleman, that we are our own masters in respect of this money and what we do with this money and a major portion of the money is to be spent in the building and the equipping of the five vocational schools, at Baie Verte, St. Anthony, Bonavista, Placentia and Springdale and I said the equipping as well, which is a major item in any vocational school, also in the enlarging of our College of Trades and in providing some equipment, as well, for our Fishery College and the enlarging of two or three of the other vocational schools. The point is, we are our own masters in this matter. We do not have to go back to Ottawa to get approval for anything. The only thing the Minister asked me, in a previous letter, if we would let him know the sites where we intended to build these schools, they would like to have that for their records. We did that, of course, and were only too happy to do it, as a matter of courtesy, so that they would be able to know on what particular sites we had decided to spend this money.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the - the hon. Minister is not in the Chamber at the present moment. With reference to, in the first instance, this building at Memorial University that I mentioned on opening day, and I referred back to Hansard last year where the question was asked about this building and the answer was received that \$1.5 million dollars

MR. MURPHY:

would be the cost of that building, subsequently, on October 27th, 1970, \$1,996,000. contract awarded at MUN. Following this or previous to it actually, there was Chalker and Association to discuss tendering methods, this was the construction association. At that time the Minister of Public Works promised that public tenders would be called for all these buildings. Now the Minister has stated that there was no time period in which to call tenders but there was a set of plans. Now I doubt if there was only one set of plans possibly. It was just as easy to draw ten or fifteen, through photostatting, this sort of thing, and on account of this he could discuss with a construction firm, (the name does not matter at this time) a wonderful deal, a good deal. The Minister was quite proud of the deal, I think he did it in something like a day and a-half or two days.

Now if there were only one set of plans in existence, I could see that. But, as I said, there must have been more than one set of plans, and the Minister discussed this thing and got a very good deal on it, as he said, \$1,996,000. There are no more I suppose than four or five main contractors in the Province, who could do a job like this, that this could be discussed with. The plans had been drawn, the architect had all the plans ready, so on and so forth. Now over the years it is one of the main gripes or criticisms that the Opposition has had with this Government and that is the passing out of public monies without any tenders being called. Now we have another situation where we are going to get five vocational schools, I broached the matter to the hon. Minister of Education yesterday, from whom I received no answer. Now the Minister tells us, and I read here that these schools are costing \$6. million and not \$8. million, as the Premier said. This is the statement by the hon. Minister of Education, Dr. F.W. Rowe, "Five new schools to be built in the St. Anthony area, the Baie Verte Peninsula, Springdale area, Bonavista area and the Placentia area at a cost of \$6. million dollars."

Last week I received a call from an interested citizen, who wanted me to place this question on the Order Paper, as to the spending of \$6. million on these five schools without tenders been called and it was stated

MR. MURPHY:

that the company that got the tender to build the schools, who are Lundrigans I understand, went to England to survey or size up different types of schools and they were accompanied by the Deputy Minister of Public Works and some other official from the Department of Public Works and they choose a certain type of building, and this is it. Now \$6. million, and I think the hon. member for Burin just mentioned it, is going to be the total cost of these schools and the main part of these five schools, as has again been stated, is only going to cost \$800,000.

Now, were tenders called on the electrical, plumbing installations for these, could the hon. Minister answer me that? Who received the tenders or who was awarded the tender, if they were so called? I would like to see tabled in this House, for the information of the people of the Province, not me, the people of the Province, just the comparison in these tenders, because anybody in the Province, everybody in the Province are as much aware as I am of the names that keep cropping up for big deals where our Government is spending the money. Now these people are known to everybody as thoroughly solid Liberal supporters. Have I, as a member of this House, have we, as members of the Opposition, the right to ask these questions? Has the Government, as custodians of the peoples' money, the obligation, the moral obligation to table all these figures in this hon. House so that the people of the Province will know just where their money is going? Now perhaps I maybe too much of a moralist or maybe perhaps a little too sincere with this type of stuff -

AN HON. MEMBER: Walking on the water.

MR. MURPHY: Oh, there was only one man walked on the water

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, but another man tried.

MR. MURPHY: Another man was run over by a motor boat, you heard that one

out for his morning stroll. I will not repeat it here. I have heard that one before. But the Hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture & Resources, silica, jokes, pollution, always manages to interject Mr. Chairman, I do not know, the House is aware when something vital to the interest of this Province is being discussed. You are being lead along another path. A foolish nonsensical remark. Everybody gets a little bit upset, bored, when we talk about how this government have spent, squandered, thrown away, passed out to their friends millions upon millions upon millions of dollars of the taxpayers money. They are over there now with the smug look, you would not know - hundreds and hundreds and millions of dollars - It is a great joke, Mr. Chairman. a great joke. The way the people's money is being squandered, passed out to personal friends of this party and I refer to the Liberal Party. If we were to have placed before us the record of the spending of this Government over this past nineteen, twenty years; to whom the money was given or awarded to whom the contracts were awarded. How many instances were tenders called? We would have many, many, many millions of dollars to do these things that this Government is so worried about, they cannot do these great priorities, these few roads to be paved, so on and so forth. They get up and put on the great front. You know, why do we do this, why do we do that? There are other things more necessary to be done. But when it comes to squandering the people's money, not a qualm of conscience in the world, wonderful, wonderful this is it.

The hard core Liberals you know, there are two groups, one on the bandwagon and the other one trying to get on. This is a definition of a hard core-liberal in this Province. There is one thing, if there is only the one thing, that we have tried to place before the public of this - the people of this Province, this past few years, is the complete and utter disregard for the squandering of the people's money. The money that is wrung from them in the highest sales tax in Canada. Second highest! Second highest sales tax in Canada. It is the highest in the sense that the base of the

tax is much lower than any other Province in Canada. My chocolate bar friend is not in the House anymore. He has resigned. Utter frustration. Just driven to it, had to get out, could not stand it anymore, if he had to have waited another few months he would have rejoiced with the rest of us. The tide was going away, away out. No disrespect to anybody. The Premier has earned a good rest, I think, from the people of the Province. The Premier may get the works from the public, I do not know.

MR CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR.MURPHY: That is right, Mr. Chairman, I will be allowed to speak without interruption. I am not worth much money, in fact, I am only a poor man- the little boy from Flower Hill - No great actors award or anything else, here I am a humble servant of the people -

MR.CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR.MURPHY: With all the banter, Mr, Chairman, let us not forget about the - When a Minister stands up on the floor of this House and says that he did not have time to call a tender but he negotiated a deal something like two days. We could not do it with two firms or three firms, just one - now we have another firm that is given a contract, without a comparison of any other tender or anything else, just pass it out - let her go - no wonder, no wonder our debt is a billion dollars. Not true? Not true? When we look at our commitments in this Province, they exceed one billion dollars. No matter what way you argue or anything else. We are now on Public Works. I am wondering now, Mr. Chairman, how far this builders' association has gotten with the Department of Public Works, with reference to tenders called. This was on August 21, since that time these buildings have been awarded, these five vocational schools, as far as we know tenders were not called. Six million dollars. Not four, not five, but six million dollars of the taxpayers money.

Well, I only quote here from the hon. Minister of Education, whom I have the greatest respect for. One of the greatest men we have ever had in this

Province, perhaps the top-ranking politician, At least the Premier says this. The outstanding man in this Province and if I disagree with my hon. friend from Grand Falls, the Hon. Minister of Education, I would not do it, I would chose the hon. minister ahead of the Premier still.

We have some questions on the Order Paper, Mr. Chairman, which we hope we will get more information, and that is with regard to the subtrades on these buildings. I presume they have been awarded in the usual discreet fine-pencilled manner that the department have used all through the years. The concrete slabs, I hope they put buildings on, not any of our bodies before this is over. I do not want to make any statement that might be open to contradiction.

Eighty thousand square feet. The hon. Minister made the statement that it was competitive with the College of Trades and Technology I think something like twenty-four or twenty-seven dollars a foot. But he omitted to mention that the cost of a new building compared to adding a story on, there is a great amount of difference in it, because the main services must be installed. The cost of the foundation, so on and so forth, is very much higher than just adding a story on a building. But it may be a good copy I think for the minister to come out and say this actually, this one over across, was built on a cost plus too. I do not know who built that one, but possibly it was the same firm that is going to build the five now, vocational schools,

Mr. Murphy.

who have done very well out of this Government and are continuing to do so notwithstanding the objections of the building trades. The total vote in this, Department of Public Works, \$3,520,000. There is one other item that I would like to discuss and that is the token vote in last year's estimates for the Expo buildings, \$100.

Now can the minister tell us where he is going to get all this money that he is going to spend on these Expo buildings, to have them ready by June, as he said the other day. Where is this money coming from? Is it another windfall from somewhere? There is only \$100 voted. I think it all came out of the \$100. I think it was three the Premier said yesterday. There are three great buildings going to be opened. We gave him \$100 with which to do it. Wonderful! Wonderful! That is the Government we want. If we could keep them in power for another twenty years, it would be something.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the amount of \$3,520,000 be reduced to \$352,000 - Item (9), Public Works. The way the minister is spending our money, he is lucky to get that much for a month.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. member for Bonavista South.

MR. BARBOUR: That is why I am on my feet. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman..

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry we cannot speak to the amendment.

MR. BARBOUR: May I speak on Public Works?

MR. ROBERTS: We will deal with the amendment and then we will let the hon. gentleman make his speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sit down until we get rid of the amendment.

MR. CROSBIE: Before you put the amendment, Mr. Chairman, or is it the ruling that nobody can speak on the amendment?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, point of order. Mr. Chairman, the Chair earlier ruled that nobody could speak on the amendment.

MR. CROSBIE: Is the ruling that nobody can speak on an amendment or if you have already spoken, you cannot speak on the amendment?

MR. ROBERTS: Well in that case, the hon. gentleman has the floor.

MR. CROSBIE: We are just asking. We are quite satisfied. That is all. We just want the ruling. Can no one speaking on the amendment or what is the ruling? Mr. Chairman, is the rule that no one can speak on the amendment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyone can speak on the amendment who have not already spoken.

MR. CROSBIE: Carry on!

MR. BARBOUR: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the committee, the people of Bonavista, the people of King's Cove, the people of Keels, Duntarra, Trinity, Melrose, Port Rexton, Port Union, Catalina, Little Catalina, Elliston, Newman's Cove, three Amherst Coves, all the coves in Bonavista South, do not think it is squandering or wasting the taxpayers' money, when we see now the opportunity coming to us to have a vocational school built in the town of Bonavista.

In the past, Mr. Chairman, students who wanted to learn a trade or a profession either had to go to Grand Falls, Gander, Clarenville or here in the City of St. John's, at considerable expense.

Now, sir, when this school is built and becomes a reality, the communities that I have mentioned will be able to go to the school in the day and return in the evening to their homes again. To them it will mean great things, because it will save money and they will be able to go to the schools with little expense. Then, there is another way to look at it. Carpenters, plumbers, electricians, stenographers, painters, secretaries will be able to go to the school and improve their knowledge or their trades. Freshmen will be able to go and to learn trades. So far as we are concerned, then, it is definitely not a waste of the people's money!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, before we vote on the amendment, I would like to speak for a few minutes on this topic. I was entranced by the hon. minister's explanation that he gave tonight. It is the most lucid and

Mr. Crosbie

at the same time opaque and at the same time most worthy of deserved attention that we have had of all these estimates. I would like to thank him for his clarification of the position. I thank him for the profulent negotiations he conducted on those contracts. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I am so pleased by the hon. minister's presentation tonight, I am not even going to mention the Expo buildings. All I want to mention is this: That between 8:30 p.m. and 1 a.m., we have had two hours and fifty minutes of orations by hon. members opposite. The same hon. members who on Thursday afternoon, Friday afternoon, Monday afternoon, Tuesday morning, Tuesday afternoon, would not say a word. Once closure was imposed, all of them suddenly found their voices. Two hours and fifty minutes out of the five hours from 8:30 p.m. to 1 a.m. During that period, Mr. Chairman, we have discussed \$6.4 million in expenditures, and we have \$64.3 million. It is now 1:30 a.m. We have a half hour, Mr. Chairman, to discuss \$64.3 million, ten departments and eleven heads of expenditure, because of the great efforts made by hon. members opposite. That is what closure means in this House. That is that \$64.3 million is going to go through, in the next half hour, Mr. Chairman, without any discussion at all, because of the outstanding efforts of hon. gentleman opposite.

MR. ROWE (F.W.) All one day on Provincial Affairs.

MR. CROSBIE: Provincial Affairs: one hour on Thursday. We had two hours on Friday. We had two hours on Monday. That is all. It is only \$100 million. The hon. gentlemen opposite have imposed closure. I just pointed out those statistics, Mr. Chairman. We have a-half hour to do \$64 million worth of work and, therefore, I wait for the next head of expenditure.

MR. NOLAN: Again we have the mutterings of a gentleman opposite, where everytime that someone stands up on this side of the House, has to sneer. He seems to forget that the same people who elected him, citizens of the

Mr. Nolan.

Province, elected the people on this side of the House; he seems to forget that the people who elected him, as a member of the Government, were Liberals. But the point we are on now is Public Works. What we are discussing, in fact, and has been discussed on the other side of the House, in addition to the trades schools, is the manner of tenderings, the method in which the department is operated and by a gentleman who has been in this House longer than most of us and once more has devoted a great deal of his time, as you know, to the department and to the office which he presently holds. There is no question about the fact for those who know him, and I refer to some of the hon. friends of mine opposite, who shared the responsibilities with him not only insofar as Public Works was concerned but also with other departments, can surely testify to the job that he has done and is continuing to do and with a group, I believe, of very qualified and certainly very dedicated officials. Number one, in this instance, is the hon. Minister of Public Works.

MR. NOLAN: That is a tender list. He walked into that one.

Mr. Chairman, I know there are those who would like to have it up for tender.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the rejects are over there.

MR. NOLAN: Yes. There are those who would like to have it up for tender, which may deprive some people opposite and including some people over here. You may not have the extra change in your pocket, However, getting back to the trade schools, I agree most heartedly with my hon. friend who just spoke a moment ago, and I am sure that all the members of the House, we welcome back to the House, from his recent hospitalization, and to see that he is in fine shape again.

MR. ROBERTS: He is in better shape than he ever felt.

MR. NOLAN: Just a few moments ago, Mr. Chairman, I am sure you will be edified to know that the hon. member was showing us his operation.

MR. ROBERTS: On the other hand perhaps it is Public Works.

MR. BARBOUR: It is water works.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, you finally come to the conclusion that you cannot win some games.

But getting back to the trade schools again, it is something that we have all wanted. All hon. members opposite. I have been very proud of the fact that we have had trade schools, for example, and the beautiful one in St. John's and Seal Cove and other areas of the island. But, no one who is aware of the problems that are involved and the demands that come from students by the thousands here would not want to see one, for example, in my hon. friend's district, in St. Anthony, in my hon. friend's district also. And the fact that they are now looking very closely and studying the possibility of have trades that are closely associated with high schools is something that, I believe, all members of this House are in favour of.

Therefore, I have no hesitation in supporting the request of my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, in his recommendation that his vote at this time, for Interim Supply, be adopted and accepted.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, since I did not make it on the amendment earlier, Maybe I can say a few words now. Principally, I think, to pay tribute to the hon. minister, but perhaps more so to his Deputy Minister, who since 1966 has been the work horse of the Harmon Corporation, which was set up at that time to take over, control and administer, under the Minister of Public Works, the property that was formerly the American Airforce Base at Stephenville.

I recall a debate in this House that year, Mr. Chairman, in which the question was raised of the rights of people living on that area, that former Base area, to vote and have the ordinary rights of citizens. And I was a little premature at that time because, I think, there were about twelve people living there. But today virtually the entire housing area on the Harmon Complex has been filled, some 450-odd units. There are, I think, in excess of 2800 people actually living in that area, which is administered by the Harmon Corporation. And, I think, the time has now come and the Government, indeed, agrees that the time has now come to consider the expansion of the boundaries of the Town of Stephenville, to take in the housing and commercial area that is now administered by the Harmon Corporation. This would mean the housing, the schools, and some of the occupied commercial property. That is one side of what the Harmon Corporation has been doing. The other side, and I think the two sides together probably make up one of the best success stories that Newfoundland has ever seen. And the other side, the commercial and industrial side there are today, and let me go back Mr. Chairman, when the Harmon Corporation took over at Stephenville, it did so in the wake of the closing of the Air Base, which at the time it closed employed 1134 people. Today, on the Harmon Corporation, administered by my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, whose Deputy Minister is the Acting Chairman of the Corporation, today there are some thirty industries, big and small, some thirty activities, commercial and industrial, which together employ in excess of 1500, and I think by next week it will be in excess of 1600 people. And that does not include some 1,000 people, adults, who are going to school full-time, five days a week, under the Federal/Provincial/Manpower arrangement at the Stephenville Adult

MR. CALLAHAN: Centre. And other groups in a number of areas of training on heavy equipment, and sophisticated heavy trucks, gear shift vehicles and that kind of thing, who are being graduated at the rate of about seventy every twelve weeks. And as we heard here the other day, Mr. Chairman, the fruits of that training programme are such that out of about 600 men who have been graduated from that latter programme, about, and at least eighty-five percent are known to be employed in the field in which they were trained.

In the Stephenville Adult Centre, which I consider to be the most basic the most enlightened thing we have done perhaps in this Province to eradicate functional illiteracy to give people a basic level of academic training, some 7,000 people, I understand, Mr. Chairman, have gone through that training centre, which is also administered, in terms of the property, by the Harmon Corporation, whose votes are provided in the votes of my colleague, the Minister of Public Works.

So that, Mr. Chairman, the Harmon Corporation, as I have said, has done a tremendous job for this Province, not only in terms of maintaining the property and administering the property, but also in terms of carrying out Government policy, in terms of making that property useful and making it an asset to the Province rather than a liability, making it a place of very great activity rather than a place of emptiness, as it had been when the American Airforce withdrew.

So far as the enlargement of the boundaries of Stephenville are concerned, we are now at the point, I think, where it can usefully become a matter of negotiation, as between the Province, represented by the Harmon Corporation, and the Town of Stephenville. And my feeling is that the more quickly that area can become a part of the town, the more quickly a number of problems that now exist, in terms of dual administration, will be eradicated and there will not be a separation between the two areas, and the people who live on the Harmon Corporation will find themselves in reality citizens of Stephenville.

But my reason, Mr. Chairman, for rising really was to pay tribute to the Harmon Corporation, who are in fact working themselves out of a job that was

MR. CALLAHAN: there mandate, and to pay tribute to my colleague, the Minister and to his Deputy Minister, who have taken over this property and made it work, and as I have said, to become a very substantial asset in terms of employment, in terms of housing, in terms of various kinds of development, not only for the Stephenville area but for this entire Province.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, like the other one, I had not intended to get into this, and I just want to make three brief points, as the hour is late, and there may be one or two other members who wish to speak to the committee. The first point, Sir, that I quite resent the cheap, unwarranted -

insinuation of the hon. member for St. John's West. He is not in the Chamber but I hope he can hear what I am saying.--in which he - the cheap insinuation - here he is now - the cheap insinuations in which he just threw out since eight o'clock tonight, members on this side of the House - the insinuations that since members on this side of the House have spoken for so many minutes and hours and members on the other side has spoken so many minutes, or else, there was some devious plot. This is typical of the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, quite typical of him. It is quite typical of the way he approaches things. He did not bother pointing out, with even basic intellectual honesty, that the Committee was today, for five entire hours debating one small item, one item, it is a large dollar item, one-twentieth of the subheads in this resolution. It is a quarter of the expenditure. It may raise a very important item, but there are a number of others equally important, I will not say more important but equally important. He did not bother pointing out that the Committee have spent more time on this Interim Supply Bill than any Bill, any Interim Supply Bill, in our history. Anyway I think it is cheap of them and I think it is perhaps quite beneath contempt.

Let me go on to say I resent the fact that I am not going to have the opportunity, as Minister of Health, to say anything about the Interim Supply Bill I am requesting, as the Minister of Health. There are a number of points which I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite wish to put to me, I know of interest to Newfoundland's medical doctors in the gallery. I do not believe in more interest that one of them has been in conversation with his friend and I regret that I am not going to have the benefit of the questions on this occasion. I do hope that I will get them later.

Mr. Chairman, I am resentful that we will not get on to all the other items that should be discussed. I resent the fact that this Committee has been delayed and that there has been obstructionism, that there has been deliberate

malevolent delay on the part of the Opposition, right from the day in which the Interim Supply Resolution, even the motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee, right from that point. That motion has traditionally in this House been put and carried without debate. It is a debateable motion, and so we did debate it. We spent an afternoon on it. There has been deliberate obstruction on the part of the Opposition. Now, let the Opposition then, having made their bed, lie in it. I am sick and tired of the whining

SOME HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman is entitled to come under medicare and also hon. gentlemen may come under the new mental health Act, if they so wish. Under the Children's Dental Health Programme and perhaps under the Rehabilitation, because while the light holds out to burn the vilest sinner may return. We will have to amend that Mr. Chairman. There is one vile sinner who has been over and back and gone again and now he is moving, in his hop-scotch. Final

Finally Mr. Chairman, I hear a braying - I hear a braying from a corner of the House - I wonder if the hon. gentleman would be good enough to let me draw my remarks to a close. I resented the fact that I cannot discuss health, thanks to the hon. gentleman and his -

MR. CROSBIE: (inaudible.)

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, and no supply and we will be here for months, nonsense. There is still the full supply debate. The Opposition tried to pretend that there would be none. Typical. I am willing when the time comes to face my own constituents. At least I have the courage to stay in the party in which I was elected, more than the hon. gentleman did. The hon. gentleman lost -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Finally, Mr. Chairman, may I say to my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, publicly what I have already said privately; I am delighted that the Government are now moving to honour and to implement the commitment which we made a number of years to provide vocational training facilities for the

people of the northern peninsula. Desperately needed, just as they are needed in Bonavista! They are needed in LaScie. They are needed in Springdale. They are needed in Placentia. Desperately needed! We need still more. I am delighted now. My colleague, in putting his estimates to the Committee has asked, and accordingly, Mr. Speaker, it will be a great pleasure for me to support these estimates.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, another thing that the hon. member for St. John's West did not point out to this Committee, and that is the fact that all of the matters that have not been debated up to now, twelve minuted to two, and all of the matters that have been debated up to now, all of the matters that are on that page twenty odd, twenty matters, totalling a hundred million dollars, all of these matters, those of them have been debated up to now and those of them that have not been debated up to now, will all be debated. He has not pointed that out. He has not pointed out that the estimates must be brought down here. He has not pointed out that a budget must be brought down here. He has not pointed out that both will be debated, probably for several weeks. He has not pointed out that questions will almost certainly be asked, running up into many, many hundreds and that this Committee, the Committee of Supply, will have every conceivable opportunity to discuss and debate and decide on every last item of the Government's proposed expenditure. Not a hundred million, but three or four times that much. Not half a dozen items, not twenty, thirty, forty, or a hundred items but several thousand items. All will be laid before the Committee, all will be open to debate, all will be open to questioning. It will take one week, two weeks, three weeks, four weeks, not a few hours, and that this is what has in fact happened ever since the coming of Confederation. This has not been pointed out. But what has been claimed is that this is a nefarious an abominable, a scandalous attempt to deprive the House of information -

SOME HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a lie. That is a lie. That is an obvious lie. That is an apparent lie. That is a lie so apparent that a stupid fool would even see it. It is completely a lie.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say a word about the five vocational schools that we are about to build. We are very proud that we are about to build them. Very happy for the people who will be served by the big new one in St. Anthony, and the other at Baie Verte. The other at Springdale. The fourth at Bonavista. The fifth at Placentia. We are happy for the people surrounding those important centres. We are happy for the tens of thousands of young men and women who will go through those schools in the next five, eight, ten, twelve, fifteen years. Tens of thousands young Newfoundlanders whose prospects of making a decent living in Newfoundland will be vastly improved by the operation of these schools. There are five of them and when they will be ready in the fall they will have cost \$8.5 million to put there. Ready to turn the key and allow the students to go in. The teaching staff to begin work, at that point they will have cost \$8.5 million

The tenders have already been called for the excavation and foundations. The tenders will be called for the electrical, for the plumbing, and heating, for the painting. The tenders will be called for approximately \$7,700,000.

Mr. Smallwood.

of the \$8.5 million which leaves a total of approximately \$800,000 that will not be called, for which tenders will not be called, something below ten per cent of the total value. The tenders will be called for \$2.5 million worth of machinery, of equipment, of paraphernalia. of all kinds that will go in the five schools. A total of \$7,700,000 will be awarded on the basis of tenders called for and will be awarded to the lowest tender. But there will be an amount of \$800,000 or a little under ten per cent of the lot that will not be awarded on tender. That amount of \$800,000 is to pay for the cost of the shells, the five shells, the walls and the roof - the shells, costing an average of \$160,000 each.

Now when the Minister of Public Works, who has served in that capacity for going on fourteen years, longer than any man in history in this Province, when he was charged with the duty of advising the Cabinet of the best way, the most efficient way and the most economical way to build those five schools, he put to us two ways of doing it. (1) the normal way of calling in firms of architects and saying to those firms; design, each of you, a school - five firms, five schools. Each of you design a school. Draw the architectural plans and draw up the specifications to the point where, we can call for tenders. Then the various builders would come into the minister. They would pick up the blue prints, and they would pick up the specifications - on the basis of which they would tender for the construction of the five schools. There would be tenders, doubtless from five, six or eight construction companies. The contracts would be awarded and the steel would be brought into the Province. The brick would be brought into the Province and almost certainly brick layers would be brought into the Province and steel riggers would be brought into the Province. It would cost much more than the \$800,000 to build and erect and complete those five buildings. It could not be done for \$800,000, an average

Mr. Smallwood.

of \$160,000 each for the five schools. It could not be done!

It would cost more than the \$800,000 and, not only that, most of the money that would be spent would go out of the Province. It is true. Most of the money would go out of the Province. Every dollar of the \$800,000 that we have decided to spend to put up those five buildings will stay in the Province, with the exception, only, of the licence fee that the firm in Stephenville, Atlantic Design Homes, will have to pay to the English owners of the ISEC system. This is a system, under which a building is erected in a factory. You take 150 or 170 men to do it in that factory in Stephenville. The building in that factory is built under a system patented in England. The owners of the patent must receive a royalty or a fee, a licence fee from the factory in Stephenville.

Now that will be the only money that will go out of the Province, of that \$800,000 because every last inch and every last ounce of those five buildings will be of Newfoundland origin and of Newfoundland processing. So, we will keep the \$800,000 in the Province. That was the first point the minister made to it.

(2) We guarantee quick and early completion, which we cannot do if we call in five firms of architects and they draw up five separate plans and sets of blue prints and five separate sets of specifications and we advertise for tenders from various firms and we finally award the tenders. We cannot, he told us, be sure that the buildings, the five schools will be ready for use in the fall. So, we had our choice in the Cabinet, as a Government representing the people of Newfoundland and trying to do what was right for Newfoundland. We knew that of the \$8.5 million, we would be calling tenders for \$7,700,000. The ISEC

Mr. Smallwood,

system, if we went that route, we would not only get the five buildings delivered to us and erected, delivered to the five sites, constructed, erected and put together but cheaper than going the other route. They would be done on time. We have a guarantee that they would be done on time. We know now, here tonight, here this morning, we know that these five schools will be done, will be completed. They will be equipped. They will be staffed to take in, perhaps, 2,000 or 3,000 young Newfoundlanders in the early autumn of this present year. We know that it will be cheaper. We know that all the work will be done by Newfoundlanders. We know that all the money will be kept in Newfoundland. Now there were our choices. The Government did not hesitate three minutes, three minutes. We did not hesitate one minute. The choices were so completely obvious. The choice that we had to make was so completely obvious. Now we knew that in making that choice, we knew very well that in making that choice, we would be laying ourselves open to attack from the Opposition and misrepresentation. We knew that. We are prepared to do it. We do not hesitate. We have not hesitated. We are not going to hesitate. We decided that we would do what was right, what was best for Newfoundland. We made that decision, and we are doing it.

Now the Newfoundland people will judge us. They have judged us before, six times, six times, they have judged us. This year, they will judge us for the seventh time. The people of those five towns will judge us. The people who will go to those schools from dozens of settlements, and their parents and their relatives and friends will judge us. The people of Stephenville will judge us. The people generally of this Province, the people generally of this Province will judge us. Did I hear? - I did not quite hear...

Mr. Smallwood.

MR. MURPHY: Is the hon. the Premier going to run in Stephenville?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I thought the hon. Leader of the Opposition was going to ask me , was it true that I was going to run.

MR. MURPHY: Oh, I know you are going to run.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was I going to run? Well now the only thing I will guarantee him is that I do not intend to seek the Liberal nomination in St. John's Centre. So, he can sleep tonight. He can sleep. He can sleep safely, when he goes home, that I will not be running in St. John's Centre. I have no expectation that I shall be seeking the nomination of the Liberal Party in the great district of Port au Port. But, I do believe that my colleague the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources for whom, I, and all my colleagues in the Cabinet have profound respect, profound respect for his tremendous ability, for his high intelligence and for his indefatigable energy and industry. No man ever served in a Cabinet, worked harder, worked longer hours or who was willing, so willing or more willing, at any rate, to tackle anything that I asked him to tackle.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, point of order. It is 2 a.m.

MR. CROSBIE: The Government's closure order is in force.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! No member shall rise after two o'clock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Wrong again, wrong again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A member who is speaking can continue. The hon. Premier's time ends at 2:09 a.m.

MR. MURPHY: Countdown.

MR. CROSBIE: One, two, three

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not need to hear the count to know now what is going to happen to the hon. gentleman later this year.

MR. CROSBIE: Ho, ho, ho. Dr. Monalesco himself! The doctor does not know, but the Premier knows, the shadow knows.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman drank too much water here tonight I can see that.

MR. CROSBIE: Not at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No? No?

MR. CROSBIE: Twenty Mile Pond is not polluted yet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No? No? Strange behaviour tonight.

MR. CROSBIE: Very strange.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Very stange behaviour.

MR. CROSBIE: What is the excuse for the Premier?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am a teetotaler, a teetotaler.

MR. CROSBIE: I will not question it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I drink a glass of wine, occasionally I drink a bottle of beer, but I am a teetotaler. I am sober now, strictly sober, and never since I was born have I been in better shape. Never in better shape than I am in now.

(Applause)

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is two o'clock in the morning

MR. CROSBIE: Our Public Works.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If this were five o'clock in the morning I would be in even better shape.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us go to five.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Try me, try me and see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order Please! At least until we get on with public works.

MR. CURTIS: I am glad soemthing works Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: The great Minister of Health is shaking his head.

MR. CROSBIE: Now we are on health, political health.

MR. ROBERTS: We are in such good health, obviously we need nothing more.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I hope we will put this matter to the vote in a moment. I hope that the committee will vote the Government this \$100 million to be spent for the Newfoundland people, for their benefit. I do not hope, I know it is not a matter of hoping, it is a matter of knowing that later in this session the Government will bring down a budget, and the Government will bring down voluminously detailed estimates of the coming year's expenditure and these detailed estimates will include, not the twenty items that are on this page, running to a total of \$100 million, but hundreds of items, including the \$100 million and several hundred millions more.

This will happen, this will be brought down, and there will then be exposed to the Newfoundland people, there will then be exposed the fraudulent charge, the fraudulent charge that has been made in this House, in this committee, that we do not want to give the information, that we do not want to answer questions, that we do not want to account for the expenditure we propose to make in the next twelve months. That fraudulent claim will be exposed and I ask the committee now to vote us the \$100 million, so that we can get on with the business of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The amendment moved by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, that the amount in item (9) be reduced to \$352,000. Those in favour please say "aye," those against please say "nay," I declare the amendment lost.

MR. CROSBIE: Standing vote Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did the hon. gentleman say water?

Amendment lost on standing vote.

On motion, clauses (9) to (20) carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the total carry?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, I move that the \$99,780,000. be reduced to \$35 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, no amendments can be moved.

MR. MURPHY: Can we have noted, Sir, that from (10) to (20), that these items were not discussed. Will anything go in the records that it was passed, through this closure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was no debate.

MR. MURPHY: No debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Too bad.

MR. MURPHY: Will the press please take note, items (10) to (20).....

On motion Resolution carried.

On motion, that the committee rise, report having passed the Resolution, and recommend that a Bill be brought in to give effect to the same, Mr. Speaker, returned to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and directed me to report having passed the Resolution and recommend that a Bill be brought in to give effect to same.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that the report of this Committee be adopted. Those in favour "any," contrary "nay," carried.

AN HON. MEMBER: Divide:

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Will all those in favour of the Resolution; that the report of the Committee be adopted please rise.

MR. MURPHY: There we have the solidarity of the party.

The hon. the Premier; the hon. the President of the Council; the hon. Mr. Lewis; the hon. Minister of Highways; the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs; Mr. Noel; Mr. Smallwood; the Hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs; Mr. Hodder; Mr. Strickland; the Hon. Minister of Education and Youth; the hon. Minister of Public Works; the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources; the hon. the Minister of Community and Social Development, the hon. Minister of

Provincial Affairs; the hon. Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation; Mr. Canning; Mr. Barbour; the Hon. Minister of Health; the Hon. Minister of Supply and Services; Mr. Moores; Mr. Saunders; Mr. Wornell.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against please rise.

The hon. The Leader of the Opposition; Mr. Hickey; Mr. Marshall; Mr. Collins; Mr. Earle; Mr. Hickman; Mr. Crosbie; Mr. Myrden.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

On motion Bill read a first time, Ordered read a second time, ordered read a third time, and ordered that the Bill do pass and that its title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, that the House at its rising do adjourn until Wednesday at 3:00 p.m.