



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 1

1st Session

Number 32

VERBATIM REPORT

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to welcome to the galleries today, the Mayor of Windsor, Mayor McCarthy, Mr. Mercer and the council delegation from Windsor. I trust that their visit here is most informative and interesting.

HON. H. A. COLLINS (Municipal Affairs and Housing): Mr. Speaker, arising out of some reference in one of our papers yesterday about the so-called fact that this government are secretive about reports being tabled when they should be tabled, etc. Reference was made to the Phalen Royal Commission Report on the City of St. John's Act. I checked it out and I find that the report was tabled, June 9, 1970, two parts of it; the final report and the City of St. John's Act. The only thing that was not tabled (I do not know why it was not) was the Interim Report which should have been tabled I suppose but maybe was overlooked.

At any rate, I cannot speak for the previous administration but I would like to table those copies today for the information of our brethern in the press.

MR. E.M. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for the former administration but I am glad the minister has tabled the reports. I am not sure what affect tabling has because as he pointed out, they were tabled in the House by the then minister two years ago. However, maybe the editorial writer in "The Evening Telegram" will - I think that is what the honourable minister is really after, the editorial in the "Telegram" which accused him of being or the administration of being secretive. They were tabled. I do not know why the Interim Report was not tabled but I believe legislation was brought before the House and adopted. It removed the corporate vote and ended the plural vote in St. John's. That was in effect before the last municipal election in the City. I do not know what more need be said. The report has been tabled. It has been

Mr. Roberts

acted on. I believe a new City of St. John's Act is in the works and presumably at some point it will be brought before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to - there is no deputy.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, yes there is.

MR. CROSBIE: No! No!

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier announced -

MR. CROSBIE: There is a Premier and an (Acting) Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well there is no Premier here, the (Acting) Premier.

MR. CROSBIE: I am glad to see that it is clarified.

MR. EVANS: - gone.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It gives me great pleasure to announce the official formation of the Classification Appeals Board which is such a vital part of the new classification and pay plan which was implemented in October, 1971. This government have been concerned with the delay in the formation of the board, a delay which was caused by a number of unforeseeable circumstances. However, I am pleased that the board is now ready to proceed and I am confident that the chairman and board members will do an admirable job in the difficult task which they face. The chairman of the board is Dr. David Facey Crowther, a history professor at Memorial University. He will be supported by a board consisting of: Miss Hazel Pritchett, a mathematics professor at Memorial University; Mr. Frank Haines, the former Assistant Deputy Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, who is now retired; Mr. Esau Thoms, a well-known Newfoundland labour leader, one of the brothers I believe of the hon. member for Bonavista North -

AN HON. MEMBER: An N.D.P.

MR. CROSBIE: And an N.D.P. - he has seen the light. He is on his way to conservatism.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: I hope he does not do that.

There is also Mr. Fred Anderson, a former manager of the Royal Bank of Canada, now retired. I am informed that office space and clerical assistance has been provided for the board and the first meeting will be held at an early date. I am sure the honourable members of the former administration know that there are many hundreds of appeals from the Classification and Pay Plan. It is, therefore, hoped that this board will be able to sit during the summer and clear up these many appeals which make us very concerned. The board is now finally appointed and we hope by the end of the summer most of these appeals will have been dealt with.

MR. NEARY: Where are the offices?

MR. CROSBIE: I am not sure. I presume it is in the building here somewhere.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not over on Viking Road?

It is here in the building?

MR. CROSBIE: That would be a good place for them. I am glad the honourable gentleman suggested that.

One of the first of the vikings.

Mr. Speaker, also, I would like to announce on behalf of the government, the President of the Hospital Association and the President of Nape. Mr. Max Dyke, that we signed two collective agreements today covering employees in the x-ray and laboratory groups. These agreements were reached between the Treasury Board, the Newfoundland Hospital Association and the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees, who represent laboratory and x-ray employees in the various government and non-government hospitals throughout the province.

The agreements provide for grievance and arbitration procedures, payment of premium rates for overtime worked in excess of forty-four hours a week, (that is effective April 1, 1972) remuneration for call back and stand by duty, annual leave, sick leave, compassionate and maternity leave. A new classification and pay plan for laboratory and x-ray employees was introduced with effect from April 1, 1972. Both these agreements will remain in effect until March 31, 1973, with the exception of salaries and hours of work which are presently being renegotiated. I believe the general principles of this were arrived at last year, but the final detailed agreements have just been agreed and signed. There are copies for the Leader of the Opposition.

MP. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the second statement of the minister, I assume that these agreements are the implementation in detail of the agreements worked out a year ago which have been in effect, although not formally so, is that the correct procedure?

MP. CROSBIE: That is correct.

MP. ROBERTS: The salaries are being reopened and will doubtless be negotiated. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the minister would either table them (I am not so sure that they should be tabled) or perhaps he could arrange to let certainly one or two of the members on this side have copies of them, because when we come to the estimates of his colleague the Minister of Health, we may have a few words to say on some aspects

of these and the other agreements. I am particularly interested in the procedure for negotiating collective agreements covering hospital employees. The minister may take note of it, especially in view of the recent activities of the Hospital Association, which I believe has said publicly that they would like to take it over. This is an area we hope to touch on.

With reference, Sir, to the first statement made by the minister, I can only welcome it. As he said, it has been a long time finding five citizens who would volunteer to undertake the job of classification appeals. I imagine that there will be a great number initially. When the system comes into full force and has been in effect for a year or two, presumably there will be fewer. I assume the minister may want to say a word on this. There has not been any change in the practice whereby classifications cannot be appealed as a class. They can only be appealed if an individual is saying that he should be a clerk grade IV instead of a clerk grade II, not the case of all of the clerks grade II of the Health Inspection Branch saying that they should be clerks grade IV instead of clerks grade II. I assume that principle still remains, because if not, it is not a classification appeal board we will need, it is an entirely new treasury board secretariat and an entirely new structure of agreements.

I wish the committee nothing but good success, they are in for a long, hot summer I am sure.

MR. CROSBIE: These points that the Leader of the Opposition has raised, Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleague the Minister of Health will be glad when his estimates come up to explain the agreements reached. I believe they have been reached by the Newfoundland Hospital Association on a procedure for collective bargaining. I see no objection to tabling copies of the collective agreements if the union does not object. I do not know if they have been asked or not.

On the other point, I do not think there has been any change. That will have to be looked at as to whether you can appeal apart from individual cases.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the appointment of Mr. John Richards Norman, as Assistant Chief of Police of the Newfoundland Constabulary. I am equally pleased to announce the appointment of Mr. John Richard Browne, as Deputy Assistant Chief of Police of the Newfoundland Constabulary. These two promotions and appointments have been recommended by Chief of Police Lawlor whose recommendation has been accepted and implemented by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council.

The appointments are effective immediately. Assistant Chief of Police Norman is a native of Bay Roberts. He joined the Newfoundland Constabulary in 1936. He was promoted to sergeant in 1945 and to the rank of head constable in 1955, at which time he was transferred to the Criminal Investigation Division. In addition to serving in that division, Assistant Chief of Police Norman has served as officer in charge of junior school patrols, officer in charge of the highway patrol and the police prosecutor on the Magistrate's Court. Assistant Chief of Police Norman was promoted to the rank of district inspector on August 24, 1961. He was appointed to the rank of Deputy Assistant Chief of Police on September 8, 1970. On September 20, 1962, he was awarded the Police Service Medal. He holds a thirty-five year bar. He is the recipient of the Centennial Medal. Mr. Norman has attended traffic courses given by Northwestern University and the EMO courses at Arnprior.

Deputy Assistant Chief of Police Brown was born in St. John's, educated at Holy Cross and St. Bonaventure's College. During World War II, he served for six years in the Royal Navy where he saw action in Norway, Dieppe, North Africa and Sicily. Deputy Assistant Chief of Police Brown joined the constabulary in 1948. During the years from '57 to '58 he attended Northwestern University's Traffic Institute,

Chicago, Illinois, where he graduated from the Police Administration Course. On June 1, 1958, he was promoted to the rank of sergeant and assigned to the Traffic Division. On September 1, 1963, Deputy Assistant Chief of Police Brown was promoted to the rank of head constable. In September, 1967, he became a district inspector. Deputy Assistant Chief of Police Brown has attended several EMO courses and last year successfully completed an Executive Development Course at the Canadian Police College in Ottawa. He is the holder of the Police Service Medal. These two senior officers have an outstanding record of service and leadership within the Newfoundland Constabulary.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Speaker, of course, we on this side welcome the announcement of these two appointments. The two gentleman concerned are respected and esteemed by all who have had anything to do with law enforcement in the province. I agree wholeheartedly with the honourable minister that they have had outstanding careers in this field. While I am on my feet, I wonder if I could ask the minister how many other vacancies do now exist as a result of the Chief of Police resigning a month or so ago? I am just wondering how many exist because of the obvious practice of moving people up to fill the vacant slots?

MR. HICKMAN: I have no idea.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): No, idea really. Okay, we will get them in due course.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

HON. H.A. COLLINS (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to Question No. 101, dated June 12, in the name of the hon. member for St. Barbe North and also Question No. 93 on the Order Paper of June 9, from the same honourable member.

HON. G. W. DAWE (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to Question No. 89 on the Order Paper for June 8, 1972. The answer is "no" to all of them.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other answers to questions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable Minister of Justice. Would the honourable minister inform the House what steps his department has taken to remedy a most serious problem at Her Majesty's Penitentiary, whereby juveniles are practically held in solitary confinement because of inadequate facilities and regulations barring mixing of these juvenile offenders with adult prisoners?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I assume the honourable member for Bell Island is referring to the panel discussion that took place yesterday. I am now conscious of the problem that exists and there is no question about it, it is a regrettable situation. I commend the superintendent of the penitentiary for drawing to the attention of the magistrates, that where at all possible juveniles should be sentenced to a correctional institution rather than to the penitentiary. There is no question at all that the situation as it exists now is most undesirable.

I would like to know the answer to the solution or the solution to the problem. I would hope that the correctional study which will be started, I suspect within the next week or two, of all correctional facilities, will make some recommendation so that we can deal with all juveniles in one or more satisfactory institutions. It would be trite to say and certainly not correct, that tomorrow we are going to tear the insides out of the penitentiary and rectify that situation. We can take some consolation in the fact that the magistrates are aware of the problem that exists there and fortunately, it is not the kind of thing that is occurring with a great deal of frequency. Once in a while it has occurred. It is not acceptable and we just must find a solution for it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the honourable minister does not remember my raising that very point under his estimates. I

would like to direct a question to the honourable Minister of Finance.

I am not quite sure if the honourable Minister of Finance or the honourable Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources would answer this question, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to know if a formula has been worked out yet, whereby the poultry farmers and the hog breeders will know, as of today, what assistance they are going to get for losses incurred as a result of the strike at Newfoundland Farm Products?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's question - the answer is that this is still being worked on and my colleague, the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, will be in a position when the House meets next week to give the full details.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for the minister. Is it a fact that the hog breeders have been offered three dollars and fifty cents to transport their hogs to the mainland to have them slaughtered?

MR. CROSBIE: No.

MR. NEARY: That is not a fact?

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Would the minister inform the House if the Local Improvement District of Dark Cove, Gambo and Middle Brook has asked for a meeting with the minister? If they have, what was the minister's answer and at what time will the minister meet with this council?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, questions no. 60 and 61 of Tuesday June 6, from the honourable member for Bonavista North, the answer to both questions is no.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion (8)

June 14, 1972, Tape 777, page 3 --apb

MR NEARY: (Bell Island) - To move:

WHEREAS, an increasing number of citizens are suffering acutely as a result of harmful dossiers maintained on them in the files of organizations specializing in provision of financial credit information; and

WHEREAS, a great deal of this so called information is based upon most trivial flimsy and often mistaken information; and

WHEREAS, the citizen is not generally aware of channels available to him through which he may inspect and correct the information files for mis-information and faulty evidence that can have most serious and disastrous effect upon his own life, that of his family and their personal reputations in the Community, as well as upon their standard of living; and

WHEREAS, these channels themselves may be inadequate; and

WHEREAS, both in the United States and in Canada Governments responsible to the needs of their citizens are setting up legislation and regulations to protect their citizens against this new and deadly invasion of privacy;

BE IT RESOLVED, that a Select Committee of the House be appointed to investigate the present and potential dangers to human rights in this Province posed by all organizations maintaining credit and personal information on individual citizens for other than their own confidential restrictive use; and that the said Select Committee recommend such additions to the human rights legislation of this Province as are necessary to protect its citizens.

MR ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, when debate on this motion was adjourned and I believe it was before the House rose for the recess following-- well, we rose early in May and we came back the end of May, I think that it has been over a month since this matter was debated here in the House. I think it was thoroughly debated on, we spent a full afternoon on the question. We let it stand over, we being both sides, by mutual agreement, with the understanding that the government would look at the motion with a view to seeing whether they would agree

June 14, 1972, Tape 777, Page 4 -- apb

to it or were prepared to support it or not. In light of the fact that I think the motion was put on the Order Paper, the Minister of Provincial Affairs gave notice that he would be introducing some Bills, Those Bills subsequently have been introduced, they were distributed to the House within the past two or three days only. They have been given first reading although as yet they have not been called and not been debated because, of course, we are on the estimates.

MR. ROBERTS: Does the House leader on the government side wish to say a word? Go ahead and then I will come back for a second or two.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, there are three bills, notice of which has been given on the Order Paper. We agreed at the time that we would go no further with these bills until such time that the government's position had been determined. Now this resolution calls for a select committee, the appointment of a select committee to investigate the potential dangers to human rights in this province, posed by organizations maintaining credit and personal information on individual citizens. There are on the Order Paper, as I say, bills dealing with this very situation. The position of the government is: (we adjourned the last time, being the democratic party that we are, we discussed it thoroughly in caucus) There is something to be said, of course, for the resolution of the hon. member for Bell Island. We feel that there is no need of a select committee to investigate this matter, purely and simply because many of the things which this resolution desires have been handled by the bill which we are about to bring in. These bills in due course, of course, will be considered by Committee of this Whole House, not by a select committee but by the entire House itself. We feel that the bills deal in substance with that which the hon. member for Bell Island wished to draw to the attention of the public. If there is anything in the bills, in any of the bills, being, as I say, receptive to suggestions from the opposition, if there is anything that the opposition wish to bring up in Committee of the Whole, we will give it full consideration at the time and deal with it when the bills come in. Our position is quite simply this: That there is no need of a select committee to do that which the government intend to be done forthwith or before this sitting adjourns. If there is anything in the bills which the opposition feel does not fully cover the situation, they can bring it up. We will give it consideration in Committee of the Whole and determine it then. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, we do not feel that there is need of a

Mr. Marshall

select committee and we will not be supporting the resolution because we are already bringing measures forward to do exactly the thing which the honourable member desires.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable gentleman. I guess he was really asking us a question because that was the only way he could say a word.

I am not so sure that I disagree with the honourable gentleman. I think the fact that the bills stand as Motions 1,2,3, - the fact that the notice was given after my friend and colleague from Bell Island put his motion on the Order Paper is a coincidence and it may have served its purpose. I think the matter has been debated fully and the House I would imagine is anxious, Sir, to go ahead with estimates. My colleague who is not here is prepared to withdraw the motion. If we may have consent, Sir, we will withdraw the motion. I think it has been adequately debated. As the House Leader says, it will come up for discussion when the second readings of the bills are called and we will take it from there. Accordingly, I would ask on behalf of my colleague if the motion may be withdrawn. As Your Honour will remind the House, that requires leave. I gather it will be given.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave to withdraw the motion? Agreed.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Marshall.

I might point out that there has also been an agreement today - private members' day. We are going to adjourn today until Monday. We are now going to go into government business. For this reason I call, with the consent of the hon. member for White Bay South and his agreement, the order, Committee of Supply.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON SUPPLY

HEADING VI - EDUCATION AND YOUTH

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, 602-01, salaries. I wonder if the minister could inform the committee as to why we have this increase over last year. Is it because of additional staff in this division or increments in salaries or for what reason?

MR. CARTER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it does seem like an unusually large increase. Part of it, of course, is the natural increment in salaries. This happens every year. But chiefly it is brought about by the fact that there were quite a number of vacancies filled in the last twelve months, particularly in the Division of Instruction, consultants and specialists. Of course, this has raised the whole salary bill. Dr. Brown's department has expanded quite a bit. This is the reason. You could argue I suppose that the \$363,300 of last year was an artificially low figure. In other words had those vacancies been filled, that figure last year would have been larger.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): You said that there were additional staff added to the Division of Instruction. There is a salary grant under that particular division. How would that affect the 602-01, general administration?

MR. CARTER: The honourable member probably did not hear me. There seems to be quite a bit of background noise. I said that at first glance the \$419,500 this year's figure does seem quite a bit higher than the \$363,000 last year. When you realize that this differential is caused

Mr. Carter

by vacancies that were filled, then the figure of last year can be seen as being artificially low. In other words had these vacancies not existed last year, this figure of \$363,300 would have been much larger. Anyway that is the reason for it. I do not expect this figure to rise by the same proportion next year.

On motion 602-01 carried.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, 602-02-08, I notice that there is quite an increase here. Does this increase cover any computers that are now in operation in his department? Are some of these computers outside of his department?

MR. CARTER: This is billed, Mr. Chairman, to the Computer Services and it is increased largely by staff increases, increases in the office load generally. This is our bill that we pay to Computer Services. It is the one giant brain that does all our work.

On motion 602-02-08 carried.

On motion total subhead 602, carried.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, this is one of the few divisions under salaries that we have a decrease over last year. I wonder if the minister could inform the committee -

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I could not hear the question.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am having difficulty in hearing answers to questions as well. It is probably because both of us are not speaking into the microphone. Could they be switched up a little tiny bit?

Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is one of the few divisions where we have a decrease in the salary vote and I wonder if there is any particular reason for it?

MR. CARTER: I am sorry. You are inquiring about 604-01.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Yes.

MR. CARTER: Not 602-01 - I am sorry - 604-01. That is a typographical error, Mr. Chairman. Last year should have been \$49,500. If the honourable members would change the figures there, they will find that the increase to \$62,500 is caused by the increase of one staff member.

On motion 604-01, carried.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, 03-06, what is the nature of the scholarships and brusaries under 604-03-06?

MR. CARTER: Their titles are: Dr. Barnes, Dr. Burk, Dr. Blackall and Dr. Curtis Scholarships.

On motion 604-03-06, carried.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman what are these brusaries? This is not the special education brusaries or grants, is it?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, these are special brusaries to extra-needy students that post-secondary institutions are experiencing in the first year of operation and this has indicated that \$60,000 is in our judgment adequate. In other words, \$120,000 was put in last year. It was not all used.

Mr. Carter

By experience it was learned that \$60,000 was adequate, obviously more would be nice but it did seem to handle the programme adequately last year.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): This is for first-year university students, did you say?

MR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Any other institutions or is it just the university?

MR. CARTER: Any post-secondary.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Any post-secondary?

MR. CARTER: Yes, the especially needy.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, can the minister definitely assure us that no needy students will be denied money required to go to any institution - post-secondary education this year. This is a decrease. This whole vote has been cut in half.

MR. CARTER: This vote again I might explain, Mr. Chairman, this \$120,000 was allocated for this last year and only \$60,000 of it was used.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Oh!

MR. CARTER: Therefore, \$60,000 was considered to be adequate.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): All right, thank you.

On motion 604-03-07, carried.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, 604-04, the honourable minister mentioned during the general debate that took place on his salary during the past couple of days that perhaps as we got through the various specific subheads, he would have some thoughts, some words to say on some of the problems which we mentioned to him and which

MR. ROWE, W.N. were aired in the House. He himself had nothing I think to say about the parents' subsidies, the mothers' allowance being abolished. I would like to hear his position on the whole thing, the idea of mothers' allowances or parents' subsidies, (1) from a philosophical or a policy position. (2) Could he inform the committee whether he or his colleague, the Minister of Finance, has been in contact with Ottawa to confirm the family allowance delay and whether now the government are in a position to amend its original idea of abolishing mothers' allowances and to raise this amount sufficiently to allow mothers' allowances to be paid until such time as at least the new family allowance scheme comes into operation.

MR. CARTER: I would be more than delighted at the opportunity to speak on anything in education under the appropriate headings. I am very pleased that the honourable gentleman has seen fit to remind me that this is the place where these particular, there are about half a dozen very contentious points in education and I am very pleased to have the opportunity to bring them up under their proper heading and this was precisely why in the past couple of days I have avoided getting into wide-ranging debate, preferring to keep my comments for the specific subjects, specific topics as they are brought up.

Now first of all, the \$975,000 is the amount that was voted in interim supply that was paid out to mothers in April, This was the April check of \$5. to each mother and the balance, if you like, it was the school year balance of the mothers' allowance, the first bit going out in September or late August of 1971 and being \$15 per child going to school and this \$5 was the balance. A total of \$975,000. There is nothing more in that vote because, as honourable members know, the mothers' allowance has unfortunately been cancelled

MR. CARTER: I say unfortunate because I think any honourable member would agree that mothers' allowance is a great help to mothers and particularly for those with large families. Unfortunately because of the mess that was left to us, we had to trim our sails somewhat. It is a gross distortion of fact to say that this money was saved. In fact the education vote is up and you could very well argue that this much money that is allegedly being saved is of course being put into education.

Now no one is naive enough to suggest that each dollar that comes into the government by way of revenue also comes in with a label on it, it goes into the pot and expenses naturally come out of the pot. It is impossible to say what each percentage point of the sales tax goes for. The answer, of course it goes into general revenue and is spent in general revenue. Education spending is up and it is up considerably it is up in effect to \$160 million, if you take into account the spending in other departments. Some honourable members might suggest that is not a fair comparison, that we are here talking about the education budget, and I will grant them their point. But at the same time the total spending on educational facilities, current and capital, in Newfoundland in this coming fiscal year is \$156 million.

The other point of course that was made by the honourable Minister of Finance is that this is the only province in Canada that has such a programme. If the financial future of Newfoundland, if we are going to have any future it is going to be largely determined by our fiscal relations with Ottawa. I do not see how we can make a convincing case to Ottawa that we are in desperate need for additional financial assistance, if at the same time we continue a plan in effect, the like of which is not in any other province. I would suggest further that those of you who are really and honestly concerned with the mothers of this province and the poor mothers in particular, would do well to sleep

MR. CARTEP: on that particular thought. In fact by granting the mothers' allowance and in affect saying to Ottawa, we are in such a wealthy province that we do not need any further help, is in fact, I would suggest, a stab in the back for the poor mothers and their future. Therefore, I unfortunatley had to concur with my colleagues that it is absolutely necessary that at this time this particular allowance be held in abeyance.

As to the increased family allowance, we are certainly not, it is certainly not definite that this will not come into effect within the next six months. We are told that it may not come into effect for another year, but I would say at the present time this is speculation and we will have to wait until it is further confirmed. If there are any other points or any other questions on this particular heading, I would be more than happy to take my seat and deal with them as they arise.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Mr. Chairman, on the point of the mothers' allowances, parents' subsidies - I would like to go on record as saying that what the honourable Minister of Education has just uttered is so much nonsense and foolishness. Ottawa is not going to do anything special for Newfoundland as a province when it comes to current account payments, when it comes to payments made by Ottawa to this province for current accounts.

What Ottawa may in fact do, Sir, is to make some adjustments to the equalization payments which will put every province in Canada in exactly the same boat - nothing special for any province. Newfoundland may get more under an equalization grant or equalization payments, but that would only be because of the formula which is being worked out, more than say, proportionally more than say Nova Scotia because of certain considerations that are taken into account when the formula is made.

So to say that we have to cut out the mothers' allowance because it makes our case stronger when we go to Ottawa looking for additional

MR. ROWE, W.N. money, additional current account revenues to run this province, is so much nonsense, Sir, it holds no water whatsoever. This province will get money from Ottawa for current account expenditures on the same bases as any other province and what this province does with its money. I would submit, Sir, firstly, is no concern of Ottawa, within our jurisdiction and within our competence as a Legislature in this province. number one. (2) I would further submit that no minister in Ottawa would be so silly, so petty or so ignorant as to inquire into what Newfoundland is doing with its money, the money that comes into the consolidated revenue fund of this province unless, from a practical point of view, unless such expenditures by the province were grossly irregular and grossly stupid. To call the mothers' allowance or the parents' subsidy or to put the mothers' allowance or the parents' subsidy in that category, I do not think even the honourable minister would go so far as to do that.

I think, Sir, that the argument which he has propounded and the argument which the honourable Minister of Finance has propounded about weakening our case to Ottawa because the mothers' allowance is in existence is not logically sensible and it is not practicably sensible because we will be in no special position with regard to Ottawa, we will be in the same position as any other province and it has nothing to do with our expenditures, it has to do with the formula on which equalization payments are made and that formula applies to Newfoundland and to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Manitoba equally. There is no special case made for any province and no special consideration is given to any province, and I doubt very much if at anytime in the future the Government of Canada, as far as operating revenues are concerned, current account revenues are concerned, whether the Government of Canada will ever consider any province to be in a special case, because that would undermine the fabric of Confederation.

So, Sir, the honourable minister would be well advised not to use

MR. ROWE, W.N. that specious and untenable argument about us trying to get more money from Ottawa, when he tries plainly to defend the abolition, the annihilation of the parents' subsidy in the estimates which are being presented to this committee.

MR. CARTER: There was another argument that I did not make, because I thought it was so obvious to all that it was quite unnecessary to make it. The fact is, I did actually allude to it.

The fact is, the main, hard, brutal fact is that our comrades on the other side of the House, our predecessors who occupied this government for the past, well certainly for the past several years, mismanaged our financial affairs to such an extent that now it is literally quite impossible to pay the mothers' allowance. I would love to pay it. I think it ought to be paid. The mothers certainly need it. No one disputes the need for that but (a) not having the money and the corollary of that is to get the kind of money that would be needed to pay the \$3.5 million. Such extraordinary financial gyrations would have to be undergone that Ottawa could well look upon us with disfavour, in fact any sane person would look upon us with disfavour.

The other point that I think should be made at this time is that if the honourable gentleman's theories were to be carried out he would put Confederation back probably before 1867, one formula for all of Canada. If Confederation means anything surely it means that special areas of Canada will get special attention and I can think of no more special area of Canada than Newfoundland. I think it is rendered particularly special when you look at the last twenty-three years of brutal mismanagement and neglect.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, I cannot stand here and hear the minister try to excuse himself for the elimination of the parents' subsidy by, for the nth time, referring to the performance of the past twenty-three years. Sir, he has a black and white policy on this and I submit that he has not given it any thought whatsoever, just a complete wipe out of the mothers' allowances without even considering the possibility of some sort of a means test that could be applied to this allowance so that the needy mothers of this province would get this allowance.

Sir, when he can refer to the past and talk about the financial

mess that we are in and the fact that this administration does not have any money whatsoever, when recently this administration passed over \$2.6 million to Spencer Lake and \$5. million to Doyle, I cannot see how that argument can hold up whatsoever. So I reject it completely.

Sir, the other point that the minister still has not answered and in fact the five Conservative members of the House of Commons are apparently as concerned as we are over on this side of the honourable House, they are concerned over what the minister intends to do if the family income security plan is not introduced over the next year. We have not heard any indication as to what would happen in this particular event.

Another point, Sir, is that the argument is being used that we are a poor province and therefore cannot afford something like the mothers' allowance. Well, Sir, this is the very reason that we have the mothers' allowances in the first place. We are a poor province and too many of our people are still poor and there are, Sir, many, many hundreds of families in this province who could benefit greatly from this \$20.00 per year per child. Sir, I have to repeat an example that was brought up last night in this honourable House. If we have a low-income family or a no-income family, and there are too many of those, with five children going to school, Sir, this family would get \$100.00 per year to assist the mothers in getting their kids to school.

Sir, that plan has been wiped out ruthlessly and instead we had a political move, made prior to the last election, when the seven per-cent sales tax on children's clothing was eliminated. Sir, I submit that this political trickery will not benefit the poor people of this province as much as the people who are better off. Sir, in order for a poor family, this family of five, to benefit from the

elimination of this sales tax, that poor family with five kids would have to buy \$1400.00 worth of clothing in order to gain back the hundred dollars that was lost through the elimination of the mothers' allowance. Sir, I would suggest that there are an awful lot of people, well off people, who are really the ones who are going to derive benefits from the elimination of that sales tax. It is not the poor people, it is the rich people who are going to benefit from that move and it is the poor people who suffer from the elimination of the mothers' allowance.

Sir, if the government or present administration wanted to save \$3.2 million in one area of education I would suggest, Sir, that they should have taken that money saved and spend it in some other area of education such as helping to, for one example, I will give you many other examples, but they could have been used in order to help reduce the present student-teacher ratio. So, Sir, I still have, I would like probably to mention just very briefly this very important point, I am not suggesting that the mothers' allowance should be retained as it was. I think that there were too many parents in this province who were getting this -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Mr. Chairman, I believe when an honourable member is speaking in this House he has a right to be heard in silence.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Sir, would you rule on it please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member ready for the point of order?

MR. ROWE(F.B.): I am suggesting, Sir, -

MR. CHAIRMAN: You ask for a ruling.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Yes, I am raising a point of order that an honourable member in this House has a right to be heard in silence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is correct. An honourable member when speaking when he has the floor and has been recognized by the Chair is entitled to be heard in silence.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): What I was trying to suggest, Mr. Chairman, is that the original mothers' allowance, which was a grand concept and three honourable members on the other side of the House must have at least agreed with it to the extent of more than fifty per-cent because they served under the administration that had this particular concept draft to start off with, but, Sir, what I am trying to suggest is that the mothers' allowances as it was first conceived probably benefited a few mothers in this province who really did not need it. What I am suggesting is that really some more thought should be given to this business of the mothers' allowance and that some consideration be given to the possibility of bringing it back in, with some sort of a means test being applied to it. Sir, I am serious about that. I would like the minister basically to relate to whether or not there is any possibility that this mothers' allowance in spite of this could be brought in on a means test basis. I would almost go so far as to say this; put the seven per-cent, I probably should not say that, back on the clothing because the poorer mothers of this province do not gain the benefits from that move, that they would benefit from as far as bringing mothers' allowances back in is concerned.

Sir, I would like to hear his thoughts on it. Secondly I would like to hear whether or not or what he is planning to do if this is delayed for say one year, because I do not believe I have heard an answer to that particular question.

MR. CARTER: The honourable member for St. Barbe North, Mr. Chairman, has not done his sums. In the first place the cost of taking off the seven per-cent on children's clothing, the cost of that is roughly,

June 14, 1972

Tape 782

JM - 5

round figures, half a million dollars. Granting, even granting that a mothers' allowance with a means test could be instituted I think we still, all honourable members will agree that we are still talking about a sum of money substantially in excess of \$2. million. I think that the honourable

2431

MR. CARTER: member would agree that even granting, for the sake of argument, that a mother's allowance with a means test could be instituted, we are still talking about a sum of money quite in excess of \$2 million. Would the hon. member grant me that for the sake of argument?

MR. F. ROWE: In other words what you are saying is that there are that many mothers in need... There are mothers who need \$2 million.

MR. CARTER: Yes, the need is certainly great. I will grant the hon. member that. There is no question about it. The need is certainly great but where would the hon. gentleman have me take it from? Would he have me take it from the maintenance grants? \$11 million. Would he have me take it from the teachers' salaries? He would have me take it from Doyle. It was very carefully established in a long, contentious but very thorough debate, right here in this very House this year, that that \$5 million was inescapable, absolutely inescapable and it was inescapable precisely because the previous administration had been so loose in their dealings with Mr. Doyle. So I think that that \$5 million we can write off right away.

Now he asks me about the money paid to Spencer Lake. That money was paid to procure a viable industry that should return that cost many, many times.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was worth less than \$1 million.

MR. CARTER: Well, certainly not in terms of its potential value. The other thing is, and here is a point that should be borne in mind, when I made the point, "we are a poor province," I meant it in two ways, We are a province, an undeveloped province, a newer province, a less industrially developed part of Canada than many other parts, So we are to all intents and purposes a poor province, but we are also a poor province because of gross neglect and mismanagement in the last twenty-three years. The hon. gentlemen may wiggle like eels but they cannot escape from that particular box, that is a label that they and their children and their children's children will have to wear, to their disgrace, to their graves and let them

put that in their pipes and smoke it. They should keep very, very quiet on that point. The hon. members on the other side of the House who were involved in the previous administration should hang their heads, There is no point, no mileage to be made out of defending that very rotten administration, and it is precisely because of that administration that we are unable to give the mother's allowance that is, in the opinion of all hon. gentlemen in this House, very greatly needed.

MR. ROWE (WM.): Mr. Chairman, one or two points I would like to make regarding the hon. minister's remarks, one is this argument that he fanatically comes up with on every possible occasion, he seems to be obsessed with it, concerning the gross mismanagement, so called, of the province in the past twenty years or so, which means that money has to be taken away in respect of the parents' subsidy. Then, Sir, in a statement which he does not consider to be at all contradictory, he asks the hon. member for St. Barbe North; where would he take the money from the estimates in order to reinstate the mothers' allowance.

Now, Sir, if there has been gross mismanagement, if programmes have been brought in which are wrong, or money spent needlessly on programmes, let him tell us, He is the great inquisitor, let him tell us where the money should come out of these estimates to reinstate at least a portion of the mothers' allowance on some kind of a needs or means test. Let him tell us. Not a scintilla of evidence or proof or any suggestion whatsoever has been adduced to show where there has been any mismanagement. Is there a programme in some other estimates, in some other department's estimates that should be done away with because it is wrong, it is evidence or proof of mismanagement of public funds? No suggestion of any kind. He himself, as a minister representing the government in respect of this department, apparently has satisfied himself that the other programmes in the estimates presented to the House are all good, viable, high priority programmes or otherwise he would have insisted that such programmes themselves would have been wiped out and the mothers' allowance kept in. He has already

admitted the mothers' allowance is a good programme, at least I have not heard him deny it. He says, "we all agree it is a good programme." If he is going to say that public funds have been mismanaged on various other programmes or various other heads of expenditure by previous administration, let him point them out in the estimates. Let him show the House where the mismanagement has taken place, where money is needlessly wasted. He cannot come up with any programmes or any points where this so-called mismanagement of public funds has taken place, so he has been bulldozed by the Minister of Finance into cutting out a very valuable programme, the mothers' allowance. I can only reiterate what my hon. friend from St. Barbe North has said, it would have been easy for the hon. minister to speak up in Cabinet or elsewhere and say, no, \$1.5 million or more than \$1.5 million in excess of the value of the plant in Burgeo should not be lashed out from the public treasury of this province to the Lake interests down in Burgeo. That \$1.5 million should be kept in our revenue to serve one of two purposes either to help balance the budget, the hon. Minister of Finance has said he cannot balance the budget on current account this year, or better still that \$1.5 million should have been used to reinstate or to keep the mothers' allowance in existence in this province for at least this year, even if it were on a reduced rate, some kind of a means test or a needs test.

Throughout the year, studies taken by the government might conceivably turn up programmes throughout the estimates which are no longer needed, or if they are needed are no longer of such a high priority that they need to take a share of the public revenue and that perhaps monies could be saved, from these programmes which could be done away with, to go towards a revised and amended mothers' allowance or parents' subsidy programme.

The hon. minister should stop talking about the gross mismanagement of the past twenty years. It is easy to talk in general, vague and abstract terms about mismanagement. It is difficult, I would submit Sir, for him to come up with solid concrete specific examples. For him to try to draw a tissue or veil of nonsense over the abolition of the parents' subsidy and to try to use this blanket condemnation of financial mismanagement for twenty-three years, try to use that as an excuse for his own lack of moral courage in insisting as a minister, that this parents' subsidy should remain in effect, Sir, stretches our sense of outrage and the sense of outrage of the people of Newfoundland who are vitally concerned with this programme, stretches it, Sir, to the limit.

MR. CARTER: I think the hon. members reasons are backward and illogical, I need only mention one item alone in the budget and that is the enormous payment of money to the linerboard mill that is made necessary by their gross mismanagement.

AN HON. MEMBER: When? When?

MR. CARTER: But it is money that we have to find. It is money that we have to find this year. In any event, Mr. Chairman, I think we have covered this point pretty thoroughly and I am certain that hon. members opposite will at least want to pass 604-04 which is the \$975,000 that was actually passed out. Surely they do not disapprove of that.

MR. ROWE (F): I just cannot stand it. Recently we heard of this great new programme that was going to be instituted, not programme but the elimination of this tax on children's clothing. There was publicity given to this all over the province, a great hullabaloo about it and we learn here, Mr. Chairman, from this committee this afternoon, that it only cost the government \$1.5 million. In other words, this was a move that saved money,

MR. CARTER: That figure is approximate.

June 14, 1972

Tape No. 783

NC - 5

MR. ROWE: Approximate, it will be up to \$1 million no doubt by tomorrow.

Sir, what the minister failed to understand completely was this - I am going to say this as simply and shortly as I can, that this removal of the sales tax on children's clothing helps richer parents to a

greater extent than it helps average parents to a greater extent than it helps poorer parents. It is as simple as that. In order to save money on children's clothing you have to be able to buy children's clothing. In order to be able to save the equivalent of what you would get with a family of five a family would have to buy \$1,400 worth of clothing.

Now, Sir, that has to hurt the poorer families. It certainly does not help the poorer families. At the same time, Sir, we have had the courage to admit, at least I have over on this side of the House, that there might have been something wrong. We have admitted it. That there might have been something wrong with the mothers' allowance as it had existed. Some people were getting the money who did not need it. We have the courage to admit that. We are simply asking the minister if he would give some consideration to the possibility of reestablishing the mothers' allowances on a means basis or something equivalent to it. That is all we are asking him to do. He gets up for the third or fourth time and starts talking about the past. We are sick of hearing it. I ask the honourable minister one other simple question. I am sure his Tory friends in Ottawa are interested in hearing the answer. That is; what is the present administration's intentions if this is delayed for one year? It is no good to say it is not going to happen or it may not happen, I am simply asking the question; what would happen? What does this government plan to do if this programme is delayed?

MR. CARTER: It is delayed -

MR. ROWE: It has been announced that it is delayed. There was some talk about the minister of Finance trying to confirm it. I would assume that an announcement from the Federal Government is sufficient, confirmation is not really necessary, and a phone call is certainly

not that difficult to make. So, Sir, that is all we are asking. We have admitted, Sir, things about our performance in the past, we got the answer on March 24th., now we are looking for action over there not here.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman got the answer on March 24th. He certainly did. The budget that we have had to bring down this year is the answer to the last five or six years of reckless and wasteful practices by the honourable gentlemen's government.

Now as far as the mothers' allowance is concerned the position is, it should be quite clear. The position Mr. Chairman, is this? The province this year has deficit current account of \$3 million. In any event, after making all the cuts we possibly could make, cuts that we did not want to make, practicing the utmost discipline, there was a deficit on current account of \$3 million this year, approximately. There was a deficit in the current account last year, it was not forecast it was not shown, of nearly \$4 million. It would have been \$20 million except that there was an unexpected windfall through tax equalization audited by the Federal Government that gave another \$16 million last year that was not anticipated. That windfall will not come through this year.

The position is quite clear, Mr. Chairman, that if we continually have current account deficit, then if we have in some particular year a current account deficit of 20 million, 30 million, 40 million it will be no good for this province to go out looking to borrow money because the money will not be available to borrow. Therefore there has to be cuts and there have to be some savings attempted. Mothers' allowance is a programme that this province instituted. As I said the other night, no one wants to cut a programme that is giving anyone in the province anything, for political reasons if for no others. We have to face the facts whether this province is going to be viable in the next

four or five years or not. If we want to make a case to Ottawa for more help than we are getting now, we have to do our best to do away with programmes that even the richest province cannot afford, the richest province does not institute. Because the richer provinces of Canada this year through tax equalization, through paying more to Ottawa, are transferring \$120 million down to Newfoundland, they are interested to know what we are doing with it.

So, regretfully, mothers' allowance is a programme that the richest province cannot afford, certainly Newfoundland cannot afford and it so happens that the Government of Canada is instituting a new family income security plan, the result of which will be, under the formula that they are going to use, that those who need and require this additional social assistance are going to have the amount they received doubled. Here in the Province of Newfoundland, because there are large families and our low incomes, the average is going to go from Family Allowance from seven dollars one cent a month to fourteen odd dollars a month. That from an amount of \$19 million which the mothers of the province will receive this year from Ottawa, once that new FI programme is introduced, they will get approximately \$38 million, twice as much. What we are eliminating is an amount of \$3,200,000 in a full year. While the mothers of Newfoundland, under the Federal programme, will receive an increase of about \$19 million. That is not all the mothers of Newfoundland because those that do not need it, those with incomes over a certain amount per year will not receive it.

Now, that is why we are eliminating the mothers' allowance and we know that whatever gap is left by it is going to be more than amply taken up by Ottawa instead of this province.

Now after the budget speech is announced Ottawa or some deputy minister says that because of the computers of such and such and so on there is going to be an eight months delay in getting that programme underway.

We have no word from Ottawa that there is going to be delay beyond January 1, 1972. WE do not know that officially yet. We do not know what Ottawa is up to in that respect. If it so happens that it does not commence by January 1, 1973, we can re-examine the situation. We will certainly know that before September. We are not promising to re-institute it. It may be re-instituted, it may not. We are not going to make a decision now. We are not going to re-institute it unless it is absolutely necessary. Why not? Because this province cannot afford it because our priorities are for other things. If we can, the \$3 million there that we are saving there can certainly more usefully be used in other aspects of education or resource development or whatever. That is our choice.

We are prepared to stand or fall by it. If the mothers of Newfoundland are dissatisfied with this then they will defeat us in three or four years time. But we are prepared to take that risk. I am not worried about three or four years time. I am worried about the state the province is in now. Whether in three or four years time we will still have our own government, that we will still be able to afford to have our own government, or will be run by a commission somewhere - So we are trying -
(inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, again the result of your years of misrule could be another commission. So, Mr. Chairman, that is the position on the mothers' allowances. It cannot be blamed on the Minister of Education or the Minister of Finance or any minister. Every one on this side of the House takes responsibility for it. If there was an election in three weeks time Mr. Chairman I prophecy there would not be one honourable gentleman left on the other side of the House because the people of Newfoundland are tired of your pusillanimous buffoonery.

That is what they are tired of, the personal attacks and abuse. Oh, the charge that the Minister of Education is incompetent. He is this, he is that. The Minister of Finance is this, that and the other. People of Newfoundland were tired of that long ago. Give us a chance to get on with the job. The mothers' allowance, you think you are on a good issue politically. Fine: You have made your point, there is no reason to go on any longer this afternoon. The press will report it, that again you object about the mothers' allowance. The point is well made. You will be yapping, yakking, wacking and quacking on the election trail all during the year when the Federal Election comes, with the same junk. They will hear it over and over again. When the election comes they will ignore it because they know that you gentlemen opposite are responsible for the elimination of the mothers' allowances.

MR. NINBY: Did you ever in your life, Mr. Chairman,

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable minister has the floor -

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, a couple of points. First of all there is no, there never was any

impression left abroad that the reduction or the abolition of the seven per-cent on children's clothing was a substitution for the removal of the mothers' allowance. That was not intended. There was no relationship whatsoever between the two. On the one hand it was felt that the seven per-cent on children's clothing was an unnecessary hardship and was removed by this government and at that time, I might add that it was hoped that perhaps the mothers' allowance could be sustained, but events proved us wrong. Hardly a day passed but a new enormity was not unearthed, left over from the old administration.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that since this Budget has been brought down the Department of Education here in the Confederation Building has not received one letter or one phone call from any mother. They understand something that honourable gentlemen on that side of the House apparently do not.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, obviously the Minister of Education is out of touch with the masses of the people in this province as is the Minister of Finance who came swaggering into this House this afternoon, Mr. Chairman. He disappeared after the question period. He must have gone out and taken a pill and gone to sleep and all of a sudden he waltzes into the House, swaggers in and makes a political speech defending his colleague, the Minister of Education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again I ask the honourable members to remain relevant to the question which is parents' subsidy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I will be as relevant as the Minister of Finance was in his remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The honourable member can appeal the ruling of the Chair, if the honourable member steps beyond the bounds of relevancy and is ruled out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am not appealing Your Honour's decision

but I am merely pointing out to the Chairman that I will stick as much to the point as the Minister of Finance did in his remarks and I am sure the Chairman will allow me that latitude. So, Sir, he waltzes into the House, swaggers in to defend again the Minister of Education.

AN HON. MEMBER: To prop him up.

MR. NEARY: Prop him up, the incompetent Minister of Education. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at some of the arguments that the Minister of Finance gave for dropping, for wiping out the mothers' allowance. First of all he says that Ottawa -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is gone again now.

MR. NEARY: He is gone again now, Mr. Chairman. The honourable minister has left the Chamber again. He cannot take it. He can dish it out but he cannot take it. He should follow his doctor's instructions and stay out of controversy. The honourable minister stated, Mr. Chairman, that Ottawa would take a dim view of this when ministers and the honourable Premier go jetting off to Ottawa by the dozens, up wandering around Ottawa, wining and dining with the Prime Minister, that they will take a dim view of this province going to Ottawa to look for additional assistance because we have a mothers' allowance in Newfoundland that is costing the province \$2.5 million or \$3. million.

Mr. Chairman, did you ever hear such nonsense in your life? Did you, Mr. Chairman, ever hear so much nonsense, hogwash, balderdash? Just is not true, Mr. Chairman. The honourable minister who made that statement knows that the Province of Quebec which is one of the poorest provinces in Canada have their own family allowance plan and Quebec is not doing bad, Mr. Chairman, gouging a few extra dollars out of Uncle Ottawa, out of rich Ottawa. So they are going to hold it against the mothers of this -

Mr. Chairman, is there any dialogue at all between the Provincial Tories and the Federal Tories? Only about a week and a-half ago we heard the Federal Tories ranting and raving, beating their gums about the Provincial Tory Government dropping the mothers' allowance. Would not the Tory members of Parliament know, Mr. Chairman, that this would affect our credit rating in Ottawa? Would they not know that or is there any dialogue between the Provincial Tory Government and their Tory counterparts in Ottawa? Now, Mr. Chairman, the honourable Minister of Education is giving all kinds of excuses for dropping the mothers' allowance, referring to the previous administration, the extravagance and the waste, Sir. Let us talk about the future. Mr. Chairman. Forget the past and let us talk about the future.

Since the election of March 24 this Tory Government has hired a minimum, Mr. Chairman, of ten special assistants, executive assistants, information officers and what have you.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, I would say ten, Mr. Chairman, that was the count about two weeks ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the count about two weeks, a week and a-half or two weeks ago was ten. I would say it is probably closer to fifteen at the present time. Fifteen expensive, highly paid flunkies, party hacks, Mr. Chairman, and now the great Director of Information Services decides that he needs a playtoy so they are going to put teletype machines in all the news offices right across this province. They are doing it, Mr. Chairman, at the expense of the mothers.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order. I do not know what the teletype machines and the Director of Information Services has to do with the subject under discussion which is the mothers' allowance and I would submit that the honourable member is restrained within the bounds of relevancy.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, what the honourable member for Bell Island is doing is showing that the mothers' allowance should have greater priority and what should happen is that other programmes such as teletype machines and what not and flunkies and this sort of thing should be abolished rather than the mothers' allowance. I would submit, Sir, that he is well within the rule of relevancy in making such a statement.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): May I speak to the point of order, Mr. Chairman? The Minister of Education suggested earlier in his remarks when he was being criticized for not being able to get a greater cut of the pie for his department that he has to take everything into consideration as far as the administration of this country is concerned. He has to consider every other department and what my honourable colleague is simply doing is exactly the same thing. He is considering other areas of administration in this province and then he is using them as examples. Then I submit the point of order is not here.

MR. CARTER: That particular point that the honourable gentleman is making came up at a time when we were not discussing sub-heads. That came up at the introduction of the estimates when the discussion was much more wide ranging and probably rightly so, but at this very moment we are on 604(04) - Parents' Subsidy. So I would like the discussion to remain relevant to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Standing Order 44(b) sets out that speeches in Committee of the Whole House must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration and you will note the emphasis "strictly relevant." Now it is relevant for the honourable member to point out areas where money could have been saved. However, it is not relevant for the honourable member to go into detail in these areas and this, I believe, the honourable member was tending to do. So I would ask the honourable member to keep this in mind and remain strictly relevant to the items of expenditure under consideration.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, you are absolutely correct. I agree with Your Honour's ruling, again we are right on this side of the House. The honourable members on the other side have tried to stifle debate but they are not going to get away with it, Mr. Chairman, not in this session of the House of Assembly. The honourable member for St. John's East talks about freedom of the press. He does not know what freedom is, Mr. Chairman. He is going to censor the press.

I started to talk about extravagance, Mr. Chairman, and it was the Minister of Education who raised the point when he was referring to the previous administration and I just turned it around the other way and started to look to the future. I would hazard to guess, Mr. Chairman, that by the time this propaganda machine, this Goebbels type propagand'a machine is being set up in this province,

by the time it is finished it will cost the taxpayers of this province a substantial amount of money, Sir. The point that I am making is that I think that that is one project that should have been dropped because it has been implemented at the expense of the mothers of this province.

I said, Sir, that the Minister of Finance was picking the pockets of the mothers of this province. I do not think it would be parliamentary for me to say that the Minister of Education is snatching their purses. I do not think that would be parliamentary, Sir, so I will not say it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, Again there is a rule which says basically that a member cannot do indirectly what he is not permitted to do directly. If this is what the hon. member is attempting to do then he is using unparliamentary language. The hon. member, once it came to his attention that what he had intended to say was unparliamentary, then the proper procedure was not to say it at all.

MR. NEARY: Well I must apologize to the Chair but I was thinking out loud, Mr. Chairman, and certainly I agree that I should not have said it. Now that I have said it, Sir, I withdraw it. I withdraw all of it. I withdraw, Mr. Chairman, a statement that I made that the Minister of Education could be compared to a purse snatcher. I do not think that is becoming of the honourable Minister of Education.

So, when we talk about extravagance, maybe the Minister of Education should take a look at the overall estimates, take a look at them. See how much, Mr. Chairman, the Premier's Office is going to cost next year as compared to what it cost when Premier Smallwood was in power in this province.

Mr. Chairman, as I said the other day, we have in this province at the moment, apart from the propaganda machine that has been set up, we have advertising agencies, agents running out of our ears. Why, Sir, they come into this building, they are so huge they can hardly get up in the

elevators. They need a special elevator to bring them up to the eighth floor, Sir, costing the tax payers of this province a mint. A mint of money, Sir, at the expense, I submit, of the mothers of this province.

Why not eliminate some of these unnecessary programmes, Sir, these monkeys on the backs of the tax payers of this province, and restore the mothers' allowance. If I were in the honourable Minister of Education's shoes at this moment, I would lay my head in shame, and I would walk out through that door and I would pass my resignation into the Premier and I would say, " here, Sir, no thank you, I do not want to belong to an administration that will pick the pockets of the mothers at the expense, or set up these unnecessary programmes at the expense of the mothers in this province. But I doubt very much, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable Minister of Education will take my advice. I doubt it very much, Sir. Obviously the hon. minister has a skin on him as thick as a rhinoceros and I think that has been proven over the last couple of days, Sir. Any minister that could sit in his seat for the last two days and not squirm, Sir, I would say that the Minister of Finance is not the only one who has ice water in his viens.

One point I want to make concerning the mothers' allowance Sir, before I take my seat, almost every speaker on the opposite side of the House spoke about the means test. We should not have had the mothers' allowance on a universal basis. It should have been subjected to the means test. Mr. Chairman, the honourable Minister of Finance and every member on the opposite side of the House know full well that you had to apply for the mothers' allowance. It just was not sent out. A cheque was not sent out from the Minister's Office automatically to the mothers of the province.

First of all if you did not get an application through the mail, the name submitted by the schools, you had to write into the Minister of Education and ask for an application. Now you know the honourable Member for Fortune Bay, Mr. Chairman, had the gall to stand

up and say, "human nature being what it is, what did you expect these people to do but fill out their applications, stay up burning the midnight oil, fill out the application, send it in and get the mothers' allowance."

MR. EARLE: How many did not come in.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is a good question. I do not know how many did not come in. I do not know if the minister, the honourable well-to-do Minister of Finance sent his in or not. Perhaps he could stand at his place in this House and tell us whether he did or not. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, if he has children going to school. I do not know how many other hon. members on the opposite side of the House sent their applications in to the Minister of Education for the mothers' allowance but Sir, they were not compelled to do it. It was not compulsory. It was voluntary. If the honourable Member for St. John's South, another well-to-do gentleman, well-to-do lawyer, Sir, was interested in saving the tax payers of this province a few dollars, he need not have sent his application in. He could have said, "no, I am going to be patriotic. I am going to be charitable. I am not going to send that in because some poor mother out on the northeast coast may need that few dollars."

AN HON. MEMBER: Or John C. Doyle.

MR. NEARY: Or Spencer Lake, Mr. Chairman. Most expensive member in the House of Assembly today, \$2,600,000. So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that I have said enough. I could say a lot more and I am sure a lot more will be said from this side of the House, and the honourable Minister of Finance may think the mothers of this province will forget but they will not forget, Mr. Chairman. They will not forget.

"If we had an election tomorrow," he says, "there would not be a member on that side of the House." Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister

is looking at this province from the vantage point of Circular Road. He is out of touch with reality. He is out of touch, Sir. Out of touch with the masses of the people. Sir, one thing I have to say before I sit down, I almost forgot this, this is a very significant thing, that the history of Tory Government in Newfoundland and in Canada and I suppose in Great Britain for that matter, is that they will promise the elector anything before an election, anything to get them into office, they will buy their way into office, but, Sir, the history, and Your Honour can check this if he wants to and I would assume that Your Honour already knows because he is a student of history, that as soon as they get in office then they drop the benefits that they gave the electorate before getting elected and this is precisely what is happening in this case, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable Minister of Finance does not reconsider I hope that the honourable Minister of Education has a little bit of a heart. I hope, Sir, that the savoury really has not gone to his head and that he will reconsider instituting the mothers' allowance and that this September coming the mothers of this province will get the school allowance so that they can send their children to school well-dressed and be able to buy school books in the fall of the year, or the ones that they have to buy in the fall of the year when school re-opens. I beg and I plead with the Minister of Education, if he has a heart at all, Sir, I plead with him. You know Mr. Chairman, I would almost go across the other side of the House, I would almost go over, if there is a vacant seat over there, I would almost go over, I would almost, Mr. Chairman, go over and sit in the Minister of Finance's lap. The only thing I would be afraid of, Mr. Chairman, would be that he might slip me a pill. But I do hope, Sir, that the honourable Minister of Education will reconsider this

matter. It is a very serious matter, Sir. It is not to be laughed at. It is a very serious matter. I would like for the minister to reconsider, even if the minister has to do it on the means test, and I do not agree with a means test myself. I do not agree with it, I think it should be universal. But if the minister thinks that the means test is the way to do it, then Sir, I would suggest that he go ahead and do it.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend

Mr. Earle

to have anything to say on this. There has already been too much said on the subject. It is rather amusing and in fact it is very amusing to find all the fuss and fury coming from the few remaining Liberals in this House. Basically when you start to examine that the reason for all this fuss and fury is the same reason that the mothers' allowance was originally introduced. At that time I was not Minister of Education, I was Minister of Welfare until the succeeding minister, who just had so much to say, replaced that with a highfalutin title like Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation. It was not the same to call it Welfare at the time. However, that is by the way. I was Minister of Welfare when this was introduced and incidentally before somebody on the other side gets up and says that he is responsible for it, that he was part of the government, I have accepted responsibility all the way along the line. But as I said in my earlier remarks, Mr. Chairman, on this particular subject, I was the one who suggested that it be attached to a means test, that there be some determining factor and that in other words it be given to the poor people and not to the wealthy people at that time. Now that was not suggested in cabinet in case somebody over there thinks that I am breaking my cabinet oath. That was suggested outside cabinet. I was laughed out of court by the person who introduced it for this reason. The remark was made at the time, and this is very significant in the light of all the noise that is being made now: "For goodness sake, where is your political sense? Where is your political sense. Do you not realize that there are far more children and far more fathers and mothers of children than there are people on welfare?" Now carry that to its conclusion. Why was the thing introduced? It was pure election bait at the time and it was out to get votes.

Now what the honourable members on the other side are saying in effect is that by standing behind this and making so much fuss about it, they

Mr. Earle

think that eventually it will recover them some votes. But the mothers and fathers of Newfoundland showed on March 24 and they will show again that they have awoken to this kind of stupidity, that there will be no social assistance, no mothers' allowances or anything else in this province unless the financial affairs of this province are brought into order. As far as the few remarks about what Ottawa thinks of us and how they may or may not curtail their programmes, let me repeat another story.

AN HON. MEMBER: Another confidential story.

MR. EARLE: This is not a confidential story. This was said, when I think at least 150 people were present. It was at the opening of the Bay d'Espoir Highway. The hon. Jack Pickersgill was there at the time and hundreds of other people were gathered around. At that time I was fighting for my district to get the roads extended into Fortune Bay. I said to Mr. Pickersgill, in the hearing of many people: "What about some Ottawa money to have these roads extended into Fortune Bay?" Do you know what Mr. Pickersgill replied was, in the hearing of Mr. Smallwood at that time and many others: "A province that can afford to buy Czechoslovakia Pavilions can build its own roads." Now this is just interpretations of the thinking of Ottawa. That was a Liberal speaking to a Liberal, mind you. How more obvious would that be if it were a Conservative speaking to a Liberal? The fact is that Ottawa is fed up to the back teeth with what went on in this province. When the honourable members on the other side say -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. EARLE: When the honourable members on the other side say that the honourable gentleman was part and parcel, he admits it. But there is one thing the honourable gentleman did have the guts to do and that was to get out of that monkey show, before the thing was completely

Mr. Earle.

ruined. Last night I was referred to, Mr. Chairman, as hair-shirted.
I cannot say -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. EARLE: I cannot say it kept me awake last night trying to wonder what the reference meant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the honourable member to remain relevant to the parents' subsidy, 604-04, which is being considered.

MR. EARLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will try to keep it as relevant as I can. I did not answer the question last night. The point is that in that reference to me last night, which was later withdrawn, the fact that I am hair-shirted, at least I have to pull a shirt on to look like a monkey, some of the others do not.

MR. CROSBIE: It is just as well to get some common sense into this. In addition to my hon. colleague for Fortune Bay, I have some information for the honourable gentleman opposite, the one who is so worried, the one whose heart is so strained, whose sympathies are so outraged, whose sensibilities are so twisted by this cruel act and that is this: Ottawa has not said that the new Family Income Security Plan will not be in effect on January 1, 1973. The deputy minister of the department has said, "within eight months after parliament passes this legislation, this can be enacted." It will take eight months because of their - they are blaming it on the computers. That is what he said. Now the Liberal Party have a majority in the House of Commons of Canada. That legislation can be passed this month. There is no reason why it will not be passed this month, unless the Liberal Party of Canada feel that it is not in its political interest to do so.

If the legislation passes through the House of Commons and Senate in June, in eight months they will be able to start the cheques flowing from Ottawa, in January or February, 1973. There is no announcement from Ottawa that this is not going to be available in January, 1973. There is no reason

Mr. Crosbie

why it cannot be available in 1972. We do not know that it is not going to be available in 1973. Now I know honourable gentleman opposite are hoping and hoping and hoping that they will hear that the Government of Canada are not going to institute this until late in 1973. That is what honourable gentlemen are hoping because they thinking they are making a little political mileage out of this issue. They are going to be fooled.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Is it in order for an honourable member of this House to impute that kind of motive to other honourable members? I would submit that it is not, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, Mr. Chairman if it is in order, I certainly mean it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: I will withdraw it, if he wants me to withdraw it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Move out of the Chamber please.

MR. CROSBIE: I am going to do that in a minute too.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman opposite talked about our Information Newfoundland Programmes that are going to cost a few skimpy dollars this year. It is the Government of Canada and the Liberal Party of Canada that instituted that great institution: "Information Canada." It is just costing tens of millions of dollars. Here we have a little "Information Newfoundland" set up which will cost perhaps \$20,000 or \$30,000 this year. That is all it is going to cost.

MR. NEARY: How much are we paying the -

MR. CROSBIE: Finally, Mr. Chairman, when the honourable gentleman concluded he was talking about *savory*. There is one thing he is quite clear on, that there is no connection between *savory* and the hon. member from Bell Island, none at all.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I think the points on 604 have certainly been covered. As each honourable member from the opposition stands up to speak, I like to make a few notes so that I can reply or that my reply can be germane.

Mr. Carter

In trying to make a few notes about the hon. gentleman from Bell Island, I found that his speech was so entirely devoid of content that I am faced with practically a blank sheet of paper. Therefore, I am about to sit down but before sitting down, I will recommend that 604-04 pass.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, I hope I can be permitted to deviate a little but there are just one or two remarks that I would like to refer to which were made by the hon. Minister of Education and the hon. Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance stated the fact that we may, if we continue the wild spending that the previous administration had been carrying on, drift back to Commission of Government or Commission by Government. What he means by that I do not know. Surely, the hon. Minister of Finance is not insinuating that this government will go back to Commission of Government, either governed by Ottawa or the form of Commission. Now if that is his policy and he is determined to save a few paltry dollars at the expense of the mothers' allowance or any other necessary expenditure, or that we may be forced to go back to Commission Government, what kind of thinking is that from the Minister of Finance? Sir, I just cannot take it in.

Now the hon. Minister of Education,

MR. WINSOR: In his usual subtle, sarcastic way said; you all on the opposition side should hang your heads in shame because of the way in which your previous administration wasted, spent the money here before we came into power. Should I hang my head in shame because I was the instigator and in co-operation with the previous administration to bring modern schools to the Eskimos of Northern Labrador? Should I hang my head in shame for bringing schools to the unfortunate Indians of Labrador? Should I hang my head in shame today that the people in Bonavista Bay, in Wesleyville, where I was born, can get in a car and drive to Gambo or drive all over Newfoundland? When I was growing up we had to walk fifty miles to make connection with the train? Should I hang my head in shame or should the honourable Minister of Education hang his head in shame? I think if there is anyone to hang his head in shame in this respect it is the honourable minister.

Sir, this is only one of the many things that I could state that I have no reason to hang my head in shame. I go around this province with my head high and I am very proud that I was associated with a government with the type of leader that we had for twenty-three years.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would submit he is not really relevant to the parents' subsidy which is being considered at the present time. Mr. Chairman, whether the honourable member has to hang his head in shame or not -

AN HON. MEMBER: Justification -

MR. MARSHALL: Justification of the previous administration has nothing to do with parents' subsidy.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Mr. Chairman, may I speak on the point of order. Mr. Chairman, the point made by the honourable House Leader may or may not be a valid point - may or may not, that is for Your Honour's decision. But, Sir, I would submit that even if it is technically out of order, it certainly is in order for an honourable member on

MR. ROWE, W.N. this side of the House to make comments on matters raised by a member on that side of the House especially when the minister, in this case who raised the matter, was not called to order by the Chair. Surely, Sir. that is in order, for him to answer some allegation or some statement made which in turn was not called out of order by the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for White Bay South is not quite correct. A point of order has been raised with respect to the relevancy of the honourable member's course of speech preceding the point of order. Now grant it, if the honourable the minister raised a matter that was out of order, the Chair should have ruled it out of order at the time or any honourable member can stand up and bring it to the attention of the Chair, if the Chair omits to notice at the time that the honourable the minister is out of order.

However, the fact that one honourable member or honourable minister gets away with a matter that is out of order does not permit another member to rely on that as a precedent when this is contrary to the Standing Orders of the House. The Standing Orders of the House say that on discussion of the specific heads of expenditure the debate must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration. The Chair should also point out at this time that there was a great amount of leeway given in the initial debate, the debate on the minister's salary and that the Chair has to comply with the Standing Orders of the House and the purpose of the Standing Order is to permit the business of the House to be expedited. This Standing Order says that speeches in Committee of the Whole House must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

Now this applies to honourable members on both sides of the House. If the Chair omits to call to order an honourable member when he is out of order, then the Chair would ask another honourable member to bring it to his attention at the time that this is done. But the

MR. ROWE, W.N. honourable member was straying from 604-04 Parents' subsidy, and I would ask the honourable member to keep this in mind in an attempt to remain relevant in the debate.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, I have no intentions of drifting from the item in question. But the honourable Minister of Education, Sir, brought the matter up and used as an excuse for cutting out these family allowances our wastefulness when we were in government.

Now, Sir, when I started to speak I said I may have to deviate a little. But, Sir, if there is anyone out of order, it was the honourable minister himself.

I have no further remarks to make. But I can assure the honourable Minister of Education and also the honourable Minister of Finance that they are under a delusion if they think that the mothers of this province are not thinking very seriously of their action.

I just came back from the Fogo District and I can assure you and I would advise the honourable Minister of Finance that I would suggest to him that he refrain from going into Musgrave Harbour, Lumsden or any part of Gander Bay for at least another year or so, until this matter settles down.

So, Mr. Chairman, I can assure the honourable Minister of Finance that he is living under a false impression, if he thinks that cutting out the mothers' allowance is a justifiable thing by the mothers of this province, I can assure him, Sir, it is not. It is very unpopular. I would also suggest to him that before September that he persuade, I know the honourable Minister of Finance is not easily persuaded but he may, he may use the old Salvation Army technique of singing the hymn "Almost Persuaded," he may do that sometime and reinstate the family allowances.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to put up with any threats, there is no part of this province that I am afraid to set foot on today, that I would be afraid to set foot on tomorrow or that I would ever be afraid to set foot on, I have been everywhere

MR. CROSBIE: in this province and I am prepared to go anywhere in the province tomorrow - Musgrave Harbour, Dotting Cove, Fogo Island, Northwest River, anywhere in this province today and I do not think I need fear anything, no matter where I go. There may be people disagree with what this government are doing or what I do or what I say, but there is nowhere in Newfoundland that I am afraid to show my face and you can be assured of that.

MR. WINSOR: I did not insinuate that the honourable minister should fear for his life. But I can assure him that he will be facing some of the most aggravated and tormented mothers that we would rather he not meet than meet.

MR. CROSBIE: I would like to say this, Mr. Chairman, if that is so, if that is so, and if there are aggravated mothers in Newfoundland, I am quite prepared to send them a copy of the budget speech and to discuss with them why we are in the condition we are in today. Furthermore, I predict this that within a year's time when the Family Income Security Plan of Canada is in effect and they are receiving much more and much better assistance in a much more satisfactory manner, they will -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Why do they not get on with it. Why do they not move on with it. They have slacked off in the last two or three months. When they are receiving those increased benefits in a better way and a more logical way from a government that has a treasury that can afford them, they will be no longer aggravated. That is my belief.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Mr. Chairman, in the course of his remarks, the honourable member for Fortune Bay, who was a member of the previous administration, is partly responsible for the introduction of the mothers' allowance, it was said quite clearly

in this House, that the Mothers' Allowances were brought in on a purely political basis. for purely political motives, is that correct? Sir. I would like to ask the honourable member whether he feels there was any need at all for the Mothers' Allowances to start off with. The honourable member for Fortune Bay, whether there was any need? Would he get up and answer that question.

MR. EARLE: May I be permitted to answer that, Mr. Chairman, because it is relative to the vote. The fact, as I put it at the time, and this I should like to make abundantly clear, that instead of the Mothers' Allowances, I was all in favour of helping the poor people, That is why I suggested that it should be done on a means test. The way I suggested it was that you raise the social assistances allowances because, this was sanity of the first order. If we had raised the social assistance allowances, we would have recovered half of it, fifty percent of it from Ottawa. As it is now. all of this, one hundred percent is coming out of the pockets of the Provincial Government. Therefore, the way to help poor people, and this is actually a welfare measure, the way to help people is where you get the most help, from Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: (First part inaudible) for a specific purpose?

MR. EARLE: Yes. one specific purpose, it was to get votes at the time.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, there was a need, I think that the honourable member has suggested generally that there was a need for it, therefore, Sir, I submit that it was not purely a political move on the part of the previous administration, even if it were? Sir, in the eloquence of debate on this particular subhead. the honourable Minister of Education still has not gotten around (probably it has just slipped his mind) to answering the question I put to him earlier regarding what would happen or what would his intentions be, if in fact this FISP is delayed for a period of eight, nine, ten or eleven or twelve months? I hope - the Minister of Finance was suggesting that we are hoping that it will be delayed. That is utter nonsense on his part. But, Sir, I would honestly

like to know what the intentions of this present administration are if in fact his FIS programme is delayed.

MR. CARTER: First of all, Mr. Chairman, that is a hypothetical question and I do not feel that it is very relevant to give a hypothetical answer. All I can say is that there is no doubting the need for the Mothers' Allowance today and there is no doubting the need for it tomorrow, next week, next month, next year. I would hope that FISP (we will call it FISP now for the sake of brevity) would be instituted as soon as possible.

Earlier in this specific part of this debate, I mentioned the fact that hardly a day goes by but a new enormity is uncovered, left over from the previous administration. Since it is impossible to predict with any certainty just how many insects will fly out of this 'Pandora's Box' now that the cover is being pried off, it is very, very difficult for me to forecast what I would or would not do six months hence.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it would be a very easy matter indeed for the Minister of Education or my old sparring buddy the Minister of Finance, who seems to be in an awfully bad mood today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Wednesday is his cranky day.

MR. NEARY: Wednesday is his cranky day, Mr. Chairman. It would be a very easy matter indeed, Sir, for either one of these hon. gentlemen to leave this House now, go out to the telephone, take up the phone, charge the call up to their office down stairs in their department, call up the hon. Mr. Munro, Minister of National Health and Welfare, say "John," or "honourable Sir," or "Mr. Minister" whatever the honourable Minister of Finance wants to call him, call him up and say; "Is it true, we have a debate going on in the House and we have to confirm this because whether the Mothers of this province will get their allowances in September or not depends on the answer that you are going to give me now on the telephone. Is it true, Sir, that the FIS programme, the Family Income Security Programme has been postponed for one year? Is this true or is it false?"

I know Mr. Munro personally and I feel certain, Sir, that he would give either minister an honest and frank answer. Now then, Sir, if the hon. minister of Finance does not want to do it nor the hon. Minister of Education does not want to do it, if they would find a telephone for me, and I know Mr. Munro personally, I have been at several Federal-Provincial conferences, Sir, as a matter of fact, Sir, I had a lot to do with originating the FIS programme.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: So, if the Minister of Finance...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. John's Centre has arrived back. Glory hallelujah! glory hallelujah!

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: The honourable minister has been too busy with other matters. He is not terribly concerned about the mothers of this province.

MR. MURPHY: Oh, that is right!

MR. NEARY: When he was a little boy down on Flower Hill, Mr. Chairman, he was concerned about the mothers of this province. But now that he is...

MR. MURPHY: I told the government three years ago what to do with the Mothers' Allowance.

MR. NEARY: Now that the honourable ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down, sit down.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman,

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, could I carry on?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, I object, Sir, to...

MR. NEARY: Now that the honourable minister can stub his toe on a swimming pool, Mr. Chairman, he is not particularly concerned about the mothers of this province. But, Sir, as I started to say...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I think that it is my privilege to discuss

this matter of the Mothers' Allowance without interruption from the honourable and I was going to say ignorant, well I think ignorant is parliamentary, Sir, ignoramus is not...

MR. CARTER: Point of Order, Sir, I think we established yesterday or perhaps it was the day before that once all the points have been covered (we are sticking of course to specific subheads here) unless the honourable member can bring up some new points or shed some new light on the debate, that his continuing to hold forth constitutes a mischievous obstruction. Therefore, I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman should assist us to move on to the next item.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is not a Point of Order, Sir. The honourable minister still has the smell of manure in his nostrils. Coming into this House, Sir. Mr. Chairman, I was raising a new matter a new point, Sir,

MR. HICKEY: Point of Order, Mr. Chairman...

MR. NEARY: Oh now we are going to have the Point of Order, Mr. Chairman, now we are going to have it.

MR. HICKEY: The honourable member raised a new matter, he used unparliamentary language. When he takes back what he called the Minister of Education, that is the new matter he raised, calling someone a clown.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is not a Point of Order. If I were the honourable minister I would go down and try to hook up that light in Tapper's Cove in Torbay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! order! The honourable member is not speaking to the Point of Order at this point. Does the honourable member want...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down, sit down.

MR. NEARY: There is no Point of Order, Mr. Chairman, there is no Point of Order, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Minister of Education raised, as I understood

the Point of Order, that there is, as referred to on page 107 of Beauchesne, the rules of debate in the Federal Parliament and ours are also similar," that the Speaker or the Chairman after having called the attention of the House or of the Committee to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or repetition . . ." Now the only reason I refer to this Standing Order is because this is the only place where I can find the rule referred to, against repetition. As this is the Point of Order which I understand the Minister of Education to have raised, I would ask the honourable member for Bell Island to avoid repetition, and again, to remain strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for that ruling. If I were the honourable Minister of Social Services I would go down and try to get that by-election held in Pouch Cove, fill up that vacancy on the Town Council.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, just a minute, Mr. Chairman, Pouch Cove is not my concern, Torbay is, and I suggest to the hon. gentleman...

MR. NEARY: Is this a Point of Order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. HICKEY: If he wants to go fishing, fine, but mind his own business.

MR. NEARY: Is this a Point of Order, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Bell Island may continue.

MR. NEARY: Now, Sir, I started to say, and this is very important, Mr. Chairman, because we have - the Committee has to have an answer from Ottawa, Is the FIS programme going to be postponed for one year or is it not? That seems to be the question before the Committee. Now, I volunteered if the Minister of Finance does not want to pick up the phone and call the honourable Mr. Munro and the Minister of Education does not want to do it, I will volunteer to do it, Sir. I will volunteer to do it provided, Mr. Chairman, that we can postpone the passing of this item until we get the answer from Mr. Munro that we need.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I could maybe save the honourable member some time and the

price of the phone call. There is a rule of the House which states that a statement made in this House cannot be contradicted by a statement by a person who is not a member of this House. Now, I do not know if this is what the honourable member would be attempting to do. As I understand it, the honourable Minister of Finance has stated what the position is. Now, I do not think that we can bring in a statement, even if it be from a member of the Federal Parliament, because that person is not a member of this House, if this is being brought in to contradict the statement of the honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. NEARY: What the minister of Finance really said was, the day I asked him the question originally, he said; 'Once it is confirmed from Ottawa that the FIS programme is going to be postponed for one year. then the government would reconsider reinstating the Mothers' Allowance in September coming.' That is what the minister said,

but the minister has made no attempt, Sir, this is the point I am making. Nobody in his administration has made any attempt to have this confirmed or denied. Is it true? We do not know, Sir, the committee does not know. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would say that we have no choice but to defer this item until we have confirmation of whether or not the FIS programme is going to be postponed for one year.

Now, Sir, I think the honourable Minister of Finance knows what is causing the delay in the FIS programme. It is not the fact that the Government of Canada, as he rightly pointed out, has a substantially more wealthy treasury than the province of Newfoundland. That is a statement of fact. That is not the reason for the delay, Sir. The reason for the delay I submit to the committee is because of the administrative problems involved in granting or altering the family allowance and implementing a means test. This is basically what is happening, Sir, with the family allowance programme. They are now basing it on a means test.

Now, the Government of Canada is on the horns of a dilemma, Sir, because of the administrative problems and difficulties that are involved in implementing the FIS Programme with a means test. They do not know whether it should be taxable, Sir. They do not know whether the mothers' allowance should be subjected to income tax. They really do not know how to go about it, Sir, They do not know whether the income, the new family allowance is based on the income of families. They do not know whether they should get the information from the income tax people or not, Sir. This is what is holding up the FIS Programme. Politics does not enter into it, Sir, It has nothing to do with politics, nothing to do with the fact that the Government of Canada does not have the money or they have the money. It is the fact

that they have to try to figure out a way to implement the FIS Programme and I would suggest, Sir, that it is going to take the Government of Canada and all the expertise that they have in the Department of National Health & Welfare several months yet before they can work out the details. So, I would suggest Mr. Chairman, if it is in order, that we defer carrying this item until somebody on the opposite side either calls Mr. Munro or call one of the - Can we defer this item until the honourable minister has -
(inaudible)

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, that is not satisfactory I want to hear what the Minister of Education has to say about this and I want to hear what the Minister of Finance has to say about it. Mr. Chairman, we need information in this committee and we are not getting it. The Honourable Minister of Education will not give us the information. I tell you what, Mr. Chairman, in order to save time, save the committee's time, if the committee will agree to a ten minute recess I will go out in the Opposition office and I will call Mr. Munro -

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, how long do we have to put up with this? We are discussing an estimate, it is here set out. The minister is looking for this money -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman,

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is tending to be somewhat repetitious on this point of the phone call to the gentleman in Ottawa. I would ask the honourable member to continue but again keeping in mind the rules as to relevancy and repetition.

MR. NEARY: I am only trying to be helpful to the committee, Mr. Chairman. If we could have a ten minute recess I would gladly go out, get on the phone and call Mr. Munro and find out, I would have him tell me, I could have one of the ministers on the extension, and tell us whether or not

the FIS Programme is going to come in the first of January or will it be postponed for one year. I think that is a pretty fair and reasonable offer, Sir.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, before we pass there are a couple of comments I would like to make. I agree with the honourable member for Bell Island that on this subject of 604-04 the present Minister of Education is out of touch with the province and with the mothers of this province, because it is definitely important and it is definitely necessary to a vast majority of the mothers of our province that they receive this parents' subsidy in September.

It is particularly necessary to the people or to the parents who are of low income bracket. I am sure the honourable member for St. John's Centre realizes -

MR. MURPHY: I do not know anything at all about it.

MR. THOMS: I am glad you say you do not know anything about it because I will put you right on the spot. Mr. Chairman, to a man in St. Brendan's who this year has seven children going to school and who has an income of less than \$4,000 this parents subsidy is important. It is necessary because this person, this parent, this mother cannot afford to buy the clothes, the books, the boots and all the other things to send their children to school in the winter to come.

I am sure the honourable member for St. John's Centre realizes this, although he will not admit it. He realizes it, but he will not admit it. I am glad you said you do not know the first thing about it. It is only one of the few things that the honourable gentleman does not know very much about. Mr. Chairman, in listening to the Minister of Education I was very disappointed in one of the statements which he raised, when he said that the past administration was a rotten administration. I wonder did the minister realize what he was saying? He was in fact calling three of his colleagues rotten because

they were part of that administration. As a matter of fact they were a huge part of that administration. If these three gentlemen were part of the previous administration, then does he indicate that they are now part of a rotten administration or are they just a rotten section of the present administration? This is what the honourable minister said.

MR. MORGAN: Point of order, Mr. Chairman, what has that to do with the parents' subsidy which we are now discussing. 604-04:

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect to the point of order, the point of order was well taken. The honourable member is asked again to keep in mind Standing Order 44 (b) which says that "speeches must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration."

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your ruling. I trust that you will give me the same latitude as the honourable Minister of Education was given when he called the previous administration "a rotten administration". Therefore I suggest that he is in fact calling three of the present-

MR. CHAIRMAN: The ruling has been made that the honourable member is out of order in

that this line of debate is not strictly relevant to item 604(04).

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Another point which the honourable Minister of Education brought up was when he said that the present administration had dropped seven per-cent on children's clothing and he compared the seven per-cent with the parents' subsidy. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the seven per-cent is not seven per-cent of the children's clothing who go to school. The seven per-cent is only partially off the children's clothing because I have a boy fourteen years old and I have to pay seven per-cent taxes on his clothes. The seven per-cent only comes to a certain size of certain clothing and, Mr. Chairman, there are grown men and I know one man in particular who today can fit himself out with tax free clothes while my child, I have to pay taxes on his clothes.

Therefore I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that our parents today will not make up for the parents subsidy on the seven per-cent dropped by the previous administration.

I fail to see, Mr. Chairman, how the Minister of Education can conscientiously drop the parents' subsidy when it is so vitally needed by so many of our people of today. Of course, maybe this is part of the Tory philosophy. I noticed in the comments of the Minister of Finance, when he indicated that if we do not retrieve this \$3.2 million from the parents of our province, that maybe our credit rating on the money markets of this world will be in jeopardy. Just imagine, Mr. Chairman, we are spending this year a total of \$589.2 million and do you think that \$3.2 million will put our credit rating in jeopardy? Nonsense, utter nonsense.

MR. NEARY: The minister is shaking his head.

MR. THOMS: Of course then the Minister of Finance comes up with the phrase that if we have to give this \$3.2 million of parents' subsidy to the mothers of this province this province may have to go

back to a Commission Government, back thirty-eight years.

MR. NEARY: What a joke.

MR. THOMS: What utter nonsense, Mr. Chairman. How can he compare this with the parents' subsidy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. CARTER: The honourable member is being mischievously obstructive I would submit, and I propose that we move on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Minister of Education is again, I assume, referring to the rule with respect repetition. The honourable member's attention is drawn to the fact that these items have been discussed extensively and debated thoroughly and I would ask the honourable member to keep this in mind, to continue with his speech but to keep in mind the rule with respect to relevancy and repetition.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I accept your ruling. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely plead with both the Minister of Finance and particularly the Minister of Education that he do all in his power in the coming months ahead to reinstate this parents' subsidy and that when September or October comes that he will be able to come out and announce to the parents of this province that the parents' subsidy will be reinstated. If he has to, Mr. Chairman, go in to the next cabinet meeting and if he has to knock his fist on the table and demand it, show to us that he is a man and not a mouse, which is apparent from this because he has apparently allowed the Minister of Finance to overrule him, he has apparently submitted to the Minister of Finance.

I hope and trust, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier will not think him a weakling in some way or other and put him in the junior cabinet because I would hate to see anyone on my right here try to take his place. While I believe he is doing a blundering job, they may even do a worse job especially as far as parents' subsidy is concerned. It is of the utmost importance that the parents this fall receive this subsidy.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, if I may please. Not wanting or doing it for the purpose of prolonging the debate, Mr. Chairman, there are a few pertinent questions I would like to ask of the Minister of Education regarding the parents' subsidy. Over the winter months of this year that the minister have received and I have received copies of correspondence from one particular community in Nain concerning the mothers' allowance that was not sent out in bilingual form, in Eskimo and Indian. A lot of the applications were received but it appears they were thrown away, thinking it was some other type of propaganda that the government was spreading around, and they failed to make application for this particular allowance.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious thing. The mothers did not get their allowance and everyone else in the province did and if I may be permitted to ask a question of the honourable minister. If there were letters written there were names of the mothers submitted to them that did not receive the allowance and I must ask if it will be retroactive and if they would receive the allowance? I would like to ask this, I am sincere, I would like to ask this of the minister. Maybe he will come up with some snide remark and say that the Eskimo mothers in Nain do not need it. It is possible, but I will say they need it, Sir, and I think that everyone in this House agree that they need that mothers' allowance. It was paid to the rest of the province and, rightfully so, it should be made retroactive and paid to those mothers.

I hope that the honourable minister will have a satisfactory answer for me. He has been giving very few satisfactory answers to this House on this Budget. I do not pretend to be worked up over what the minister is saying, the passing of his decrees in great stride and great pride to people on this side of the House. I think he is worth what he is getting in this House today and rightfully so,

he deserves it. But I ask that question, Mr. Chairman, in all sincerity and I hope in respect to the honourable minister when he travels throughout this province that he will conduct himself, when he is meeting with the educators of this province, in a much better and more ruly fashion than he is conducting himself in this House, well, possibly since this House opened.

MR CROSBIE: That is tripe.

MR. WOODWARD: It may be tripe for the Minister of Finance but it is not tripe for citizens of this Province, if this is what the hon. Minister of Finance has got in mind. In terms of service, no, Sir. It is very distasteful. The minister has displayed to the nth degree arrogance in this particular House, and I am sure that if the honourable members on the other side were to get up and speak realistically and frankly and truthfully that they would say the same words as I am saying here.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask him this particular question and I would like to see if the mothers did not receive it, which I am sure they did not, that it will be retroactive and they will in time receive what was rightfully due them in the beginning. There is the problem with education and I doubt very seriously as far as the honourable minister is concerned, I question the knowledge, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable minister has and the conditions, if he know of the conditions throughout this province other than maybe within the perimeter of this great city, what have really taken place. Maybe I direct my question to the honourable Minister of Finance, his method- if he really knew the conditions of some of the families in the most remote parts of this province, when he saw fit to take away the mothers' allowance from them?

It is a serious situation, Sir, and I think that possibly in time and I am sure it will be in time that in his wisdom, if the honourable Minister of Education is going to live up to his particular office

and is going to guide this province on the right path as far as education is concerned, is going to see fit to have this mothers' allowance reinstated. I also think that the honourable Minister of Finance in his wisdom will turn around and say, "Yes, we were wrong. We did a bad thing." You know, you can always be wrong once. But how many times can a government be wrong.

This is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman. I would like the honourable minister to answer the question concerning the retroactive mothers' allowance.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that certain residents of Labrador were deprived of the mothers' allowance because they could not respond to a letter from the government? Has that happened

MR. MURPHY: in the past two or three months? My department is not aware of it. I am just wondering what the member for that particular district has been doing? I just want to find out if this is an actual fact.

MR. WOODWARD: May I be permitted to answer the question, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MURPHY: Whoever is the member, tell us what is going on in your district. What else have you got to do without that you are not telling him about?

MR. WOODWARD: May I be permitted to answer the question, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not answer hypothetical questions. The honourable member is entitled to speak any number of times in the debate. If he is out of order, then either the Chair or an honourable member will bring it to his attention.

MR. WOODWARD: I think when the honourable Minister of Education answers the question that he will put the honourable member for St. John's Centre straight. Yes, there are a number of families that received the applications. They could not read the applications because they were Eskimo families and they did not make applications for the mothers' allowance and consequently they did not receive mothers' allowance. But it has been brought to the attention of the minister. The names have been submitted to the minister but to date we have not heard any statement from the minister as to what action he is going to take on it.

MR. NEARY: Resign. Resign.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, the mothers allowance was introduced in late August of 1966, it was enforced until the present time. The former Minister of Labrador Affairs I believe was the honourable member for Fogo. In fact I am given to understand that he understood Eskimo, in fact he did say a few sentences in Eskimo in this House.

I am very, very surprised that such a situation could have possibly

MR. CARTER: existed so long in Labrador. The honourable member opposite was a minister in the previous administration and was in a position of authority from. I believe, he can correct me if I am wrong, sometime last summer. So it is all the more surprising that such a situation could continue. I have received a letter with the complaint that these forms were not understood, were unintelligible to a few families. I must confess I do not know what to do about it. I cannot, in fairness, it would be unfair to the rest of the mothers in this province, presumably, if one were to make a special case. Yet I am at a loss to understand how this situation could have continued all these years without -- and this is the first indication. So until I get some more information I am unable, quite literally, quite honestly I am quite unable to make up my mind and my officials are equally perplexed as to what to do in this particular case.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: This would have nothing to do with deferring the last point of order.

Anyway Mr. Chairman I think that most of the points have been covered, any further discussion I think would be mischievous and I therefore propose that this vote be passed.

MR. ROBE F.B. Mr. Chairman, before it is carried I would like to make a brief comment, Sir, we have had a very long and dragged out discussion on parents' subsidies this afternoon. Sir no doubt the honourable members on the other side will have indeed accused us of delaying tactics and obstruction and this sort of a thing.

Sir, the only person that we can lay the blame on for this long debate on this subheading this afternoon is the simple fact that the minister was asked two direction questions and he refused to answer either of them. He could have either given a "yes" or a "no." We simply asked him what his intentions were if this is delayed for eight to twelve months? To give some indications of what this

MR. ROWE, F.B. government are prepared to do. He could have said; nothing. They intend to do nothing or they intend to do something. He did not reply to the question whatsoever.

Sir, we also asked him if there was a need for the mothers' allowance in some cases and whether there was any possibility of working out some sort of a means test or an equivalent allowance for the needy mothers of this province. Sir, all the minister had to do was to inform this committee as to whether or not he had any intentions of doing it, this simple "yes" or "no," or hopefully an explanation. But, Sir, we could not squeeze, beat, hammer one single answer out of the honourable minister. This is the simply reason why we spent a total of three hours here this afternoon debating this one simple subhead.

So, Sir, if we hear

Mr. Rowe (F.B.).

anything in the press or in the news concerning -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE (F.B.): I like to speak for myself. We do not need any words from the hon. member for St. John's Centre. He just cannot resist the temptation to blow off some of that wind that he has over there - the furnace from St. John's Centre, heat the whole block down there.

Sir, we will undoubtedly hear charges of obstruction and, Sir, the blame can only be blamed on the Minister of Education for not having the guts to answer a few simple questions that were put to him.

MR. CARTER: I am not particularly impressed, Mr. Chairman, by the precocious insincerity of the honourable members. However to set their minds at ease, all I can say is that given the state of the public treasury, which the honourable gentlemen, our predecessors, left us, it is practically impossible -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CARTER: I was asking -

MR. NEARY: Sit down when there is a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the honourable minister is repeating himself. I suggest he is out of order.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, I am merely trying to satisfy honourable gentlemen on the other side who have reiterated a rather tiresome and hypothetical question. I am trying to give a reasonable and sensible answer to it. I await your ruling with pleasure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the point of order, the Chair has to give a certain

Mr. Chairman.

amount of leeway in that repetition is often resorted to for the purpose of emphasis. However, there comes a stage when repetition is out of order. In this particular case, the honourable member's question, which was repetition, was permitted. The Chair decided that it was not over the boundary. Also the Chair rules that the Minister of Education in replying therefore to the member's question is not out of order.

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will only be another couple of moments. I cannot see any possibility, quite frankly, of how this government are going to be able to reinstitute the mothers' allowance. If we had thought that we could have, we would not have. I might remind the honourable members opposite that their predecessors agonized long and hard and stayed awake late at night trying to figure some way to wiggle out of the mothers' allowance. Of course, they were not courageous enough to take the step that their financial irresponsibility indicated. Of course, we were left to pull their chestnuts out of the fire. I would like to say that this government are not lacking in courage. They are not lacking in initiative. Also they are not lacking in compassion. It was with grave hesitation that we did it. We found that there was no other way possible, that in order not to do it we would have to cut something more vital, like teachers' salaries or like the maintenance grants to schools. Therefore, reluctantly, we abolished this particular subhead. I am sorry we had to do it. It was forced upon us and so be it.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable minister for his answer. If I heard him correctly, he said that the mothers' allowances will not be reinstated. Is that correct?

MR. CARTER: I do not see any way we can.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Okay.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable minister has said that in his opinion the government will be able to do this. The position expressed by the

Mr. Crosbie

government to which we all concur is that this will be reviewed if in fact it is not instituted by the Government of Canada by January 1, 1973. The minister may very well be right. His opinion or guess might be right. But the government have said that we will reconsider this when we know the exact facts and that is the position.

On motion 604-04, carried.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, 604-05, is this the subhead under which you will find or could find reference to the graduate fellowships at the university? This business of the increase in the amount the student has to borrow in order to qualify for provincial assistance, is this the particular vote under which these topics come up? When the minister gets an opportunity to answer these couple of questions, I would ask him if he could briefly explain the document that he tabled in the House the other day regarding student aid? Perhaps he could give me a synopsis of this. I find it a little bit confusing in places.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman,

to answer the first question first, 605 - this covers tuition allowances and graduate fellowships to university students. We anticipate that some 5,000 students will receive aid under the student aid programme. Last year it was \$3,685,500, this year it is \$3,780,000, this is an estimate but I think it is a fairly substantial increase and with reference to the submission that I tabled, I think the hon. member has that in his possession. I thought I saw him produce it when he asked the question and I do not have it in front of me. I wrote it out carefully so I am prepared to stand by it.

MR. ROWE (F.): Mr. Chairman, the only thing that I can really, and I hope this is not repetition, repeat here is the fact that I am extremely concerned and I am sure my colleagues are and I am sure many students in the province are extremely concerned over their opportunity to be able to get into the university to carry out their undergraduate or graduate studies. Sir, it was mentioned by the honourable Member for Green Bay that we have somewhat less a percentage of students attending the university compared with the other provinces of Canada. We certainly are not up to the national average. We are I think about half of the national average and in fact...

MR. CARTER: If the hon. member would permit, this is rather important at this point, this is one subheading-- Memorial University Tuition and Allowances, I think possibly he is also referring to a later subhead that concern Memorial Capital Grants to the University, now that is coming up and it is entirely up to themselves but I would think that the comments he is about to make or was beginning to make would be more relevant at that stage than at this particular stage. I do not know if he would like to postpone them until then.

MR. ROWE: I appreciate the minister's concern, Sir, but I was going to relate specifically to the fact that a student has to borrow \$200

in addition to the amount he had to borrow last year and the fact that fellowships have been reduced from 130 to 90, and I was just bringing in some facts that came to this hon. House a few days ago, that we already have in this province half of the national average of students attending the university and in comparison with some of the richer provinces only one quarter.

Now, Sir, what we got to look at here is the fact that one of these things in themselves may not appear to be too serious, you know the fact that a student has to borrow \$200 extra in order to qualify for provincial assistance may not appear to be too serious but when we add that to the possibility, and this comes under another subheading, that a student was counting on \$400 special assistance, if he were a student teacher at the university, that is another grant. I am dealing with an example now. When we consider that the capital grant which we will come to later on is somewhat inadequate for the expansion of space and it has always been somewhat inadequate, I will agree with that, and when we take into consideration that there has been a reduction in the graduate fellowships, what I am saying is that all these things added together will probably mean that there are a number of students in this province who will not have the door shut in their face when they come marching up with their books in September to the university but they may very well decide at this very moment that they cannot afford to come to university.

Now when you take the total thing into consideration, Sir, so this is why I would like to bring this point up here although I may in fact spill over to other... Do you have a question?

MR. PECKFORD: What the hon. member for St. Barbe North is saying is that you are taking just about all the students now and you are saying, at the same time as he is doing first year or second year or third year, he is also getting a graduate fellowship. You are using that other decrease by the administration and bringing it to bear upon all the students

so that, therefore, what you are saying is extremely out of point unless you separate them. If you talk about those people who are ready to go into graduate fellowships ...

MR. ROWE: The cheerleader for St. John's West. I sat down, Mr. Chairman, because I assume the hon. member for Green Bay was going to ask me a question, but it turned out to be a speech, trying to point out my failure of logic. I suggest, Sir, that it might be his failure of understanding rather than my failure of logic.

MR. PECKFORD: You try to prove that.

MR. PECKFORD: I asked, Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN Order!

I understood that the honourable member for Green Bay was asking you whether that was what your statement meant?

MR. ROWE, F.B. I do not know what the honourable member for Green Bay was referring to, because he was making a speech and he did not repeat anything that I had said, Sir.

Mr. Chairman what I was trying to suggest here is simply this, that there are a number of areas where we have had cutbacks and reductions that relates to the university that would seem to indicate to me that there is a distinct possibility that some students in this province may in fact decide not to try and gain entrance to the university next year. This is all I am trying to say, Sir.

Now, Sir, I submit that there are students, particularly in the rural areas of this province, when they realize that they have to borrow \$200 additional dollars in order to qualify for provincial assistance, when they realize that a special assistance grant for them, I am talking about a specific case now to straighten you up, an education student, and we have very many education students at the university, he realizes that he cannot get that \$400 additional dollars to help him during his years at university - that he may in fact decide not to go to the university this coming year.

Sir when we consider, as the honourable member for Green Bay has suggested, that we have too few of our students going to university in our province, and the whole economy and future development of this province depends upon, to a certain degree, the calibre and the number of graduates we have coming out of this university, when we consider these factors we have an extremely serious situation on our hands. Students of low-income or no-income families suddenly find that they have to find \$600 additional dollars in order to get into the university or to stay in the university this year.

Sir, last night the member for Hermitage, I believe, the honourable

MR. ROWE, F.B. Minister of Fisheries suggested that we have to have more people working hard for what they get. I cannot remember the exact statement he made, but they have to work for what they get. Now, Sir, I could not agree with him more. I think when a person fights to the death to get something he appreciates it to a greater extent. He will be all the better for having to fight and work hard for an education in this case.

But, Sir, unfortunately, if he could guarantee to honourable members on this side of the House that everybody in this province who wishes to attend this university has to fight to an equal degree to finance himself to get an education, I would go along with him wholeheartedly. But, unfortunately, Sir, again this is another example of where the poor student, the poor community, the poor person really has to suffer, is discriminated against with respect to his capabilities of getting a university education.

Sir, I am deadly serious and I believe what I am saying, when I predict that we are very dangerously approaching the point where a student's capacity and I repeat, the probability, his chances of getting a university education is dependent upon his

Mr. Rowe (F.B.):

financial capacity, rather than his intellectual capacity. I wish I could be guaranteed that his capacity to graduate from university would be directly correlated to his capacity to fight and work and scrape for that university education. But, Sir, this is not the case. The poor people of this province are made to suffer with respect to trying to get into the university. Sir, with respect to -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable member continue later on, as the Speaker wishes to bring to the House a matter with respect to the recent decision of the Supreme Court - if the honourable member would continue at a later time.

On motion that the committee rise report having passed certain estimates of expenditure under the following heading: Heading VI, Education and Youth, item 602, 604-01, 02, 03, 04 and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to inform the honourable members of the House that I, late this afternoon, received the following document from the Supreme Court of Newfoundland:

" 1972 No. 730

" In the Matter of The Election Act,
1954 and Amendments thereto.

AND

" In the matter of a General Election of members to serve in the House of Assembly of the Province of Newfoundland on the 24th. day of March, A.D., 1972 in the Electoral District of Labrador South.

AND

In the Matter of the Petition of Solomon Michael Martin of St. John's in the Province of Newfoundland, Journalist.

Mr. Speaker.

CERTIFICATE

"To The Honourable the Speaker of the House of Assembly

" We, Harold George Puddester and James Douglas Higgins, Judges of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, having on the 13th day of June, A.D., 1972 heard the evidence presented in support of the Petition herein, a copy of the notes of the evidence being hereto appended, and having determined that ballots were cast otherwise than in accordance with the manner of voting prescribed by Section 69 of The Election Act, 1954 in such numbers as could have materially affected the result of the election in the Electoral District of Labrador South HEREBY CERTIFY, in accordance with Section 143 of the said Act, that the election in the Electoral District of Labrador South in the General Election of members to serve in the House of Assembly of the Province of Newfoundland held on the 24th. day of March, A.D., 1972 was void.

"DATED at St. John's this 13th day of June, A.D., 1972

/s/ H. G. PUDESTER
 Judge
 J. D. HIGGINS
 Judge "

I would also like to inform the honourable members that I am now in the process of taking steps incumbent on me as Speaker of the House, under Section 147 of the Election Act.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. House Leader adjourns the House, I wonder if I could ask Your Honour, arising out of the statement that Your Honour just made -

MR. MARSHALL: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think it is necessary -

MR. MARSHALL: to ask the hon. the Speaker a question with respect to the statement that he made. If I could continue with my point of order. I think the Standing Orders are clear that the hon. the Speaker - it is not the intention to get the Speaker into a debate.

MR. NEARY: That is not -

MR. ROWE (W.N.): A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. House Leader is absolutely correct, Of course

MR. ROWE (WM.):, for the benefit of the hon. member, he might have gone on to say that the Speaker is a servant of the House, and it is quite in order for him to meet with the Speaker privately, after the House rises today, to ask some question of the Speaker. I think those are in the Standing Orders as well or the precedent which has been built up.

MR. SPEAKER: According to Beauchesne, Page 148, Citation 171 (ff) Quote: (a question ...must not) seek information set forth in documents equally accessible to questioner, as Statutes, published reports etc.

MR. NEARY: I will gladly meet Your Honour outside, or maybe it is the House Leader, I do not know who it is that can provide me with the answer. All I wanted to know was who calls the by-election, whether it is the Premier, the Speaker, the House leader, who is it?

MR. MARSHALL: The by-election, Mr. Speaker is dealt with in accordance with the provisions of The Election Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do move that the House at its rising do adjourn until 3:00 P.M. Monday next and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 6:00 P.M., the House do now adjourn.