



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 2

2nd Session

Number 50

VERBATIM REPORT

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. J. C. CROSBIE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of a breach of the privileges of all the members of the House. I will speak for everybody, I hope, on this.

There is a headline in the "Daily News" this morning, Mr. Speaker, and the story is false, completely untrue. There is not a word of truth in it. This says, in connection with the conflict of interest legislation that has been distributed in the House, the headline reads: "Fine Officials, Not Politicians." Then if you go down the story and come to the final two paragraphs it says:

"A civil servant who is late filing such information would have his salary docked during the period. It plainly disclosed that the information would result in fines up to \$1,000 or three months in jail," Mr. Crosbie said.

"While the penalties would not apply to Legislature members, Mr. Crosbie said that it would be difficult for a person to sit in the House of Assembly if he were found to be breaking the conflict of interest law."

Now the story is completely false, Mr. Speaker. There was no interview by the St. John's "Daily News" with myself. I was not called by them. I was not interviewed by them. I was not spoken to by them. I was not contacted by them. This is a story cribbed from the CBC interview, an interview last night with the CBC, I gather from reading it, and which the "Daily News", in its usual irresponsible manner, got wrong. What they were taking down what was said in this interview with the CBC, it is directly contrary to that. The story is false. It is an example of journalistic

thievery where the source is not attributed to the CBC or CJON whichever station it was. Then they take it down incorrectly. Then the story reads as though it were an interview with me when they never interviewed me. It is the height of irresponsibility. Then it is put in a headline, on the front page of the "Daily News", that this legislation provides for fines for officials and not for the politicians. Now the legislation, Mr. Speaker, provides for penalties of fine or imprisonment for anyone who violates the act, whether he be a member of this House or a civil servant to whom the act applies or a member of the cabinet or anyone else and the penalties are exactly the same. It provides that if the act be not complied with in the disclosure statement filed that whoever is guilty of failing to comply with the act is not entitled to be remunerated during that period.

It is an extremely damaging story. It is completely false. It should be retracted by the "Daily News" tomorrow and if it is not retracted by the "Daily News" tomorrow, then in my view the House should take action.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Well we do not need to go that far, I feel sure Mr. Speaker. Certainly this is an insult to every member of the House, to imply that we would pass legislation that would fine officials and not apply the same penalties to other people to whom the act applies. I would like to table a copy of the paper in case we need to take any further action on it. It is not in the scurrilous, yellow journalism class, it is in a class all by itself.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: If I thought it would do any good, I would. Why does not the honourable gentleman?

HON. G. DAWE (Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to clear up a point that rose during the estimates

of my department last week. In the "Evening Telegram" the next day dated April 4, it states, if I might quote from it: "He also revealed that the Hattenhauer Enquiry into working conditions at the Electric Reduction Company of Canada Limited, Long Harbour Phosphorous Plant, cost the government \$6,739. This amount covers Dr. Hattenhauer's fee of \$100 a day, plus expenses as well as legal fees and other expenses." It goes on to say: "the enquiry last summer, headed by M. O. Morgan, Vice-President of Memorial University, into strikes in Labrador West cost \$4,500." This implies that Dean Morgan was paid \$100 a day, the same as Dr. Hattenhauer. I would like, for the record, to straighten it out. Dean Morgan undertook that enquiry for the grand sum of \$1.00. In other words he donated his services, for which we are very happy. I am also very happy indeed that he drew this to my attention.

There is one other point and that is that the \$12,000 or the \$11,900 which so far has been paid out for the history of the labour movement of Newfoundland was not paid to Professor Hattenhauer. It was paid to the Institute of Social and Economic Research at the University. I would like, if I might, to read the last paragraph here. I think it is important in view of the work which Dean Morgan is trying to get underway and the encouragement he is trying to convey to other people to undertake these surveys or enquires at no cost to government.

"I am particularly disturbed by the implication of the disclosure of the \$4,500 cost of the Labrador Enquiry without any breakdown of these costs. As it follows, the statement that Professor Hattenhauer received a fee of \$100 a day, plus expenses. The implication is that I also received a fee. You are no doubt aware that my fee for this enquiry was \$1.00, which incidentally I have not received, and presumably the \$4,500 covers the expenses

of the visit of four people to Labrador City in connection with the enquiry and the expenses of bringing members of the bargaining units, both in Wabush and Labrador City, to St. John's for discussions with the commission and the cost of the publication of the report.

"You presumably made no mention of the fact that I had declined a fee. My chief concern here is my endeavour to encourage members of the faculty of the university to contribute their services, without any gratuity, to the Provincial Government. The reported account of the Labrador Enquiry will give little credence to my efforts."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

HON. T. DOYLE: (Minister of Tourism:) Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answers to Questions Nos 201 through 206, asked on the Order Paper of March 28 by the hon. member for White Bay South.

HON. DR. A. T. ROWE (Minister of Health) There was a question from the hon. member for Fogo two days ago. There was no thalidamide infant born in the Province of Newfoundland. The only association Newfoundland has had with this particular disaster was the fact that there was the wife of an American serviceman who delivered a child, in Germany, that had the thalidamide deformity, who came and resided in Labrador while her husband was serving a part of his time with the Armed Forces. There is no documented case of any thalidamide disaster in Newfoundland.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have a very simple question for the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. Is he in a position where he can tell us anything at this stage (I gather the gentleman from Labrador West has reported to him or consulted with him, whatever the phrase is) about the labour situation in Labrador West I gather that again 1,800 men are out of work because of a withdrawal of services let me say, to put it in a neutral term, by twenty-three men who

feel they have a just cause. I think they do.

MR. DAWE: This strike, as we know by now, was caused because twenty or twenty-three railroad workers decided to go on a wildcat strike. These people have applied to the Labour Relations Board for certification and since a question comes up here as

to which government has a jurisdiction over these employees, since it is an interprovincial railway, I am afraid that since it is in a state of subjudice, I would say that any comment right now might be detrimental, other than that.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. My information and I wonder if the minister can confirm or deny this, is that this strike dates back to an arrangement made to which the Government of Newfoundland were a party, through one of the officials of the Department of Labour. I am not sure when it was done. Was it a year or two ago?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: June of last year.

MR. ROBERTS: June of last year. An official was sent there by the minister, in the normal course of events. An arrangement was made with the Government of Quebec, on one hand through an official and with the employer concerned on the other hand. Apparently that is where the problem was caused. If that be so, I wonder if the minister would undertake to look into it and take the appropriate action? It does not seem to be at this stage a matter for the Labour Relations Board, does it?

MR. DAWE: There is some reference to the transaction back in June of last year and I am getting reports from various parties with regard to that transaction. I cannot elaborate any further than that on it. It certainly appears to have been illegal once, since it involved I think it is the Ministry of Transport or the Transport Commission.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary question. I understand that the minister does not know everything about the department. Could we expect a statement from the minister at some time? I think this matter is of some considerable public interest particularly in Labrador City but also throughout the province as a whole. It is one of the largest operations we have.

MR. DAWE: I will take the honourable Leader of the Opposition's

question as notice and go into a statement later.

CAPT. E.W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I asked the question of the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Unfortunately, he is not in his seat this afternoon but I feel duty bound to direct that same question now to the honourable Minister for Transportation and Communications. The question is this, "Has he had any representation from the council at Change Islands regarding the road conditions there?". I understand that the bus has not been able to operate for the past two days, busing school children back and forth.

HON. DR. T.C. FARRELL: (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS):

Mr. Speaker, do you mean, Sir, did I receive any representation in the past two or three days?

CAPT. WINSOR: Yes.

DR. FARRELL: Not to me personally directed.

CAPT. WINSOR: Sir, the department? A supplementary question. Has the Department of Transportation and Communications had any correspondence or discussion from the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing on this matter?

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question; this may be so, Sir, and I will ask to have it tabled and I will get a report on it.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable Minister of Health. There are at the moment rumors circulating in my district to the effect that the nursing station at Forteau is about to be closed down. I wonder if the honourable minister can inform the House if there is any shred of truth to that?

HON. DR. A.T. ROWE: (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of this information but I will inform the member for Labrador South as soon as I can contact the officials involved. I will advise him.

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole

on Supply. Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. When the committee rose at eleven last evening the honourable the Leader of the Opposition had the floor.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was saying a few words about bus transportation or transportation of school children as it is called in the estimates. I was saying that the problem with the policy that the government have now adopted, a legacy from the gentleman of St. John's North, from his short but altogether disastrous tenure of the ministership, the problem has been caused because the policy does not take into account the realities of the situation. To recapitulate very briefly, Mr. Chairman; the situation is in reality that tenders are called for a given bus service. One or more people tender on it. There may be cases where nobody tenders and then a tender in the normal course would be awarded. That is fine. That is what always happened over the years. It happened time and time again and the costs went up and the Minister of Finance, whoever he was, had gray hair and the Treasury Board people had gray hair because the Minister of Education would come in and he would say, "I have got to have another million or another million and a-half or another \$826,412.08 for bus transportation." People would throw their hands in the air and say, "Why?" Can you not cut it down?" He would say, "Yes, we can cut it down by cutting out bus routes." It would be agreed that that could not be done. Then he would say, "Well, tenders have been called and this is what it would cost". So, the government felt that they had no choice except to pay that bill.

Now, we have a different policy whereby no longer is it a matter of calling for tenders for the service and then deciding the best tender and usually of course the lowest tender, giving in to that and then paying the bill. Rather it is a matter of saying that there is a given amount of money, we will buy service

with that.

The only problem with that, Mr. Chairman, is that it does not work. It has not worked. We have now had a full year of this system. The fears which we expressed a year past have been borne out in full measure. It just does not work.

I am most familiar of course with the situation in my own constituency. I probably know more about that than I do about other districts. The honourable gentleman from Port de Grave who, in private life, when he is not a member of the House, is among other things an operator of a school bus, he has a contract, as he told us last evening, from a school board. He has confirmed what I said. The problem is going to become more acute because last year, at least in White Bay North, the two bus routes that are being operated in the St. Anthony area, one within St. Anthony and the other North of St. Anthony, the communities feeding in there, are both integrated. There is one Pentecostal bus system centered around their school at St. Lunaire.

Last year the board was in a situation where operators had contracts and fixed prices. This year the contracts have expired, tenders will be called. Now, what is going to happen, Mr. Chairman? I would like the minister to answer this if he would, please. What is going to happen if the board call tenders, as they will? The Vineland Board based at St. Anthony call tenders for these services and in comes one or more bids. Let us assume there is more than one but certainly arms-length tenders. No question of anything wrong or improper and I do not think that there ever has been any of that, not to my knowledge. I am quite certain about the St. Anthony area. In come tenders and when the amount is added up it is far more than is available under this formula. The amount under the formula last year was \$140,000 in round figures. That is going up ten dollars per student. There are what? Maybe a thousand to twelve hundred

students in that area. Let us call it fifteen hundred. Let us say that it is going up \$15,000. So, let us say roughly \$155,000 to the Vineland Integrated School Board. What happens if they cannot get people to perform the services within the price that they have? It is easy to say that they should. If they do, well and good. Part of the problem of course is that people know \$155,000 is available. They know it is so much per student. Multiply it by the number of students and the minimum will become the maximum. I am sorry, the maximum will become the minimum. What is happening there is exactly what the Minister of Education and the Minister of Finance told us last night would happen if they gave out figures on how much was in for school teachers salary increases. What is going to happen? What are the board going to do? The board have no resources of their own. It is all very well to say that they should raise money but people in the area are now paying a school assessment of five dollars per month. It is more of a burden for them than a comparable amount would be for many other people in this province because the average incomes are lower and many people are financially not so well off. Maybe the people who work for IGA are well off. They are being paid provincial scales but the fishermen and other people in the area are certainly not well off. So, what are the board going to do?

I could repeat this. I think it is probably true in Labrador South and in St. Barbe North and in many other parts of the province, because the formula does not take into account the realities. It does not take into account what is actually happening. I make no apology for going over this again. I think it is the very heart of it. Last year we skated on what we had. As far as I know, there were no crisis.

In white Bay North what happened is that the maintenance of the buses is down. The buses that now run into the schools are a shambles.

The windows are broken, the seats are ripped. I am told there is supposed to be a radio on those buses in case of being stuck in a storm. I am told there is none. That is not the fault of the operators. The operators, as the gentleman from Port de Grave told us last night and we all agree on this, it is good common sense, are not going to run at a loss. They are not. They cannot. If they are not being paid an adequate sum, then what choice have they got? This year they have let their equipment go down because they are locked into a contract and so forth, but next year they are going to put in a price that will guarantee them an adequate return or they will not take the business. If they do not take the business, who is going to do it? Is the school board going to do it? That is fine but can the school board do this service any more cheaply than private operators? If so, I am all for it but I must say; if that can be done, why have not school boards done it all over Newfoundland? Maybe some school boards do operate their own buses. The Pentecostal people I know at St. Lunaire own and operate the buses but most school boards in Newfoundland have gone through the tender process.

So, it is a real problem. I think we may face the crunch this year on school buses. We got away with it last year. I wonder if the minister could explain what position he will take if this does happen? It is hypothetical but I do not think it is very hypothetical. I wonder if he would undertake to review the entire system? I said before that I think that there are only two acceptable alternatives, one of which I would recommend and the other which I do not. The one which I do not recommend is that the government operate all the buses either directly or through the school board. I think that that would lead to ballooning costs and would lead to administrative chaos but it could be done.

The one which I do recommend is the one which was in effect

for years, namely a bus route is approved, standards are set down of how many children and what distances and so forth and a bus route is approved by some official within the minister's department. Then tenders are called. Maybe they should be called province-wide and not just in one area. If somebody from Gander wants to bid on a tender to carry students in Goose Bay, he should have the right to do so, move in and become a corporate citizen of that area. There is nothing wrong there, nothing wrong at all. When the tenders are called and it is arms-length tendering and fair and all that, everything done proper and according to "Hoyle", then the lowest tender gets the bid and the government pay that price. That is what was always done.

Now we have a completely artificial system bearing no relationship to reality. Some boards I suspect make money on school buses. I suspect they do not need, they do not have to spend the amount that the government give them on this formula because they may have a lot of students within a relatively small area. Other boards such as the Vineland Board of White Bay North and the board in the Straits of Belle Isle, board so called, the integrated board there, I suspect lose money because they happen to have relatively small numbers of students spread out over relatively large areas. Either, The minister or his predecessor pointed out last night the cost per student in the St. Barbe Integrated School Board Area apparently is the lowest in Newfoundland. That just shows in my view how thinly spread out the resources are. They do not have the money to put out. We are seeing it in bad buses, in deteriorating equipment. You can get away with that for a year or so. If Your Honour has a house, he can get away with a year or two without maintaining it, it will not show, but in the second year or the third year or the fourth year or the fifth

year the lack of maintenance will begin to show. It will begin to show clearly. I am afraid that that is what is happening with our school buses now. I am not saying that we will have any accidents. I do not think it will lead to that. It will lead to many students being miserable, to travelling in needlessly uncomfortable conditions. Busing is an emotional subject. There are children in White Bay North being brought thirty miles to school. That is an hour and a-half, on fourteenth class dirt roads. It is a long time to bring children to school, an hour and a-half over in the mornings and an hour and a-half back. To get them to school at eight thirty or nine, it means that the parents get up at six, the children get up at six. By the time that they have their breakfast and get on the bus and get carried over to St. Anthony and get into school - I suppose there are arguments pro and con and I do not propose to get into them but the point is that in human terms this system is having its toll.

I know of cases where children get quite sick travelling on the buses because of the combination of bad roads and worse buses. The roads are a bigger problem.

We are not talking about roads. Not much can be done about them I suppose, in the short term anyway. It would take millions to improve the roads.

The bussing policy is wrong. We are going to have to pay the cost and the cost is going up each year. It has gone up ten percent this year. I think the money could be better distributed. I think the policy introduced last year was wrong. We said at the time it was wrong and the minister made some modifications (or the then minister) which were improvements but it is still wrong and I think it has been shown so in practice. All I can do is to ask the minister if he will reconsider it or, if he will not reconsider it, perhaps he could offer some defence to the policy, because I for one have been unable to understand it.

I think that is the experience of those of us who have talked to the school boards and the people who had to try to make this policy work.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, to review briefly some of the points I made last night and to comment on the matters raised by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, when this policy was introduced last year it was forecast by a number of honourable members that it would be impossible or it would lead to catastrophe and disaster financially. (I do not mean in terms of loss of life) That has not been the case. I certainly do not deny that some school boards have had difficulties in financing under this arrangement. Some school boards, certainly the one to which the Leader of the Opposition referred, that is among them, have had difficulties.

Of course, that and other school boards have financial difficulties, not only in the bus transportation service but in general as the government does have financial difficulties as well. However, it is our opinion and the opinion of the Department of Education that the ten percent increase should, well, will obviously alleviate the situation but should alleviate it in such a manner

whereby those school boards which were having such serious difficulties will not be in anything close to that position.

We have an official in the Department of Education whose basic responsibility is school bus transportation. He visits and meets with boards and is more or less at their service and disposal in terms of guiding them and passing along the information and knowledge that he has. Certainly the department would be very pleased to send him to St. Anthony to discuss with the school board their overall transportation problems, bearing in mind the ten percent increase which is forecast in these estimates.

The other matter I wish to refer to and this was mentioned by a few honourable members last night when they asked whether the formula could in fact be improved and they mentioned a number of things which should be brought into it: As honourable members know, it is distance and then roads paved or unpaved. As far as I can see, the only additional factor one could put in would be a division of unpaved roads into classes (a) and (b) bearing

in mind that some are in worse condition than others, operating costs would be higher. This is certainly something we will look into and see if it is feasible or practical to do it.

Meanwhile, all I can say is that from our examination of the situation, (the Department of Education) there should be no insurmountable difficulties next year. Obviously, if any board or boards because of very particular circumstances have very particular problems, then certainly we shall be glad to meet with them and work out an acceptable solution.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a suggestion if I may. In spite of this ten dollar increase on a per capita basis or per student basis the minister mentioned, I am convinced, having talked to members of school boards, that there will be certain school boards that will still experience a tremendous amount of difficulty this year in financing their school bus operation.

On the other hand, Sir, I am convinced in looking at the situation with respect to some school board areas, that they will actually make money, they will have money left over as a result of the use of this formula. The problem is the formula itself, because it only takes distance and pavement or no pavement into consideration, I will admit and I thank the administration for this increase. However, I have to point out that there are some school boards that will still not have enough money whereas there is a distinct possibility that other school boards will have money they will get through this formula, They will have more money than will actually be spent on school bus operations and they can use this money to spend in some other sort of area, as mentioned by the member for Port de Grave last night. He mentioned that some school boards at the present time are spending school bus money in other areas of school board expenditures.

Here is a suggestion that I would like to make. Because of the fact that we have areas that will not have enough money and areas that will have more than enough money for school bus transportation, (and I can give examples of that but I do not want to mention any names of school boards or names of communities here) I would suggest that the minister give some consideration to working in a plus or minus ten or fifteen percent leaway in the formula. In other words, once the formula has been worked out and the amount has been worked out for an individual school board, if it works out to fifty thousand dollars say, if you have a built-in plus or minus, say ten percent or fifteen percent or it may even be necessary to be twenty percent but then that is a forty percent difference. Probably a plus or minus ten percent would be satisfactory, That means that some school boards instead of getting the fifty thousand dollars, if they are in an area where you have dirt, narrow, hilly roads that are closed a lot of the winter because of the inefficiency of the snow clearing operations, where you have tremendous water holes in the spring and in the fall, where you have a lot of wash-outs, where the maintenance is high

because of the condition of the roads, where the weather is severe, where you have a scattered population, that school board, instead of getting the fifty thousand dollars, would probably get fifty-five thousand dollars because it is recognized by the officials of the department that this is a very poor area but a very expensive area for operating school buses.

On the other hand, if you have an area like in around the Gander Area, where you have a good snow-clearing operation, where you do not have the high winds that you would get on the Northwest Coast, for instance, with the snow blowing off the Straits, where you have a lot of pavement, where you have a fairly concentrated population, that school board, instead of getting the fifty thousand dollars according to the formula, the officials of the department may come to the conclusion; "Well this school board can quite adequately get along with forty-five thousand dollars." There is a difference of ten thousand dollars that is being manipulated in such a way that these areas that have severe conditions can get a little bit extra. Probably the percentage could be fifteen percent difference, probably the percentage could be a twenty percent plus or minus thing build-in to the formula.

I would like to hand that out as a suggestion to the minister because I am convinced that there are school bus areas (if I may call them that) that will not have enough money this year, in spite of the increase of ten dollars per student, and there will be school bus areas that will have more than the money that they will be spending on school bus operations. Mr. Chairman, I hand that out as a suggestion to the committee and I would ask the minister if his department would give this some serious consideration because it makes no difference in the vote. The money is there in the vote, it is the actual distribution of money that will be handled in a different manner. I think this would aid some school bus areas tremendously in the coming year.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I will take note of the suggestion and have its implications looked into. It certainly sounds good. Its implications obviously, we will have to work out. We will certainly look into it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 03-06 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, as honourable members know, this is the amount which has been made available for capital construction during the past few years and I think honourable members will recall as well governments' policy to implement or develop, in consultation with those responsible for building schools, to develop and implement a long-term financing programme. I think this is certainly necessary for the school boards and the Denominational Educational Committees. I think in the long run, well, obviously, they and others would like to see this \$8 million increased. I think the system of long-term financing is even more beneficial than, let us say, an extra million or a half million or whatever happens to be on a per annum basis.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, it is obviously useless and futile for me to get up and say more about the small amount of this vote compared to what is needed in the province. I can only point out the fact that the Denominational Educational Committees, during the summer announced the fact that they needed \$70 million for approximately two thousand new classrooms for the schools this year.

At the time, I thought that this two thousand dollars was somewhat of a modest request on the part of the Denominational Educational Committee. I am sure that the need is much greater and in fact the Denominational Educational Committees realize the financial constraints imposed upon them by government, because of their financial problems, as stated by the minister (alleged financial problems, as stated by the minister). I thought that this was a very reasonable request.

However, Sir, this seventy thousand dollars they needed

up to 1975, so that is over the next two and a-half to three years the Denominational Educational Committees claimed that they needed seventy thousand dollars to carry out the capital projects that they wanted to carry out.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$70 million.

MR. F.B. ROWE: \$70 million, I mean. That works out on an average of \$23 million per year and we see only \$8 million in there which represents one-third of the total amount needed by the school boards.

I have to admit of course (Am I correct here) that there is \$11 million in there for capital construction this year through DREE, I am assuming that. That \$11 million is that outside the stated need of the Denominational Educational Committees? In other words, when the Denominational Educational Committees stated that they needed the \$70 million, were they excluding any DREE construction or were they including any DREE construction? Could the minister just...

MR. OTTENHEIMER: They did not refer to DREE at all, but I would certainly imply that they were thinking of the total needs. What needs are filled through DREE are part of the total needs. That would be what I would infer.

MR. F.B. ROWE: What we are really saying here is; of the \$23 million— (we can say thanks to the federal government) they are going to be getting \$19 million this year, that is \$11 million from DREE and \$8 million from the provincial government for capital expenditures. Is that correct? It is still \$3 million short of what the modest stated sum was that was made by the Denominational Educational Committees.

The most serious aspect of this whole thing, as far as I am concerned, is the financial whirlpool that the boards of education find themselves in. We all know what the situation is with respect to a whirlpool: You get stuck in the centre of it and there is hardly any way out of it at all. What I mean by the financial whirlpool as far as the boards of education are concerned, is the example

as pointed out by the Roman Catholic School Board here in St. John's. The Roman Catholic School Board is \$7 million in debt. That is just one school board in our province. It is \$1 million less in debt than the total grant. What we are saying here really, Sir, is that if we added up the total debt of the school boards of this whole province, even the capital grant to the school boards that is passed out by this administration now does not even go close to covering the debt. This is why I tried to make an argument earlier in this session; that the \$24 million that was coming to the provincial government should be used for purposes of education in order to write off the debts of the school boards so that they could use the money for the stated purpose and that is the capital construction, instead of having to use that money or a fair sum of it for servicing the debt.

I believe, I am not an expert in banking but I understand that if you have a \$7 million debt, this means approximately one hundred thousand dollars per year has to go toward the servicing of that debt, year after year, after year, after year. In ten years that is \$1 million. A ten year debt is \$1 million for the servicing of that debt. Sir, that is an extremely great sum of money.

Now I suggest, Sir, that we have to try and do something to get the school boards out of this whirlpool of financial trouble that they find themselves in. I do not know what the answer is but I would suggest that the first step is working out some way to liberate, to liquidate the debts that the school boards have at the present time. The quicker we can make use of some federal money that is coming to this province for that purpose the better off the school boards in this province, the better off the children going to school will be.

Now, Sir, I welcome the statement made by the Education Minister that the government will be working out some sort of a system of long term financing. When did the minister suggest that this would actually start? Is it this coming year?

MP. OTTENHEIMER: This present year.

MR. ROWE, F.B.: This present year long term financing schemes would have been worked out with the boards. Sir, I suggest and I have to be repetitious, but I suggest that the minister go one step further and put a complete freeze on the establishment of any further school tax authorities in this province. I stated yesterday and the day before and on other occasions in this House and I would like to get this straight, Sir, because I heard a couple of newscasts last night that concerned me just a little bit because it kind of left the impression that I said that school tax authorities were inefficient and stupid and unfair and inequitable and all this sort of thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F. B.: Yes. But I am just going to clarify that. The honourable Minister of Finance is always ready to try and lead me up the garden path. He almost caught me the other day on a suggestion, that I might be calling for strikes by teachers for some reason or another, but he did not quite manage. But, Sir, the point that I am trying to make is that I recognize the extremely valuable service that members of school tax authorities are providing in this province. They are dedicated gentlemen. They are hard working gentlemen. They are trying to provide

an educational service to this province. I am certainly not calling the individual members of the school tax authorities stupid, unfair, inequitable, cumbersome or anything else. It is the whole school tax authority concept that I am criticizing and that I am calling cumbersome, inequitable, unfair, stupid and, Sir, I have no hesitation in say that in spite of the fact that it was the previous administration, I believe it was, while they were in office that the school tax authorities started to be set up. I am still a Liberal. We still sit over here on this side of the House. I have no hesitation in saying that if this school tax authority keeps going the way it has, we are going to have massive duplication and we are going to be cutting into the revenue collected.

Sir, I ask the minister very seriously to put a freeze on the establishment of any school tax authorities in this province immediately and over the next year phase out any existing school tax authorities that are operating in this province at the present time and over the next year while they are phasing out those school tax authorities set up one of two things, either a provincial school tax authority with one office, with one administration, one collection system or better still make the authorities put a division in the Department of Education that would be responsible for collecting revenue for educational purposes in this province. Because, Sir, as long as we continue on with school tax authorities we do have this duplication. We have ten per cent or twelve per cent of the money collected going towards the administration of these school tax authorities. If you have a dozen of those or fifteen or thirty of those you can see where the money is going. Besides that, Sir, school tax authorities are controversial. It is difficult to collect money in the first place. It has been a very troublesome thing anywhere it has been set up, I maintain that it is inefficient, it is cumbersome, it is stupid if we are going to branch out into thirty or forty of these school tax authorities all over the province. I cannot find adjectives enough to describe the inefficiency of continuing to have school tax authorities continuing to work in this particular province.

So, Sir, I would like for the minister to relate to the fact this whole business of phasing out school tax authorities, putting a freeze on them and having government made responsible wholly and solely for the collection of taxes or the collection of revenue for school board purposes. I would like for the minister to give the House some indication of what the school boards actually owe in this province and how much it is costing per year to service the debts of the school boards. I do not know if the minister has the information readily at hand. I have been trying to get the information from the Denominational Educational Committees. I got scattered information but not enough to put the full picture together.

But, Sir, if you can give this committee some indication of what the total debt of the school boards is, how much it is costing, the province, in other words, to maintain this debt. Sir, I am convinced

that this debt should be wiped out one way or the other and we can have this long term financing. Then you would see an awful lot more capital construction of schools going on in this province. I guess it is too late to mention it now, Sir, but I am sure that the construction of these new DREE schools is going to cause headaches in the final analysis because the operating grants are insufficient in order to operate these schools - but that particular section has gone through now.

MR. MARTIN: Just a few words, Mr. Chairman: We heard so much when this present administration were endeavouring to get themselves elected, we heard so much about planning and priorities and the necessity of putting the priorities in the right place. It is rather perplexing to look at the way that education is being treated because one would have assumed that education would automatically have the highest priority of all. If this budget shows anything at all, it shows the importance of education due to the fact that we are spending more money on that than anything else. Also, the amount of money available is so woefully inadequate. I would certainly agree most wholeheartedly with my friend from St. Barbe North that this whole

matter of raising of revenues for education must be looked at in entirely a new light. The whole concept of school tax authorities must be done away with. It is another way for a provincial government, any provincial government, to renege on its responsibilities to provide the revenues. I think everybody will understand that education is important enough that if taxes have to be raised, then they have to be raised. Whether it is raised through a school tax authority or private subscription or whether it is raised through the Department of Finance or whatever other means, everybody recognizes that we must have more money for education, and it is time to stop beating around the bush and get on with the business.

I think, Sir, that we must not dismiss this idea too quickly about how we have to go around raising revenues and I believe if this administration were to impose another small tax on the general public, right across the board, I do not believe that anybody would complain too loudly if everyone knew that it was going to be used for the purposes of education.

HON. A. J. PURPHY (MINISTER OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE): Mr. Chairman, if I may just have one or two words. I have just sat here being sort of amused, and I listen to the honourable member here talk about school taxes. I throw myself back about four years in memory when I sat there and not junior but senior over here talking about imposing school taxes, how we were going to get the money. I just want to say this that I certainly wish that the honourable the member for St. Barbe North had been here with us at that time when the great conversation, the great Magna Charta of education was being drawn from the back benches here three or four years ago. You just look back and things have changed and still they remain so different, not the same.

MR. CROSBIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, a very apt remark. Fred junior is attacking Fred senior ferociously here today," by turning his back on the school tax authority, that magnificent innovation instituted during the reign of King Fred I. We have not come to the reign of King Fred II yet.

Mr. Chairman, I only want to make a few comments. The honourable gentleman for St. Barbe North has such tender sensibilities for the debt incurred by one of the Avalon school boards here, it has \$7 million debt. The honourable gentleman wants to see that debt is done away with. It is a shocking thing for that school board to have a debt, just because it built schools and spent money, now it has a debt. It is a shocking thing for that school board to have a debt but it is nothing shocking about the province having a debt. This is what amazes me and it confuses me. Here it is in exhibit one, the total debt of the province, - March 31, 1973. Direct \$761 million, crown corporations \$56.5 million, guaranteed borrowing \$327 million. total \$1,144,000. last year it was \$1,026,000. But the honourable gentleman is not concerned and he is not worried and his sensibilities are not aroused or his fears or anxieties are not aroused by this debt that the province has. But if a school board has a debt, by George we have to do something about it. Wipe it out!

Now these were debts incurred by that school board and others during the past twenty-three years not just in the last twelve months, because of a system that we had in effect in the province of financing school construction and the rest of it. That is a problem that they have. It is so easy to sit opposite with all the solutions. What is the honourable gentleman doing, Mr. Chairman? He wants to do away with the school tax authorities, abolish them, stamp them out, eliminate them, guillotine them, assassinate them, they are stupid, they are ridiculous, they are jejune, they are silly, they are foppery, they are nonsensical.

MR. ROWE, F. P.: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I just for the record want to point out that it is the honourable the Minister of Finance who is using these adjectives and it was not the honourable the member for St. Barbe North who used these words. The next thing, I will be quoted as saying this.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, all right, then perhaps you did not use all those words but it is the same effect; it is silly to have the school tax authorities, do away with them. The member for Labrador South he is up to, he is just as irresponsible as the member for St. Barbe North. He wants them done away with. They are silly; they are nutty, they are tutti-frutti, they are footless, they are fruitless, they are expensive, they are inefficient, they are barbarous, they are degrading, they are degenerate. We can think up a whole lot of things that the school tax authorities are.

So these honourable gentleman, Mr. Chairman, what is there answer to the public? What they are urging the government to do is to put up the income tax. When we put the income tax up one per cent, that will bring us in some \$900,000. That \$900,000 is going to go nowhere. Tossed into the thirsty, hungry, grasping maw of the educational system of this province, that will go nowhere. So one per cent of the personal income tax, not even in it. If we are going to do away with the school tax authorities we will have to do better than that. We will have to up it another per cent. That will give us \$1.8 million. That is not going to be enough. Fine! We will put her up five per cent. That is \$4.5 million. Now we are getting somewhere near what we will need. But \$4.5 million will not do it. So that is only a five per cent increase in the personal income tax. Well, we will have to put up the S.S.A. tax. We will put that from seven per cent to eight per cent.

What will that do for us? That will bring in an additional \$8 million. That is all that will bring in, another \$8 million. Will that satisfy the demands for education, \$8 million plus \$4.5 million is \$12.5 million? That is what we will get this year if we put them both up. That is not enough. What else? Let us put up the gasoline tax. It is already the highest in Canada, but let us put that up another cent a gallon. That may get us another, I forget the exact figure, \$700,000 or \$800,000, a drop in the bucket. It is no good putting up the

gasoline tax one cent, let us knock her up ten cents, bring in something decent for the purposes of education. Still that is not enough. Well, let us belly up the corporation tax.

The honourable gentlemen opposite when in opposition do not think much of corporations. They will be all for that, so we will put up the corporation tax. What will that bring us in here in Newfoundland when we do that? One per cent on the corporation tax, that might get us - I forget the exact figure, \$800,000 to \$1 million. One per cent is no good. We will have to drive her up five per cent. Well then we will not attract any companies here, the ones that are here will want to leave if they can do it. But that is all right.

Now we have \$20 million near abouts. And \$20 million is the amount the educational budget has gone up this year. The estimates of the Department of Education are up \$20 million this year. So then the honourable gentleman slides on to the favour subject of the honourable myopic gentleman opposite, the \$24 million that we are suppose to have gotten or hoping to get this year, increased tax equalization. They say that should be gone. That should go into education. Well, it has gone into education. If it is going to be \$24 million, you can say that \$20 million of that has gone into education because the education estimates are up \$20 million. And who knows how much more we will need during the year. So that is no solution.

So I suggest.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, what we all need to be concerned about is where we are going to get the revenue from. No matter who is in power, where are we going to get the revenue from to carry the province on at all? Whether it is education, health, welfare and the rest of it, where is it going to come from next year? Perhaps we will get another boost from the tax equalization next year.

But when the honourable gentleman talks about doing away with school tax authorities and this can be done easily and is sensible and we can replace it by increasing one of our other taxes, I would like to know which one. If we increase all our other taxes for that purpose, where do we get the additional revenue we are going to need next year for all of the other services we are involved in and what services do we cut out?

Now that is the position the province is in. I know, Mr. Chairman, it is not the worry of the opposition. They are not responsible and we are. We have to grasp with the problem and they are making these little suggestions which will look perhaps good in the paper.

The honourable gentleman made a mistake yesterday. He got a couple of phone calls today from irrate members of school tax authorities. "What are you doing, calling us stupid and ignorant?" The honourable gentleman got dusted off this morning because when he spoke this afternoon he wanted to -

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the honourable Minister of Finance is serious but that is a complete untruth. He is lying through his teeth.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I know the honourable gentleman is upset and he does not mean that, so I will say all right, I agree. Nobody contacted the honourable gentleman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable Minister of Finance would permit. The honourable member for St. Barbe North has uttered a completely unparliamentary phrase and it calls for the strict

MR. CHAIRMAN: intervention of the Chair. The honourable member for St. Barbe -

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, a rose is a rose by any other name and what the Minister of Finance is uttering there now is a complete falsehood and, I repeat, lie and is without any substance or substantiation whatsoever, and I refuse to withdraw it, You ask the honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman, my colleague from St. Barbe North has used an expression which we all know is unparliamentary. I am quite sure he will withdraw it but I think first the Minister of Finance should be required to withdraw a statement he made with reference to my honourable friend, which is equally unparliamentary and equally untrue.

The honourable Minister of Finance made a flat statement that the gentleman from St. Barbe North had received some phone calls. My colleague says that is completely untrue.

Then I think it is incumbent upon the Minister of Finance to withdraw his statement and I am quite sure my colleague will do as Your Honour wishes and withdraw his statement.

MR. CROSBIE: No problem Your Honour, no problem, if the honourable gentleman says he did not get any calls, I accept that.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw -

MR. CROSBIE: If the honourable gentleman did not get any calls, I am disappointed in him. But if he did not get any calls, Mr. Chairman, do you know what happened, he read his own words and he knew he was going to get calls if he did not fix that up because when he read this morning that he said they were stupid and this, that and the other, he knew he was going to get calls and now this afternoon he is saying that it is not the people on the school tax authority that are stupid. Well, I am glad he did that.

MR. CROSBIE: He is a young man just starting in politics, destined for defeat in the next election if he does not mend his ways. Therefore, of course, we can forgive him for it.

So just to end up, Mr. Chairman, all I want to do is point out that it is just not as simple as the honourable member for St. Barbe and the honourable member for Labrador South appear to think it is. If we do not have the school tax authorities and heaven only knows they are a clumsy enough device and I am sure the minister is examining them and if they can be reformed in some way or made more effective, they can continue. Perhaps some day they must go, because they are too clumsy. But they are another revenue source and if they are done away with and we have to assign revenue from increasing the few taxes we have in this province, what do we do to meet all the other heavy expense for the country's upkeep?

I think that should be kept in mind. The matter is not as simple as honourable gentlemen want us or the public to believe.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, not carried. I want to say a word or two. I have heard some performances from the Minister of Finance but rarely have I heard one where he has distorted and twisted the facts as he has in this one.

Let me deal first of all with what my friend and colleague said a number of times. He said the problem with school tax authorities is that they are an inefficient way to collect money. He may have used the adjective stupid, "they are a stupid way." The school tax authority system is a stupid way to collect money. The fact that it was offered by the Liberal Administration -

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. I have not heard, Mr. Chairman,

MR. ROBERTS: I have not heard the honourable gentleman from St. John's Centre object to the fact Babb Construction are getting contracts without tender. I have not heard the honourable gentleman from St. John's Centre object to the fact the Premier's brother-in-law was hired for \$20,000. I have not heard the honourable gentleman from St. John's Centre object to the fact that this administration are paying out \$800,000 to George McLain.

MR. MURPHY: Let us talk about Come Home Year.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I am all for it.

MR. MURPHY: Who was in charge of that?

MR. ROBERTS: Fred Rowe.

MR. MURPHY: Who was responsible.-

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, do I have the floor?

MR. MURPHY: Yes sure, but tell us that.

MR. ROBERTS: I will tell the honourable gentleman anything he wants to know. I only wish I could make him understand.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance got up and deliberately or otherwise, and I prefer to believe otherwise, twisted and distorted and misrepresented the position taken by my friend from St. Barbe North which is, to repeat it, that the school tax authorities are a very inefficient, ineffective, etc., etc., (one could get a thesaurus and go through it) way to collect money.

Then the minister went on in his usual defeatist way and I have never seen a man, Mr. Chairman, in a year, in the twelve or fourteen months that man has been in office, come from being so high and proud and so arrogant to being so willing to admit defeat. Next we will get an attack on Ottawa because Ottawa is not bailing him out. My God, Mr. Chairman, do those men want Commission of Government? Do they want Commission of Government in this province? That is what they seem to be saying. We did not hear anything, Mr. Chairman, a year ago, about the

MR. ROBERTS: difficulty of providing money for schools on capital account, when they were trying to get elected. What did we hear then? "We are going to give you everything you want." They were flitting about in government helicopters.

The honourable Minister of Finance has a short memory when it suits him. He has a long memory when it suits him. It is too bad he does not apply the same standards.

Now let us look at the problem. The problem is one simply that more money must be put into education. That is what the gentleman from Labrador South was saying as well.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, let the Minister of Finance be quiet for once in his life. Let him even be willing to admit that he may just learn something by listening to other members of the House. The arrogance of the honourable gentleman, let him be quiet. Mr. Chairman, let him be quiet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The honourable Leader of the Opposition has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman should listen even if he cannot learn.

The point being made by the gentleman from St. Barbe North and the gentleman from Labrador South is a very sound one.

The honourable gentleman talks of wasting time. He got up and went back, I wonder why he did not blame us for the fact that in 1949 the budget on education was only \$3 million and in 1932, Mr. Chairman, school teachers' salaries were cut in half, probably by a Liberal Administration or else by the Tories, I am not sure. The government changed in that year. Maybe I am at fault for that too.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as we were saying, if the honourable gentleman from St. John's Centre has nothing to add to the debate, he would be wise not to try to subtract from it. The point is, Mr. Chairman, that we have got to put more

MR. ROBERTS: money in education in Newfoundland. True, we have to put more money into other things as well. We are talking about education. We are talking about capital grants for schools and the question is from where that money must come.

The administration opposite, as part of their concerted attack, their campaign to pretend that all of the ills of Newfoundland can be cured if only Ottawa will give us more money, snibbling, weak-kneed, begging attitude that they have, and they pretend they are big men about it. They have no more plans than children do. We will come to that in due course.

The crowd opposite, Mr. Chairman, have no answer. What we are saying is that the present system - we authorized it and now we are saying it is wrong. We tried it and it does not work. The present system does not work. It is unfair, it is inequitable and in that sense it is stupid. It is a stupid system. The people running it are not stupid, Nobody said they were. The Minister of Finance is deliberately trying to distort because he knows what asses the government are making of themselves in this matter.

The problem carries with it the solution. The problem is that the tax burden in this province is inequitably distributed. We use in Newfoundland the most regressive forms of taxation - the sales tax, gasoline tax. The gasoline tax might not be as regressive because it is related to one's consumption. The sales tax, which falls alike on rich and poor but hits the poor far more. The school tax assessments, whatever they are called, whether they be assessments as the boards have now or school taxes in the areas where there are school tax authorities, all of them raised for capital account, for the \$8 million that is being spent on capital account.

MR. ROBERTS: By law, Mr. Chairman, the money can only go for that purpose or for certain very limited specific purposes. The present Minister of Justice helped draft the law. He was the Minister of Justice at the time and if one checks Hansard one will find his eloquent explanation of it, which certainly convinced me at the time to vote for it. I was young and impressionable in those days.

Mr. Chairman, the problem carries with it the solution. The solution is - how can we distribute the burden of taxation in this province? It is all very well to say that we are being tender because the Roman Catholic School Board of St. John's have a debt, So does every school board in the province, I would assume, and the Minister of Finance says, 'Oh well, let them have it, not us.'

It is all the same. A school board in this province, Mr. Chairman, represents the public. It may not be legally the government of this province, I do not even know if it is morally the government of this province, but certainly the government of this province would not allow a school board to go under. That has happened time and time again. It has happened in this administration, the government have bailed out school boards.

The question is where the tax burden should fall. We now use methods that make it fall very unfairly. The suggestion I would make is that the ministry might consider setting up either a royal commission on taxation in this province or some other form of enquiry. I am not necessarily sold on royal commissions. Some of them have laboured long and produced results which were not acceptable to the administration - they may be in time.

My own thinking on taxation is quite simple. The income tax is by far the fairest tax ever devised. It is not a popular tax, no tax is popular, but it hits the rich far heavier than it hits

MR. ROBERTS: the poor and the honourable gentlemen opposite will point out that under the inflationary - I mean when the minister attacks Ottawa, as he has a number of times - "Money rolling out of its ears," I think is the phrase he is using these days, his wordsmiths have crafted for him. He is right because the income tax works in an inflationary era, such as we live in, to produce far more revenue.

Well we have an income tax in Newfoundland. When the honourable gentlemen in this House, Mr. Chairman, and when Your Honour yourself fills out his income tax form and sends it off to Ottawa this year, something like 30.5 per cent of the tax goes to Newfoundland, not on tax rentals, Mr. Chairman, not a tax rent at all, that is a Newfoundland tax, levied under statute of this House because we have the right under the constitution. Every province has the right to levy a direct tax.

Now maybe we should abolish the school tax authorities, abolish them. They do not produce a lot of money. Abolish assessments, whatever they produce in a year, \$2 million, \$3 million or \$4 million is the whole kit and caboodle, \$4 million, and wack five points on the income tax and then the fishermen in Labrador South would not have to pay as much as I would pay, making \$20,000 a year, or the gentleman from Labrador North who makes \$500 or \$1,000 a week. We would pay more and so would the Minister of Finance and so would all honourable gentlemen in this House, but surely we can afford it better than can many of my constituents who are living on social assistance and living on unemployment insurance or catch as catch can, or many of the people living in Stephenville or out on that peninsula, Your Honour, those in Your Honour's district. Maybe that is a fairer tax.

It is not for me to suggest, though I put it forth as a suggestion. It can be attacked, it can be knocked down. I

MR. ROBERTS: do not like to see taxes increase but I would like to see the tax burden laid fairly and equitably and in Newfoundland it is not and it is becoming less fair and more inequitable as time goes on.

We now have in Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, a class of people who are very wealthy, relatively speaking. If you look at the income tax statistics in this province, Your Honour, you will find that we have people who are well off. They are not paying their fair share, they are not. The poorer people in this province are paying relatively far more than their fair share. If you want to blame the Liberal Administration you can, because the system has developed over twenty-three years - not twenty-three years, I suppose it has developed over four hundred and twenty-three years.

Maybe the time has come when we should have a long, hard, impartial look at our tax system. We have the right to levy direct taxes. We do levy direct taxes, in income tax, sales tax, Perhaps we should look at them and just shift the burden. We cannot lighten the burden, Your Honour. The burden if anything will get heavier in Newfoundland. We will have to put more money in than this \$8 million -

The Minister of Education knows that and will I think quite readily admit it. The problem with that \$8 million is that it is all spent now. It is going to service debt. I do not imagine \$1 million of that \$8 million is going to provide new facilities this year. I do not know if the minister has any figures or not, but it is a very small part.

The school boards have had to do that. That \$8 million is only two or three years old. It used to be \$4 million not so very long ago and we have reports. Is it Dr. Warren or some other professor at the university, in education, did a report? Professor Fisher as well, It shows half the schools in Newfoundland should be condemned, half the buildings.

April 10, 1973

Tape No. 1135

NM - 10

MR. ROBERTS: I know schools are more than buildings but it is difficult to use the modern methods in some of the school buildings we have. I wish they were all like the schools in Labrador West but there we are lucky, we have the iron ore companies, for their

own selfish purposes but genuinely have contributed substantially. Indeed I believe, if my memory serves me, that the schools in Labrador City are a private system. The high school at Labrador City is a private school because the company for their own purposes - fair enough, we will take advantage of that - are providing good schools. That is Labrador West's good fortune.

Mr. Chairman, that is the point my colleague from Labrador South is saying, and I think they deserve better from the Minister of Finance. He is obviously getting to him. He has been making these personal attacks, silly, irrelevant tripe. Let him deal with the issues. I do not mind him dealing with them in his debating style, that is good. The issue is simply: Where should the burden of taxation lie? Of course, we should be putting more in than \$8 million. Every member of the House knows that. Every member of the House would do it. Every member of the House knows the financial situation of the province, knows that our needs, let alone the demands of the people of the province, are far more than this province can afford. We did not hear that a year ago when the Progressive Conservative Party were raising expectations. Did you hear the snibbling dribble that characterized the Budget Speech, and the minister made three or four speeches in this House. That is the issue. The issue is: Where should the burden of taxation lie? How should we get that \$8 million? Where should it lie? Who should bear it? We cannot lighten the total burden. Perhaps we are going to have to increase it. Obviously, we are going to have to try to get help from Ottawa. It is significant, Mr. Chairman, that we are providing \$8 million this year out of our own resources and we are providing \$11 million through DREE of which half is grant and half is loan.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. Is it a fifty/fifty grant loan?

We are putting up out of our resources roughly \$13 million this year. Ottawa is putting up \$6 million. I am using round figures but I think the proportions are roughly correct. That is most significant.

On current account - well it is not shown, it is no longer an university grant. The post-secondary education grant from Ottawa is very substantial. They chunked in the extra \$24 million specifically linked to school taxes, Mr. Chairman, because in other provinces they have a system of municipal taxation. Perhaps in Newfoundland, if we do not want an income tax, perhaps we should look at property taxation for school purposes. I am not recommending it. I think it may bear looking at. Certainly here in St. John's it is now going to fall on rich and poor alike. Some fellow living down on Flavin Street or Monroe Street will have to pay the same tax on a poll tax basis as will somebody living in Elizabeth Towers or in one of those \$80,000 or \$100,000 houses over here on the Logy Bay Road. They will each have to pay \$10 or \$20 a year, whatever it is. That is not very fair. If you could afford to pay \$100,000 or \$150,000 for a house or even \$50,000 for a house, surely you can afford to pay a little more towards the educational system than some person who is living on Monroe Street or even for that matter in a subsidized rental unit. That is the issue. I think that that is a real issue. It is one which the government of this province are going to have to deal with, whether the government be formed by the Progressive Conservative Party, by the Liberal Party or by any party. Nobody is going to try to pretend to the people that miracles can be worked. That is what happened to the present crowd, Sir. They pretended that a year ago and now they are being hoist on their own petard. They will pay dearly for that. They will learn that people can be fooled once.

As Abraham Lincoln said, "You can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time." They are finding that it is coming home to roost now . That is why the Minister of Finance - I hope he will say a few more words, I suspect he will - is getting so uptight and so angry and deliberately trying to distort the debate. The gentleman from Labrador South, with whom I have my disagreements, and the gentleman from St. Barbe North, with whom I am in perfect amity with political matters and presumably family matters one of those days, if all goes well, these gentlemen put forth a problem. They offered a suggestion, be it good or bad, instead they were scorned and abused and had their remarks twisted and distorted for cheap sensationalism. I think we can expect better than that from the Finance Minister.

What about an impartial enquiry into not just education but the whole cost of taxation in this province. Let us see who should bear more. Are the wealthy people, the better-off people, paying their fair share of taxes in Newfoundland? Our income tax is now among the lowest in Canada. Manitoba has higher. I think the only provinces that are lower than us are Ontario and British Columbia, wealthy provinces, maybe Alberta. Well maybe it is undue. I am not putting forth - I looked at my income tax form this morning and in the form there is a table showing the provincial one. Ours is thirty point five, I believe or is it thirty-six point five, I am not sure. The point is that there are several provinces with higher income tax rates than ours: New Brunswick for one; Nova Scotia for another; Manitoba for another - three at least. No, there are at least three provinces. Nova Scotia has a higher income tax rate than ours and so does New Brunswick. Well let the minister check it. I looked at it this morning. Ontario is lower and British Columbia is

lower, although I suspect that when Mr. Barrett and his administration are finished in British Columbia, they will shift the burden of taxes. That is all we are talking about, shifting the burden. It is largely regarded in Newfoundland that we use the sales tax too much, it is an unfair tax. I guess I will have to talk about that on the budget and not on this but nonetheless I think the school tax authorities are ineffective. The time has surely come when we should have a long, hard look at their functions. I would be a very happy man and I would suggest that my colleagues would be equally pleased and happy if the Minister of Education told us that he is in fact looking at them from this point of view, with a view to abolishing them, not to wipe out the tax, because that tax will be wiped out and another one will be imposed of some sort. The money must come. I am not going to be the sort of a two-faced person who stands here and pretends that it is going to come. I am not going to do what that crowd did, Mr. Chairman, wipe out one tax before an election and then slash it to the mothers two weeks or two months after the election - take away \$2.00 for every \$1.00 they gave, not that sort of rank double-dealing hypocrisy. Let them have a look at it, Mr. Chairman. The \$8 million is not enough. That is common ground. More will have to be provided. More will be provided but the question is: How can it be best provided? Our people can only afford to pay what they can and the question is: Are they being asked now to contribute fairly? The old slogan: "From each according to his means, to each according to his need." It may be a socialist slogan but it is also, I think, good taxation policy. I think the time has come in Newfoundland when we should have a long, hard look at that because our system does not look at it now.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I feel compelled to respond to the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Finance, if only to clear up a point. Surely the honourable minister does not believe that I was suggesting and the hon. member from ST. Barbe North was suggesting that

as a result of wiping out the school tax authority and putting on a one, two, three or five per cent personal income tax that we would automatically wipe out all these further financial requirements of this country. I cannot believe that the honourable gentleman was trying to suggest that, Sir. What we were trying to say was that the school tax authority, as one means of collecting revenue, is an inefficient system and that if we can save a few hundred thousand dollars or even a few thousand dollars by making this system more efficient, that we should be doing that. That is simply all we are trying to prove. Of course, we need more money and of course we have to go to Ottawa, at least in the interim, until we get on our feet and get more money.

I do, Sir, resent the inference that the honourable gentleman made that in trying to do justice to my job here as an opposition member, that what I am really trying to do is to gain cheap publicity by making such a suggestion. I would have raised that as a point of personal privilege except that I think probably the honourable gentleman is trying to provoke me. If that were his game, then he has succeeded and I accept that in graciousness as his contribution to my further political education.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, in fact I cannot remember saying that. The point is anyway that what the honourable gentleman said when he stood up or offered was a very simplistic solution that the school tax authorities are clumsy, inefficient and cumbersome and should be done away with and the thing to do is to raise the income tax. All I pointed out, Mr. Chairman, is this, that of the three or four sources of income which we have and the income tax is one of them, that a one per cent increase in the income tax is \$900,000 and to replace the \$4 million now collected by school tax authorities would require a five per cent increase in the personal income tax. When you have done that, you are in exactly the same position revenue-wise. You now

have \$4 million from the personal income tax and you have lost \$4 million from the school tax authority. Now the honourable gentleman has just suggested that if there were some way of making school tax authorities more efficient or more effective, this should be done. Naturally! But that is not what he suggested the first time the honourable gentleman spoke nor what the hon. gentleman from St. Barbe North suggested.

Now to come back to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman. It gets a bit tiring and a bit sickening in this House every time you enter a debate to have the Leader of the Opposition jump up and snivel and falsely state that you just made a personal attack on someone. If an argument is advanced from the other side and the counter-argument is advanced from over here, that is a personal attack on the poor member for St. Barbe North or the member for Labrador South or somebody else, which it is not. We are entitled to attack any suggestion which the hon. Leader of the Opposition puts forth or anyone else, if it is worth attacking. That is what I attempt to do in this House. I do not indulge, Mr. Chairman, in personal attacks. I am a little tired of having the Leader of the Opposition sneaking up to his feet, snivelling and falsely stating that somebody has been personally attacked, in his usual insidious and sneaky manner, while he himself is engaging in the very thing.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: What is the point of order?

MR. ROWE (F.B.): The point of order is that he is irrelevant to the particular vote under consideration and I would assume that we will be given the same degree of latitude when we get up to speak on this.

silly references by the Leader of the Opposition to attacks on Ottawa. We have our point of view, Mr. Chairman, a provincial point of view that does not agree with that of Ottawa. We do not adopt the attitude of the last administration that we must, when we go to Ottawa, be quiet or snivel quietly with our hands out, waiting for a handout. We have adopted the position that the provinces of Canada and this province have legitimate constitutional and financial proposals to put before the Government of Canada to urge them to change some of the things they are doing there to assist the provinces and give us the fiscal resources we need. That is not attacking Ottawa. That is putting forth what we consider to be the right policies they should adopt. Nowhere else in any province that I am aware of do we hear the opposition attempting to put out this canard, that when the government deal with Ottawa, it is attacking Ottawa or if somebody says that the Canada Student Loan Programme should be made into grants instead of loans, that that is a savage attack on Ottawa. It is an attack on no one. It is a suggestion that policy should be changed by Ottawa. I just want to point that out because this piece of deceitfulness gets repeated in the House every day and soon somebody may believe it, even the Leader of the Opposition, if it is not pointed out to him.

It is interesting to note that the Leader of the Opposition suggested possibly increasing the personal income tax or a property tax for school purposes. These are two suggestions. Perhaps a royal commission should look at them and see what they bring in. Perhaps it is time to have a look at the tax system here, by a royal commission. If either of these things are done, we can always say who first suggested them anyway.

MR. CROSBIE: The Leader of the Opposition has just had exactly the same latitude.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Well I just hope we get the same latitude when we get up to speak.

MR. CROSBIE: Latitude? Mr. Chairman, there is not another House in the world that would put up with the nonsense we are getting on with.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, is there a ruling on this particular point of order or not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Minister of Finance will permit me. There is a fair amount of latitude given in the committee stage. Quite often the estimates will pass much more quickly and to everyone's satisfaction if a certain amount of latitude is given. However, the latitude must not turn into longitude. Honourable members should keep their remarks as close to the topic as possible and digress as little as possible.

MR. CROSBIE: It is a very good admonition, Mr. Chairman. I know you will make it for people on the other side too. They are always up crying.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one other point before I sit down and I have to make this because it is a deliberate campaign of deceitfulness by the hon. Leader of the Opposition about attacks on Ottawa. I have yet to hear an attack made on Ottawa in this House during this session. But I have heard and I have made myself references to our position vis-a-vis Ottawa, what our position is vis-a-vis the Government of Canada; what the Government of Canada's financial policy should be, in the opinion of this province and some of the other nine provinces. That is not an attack on Ottawa, yet week after week we hear these

MR. ROBERTS:

I do not intend to prolong the debate but the honourable gentleman called me, as I understand, deceitful. Well, that is a matter of opinion. All that I can say is that there are thirty speeches in the House. They are attacks on Ottawa. They have been eloquent, loquacious and interesting, just complete attacks on Ottawa. That is one of the basic postures of this administration because when they talk about the constitution, Mr. Chairman, the British North American Act, as the Minister of Education knows, specifically says that education is an entirely provincial matter. In fact, the minister himself has made references to the fact that Ottawa should be doing more.

Well, I say, Sir, that this government are on the verge of, with reference to capital account, Your Honour, proposing to Ottawa a form of commission of government. That is what they seem to be working towards.

Mr. Power and I happen to be in the same political party. We have not always agreed on political items. We did not vote for the same party last March, Mr. Chairman. We certainly supped together and a very good supper it was. The honourable gentleman may have supped with Mr. Power, I do not know. He certainly shared a political bed with Mr. Smallwood. His supper with Mr. Smallwood was like the Last Supper. If we were casting, we would know which of the thirteen apostles the honourable gentleman would be. Mr. Chairman, as long as the gentleman from St. John's West does not attempt to kiss me. That would be too much both on grounds of good taste and on political grounds, to draw the analogy.

The point remains that this administration -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: There may be none of it in their party, Mr. Chairman, but if the Premier ever returns to this House, the honourable gentleman, the Minister of Finance, may find out what next time he gets off with, "People like Shaheen". Oh Lord, if he had

seen the look on the Premier's face. It was worth the cash. It was eighty millions cash. Now, Mr. Chairman, to come back to the - I do wish the Minister of Finance would not drag me off the point, Sir. I am speaking about 612-03-06, it just leaps off the page, Your Honour - erection and equipment of schools (capital) , \$8,000,000.

The fact remains that this administration in their approach to - I am not going to debate their approach to Ottawa but in their approach to the problems of this province, as exemplified by this, are throwing up their hands and admitting defeat and despair

This underlies their approach is the minister's budget speech. I will save it for the budget speech. Anyway, the point is the minister may think that I am being deceitful, I know he is being deceitful. He is not serving the best interests of the public of Newfoundland. I think that that will be proven by events.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I never thought that I would see the day when the honourable Minister of Finance and the honourable member for St. John's Center would be in the same political league but we have seen this this afternoon. Both of these gentlemen, Sir, missed the point completely. All we were doing was we were saying what a fact is. The fact is that school tax authorities are a cumbersome and inefficient means and an inequitable means and an unfair means of collecting revenue for purposes of school board funding. That is all we said, Sir. As a matter of fact, honourable members on this side of the House have pointed out a number of examples where revenue might be more fairly and more efficiently collected for school boards. We did not say that that should be the way it be done. We did not say that the sales tax should be raised. We did not say that income taxes should be raised. We said that the administration should take a serious look at this.

Sir, I would like to remind the honourable members on the

other side that it is they who are now the administration of this province not the opposition. It is they who have to formulate policy and administer this province and it is not the opposition who is supposed to formulate policy for the running of this particular province. We will have our policy formulated in plenty of time for the coming election. It is not now.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I cannot believe it.

MR. F. ROWE: You cannot believe what?

Mr. Chairman, here we go again. Every time an honourable member on this side of the House gets up, we get badgered with questions and snide remarks. The simple fact of the matter is that this administration is responsible for administering this province. If they are expecting the opposition to do it, they might just as well forget it from this point onwards.

Sir, the two honourable gentlemen are in the same league because they sunk so low in comparing Fred Sr. with Fred Jr. Sir, I will point out for the record of this House that I am quite proud of anything that Fred Sr. happened to do for this province. Of course Fred Sr. and the whole of the previous Liberal administration were not one hundred per cent -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We are not debating the caliber or the ability or the conduct or the things done for this province by the honourable member's father. We are debating the education estimates and let us stay relevant.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order, I deliberately got up and asked the Chairman if we were to be given the same latitude as the honourable Minister of Finance was given, because I wanted to refer to this particular point specifically. That is why I asked that question at that time. So, am I allowed to continue, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Honourable members have been made aware on numerous occasions of the rule, long-standing, well-precedented, time-steeped

rule that discussion is to be relevant. However, there is an equally long-standing tradition that honourable members are allowed a certain amount of latitude within that rule. That latitude has been stretched to its limits this afternoon, largely in the interest of amity within the committee. However, the point is reached where the Chair can no longer tolerate the further stretching of this latitude. The honourable member for St. Barbe North may continue but hopefully he will make his remarks brief and to the point.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you for your ruling. I will indeed make them brief, Sir. The point that I was trying to make, Sir, is that I had the courage and the guts to get up here and say when we were referring to this particular vote that not every single thing that the previous administration had done was perfectly correct or one hundred per cent correct. These school tax authorities was an example that I gave of something that might have been suitable at the time but they are growing out of control now and it is the sort of thing that should be abolished and a freeze put on it immediately. The honourable Minister of Finance and the honourable member for St. John's Center turn that around and twist it around to try to create an embarrassing situation for me on this side of the House, Sir. That is all that I have to say about it.

Sir, I believe that if we check Hansard we will find that the honourable Minister of Education did suggest some weeks ago in this Assembly that he would be prepared to take a very serious look at the abolition of school tax authorities within two or three years. Sir, the simple question that I have to put to the honourable minister is, "Why not give this immediate consideration? What is going to happen in two or three years time that will create a different situation from what we have now?". If the honourable minister is prepared to

look at the situation in two or three years time, I would like to know the reason why he does not think the situation is ripe now for taking a very serious look at putting a freeze on school tax authorities and abolishing within the next year existing school tax authorities and phasing in a provincial school tax authority or making the government completely responsible for the collection of educational revenue in this province. Why is it necessary to have two or three years before the honourable Minister of Education does take a look at it? Because, Mr. Chairman, the minister did say that probably in two or three years time we could take a very serious look at the abolition of these authorities but now is just not the time. I would like to know the reason for that.

HON. V. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I did not wish to contribute to this debate because it has rambled all over the place. I will be very brief and hope that I will be somewhat relevant to the point which has not always been the case I am afraid in this debate on education so far.

In the case of the vote for school construction, there is rather an interesting background to this. Back some years ago I was Minister of Education and frankly I accept full responsibility for what happened at that time and what I was part and parcel of in the former Liberal administration. I recall very well that when the stipulation or the thought was broached about discontinuing school fees, the Premier of that day asked me if I thought it was a good idea. I said, "Yes if we can afford it, but where are you going to get the money?". He said, "How much do you think it will cost us?". My answer immediately, without even checking any figures, was \$10,000,000 at least. He said, "You are crazy, completely crazy! It will not cost us \$10,000,000."

Well, it has not been many years and it is up to \$10,000,000

in what it is costing us actually. The point is this; that as soon as the school fees were removed and supposedly abolished by the former government, they were immediately substituted by assessments for capital expenditures. These assessments have now risen higher than the former school fees had ever reached. So the public are still paying for it. Also, at about that time some members may recall that there was a large scale education conference and the graphs that were produced which were showing the costs of education were just going straight up, skyrocketing. These graphs were essentially correct because what we have seen since and particularly what we see in these estimates show that all costs of education, be they school construction, teachers' salaries or what have you, are just headed straight up.

We are not alone in Newfoundland in that particular problem because it is pertinent all over North America and particularly in Canada. I think it behooves the province that knowing that and having known it for some years, that we are headed for tremendous escalation in education costs, if we are to exist at all, there are only two courses to take. One is to cut back on education, to reduce the services or, as my friend, the honourable Minister of Finance, said, get the revenue to pay for these services. There are not too many areas of tax that can be further expanded. You can talk glibly or what you like about expanding the income tax or anything else but to bring in any worth-while amount of revenue, the increase of taxation on our people would be quite unbearable.

Now, I want to make only one more point before I sit down. There seems to be a theory, there always has been among the denominational authorities - I was chairman of one of the largest school boards in St. John's for many years - that school construction was something that had to be paid for immediately or

within the matter of a couple of years. I think it is an unrealistic way to look at it because schools when they are built are built not for five years or ten years but possibly for fifty years and maybe a hundred years. We should look at the school construction picture in Newfoundland as a very long-range programme in which we are building the assets of our economy, namely in our educated youth. We must look at the school construction programme over a long-ranging, self-liquidating affair which must be spread over many, many years. I am not sure that we may not some day have to come to some sort of an arrangement in this country. If it is not a school tax authority or a combination of school tax authorities, it might well be something in the nature of a crowned corporation or it could be like the Municipal Financing Corporation or something of that sort set up under the government where schools would have to be financed over a long period of time with proper built-in liquidation of the monies we spend and completely divorced from the normal expenditures of government.

I cannot go into detail now but I think that something of this nature must be looked at because when you take exactly a quarter of our whole expenditure for the year going on education, if we are to continue in that direction for many more years to come, we must certainly look at that big block expenditure and treat it as something completely different, something completely aside from our normal expenditure and something which has to be met by extraordinary means.

Now, the method that I am suggesting may not be at all practical but I think, in an exigency such as is facing us in the cost of education, we have to look at all means, practical and otherwise.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I feel as if I were sitting down here just about going into two days and a night listening to this

conversation on education. I am greatly concerned, Sir, and I will tell you the reason why. We are arriving at a place that if we do not do something about it, then I do not know where the province is going to end up at and the people that are into it. With the bit of experience that I have of working on school boards, building committees, and you will know

what we were faced with in the past it is unbecoming to me to sit down and take it on the chin and to know and to be active and see what is going ahead and to listen to what is going on in this honourable House. First, we had started here with university students about what money they had to raise to get a university education. We heard in this honourable House that the present government were barring students from going to university. I yet fail to see where there is anybody or any student got it about him to attain a higher education. I am right here to say now that I never saw that person with dollars and cents intervene whatsoever and I have the privilege of knowing it. I had the privilege of putting them in university who travelled the streets of this town with knee rubbers on for a winter and got a scholarship and went on to principals of eleven and twelve room schools.

This is hard to take for one who came up with not the privilege to get a higher education, to be placed in the position that I am in here now and I am asked to defend it. Something has to go along somewhere along the line about the bus system, about our school system, about our tax system and all the rest of them. How are we going to pay for the education of the youth? The youth of today are the men and women of tomorrow. We will hear people say, "Well, what am I going to pay for? I have no one going to school." Well, I am here in this honourable House to say that someone along the line, if they have no children going to school as far as that is concerned, should have to pay the fee as well as a man who has them going. It is only for the people who have children going to school that I probably would not be sitting in this honourable House. It took a lot of these people to do this and keep me in business and what not, and why should I not be taxed and have to pay it too.

This is something sad that has happened. Someone figure

because they have no children, a man and his wife, that they do not have to pay anything for education. I say that if we do not think any more about the youth of our province than that, I should say we are going to end up nowhere. I say here now in this honourable House about the school buses is another thing. When you come to turn around the Board of Education paying or this government, as it is now, the school bus services, to go and pick up seventy-six pupils in the morning, seventy-six hockey sticks, seventy-six pairs of skates and possibly eighty-eight or a hundred or ninety children on the same bus, seventy pairs of skates and seventy hockey sticks, now somewhere along the line there is something wrong. There is a school bus going here, another one going back and forth and then there are four or five cars on, probably, for the deaf and dumb. God knows they need to get to school as far as that is concerned but why are we paying empty buses to be going back and forth? Why pay \$750,000 to get a school built when you sit down with a contract of \$420,000 to do the job and end up the Board of Education paying \$750,000 to get the same job done? I say right here now to the government and I am one of the crowd over here, if they want to do anything in education, throw out what the former administration had in and build a new one and if they go wrong in four years time, bang us out. That was nothing else only a political game. If you belonged to the right church, sat in the right pew you got just whatever you wanted, whether it cost \$500,000 or \$1 million you got it.

Now I know what I am talking about. I happen to be in a place where they built a school and the price quoted on that was \$47,000 to build it and I came up with a price of \$25,000 and that school was built and the pupils are in it and there had to be some fight to get it. There is what we are into, as long as you get aboard the lifeboat and go along with it. I tell you this, that education wants to be looked into fully and I am not

willing to deprive any of the youth of our province of education. I wish that I could only put some of them, the smarter ones who are not interested enough to go to university, to put them there to make something. The only pupil who I have found to have done a good job in my area was a pupil who went there and worked his way and he knew what it was to get an education and it was not all thrown at him. He worked his way and it made a man out of him. He learned on the way and he learned how to do his work and he learned what it was to borrow and have to pay it back. I say here now, you can give all you like to him and he would be like the rich young ruler. Thank you!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Before the vote is carried, Mr. Chairman, just a few remarks on the school tax authorities and I am pretty sure I made the same remarks or remarks to the same effect yesterday. A correction, it must have been some weeks ago, probably on interim supply. I made a statement to the effect that in two or three years it might be necessary or advisable to get rid of the school tax authorities but not that we would look into it in two or three years. Obviously we keep our eyes open on this all the time and within the past three months we have had meetings on two occasions with executives of the provincial school tax authority. But certainly the government's position has not changed. It is not now our intention to abolish or put a freeze on school tax authorities. We are giving serious study to various recommendations of the school tax authorities with a view to amending the legislation and the regulations in order to make the system more efficient.

It may well be, as the Minister of Finance indicated, that a commission, royal or otherwise, might well be advisable in the very near future to examine taxation in the province. That may well be the case but we are now working to endeavour to make school tax authorities more efficient, to bring in necessary

amendments and changes to the legislation, to the regulations. It is not the government's intention now to abolish them or to put a freeze on them.

On the other matter, and that is the capital grants to schools of \$8 million, much has been said about the indebtedness of the school boards and there is no doubt that the school boards, every school board in the province is in debt. I would hasten to add or I would venture to guess that every school board in Nova Scotia and Ontario and probably British Columbia is in debt. I do not know if there would be any school boards in Canada apart perhaps from some private schools for wealthy people but I would not think that within the regular public school system that there would be any school, at least which has been in operation for a couple of years, which is not in debt. The most serious aspect of it, from the school boards' point of view, is not that they are in debt but the fact that they do not have a long term position in which to work. It is not the fact that they are in debt but it is the term within which they have to work. That is why we feel that a policy of long-term financing for school boards will go very far to alleviating their difficulty there. They think that it is not the indebtedness so much as the term in which they have to pay that debt back.

On motion, 612(03)(06), carried.

612(03)(07):

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, Grant in lieu of DREE (Capital).

This is the grant (is it not) whereby a certain denomination which might have been, for want of a better word, discriminated against with the DREE money coming in, I do not mean deliberately discriminated against, I mean that they were discriminated against in that they got less money out of DREE than proportionately they should have gotten. So this is for the Pentecostal Denominational School Board.

While we are on that point, Sir, I think this is a

relevant matter, could the minister give us just an idea as to how long this is likely to go on, \$500,000 this year and I notice there was \$536,000 last year. Do we have to keep doing this for the next few years under the current DREE agreements? - number one Number two, could he give us some indication as to what has happened with regard to the resolution forwarded to Ottawa six years ago, I think, asking that the rights of the Pentecostal Denomination be entrenched in the constitution? I was under the impression a year or two ago that the Government of Canada was going to bring it into the House of Commons and that it was going to be sent over to Westminister for inclusion into our constitution. Perhaps the minister might be able to give us some indication on that since it is related to this, Mr. Chairman, because this vote is here because of the fact that they are treated for intents and purposes as having their rights entrenched in the constitution.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this vote is for denominations which their school boards have not had any funding from DREE and in line with the grants on a proportionate per capita basis. The honourable gentleman asked how long it would continue if the denominations did in fact get a DREE school. That would be depending on what the cost was there, but in all likelihood it would be more than that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is this only for the Pentecostal?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The Seven Day Adventists would have a very small portion of that or certainly less than half. But if, for example, that denomination were under a DREE programme to have a school, then there would not be this grant in lieu of that, because this is since they have not yet had that new school.

Now with respect to the question regarding the resolution which was passed in the legislature some years ago and sent to the Government of Canada with, I think, the suggestion then that the

Government of Canada would ask that the constitution be amended in order to put that in the British North America Act. I do not know what the status of it is as of now. The last I heard was, and perhaps the Minister of Justice might be more knowledgeable on this, that the Government of Canada, bearing in mind various constitutional issues, was somewhat hesitant to go to Westminster to amend the British North America Act because of I suppose nationalism in Canada and the fact that certain Canadians feel that we should be totally autonomous in any amendments to our own constitution. That to the best of my knowledge is the reason that it has not gotten any further. Of course for all practical purposes in this province and in this legislature there was total, complete recognition of the rights and the grants were made on a proportionate basis and on a per capita basis and for all practical purposes there is fairness and equity and I never heard it suggested that there was not.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the minister has skated neatly away but I think we should ask him to skate back. The status of the motion in question, actually it appeared on the order paper at one stage in Ottawa, in the name, I believe, of Mr. Jamieson. It was a government motion. It did not come to a debate but that was in the House which was dissolved last August or September or whenever it was dissolved with the election which was held the end of October. I do not believe it has appeared on the order paper since. What I would like to know from the minister, and I think we augur a clear and unequivocal statement of the ministry's policy with respect to this, have this administration, Sir, pressed this matter with the Government of Canada? Have they made representations? If so, what are the representations? If so again, what result if any has come?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I would have to take that as notice because, as the honourable gentleman knows, I have only been minister

for approximately three or three and a half months. I would have to consult with - No, I have never been to Ottawa actually since I have this portfolio and I would wish to consult there with two or three of my colleagues who have in fact been there and who would know from personal knowledge.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman is still skating. He has been a member of the ministry, Sir, since the day it was formed. I agree it is fair to take notice with respect to what representations had been made. I realize he does not carry in his head all the correspondence even

on a matter such as this. Maybe the question should be directed to somebody else. But I want a statement of the ministry's policy. That was the first question I asked with respect to this matter. We have a unanimous resolution of the House of Assembly. I do not recall if the honourable member at that stage -

AN HON. MEMBER: He was a member.

MR. ROBERTS: He was a member. In that case he did vote for it, as did the honourable member for Burin, the honourable the member for St. John's Centre. Those are the only gentleman on the other side, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. But he is not. I was only naming people who happened to be in the - the honourable the member for Fortune Bay would have been as well, and St. John's West. I am only speaking of people who were in the chamber at present. I would like to know the minister's attitude towards it. That is why I asked for a clear and unequivocal statement of policy.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Certainly our attitude is that it was passed unanimously in the legislature sometime ago, in a previous session. It is our policy that the Pentecostal Denomination have the same rights as all the other denominations, recognized for educational purposes, and that should be recognized constitutionally as in fact it is recognized by the government and in this legislature.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister. I think that is a fair statement of policy. Will the minister undertake, Mr. Chairman, to make, either at some point in the estimates or other heads where this is appropriate or if he wishes alternately as a ministerial statement, within the next three or four days a clear and definite statement as to what steps, if any, the present administration have taken with respect to the Government of Canada to press this matter. What has been done since January 18, 1972, the day of infamy, what has been done to forward this matter at Ottawa? I do know that it was on the Order Paper at Ottawa. As of the end of August, I think it was the 25th, the Parliament of Canada was dissolved and of course it disappeared

with the dissolution.

So perhaps what I need to be told really is not what on January 18, what has happened since say the 30th. day of October when the present Parliament of Canada was elected. What steps have the government taken? What have they said? To whom? On what occasion? What result has come from these representations, if any? So could the minister undertake to make a statement on that matter, please?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Just before it carries, Mr. Chairman, because of the fact that the \$500,000 is apparently destined for Pentecostal Denomination facilities, does this imply that the other DREE capital grants, loans and grants, have been almost ideally proportioned to the population of the other denominations?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: On the whole it has worked out that way. But I do not think that either of the other two have insisted that there be a parity, because one series of negotiations might go one way and one the other way. I suppose almost, the law of averages, on the whole it has worked out that way.

On motion 03-07 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 03-04 carry?

MR. ROWE, WN. On 04, Mr. Chairman, Educational Development. There is a requirement in the specifications with regard to these schools which DREE helps to fund by way of grant and loan, that there be free accessibility by students. This raised some alarm among the various denominations as to whether this was going to be a public school system as the term is usually understood elsewhere, outside of Great Britain. A public school system where church and state were completely separate, state-owned school systems with regard to any religious matters whatsoever.

We had a meeting with the DREF officials on that before we left office and they gave a firm undertaking that they were in no way desirous of infringing on the constitution. I think that among some of the officials there was a certain anathema on their part

towards the denominational system as they conceived it in this province. They perhaps thought that they could get the thin edge of the wedge into this system by these DREE grants and by the inclusion of that type of a requirement, the free accessibility. We drew to their attention that the merits or demerits of a denominational system did not come up for consideration because it was a part of the Canadian Constitution. Neither the Government of Canada nor the Government of Newfoundland nor any House of Commons or a House of Assembly could unilaterally or even together violate the Constitution of Canada in this regard.

Now I am wondering if that provision is in the new DREE Agreement. Perhaps some of the officials of the department could inform the honourable minister about free accessibility. And if so, how is it being treated by the government in its talks and negotiations and transactions with the various school boards? For example, if a Roman Catholic School Board has a school built in St. John's East, with DREE help, is this school then to have free access as far as all the students in that area are concerned or just the Roman Catholic students or the Protestant students as the case may be, integrated students as the case may be? What is the situation with regard to that?

I must say the honourable the Minister of Justice when he was over on this side of the House waxed rather eloquently on this whole point a couple of years ago. I think at that time he was saying more or less that - I am not quite sure on the point the minister was making at that time but I got the firm impression that he was all in favour of free accessibility being considered literally. If you are going to have a school with Canadian money going into it, that free accessibility should mean that all students within that area of whatever denomination they might be should have free access to that school.

Perhaps he might want to enlighten, give the House some ideas now as to what his position is now that he is in the government and

has to uphold the Constitution and uphold the law and uphold the policy of the government. Perhaps the Minister of Education could give us some ideas on it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, that policy is the same, that is that DREE schools are suppose to be accessibility to all. There has been, certainly since we have formed the administration and during the past few months, no attempt that I am aware of at all, none whatsoever of the Federal DREE counterpart to infringe upon or attempt to modify or even to comment upon our own system within this province. There has been no attempt for them to put their nose into that area of provincial jurisdiction. The DREE schools are indeed suppose to be accessible to all. That has never caused any problem because I would think there are very few schools in Newfoundland where there are not people of a number of denominations, I would think there are very few Roman Catholic schools without some pupils of other faiths and very few integrated schools who probably do not have Roman Catholics, certainly in areas outside of the large cities, even I would think in St. John's and in Corner Brook.

But there has never been any problem. For example, an integrated DREE school is in a certain area, what in fact does not happen is that a Roman Catholic school perhaps a half mile away is depopulated because I suppose parents in general send their children to the schools representing their own faith. But this has not caused a problem, yet no DREE school is suppose to refuse any person because of his faith. As a matter of fact, I do not know if any school in the province DREE or non DREE refused admission to any pupil on that basis. But there has been no attempt, certainly since our period of office, for the federal officials to interfere or attempt to influence, to the best of my knowledge, even to comment upon our own provincial system of education nor has the accessibility condition posed any problem.

MR. ROWE, W.N. On that point, the honourable the Minister of Education and the honourable Minister of Justice are of course right in theory, all schools have free accessibility to them. What is the situation though with regard to one of these DREE schools or any other school, if say a Roman Catholic youngster is living next door to an integrated school and his parents apply on his behalf to go to that school? Is it the policy of any of the boards to take first the members of their own faith so-called or do they take it on a first come first serve basis? The denominational aspect is merely I suppose the fact that a certain church or a certain denomination happens to run that school has no practical effect as far as anyone trying to get into that school is concerned. Is that the idea? Is it a first come first serve basis or do boards take members of their own denomination first?

MR. OTTENHEIMER I would say that in an instance where that school or that classroom was not full then the person applying would be immediately accepted. If it were the case that there were perhaps more pupils than places, the usual procedure is that the two school boards meet locally, regionally within that area, to resolve the situation, looking at the total places available for both of them, the total space available, the total number of students. This is usually done on the basis of mutual consultation.

On motion 03-04 carried.

On motion total subhead 612 carried.

MR. ROWE, F.B. The total, yes, Mr. Chairman, I did not see any other area to bring this up but could I get a word from the minister on this whole business of school board elections. A number of school boards have voiced concern over the fact that they do have to fund the cost of school board elections and they said this is an unfair system and they would like the government to put some sort of a vote in there for the purpose of underwriting the cost of school board elections. I was wondering if the minister could indicate to the

committee whether or not his administration is prepared to underwrite the cost of school board elections because they can become very expensive processes as the minister well knows.

Also, Sir, I brought earlier to the attention of the minister this whole business that a person who is in arrears to a school tax authority or to a school board cannot serve on a school board nor can he vote in an election for members of a school board. Sir, in my view this is a very unfair regulation and I would like to see it removed completely. I brought it up in the consideration of the salary estimates but it must have slipped the minister's mind because he did not refer back to it and this seems an appropriate time to bring it up. Sir, there are a great number of persons who are on social assistance or welfare or who are on unemployment insurance and they, some of them, have refused to pay their school assessments or to pay any kind of fees to the school, on principle alone, let alone the fact that they can ill-afford to pay these school assessments or school fees.

So, Sir, I think this particular regulation should be removed altogether. This means that a person who may be on social assistance, who refuses to pay his school assessment or cannot afford to pay his school assessment, is in effect ruled out from being a member of a school board and there are many people in that category who have the time to devote and who can make a tremendous contribution to school boards. On top of that, they do not even have the right to vote in an election of school board members. Sir, this is a most unfair regulation. I would ask that the minister give some consideration to deleting that particular regulation from the School Election Act or whatever it is.

Also, Sir, what consideration is the minister giving to this whole business of underwriting the cost or assisting the boards to run their individual elections?

MR. H. W. C. GILLETT: Mr. Chairman, if this is the appropriate place to deal with those on welfare, particularly long-term assistance being compelled, being in fact forced by law and by court to pay the assessment, then I would like to speak on behalf of those who have approached me in this connection.

I have a letter today from a family in my district, a man who has been summoned. He had appeared before the magistrate. He has been ordered by the magistrate to pay \$5.00 a month. Now

MR. GILLETT: I was given to understand last year that long term assistance recipients are not actually compelled to pay. The school tax authority in Lewisporte informs me, in fact it assures me that if a household has an income of up to \$1,500 per annum, the head of that household is liable to pay the \$40 -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. GILLETT: Well \$1,500 or over.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. GILLETT: Yes, \$1,500 is the minimum. Consequently many people by the scores are being summoned brought before the magistrate when he visits Twillingate and Herring Neck, and these places and they absolutely refuse to pay.

Now on the advice of an official of the Department of Social Assistance, I actually told these people to refuse to pay it. This is why I received a letter a couple of days ago from this particular family so I am caught in the middle between the advice of the department administering the social assistance and the Department of Education, through its school tax authority.

Now perhaps if the minister could give me a clear-cut clarification on the regulations, whether or not they are blanket all over? I do know that one of the men working with one of the school tax authorities told me that they take every individual case of a person, particularly those on long-term assistance, and if that man, in their opinion, can ill-afford to pay his school tax, then they exempt him.

I understand also that there is an exemption form but once that person who applies for exemption has been refused that exemption by a board, I presume then he has no recourse at all. The law just takes its course and he must pay. Perhaps the minister can clarify this for me because I would like

to reply to my friend in my district.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, first of all there are, from what I understand, legal opinions as to whether welfare recipients are liable under the act or not. That is a legal question which I certainly do not wish to comment on.

A number of boards exempt, within their own regulations, welfare recipients but some do not. Now when I said a bit earlier this afternoon that we have a committee meeting, examining the School Tax Act and the various regulations made under it, with a view to amendments and improvements and clarifications and more consistency and more fairness and equity, this is one of the areas and we plan to introduce amendments to the act which should look after the problems to which the honourable gentleman is referring.

Also the question of arrears and a person's eligibility if in arrears is a matter which is also being looked into with a view to whatever changes are necessary.

Speaking about elections to school boards In last year's estimates a certain amount was voted to assist school boards in holding elections. For those school boards when they are preparing for the election for the first time, they have obviously a number of difficulties. It is the first time they are doing it. They have a number of problems. They are in pretty close touch with officials of the Department of Education. There are certain requirements there. They said they find it difficult, this or that, but we have not had, to the best of my knowledge, any specific request for a change or a suggested change. It was something that was discussed at the last meeting of superintendents. They would be people representing various areas of the province. If any one or several school boards have specific recommendations for changes which can accomplish the purpose of making it less onerous for them.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: certainly we would be glad to hear that.

I think myself that a lot of the problem is because it is the first time that there are school board elections in a number of areas and after the first one I would not foresee that there would be any great difficulty at all. I can understand that for a number of school boards the first time having elections, they would run into problems. I do not think that they are insurmountable and officials of the department are always willing to meet with them and to give them whatever help they can. If indeed any single or several boards have specific suggestions how this system could be improved, we would be glad to hear them.

MR. MURPHY: Possibly I might just say at this time, being the minister responsible for social assistance, that it is a problem that we deal with in our department with reference to whether welfare recipients should pay this school tax. I will just say this that it is an ongoing thing. Another is, and I may bring it in at this time, it is municipalities.

I am hoping, I have already started to try to meet when we get a chance, when we get out of here, to do some business with the Minister of Education and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, to define the full status of the welfare recipient and just what he can do and what he can contribute as far as education is concerned and as his taxes to municipalities are concerned.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I know of at least one specific proposal that has been made by the chairman of a school board, publicly. This is probably not the kind of proposal that the honourable Minister of Education was looking for but Rupert Bartlett, Chairman of the Avalon Consolidated School Board, said last November that he feels the cost of conducting an election should be borne by the provincial government.

That is certainly a specific proposal, Sir. I do not

MR. F. ROWE: know if the government is prepared to go one hundred per cent or not but that seems to me to be as clear as the handwriting on the wall as far as the proposal is concerned.

I just thought I would throw that in, Sir.

The other point, I do not know whether the minister answered it or not, I was listening at the door there. Does the minister intend to do anything about that regulation whereby people who are in arrears to school boards or school tax authorities are not able to vote for school board elections nor are they able to stand for election as a candidate? As I said before, Sir, I feel that this is a most unfair rule and I think it should be removed altogether.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I did mention that a committee is working now to make recommendations for amendments to the acts. I think a lot of the problems in that area are related to the position - a lot of problems, welfare recipients and the question, for example, that some tax authorities exempt them and some do not, and in some magisterial court decisions there is a certain ambiguity as well.

I think when we clarify that matter, many of the problems which result from the point of view of somebody in arrears, their ability to run or to vote, I think that they are very closely related. That is a matter as well that we are looking into and the various inconsistencies, if you wish, or lack of precision in certain aspects of the affluent regulations under it. I think the two are pretty closely related.

On motion total subhead 612, carried.

On motion total subhead 614, carried.

MR. F. ROWE: (615-01) Mr. Chairman, I hope I do not prolong this to too great an extent, but in my view, Sir, the Instructional Division of the Department of Education for all intents and purposes and for all that education means is probably the most important division of the Department of Education. It is the division of the Department of Education where you can have the

MR. F. ROWE: most change take place for the total good of instruction in this province.

Sir, I think and this is not a criticism of the personnel of the Division of Instruction in this department but I think, Sir, that the Division of Instruction in the Department of Education needs to be vastly and greatly upgraded. I think that we should have educational experts, curriculum experts in every subject field, primary or "K" through XI, if you want to call it that, I think this business of dividing it up into secondary education and primary and elementary education is kind of an artificial division.

The educational process is a process that continues from kindergarten through Grade XI. I feel, Sir, that until such time that we have people the equivalent of doctorate in mathematics education, in social studies education, in science education, and in foreign languages education and in English language and literature education, doctorate in each one of these areas, and probably I have missed a few, art education, music education, social sciences - well I said social studies - probably social sciences, each one of these areas, Sir, should have a top-notch man sitting here in the Department of Education, each one of whom has a competent staff under him, who can travel this province conducting workshops all over the province, training teachers in the field.

Now, Sir, I can go on and talk about this for the next six hours but it will gradually be reduced into the equivalent of an education 417 or something course at the university, and the impact will be lost. But, Sir, last year I suggested to the then Minister of Education, and he thought it was a good idea and he promised to look into it, that probably we should take some of our more competent teachers, more experienced but young competent, energetic teachers in the area of mathematics, in the area of science, in the area of the social studies and the other subject areas and finance their education in some

MR. F. ROWE: Mainland university or British university so that they can get the equivalent of a doctorate or certainly a post-graduate degree so that they themselves would be curriculum specialists in these particular subject areas. Then these people can be brought back into the Department of Education and they can get a competent staff, again of people who might have had to go off and get the equivalent of masters degrees in these subject areas. Then they could spent full time going around this province conducting in-service workshops and this type of thing, so that the full impact of curriculum changes that are going on all the time can be felt right in the classrooms of the province.

This is the same thing exactly as what the medical school is doing and you might say, "Well, why cannot the faculty of Education at Memorial do it?" The basic problem is, Sir, that there are some 6,600 teachers or something like this in this province and there are certainly not 6,600 doctors.

So whereas the medical school can conduct these in-service workshops quite easily and quite readily throughout any year, this is not true of the Faculty of Education of Memorial, the Faculty of Education are conducting workshops but they are not going anywhere near meeting the need, simply because of the great numbers of teachers.

Sir, I would suggest that the vote for this particular division in the department should be up at least five times and we should have those competent individuals in the departments and experts in leadership, that they should be doing working, of course, in correlation, in co-ordination and co-operation with the Faculty of Education at Memorial. So I will just leave it like that and hope that the minister will see fit, next year or this year, consider sending people off and greatly increasing this vote in this particular division because it is the essence, it is the heart of our educational system.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, just a few comments on what the honourable member for St. Barbe North has said, Let me say that I fully endorse his opening comments regarding equipment development and as it relates to Division of Instruction in the Department of Education. No question at all with it, this is the only real problem, if you look at it as a whole, if you look at all the estimates for the Department of Education and there comes a point where you are going to have to decide on priorities for the division in relation to the amount of money that is going to be available, where you put it. Speaking

generally or almost theoretically on it, I do agree wholeheartedly. One of the other points, besides the Department of Education itself having competent and well-trained people with degrees in curriculum development or a given field like mathematics, it is no good for a teacher or a student to go on in mathematics per se but into curriculum development of mathematics, the teaching of mathematics, the teaching of English or the social sciences. This is the kind of learning you are talking about I think rather than it being the pure mathematics or the pure English. You are talking about the teaching of same.

What disturbs me in some boards around the province where they bring in - this is related to the same thing that not only does the Department of Education need to have more competent people within the curriculum development field, within the department but a lot of the boards around the province hire so-called specialists who themselves are perhaps in the same position as are many of the people in the division of instruction who cover the whole gamut of curriculum. They are supposedly curriculum specialists but in actual fact they are not, they have to cover all the subject fields. The boards themselves perhaps have a responsibility here (I do not know how) to make sure that when they hire somebody and they are going to allocate \$10,000 or \$15,000 a year salary for a person that perhaps they are not doing any great service to instruction and curriculum development by hiring a person who has to cater to the problems of developing a bona fide English programme from Grade 111 to Grade XI and at the same time has to involve himself with the problems of teaching earth science in Grade X or something of this nature. It is not only a problem within the Department of Education but it is also a problem with the particular boards around the province, to hire people who have to be versatile in all subject areas rather

than be specialized. It might be a good idea that when a board is going to allocate a salary for somebody in the curriculum, it might be better for them to get just one person who is qualified in a given field and let that person go to work in that English field or in that mathematics field rather than hire somebody who supposedly qualified in all the fields. It is better to have one person who is good at English curriculum development and let him go ahead in the system on that, rather than take somebody who is trying to do something in all the various fields and ends up being no better off perhaps in the end than if the person were not there at all.

I could not let the occasion go by, being involved somewhat in English curriculum development for three years, without endorsing the comments of the hon. member for St. Barbe North. The only problem is money again and where do you put your priorities in relation to school bus transportation and all the rest of it. There are so many aspects of a given department's estimates that need extra money. Nevertheless, I think the point is well taken and I fully endorse it.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, just before the minister rises to answer my questions, I would like to point out, with all due respect to what the hon. member for Green Bay had said, that we have to consider other aspects of the whole budget in the field of education. It was last year, on September 13, when the mothers' allowance was wiped out, that the then Minister of Education said this: "The \$3.6 million saved the Treasury by cancelling the allowance is being used to improve the educational programme." Now anybody reading that would assume that the \$3.6 million is going to educational programmes, meaning curriculum instruction. So, Sir, I would suggest that since we have only \$1 million in there, we are lacking by some \$2.6 million.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, briefly on that. Well there can be no doubt that this is certainly a question of instruction and curriculum and the subjects taught in the schools, the very essence and guts of the department. It will be noted that there is an increase from \$220,000 to \$350,000 or \$360,000, to round it out, which will allow for recruiting. At present there are nine department directors and assistant directors, people in eight areas, eight specific areas, music, art, English, home economics, physical education, French, social studies and industrial arts. There are also people in testing evaluation. We either are now or are about to advertise for positions in reading, library, science and mathematics.

I think what we have to do, certainly in the next few years in the provinces, in this area is to make as great a use of all the people we have, the mobility of the people who are in the Department of Education, who are at the university, who might be experienced teachers, and in other parts of the province so that they can all be used to the maximum advantage. I think to a large extent that is being done but it does not mean that it cannot be done further on an increased basis.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, curriculum specialists throughout Canada and the United States are paid a tremendous sum of money and it is questionable whether or not this province can actually afford to be competitive with the other provinces. There in lies the problem, I guess.

On motion 615-01 to 03, carried.

AN HON. MEMBERS: Mr. Chairman, 04, correspondence courses.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: This is essentially a token vote. There have been within the past few years - to put it this way, the Department of Education has not given out correspondence courses during the

past few years. We would perhaps get a couple of inquiries a year and certainly it would be impossible, for one or two or three persons to develop our own correspondence courses. These people usually do it through the Department of Education, as in the Province of Nova Scotia, and that has been on a continuing basis for the past three years. The demand here is practically negligible, perhaps one or two a year, perhaps none.

On motion 04 carried.

On motion 615-03-01, carried.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, on 02, would the minister tell the committee if there is any money in here for Mr. McLean or any of his colleagues?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now, Mr. Chairman, this vote of \$240,000 is broken down approximately as follows: \$200,000 for what you would call audio-visual instructional material, sixteen millimeter films, slides, audio tapes for language or French, for music perhaps as well, but the \$200,000 is in that area. There is \$40,000 which will be used for promotional film presentations with respect to the College of Fisheries, the College of Trades and Technology and various adult education programmes, remedial upgrading programmes and craft training, the district vocational schools, in an attempt to publicize new programmes, apprenticeship training programmes. The cost of these presentations is approximately \$4,000 each. The \$40,000 will allow the government to have ten of them. The honourable gentleman asks is it George McLean? It is whoever the government contract to do it. If it is somebody else, it will be somebody else. I would not wish to make an unequivocal commitment that the government are going to continue with Mr. McLean or with anybody else. If it is in fact Mr. McLean who is doing this work, one never knows. I am not avoiding the question. I have been

very frank and honest. I said what the \$40,000 is for. I cannot say that it is all for McLean or if any is for McLean, whoever in fact does it. What the \$40,000 is for is for ten slide presentations the purpose of which will be to point out opportunities for training which are available, if you wish, in continuing education and I am thinking especially in terms of the College of Fisheries, the College of Trades and Technology, the vocational schools, craft training, remedial, adult education and apprenticeship training programmes, in these areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 615-03-02 carry?

MR. ROBERTS: A nice try, Mr. Chairman. If the minister is finished, we will have another go at it.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is all the excitement?

MR. ROBERTS: All the excitement is that I did not want to sleep on my rights. That is all. The Chairman is railroading things through. He obviously has his instructions.

Now the minister has been his usual charming self.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I take exception to the insinuation that the Chair is railroading. He has every right to speak on the estimates. Nobody is trying to stop him. I think that insinuation should be withdrawn.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I have no hesitation in withdrawing it. I am glad to know that Your Honour - of course it was said facetiously. I will withdraw it. I hope that the call will be as slow as the quorum count usually is in committee. Perhaps the honourable the junior, junior, junior clerk, if that is his title, could be asked to call the items because he would be as slow there as he is counting.

Now as I was saying, the minister has been his usual charming and absent self. Where has he gone? We have not even started on him. Is he ashamed of this vote? Ah! there he is. He is habituated again. His addiction is getting the better of him.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is getting close to the window.

MR. ROBERTS: He is getting close to the window.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister has said that this money is for film presentations, \$4,000 each, ten of them. That is the first point. His predecessor who had a brief, spectacular but unhappy career as Minister of Education, terminated not at his own request, made some interesting statements when he left the ministry. They were widely reported in such scurrilous rags as the "Evening Telegram," that yellow dog of journalism. Ah, they are bringing in the heavy artillery on this one. The gentleman from Port au Port assumes the Chair. I welcome it.

I would like first of all to hear from the minister on these cost items. It is a very serious matter. Here is a gentleman who is responsible for administering the Department of Education from January until December, ten months. Either he knew what he was doing or he did not know what he was doing. I resent that the gentleman is not in his seat at this stage to tell us the situation and to hear what I have to say about him. He made the flat statement that the film strips could be produced for \$500 each. Here comes the minister dancing before the committee to ask for \$4,000 each. It is rather a significant difference. Either the former Minister of Education, the gentleman from St. John's North, knew what he was saying or he did not. I should not be surprised if he did not know because we considered him incompetent as Education Minister and I think his record demonstrated that quite conclusively. I would like first of all for the minister to address himself, please, to the point of whether these things could be done cheaper. Secondly, while I accept (I was going to say because I have to but also because I am charitable and the minister is charitable and honourable) his assertion that no

arrangements have been made with Mr. McLean. I find it somewhat straining credulity to believe that Mr. McLean will not have an opportunity to press for this work. We all know that Mr. McLean was in the province on Friday, briefly. He met with the Premier and skedaddled back out to Toronto very quickly. It was not announced by "Information Newfoundland." He was here on Friday, in the province for a meeting with the Premier. It may have been Thursday. The Premier was away all of Thursday afternoon. I would like the minister to address himself to the point of whether or not public presentations will be called, whether or not any firm capable of doing this work - I suspect that there is more than one. I suspect that Atlantic Films and Electronics people are capable of making a presentation. I suspect that Mr. George McLean is capable of making a presentation - an open, public one. If the minister would merely give us the assurance that before he commits \$40,000 for this that he will call, put a notice in the newspapers, it does not have to be that scurrilous rag, that yellow journalism, the "Daily News." It could be that yellow journalism, the "Evening Telegram," or the yellow journalism, the "Sunday Herald." The only paper we have left in St. John's which is not yellow journalism is Mr. Pumphrey's "Town Crier" publication which seems to find favour with the ministry, although the latest issue did not have any of them in it.

AN HON. MEMBER: "The Newfoundland Gazette."

MR. ROBERTS: Anyway it is an interesting paper. I certainly read it. I enjoy it. Now I would like the minister merely to say that he will put a notice in the newspaper detailing what sort of project he wants and asking any qualified to make a representation, to make application.

Then I should like the minister to set up an independent committee and by independent committee I do not mean Mr. George McLean and Mr. Robert Nutbeam, the two people who handled the Tory publicity.

I mean an independent, perhaps he is deputy minister or some officials who would make a report to the minister as to which company, which firm, which agency should get the account, either all of the ten strips or one of them or more than one. Now, if the minister would give us that assurance, I for one would be prepared to let the \$40,000 item go, assuming he can also explain to us why he is requesting \$40,000 for a film strip that his colleague who spent ten months longer than the minister has, ten months in a department. The minister has only been there four or five months at present, if he can tell us why his colleague said that they could have been done for \$500. Did the honourable gentleman from St. John's North know what he was talking about or not? I mean, if he did not, he did not. I am prepared to accept that. I should like the minister to address himself to these points. Depending on what he has to say, then we will see where we will go from here.

This really is a very serious item. The gentleman from Labrador North may wish to say a few more words. The gentleman from White Bay South seems to be gathering himself, eager to add to the wisdom of this debate. I think the minister, you know, he started by being frank. He did not try to hide it.

Frank; that is funny. Do you know there was a speaker in Corner Brook the other day who said, "I am going to make some frank remarks about regional colleges," and people said, "No, no! Give us the truth instead." The minister started by being candid. Let him continue by being candid and answer these two points please.

MR. W. ROWE: Before the minister does answer, Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few remarks in support of what the honourable Leader of the Opposition has had to say but I would like to approach the problem from a slightly different angle. Of course, I am against money being passed out to Mr. McLean or his companies when other people have not had the opportunity to make similar proposals. Also, there is another equally serious reason why there should be

something done about Mr. McLean and his companies with regard to the governments' publicity, whether it be film strips or anything else. In support of my argument, Sir, I would like to read into the record of the House a letter which is found in today's "Evening Telegram". It is relevant, Sir. If you will bear with me for the first paragraph or so of the letter, you will see where the relevancy lies.

The headline accompanying the letter says, "PC's Should Wake Up."

"Sir, it is very obvious that the Opposition Liberals are waging a strenuous election campaign where they left off last year. It is also very obvious that this slimy propaganda will last up to the next general election. I am not much concerned with the campaign. The people in Newfoundland know what the Liberals were like for over twenty-two years but what does concern me is that the Progressive Conservative party does not seem to come back at this propaganda in any shape or form, at least not strong enough to offset the stuff that the Liberals are putting across to the people. Surely" (and here is where the point comes in, Mr. Chairman) "we have men in the Progressive Conservative Party who are well qualified and strong enough to blast this propaganda, in other words, fight slim with slim. I think that their public relations men" (this is the Progressive Conservative Party) "are lacking badly in not coming up with good, solid reactions to all this bunkum that the Liberals are trying to ram down the throats of us people, making it a repetition of twenty-two years of the same stuff. If the public relations people for the Progressive Conservative Party are not competent to - "

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I assume that the honourable member from White Bay South is reading an article written by a person who is writing to the editor of the paper. I refer to the Standing Order that says that it is out of

order to read extracts in a debate if it reflects upon the conduct of persons in authority. I, Sir, think that the article that he is now reading does reflect on the persons in authority. It is out of order.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to the point of order. This same point was raised a day or two ago when Your Honour ruled that it is in order to read extracts from newspapers. Your Honour is not hearing any argument on the point.

The point that I was trying to make, Sir, is that Your Honour was confronted with the same decision, the same ruling, a number of days ago when there was a motion of no-confidence before the House and Your Honour said at that time that it is in order for newspaper articles, excerpts from newspapers to be read unless they are in breach of some rule of order.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He did not rule on a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: I will tell you the point of order. He is not speaking to the point of order.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, will Your Honour control the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the member for Bonavista South has raised the point of order. The honourable the member for White Bay North is citing precedents. Whether the precedent is in fact precedent on the point of course will be ascertained by the Chair but the member for White Bay South is quite in order in his argument.

MR. ROBERTS: You will make the Cabinet yet "Jim". Keep it up boy.

MR. W. ROWE: The great civil rights man over there, Mr. Chairman.

I just wanted to clew up, Sir. I have not had an opportunity to make a continuous statement on the point of order, Sir, because the civil rights man, the great civil libertarian over there continues to interrupt me.

The point, Sir, is that it is in order unless it is in breach

of some other rule or some other point of order. It is in order to read extracts in the House of Assembly or in committee as Your Honour so ruled, I think about a week or so ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The ruling some time ago, if I remember correctly, was that items of so called news reporting could be read into the record. However, items which reflect upon proceedings within the House, which this article appears to be - it is in effect editorial comment, being a letter to the editor, and also the taunting of the letter does appear to reflect upon proceedings in the House. If honourable members want, we could make a ruling later. However, at this point it does appear as if the reading from that particular excerpt is out of order.

MR. W. ROWE: An observation during my remarks in the debate I have not mentioned, the letter does not mention anything about anything going on in the House. They talk about public relations men for the Progressive Conservative Government, Sir. I mean, I am sorry. That is a fact. I can pass the letter to Your Honour, if Your Honour desire. We are talking about a public relations man for the Progressive Conservative Party and the Progressive Conservative Government. We are talking about some of the work which he is likely to get under this vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member of course realizes that at this time we should be talking about, we should be directed to 615-03-02 which is films, negatives stock and film strips. The honourable member is -

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, Sir, I have mentioned earlier that I was bringing this letter into line with the relevance of that. We are talking about film stocks, film strips, films which Mc Lean or his "NACON" or his "NABOB" or whatever he calls himself are going to produce for the Government of Newfoundland at \$4,000 each in cost or he is likely to be developing for the Government of Newfoundland, which the earlier Minister of Education said would cost \$500 if done by the departmental people. He has been recorded in newspapers.

Now, I was reading a letter here, Sir, in the paper, by an obvious "P.C." who signs himself "L.J.W." I do not know who that is. He did not name himself. He is an obvious "P.C.". He hates the way in which the Liberal Party and the Liberal Opposition in the province are getting their -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable gentleman is directed again to keep himself on target, 615-03-02, which the honourable -

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, if Your Honour will tell me where I am going astray, I will gladly try to hew to Your Honour's ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will surely agree that the public relations work for the Progressive Conservative Party has very little to do with 615-03-02.

MR. W. ROWE: I beg to differ, Sir, on that point, assuming that Your Honour has not ruled, because it is a well known fact established in the land that the public relations firm for the Progressive Conservative Party is the same man and the owner of the same company that is getting free handouts by the Department of Education and other departments in this government in order to produce films and similar things at obviously exorbitant cost to the people of this province. Now, Sir, if that is not relevant, nothing in this debate is relevant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The later remarks that the honourable member makes are relevant. The earlier remarks he made with regard to the partisanship or otherwise of the gentlemen are irrelevant. The honourable member is not prohibited from speaking at all to the point. However, there are certain matters on which if brought to order the Chair will have to rule - and fairly frequently rule the honourable member out of order.

MR. W. ROWE: Fine, Sir. In any event, this gentleman in this letter which I will not read because Your Honour has ruled that it should not be read, this gentleman, Sir, has the same feeling as I do about it. Namely, that McLean and his ilk are doing no service to the government, either by providing films or providing

other services to the government. He is doing no service to the government and he is also doing no service to the party which the government represents in this House and he should be tossed out for that reason as well as the reason which the honourable Leader of the Opposition has stated, namely that it is certainly getting very close to the line to have a supporter of the Progressive Conservative Party and a publicity agent and a public relations man for the Progressive Conservative Party, who supported them in an earlier election, to be passed over this \$40,000 now when in reality it should cost \$500 I think, to use the figures of the member of St. John's North. I support that.

I also think that, by way of passing, on another angle on the situation that the Progressive Conservative Party and the Progressive Conservative Government are not getting value for money paid in any event, as is supported by this letter which I have just read. So, on both counts, Sir, the people of Newfoundland are being ill-served by the present administration as far as getting this type work done, film strips and this sort of thing, because for quality received the cost is too high. The Progressive Conservative Party and the Progressive Conservative Government are not getting service for money paid either by the party or by the government because as this gentleman in the "Evening Telegram" has said, they are doing very little to get the Progressive Conservative Party's message or the Progressive Conservative Government's message in education or anything else across to the people of this province .

MR. HICKMAN: I rise on a point of order. I understood that Your Honour's ruling was that that letter cannot be read. What is the difference in referring to the unsigned letter? May I draw to the committee's attention Beauchesne at page 134 which says, "An unsigned letter should not be read in the House." The Speaker

said, "Such a letter should not be read in the Hansard. "All letters when read must be signed and they become part of the documents of the House." Now, Mr. Chairman, either we have a ruling on this now or we do not.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. My colleague is not reading the letter, he is merely referring to it. Are the government attempting to choke off all debate in this House?

MR. W. ROWE: Now, Sir, if I may continue. I am not reading a letter but the paper is down here on the floor, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If honourable members will permit. The phrase "A rose by any other name is still a rose" probably applies to this. As the honourable member has earlier referred to the letter and now paraphrases the letter, it is out of order to read it into the record. It may be a debatable point whether the contents of the unsigned letter may be read into the record by inference or by paraphrase or precisely. However, I think that we would not have to stretch the authorities too far to sustain a ruling that the honourable member is out of order.

However, it now being six of the clock, I do leave the Chair until eight of the clock this evening.

The Committee resumed at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

HON. T.P.HICKEY (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS): I would like to state that when the Speaker resumes the Chair, I intend to rise on a Point of Personal Privilege.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the procedure is when a point of privilege is raised in Committee, Your Honour should leave the Chair and we should rise the Committee and deal with such an important question immediately. I think that is the correct procedure, Sir.

MR. HICKEY: Tomorrow will do. I just gave the House notice so as to rise on the first opportunity.

MR. ROBERTS: The thing is that I believe the procedure is quite clear and when such a matter as a point of personal privilege comes up the Committee should rise. I do think that is the procedure, I am not joshing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There has to be a motion to that effect. The Committee will remain.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, speaking to a point of order, I suggest that is the correct procedure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will entertain the point raised.

MR. ROBERTS: We will take a couple of minutes to have a look at it, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the meantime, we will proceed with Head VI, Education: We are presently dealing with Head VI, 1503-02.

MR. W.N. ROWE: 03-02, right, Mr. Chairman. Just before the Committee rose for six o'clock, Your Honour was mercilessly ruling me out of order. That is all right, reading a letter in the House has been ruled to be not in order. The Minister of Justice was viciously attacking, typical of the way he has administered his own Department of Justice.

Mr. Chairman, the point I was trying to make just before the Committee rose was that there is forty thousand dollars laid aside out of a total of two hundred and forty thousand dollars, forty thousand dollars laid aside for some ten film presentations which are going to be done for the government, for the Department of Education. The minister says that he does not know who will be doing them but we can make a shrewd guess, since one ex-minister, to use his own interpretation of the situation, was put out of the cabinet because he dared to complain that Mr. McLean's processing of these films was costing four thousand dollars each as against five hundred dollars which would be the actual cost if the department itself were to prepare these film strips. We were making a few comments on that.

The Leader of the Opposition had stated that it is an unwarranted use of public funds to pay these exorbitant prices for film strips for Mr. McLean or anyone else. He had suggested that if not public tenders, then public proposals should be invited by all people who are involved in this kind of a business to prepare that kind of a film strip. Perhaps even better, that the Department of Education itself should prepare these strips themselves at a much lower cost.

I brought in a new angle on it, Mr. Chairman, namely that not only is Mr. McLean not doing the province a service by charging these exorbitant prices for film strips, film presentations, but he is not even doing the government, the Progressive Conservative Government, nor the Progressive Conservative Party a service, as can be seen from talking with almost anybody outside the House today. The publicity of the Progressive Conservative Party, the Government, is far from excellent, very poor. I gave an example of one gentleman whose letter I happened to read some time ago, who said that the Liberal Opposition and Liberal Members were propagandizing and making the Progressive Conservative Government look like - not look too good, not in too good a light, and that the Progressive Conservative

Government should get rid of its publicity agent who would undoubtedly be, Mr. McLean.

I am tempted to agree, Mr. Chairman. Not only should the government get rid of Mr. McLean because he is doing no service, he is doing a disservice to the province, to the government and the province and public at large, but he is doing no service for the government as a political entity nor for the party that this government represents in the House. On those two grounds, Sir, the government should get rid of this particular agency and do whatever it can itself with its own resources down in printing and photography or using other resources within the department or within some other department of government, to come up with things like film strips at a much lower cost. If the government itself does not have the capability, the capacity or the resources, then in all cases they should ask for proposals to be submitted to the government. The subject matter of what is wanted should be advertised, the amount of money which the government are prepared to spend on each subject matter should be advertised and people should be asked to submit proposals to the government which can be reviewed by government officials to see which proposal is most advantageous to the public and to the department to which it relates.

I would move that the amount of two hundred and forty thousand dollars be reduced by thirty-five thousand dollars. In other words, the amendment is, Sir, that I am proposing, that this amount be reduced to two hundred and five thousand dollars. I dare say that one or two of my colleagues might want to speak to that proposed amendment.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the motion put by my honourable colleague, the member for White Bay South. I followed with interest the statements made by the former Minister of Education with respect to how much these films or these strips could have been made for. One thing that has not been brought before this House, at least today, is the simple fact that the director of the Audio-

Visual Education Centre at Memorial University in the faculty of education, Mr. Fizzard, I believe it is now, came out strongly the day after the ex-minister made his statement regarding the inflated costs of providing these particular film strips to which my honourable colleague is referring in his motion. He suggested, I believe, that instead of four thousand dollars, these things would cost approximately five hundred dollars to produce.

I have had just a little bit of experience in the development and the production of such film strips, audio-visual tapes, sixteen and thirty-two millimeter films, still slides and the still film strips while I had the pleasure of serving at the university. I know, Sir, that the cost that was mentioned by the honourable the minister with respect to producing these films is an absolutely ridiculous figure. It is a horribly inflated figure.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Is that the four thousand dollars?

MR. F.B. POWE: That is the four thousand dollars. It is a very highly inflated figure. I just cannot see what is going into the production. How long are these films by the way, or these strips?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. F.B. ROWE: A slide presentation, is that correct? A slide presentation - are these individual slides?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes.

MR. F.B. ROWE: That can be put on an audio-visual tape presumably?

MR. NEARY: Thirty-five millimeters.

MR. F.B. POWE: An Audio -video tape I mean, video tape for T.V.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It can be put on T.V. or...

MR. F.B. ROWE: Approximately how many of these slides would there be in each package?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: In each series? I would think, roughly forty.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Forty slides, costing four thousand dollars for such a production?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I think.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I used to have students at the university. True they may not be of a professional quality, the professional quality that the honourable minister is talking about, we have not seen what the professional quality of these things are, but I have had students in my courses at the university producing slide series, in science education courses, in geology and biology, that would vary little more than approximately twenty dollars a production. True the students were putting their own free labour into it because of the fact that it was a project that was being done. But, Sir, four thousand dollars for any kind of slide production or series is an absolutely ridiculously inflated price. It just cannot be justified no matter who is doing it.

I submit that the proposal made by the honourable member for White Bay South, that the government do one of two things, is justified. (1) they should call public tenders for such a thing or they should ask various groups of people to submit proposals to the government so that the government then can pick the cheapest or the most inexpensive cost proposal that is made to them in view of the capacity of that particular firm to make these slides. I have not hesitation whatsoever in supporting the amendment put forth by my honourable colleague for White Bay South, particularly in view of the fact that we have had a professional person, a reputable educator in this province come out and agree with the statements made by the honourable member for St. John's North, when he made them, that such slide productions can be done at a relatively insignificant cost, around four or five hundred dollars.

On top of that, Sir, we do have the facilities in this province to make such presentations. I would not be the least bit surprised that we would not even have to go to private enterprise for it. I am convinced that students who are up there doing those communications courses at the university, within the department of

or the division of audio-visual education, that the director of that division would be only too happy to have his students, his graduate students do such productions as a project. They would be close to professional productions and they can be done very inexpensively and provide some practice for the graduate students at the university, at the same time, who would have had the initial training.

I think it is absolutely ridiculous that we have a situation here where we are giving away at least thirty-five hundred dollars per slide series. We are just giving it away. If we ever heard of political patronage, Sir, this must be it and I have no hesitation in supporting the motion put forth by my honourable friend for White Bay South.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I have one very small but I think quite important point to make in support of this amendment. I would like the honourable minister to bear in mind, Sir, that while it may be a very desirable thing to try to achieve a high degree of artistic professionalism in such things, that perhaps now is not the time to strive for such professionalism. These kinds of things come high, we have to pay a lot for them, we have to pay for the training of the people that are doing these. I submit, Sir, that we are going to get as much out of such film strips if we are prepared to accept a little less professionalism, if they are done, as my honourable friend from St. Barbe suggests, by somebody less professional and someone who has less expensive services to offer.

I think we can get just as much out of it from an educators point of view as we could from something of this high artistic quality which, we would assume, we would demand for such high prices.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to speak at any great length on this subject of great and intense interest to the committee.

As honourable members may recall we had four or five days of debate on a private member's resolution, certainly on the same topic, the same general area, not on estimates of any department but the same general area. I think just about everything that can be said for or against the whole question was probably said several times.

The point was made then by me and by other members on this side of the Legislature that to the best of our knowledge there are no instances where the Government of Canada or the government of any province in Canada does advertise for tenders or for submissions in this kind of publicity work. To the best of our knowledge that is not practised. It was not the practice in the former administration here and that does not mean anything. But to the best of our knowledge it is not the practice of any provincial government. Certainly if any person in the province has a proposal to make with respect to this kind of public relations or promotion or advertising of services whatever you want to call it, certainly we would be very glad to receive it and to weigh it on its merits. I want to make that very clear. The fact that we have not advertised tenders or advertised for submissions for this kind of promotion work, which is not usually done, obviously does not preclude anybody from writing to me as Minister of Education or to an official in the department to make any submissions or suggestions, to describe their services, to point out what they could do and the cost at which they could do it.

I am aware that a gentleman at the university stated that it could be done by students at a great reduction in cost or this or that. I have not received any communication from anybody, written, formal and it does not have to be formal because I am not that formal a person. I have not received any communication, submission, request for a meeting, proposals from anybody either at the university or in any private enterprise in the province or anyone at all suggesting their series of programmes and giving

the cost breakdown. Certainly if anybody or if several persons wish to send it, we would certainly be pleased to receive it and to give it very careful consideration.

The point has been made by honourable members opposite and I think here they were quoting a remark of the member from St. John's North, that these productions could be done at a cost of around \$500.00 in the Department of Education. Mr. Chairman, if these were to be undertaken in the Department of Education they would certainly necessitate an increase in staff in the audio-visual and I would be quite sure as well that it would require a capital expenditure in equipment and this in itself, there is nothing wrong with that. However, I would hardly think that this is the kind of programme, I am speaking now about the \$40,000 for programming within the Department of Education. The basic purpose of this is to make known to Newfoundlanders throughout the province, through television, through sending these programmes on circuit, if you wish, to be shown at school associations, school board meetings and various schools, development associations, parish organizations, anybody and everybody. Our object is obviously to get as wide an audience as possible to describe various facilities, opportunities available for self-betterment in the courses of the various vocational institutes, at the College of Fisheries, at the College of Trades and Technology, the various programmes and basic training for skill development, which are manpower upgrading programmes, various opportunities and remedial adult education and various opportunities in craft training.

In many areas there are opportunities for advancement and for the learning of skills and for getting financial assistance while you are doing it which are not well enough known in certain parts of the province. So this is the purpose of it. I would think that the right kind of programmes given sufficient coverage

throughout the province that within one or two years that information gap should be served. If one is going to build up a civil service structure by hiring additional people and this and that, then what do you do after one or two years? I would not think that for what would appear to be a temporary need one would necessarily build up a permanent kind of service. I am aware too that quite similar packages, one done for the Province of Ontario cost approximately \$4,600 and I forget exactly, I had the figure in front of me when we were debating on the private member's estimate and it is in Hansard and it is in a document tabled in the House, but \$4,600 is pretty close to it, and a similar one done for one of the departments of the Province of Quebec cost \$4,500. To the best of our knowledge these professional kinds of programmes which are made not just for showing in a classroom or not primarily for showing in a classroom but which are for use on television, over a couple of years period, for repeated use on television and in various other outlets as well, to the best of our knowledge this is a reasonable price.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, while it is not the practice to advertise for tenders or submissions certainly any person or group or organization of private enterprise or interested body who wishes to make a submission or make a proposal to the Department of Education, that would be very welcome. As I said as well, it is not my intention to speak at length because I think just about everything that can be said for or against has been said on dozens of occasions and no doubt obviously that is everybody's right, but it is not my intention to speak at any greater length on it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, like the minister I do not intend to speak at length but I may be as long as he was and I hope I am more convincing than he was because to the surprise I suggest of very few people, I intend to vote for the motion. If I had not intended

to vote for it after the speeches of my friend and colleague from White Bay South and St. Barbe North, I would after hearing the defense of the minister. It was weak to begin with and it got weaker as he went along. One hardly knows where to start with the minister because of course his mind is closed on it, orders are orders and George must be protected. The majority will prevail and George will get his pound of flesh, \$40,000 worth, and this from an administration that whacked \$60,000 out of bursaries and \$1.6 million out of the backs of the students of this country. It shows priorities. All this from the administration where the Minister of Finance gets up day after day, after dreary, boring, wearying day, to tell us how we must tighten our belts, how we must prepare steadfastly to work for the future. Well, Mr. McLean is not tightening his belt. The government are not tightening their belt with respect to George McLean. If anything they are loosening their belts and giving him more and more and more. We have not even yet asked the questions, which we shall, about last year, how much cousin George got of this and what it went for.

Mr. Chairman, to deal with what pass for substantive points in the minister's defense, he first of all says that this only happens once or twice. Well that, Sir, is arrant nonsense and I am surprised at the minister bringing it out. If there be a need for this sort of education, and I am prepared to believe there is, or this sort of publicity, then surely the need continues indefinitely because each year, Mr. Chairman, a new class of students comes to grade XI or grade X or whatever point they finish their academic education at. So if there is a need in 1973 then there will be a need in 1974 and 1975 and 1976. Surely the minister would not pretend for one second that we do this marvellous course now and we get these marvellous film strips at \$100.00 each, Good Heavens! no wonder the member for St. John's North, \$100.00 a picture and what are they? About ten cents to buy them down at

Tooton's somewhere - \$100.00 each, it is gross patronage. It is a gross rip-off of the worst sort to pay any man, to pay any company and I do not care whether it is Mr. McLean or not, \$100.00 for one simple little frame, one simple, small frame on a film strip. That is outrageous, and the minister tells us about austerity. This is the same budget - There is only \$35,000 for the audio-visual centre, \$40,000 for curriculum development. Mr. Chairman, we are being asked to spend \$40,000 for some film strips and the whole of the curriculum development which is surely one of the crucial questions, and the minister is only asking the same amount, \$40,000. He should be ashamed of himself. I do not mind patronage. I mean I understand this administration is committed to the principle of patronage. After all one of their leaders, perhaps the leader, The Minister of Finance, told us in a speech in the House, Mr. Chairman; Your Honour may not have been here at that precise moment because I know Your Honour would want to be aware of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: His Honour was here. Well, I just want to refresh him then. It was such a brilliant speech of political philosophy. He said patronage is always with us and I say "Amen" to that because, Mr. Chairman, I shall say that this \$40,000, the minister -

AN HON. MEMBER: No quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: Two, four, six, eight, ten, twelve, Mr. Chairman, I really think there should be - Well, the minister from Labrador has gone out and there are some more coming in. That is good. By the way this must be why the whip has resigned, the Tory whip has packed it in, Sir, he has packed it in as whip. He just cannot keep - they need seat belts. The hon. gentleman for Labrador West should be the whip. It would be a promotion for him. Hold on now, twelve -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I do not care if we are drawing the crowd or not. I mean the hon. gentleman for St. John's Centre is here. He is

faithful and he is the only one I care about. If I can convert him in the next two or three years, I shall have worked a miracle worthy only of our Saviour turning the water into wine. It is the only comparison I could think of, an absolute miracle.

MR. MURPHY: That is beautiful. Great minds think alike on that.

MR. ROBERTS: Twelve, Mr. Chairman, could we have a quorum, please. Would Your Honour ask the clerk to count, please? Has Your Honour found a quorum? Fine, that is fine. Mr. Chairman, I have not yielded the floor to any of the honourable gentlemen opposite.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, there is an amendment before - To begin with to show how stunned they are, Sir, there is an amendment before - Is the amendment carried?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I will settle for that. The amendment is carried, hurrah! They say the amendment is carried. That is the motion before the Chair, Mr. Chairman. If it is carried it is carried. Is it carried? Would Your Honour tell me, was it carried? Was the amendment carried? Does George not get his \$40,000?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the House ready for the question?

MR. ROBERTS: No, of course not, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, for the last two minutes I have been standing on a point of order and it just goes to show how honourable gentlemen abide by the rules. Are the members of the opposition permitted to leave the Chamber whenever they feel like and then when an item is carried to object? If you are going to debate the subject, stay in and debate it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, may I speak to the point of order? Well, the honourable gentleman from St. John's East Extern, the minister responsible for garbage, as he keeps telling us has time and time again, raised that so-called point of order. He has been ruled out of order time and time again and furthermore, Sir, the

motion before the Chair was the one made by my colleague from White Bay South, that the vote be reduced by \$40,000, and if that is carried I would welcome it. I intend to vote for it. Has it been carried, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, -

MR. ROBERTS: I am not surprised.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I am a little sick at the use of this word "garbage." Now the greatest bunch of garbage in this House is what comes from the honourable gentleman's mouth and if he would keep his mouth shut you would not need a minister responsible for the disposal of garbage.

MR. ROBERTS: If the honourable minister responsible for garbage is finished I shall go on, Sir. Now as I was saying,

it is important, Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum here. We are spending millions of dollars of the people's money. Mr. Chairman, would the honourable gentleman who is so tender on the points of order, please be quiet. I mean, would he please observe and that goes for the honourable gentleman for Bonavista South, would he observe the rules. I mean he was lecturing us all on television tonight, I was fascinated to watch him. Fascinated to watch him, the wisdom. The honourable gentleman for Twillingate, he missed it? The honourable gentleman for Twillingate -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Leader of the Opposition has been given great leeway in the debate on this motion. However, 615-03-02 and the amendment thereto have not been dealt with in any substance by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition for the past ten minutes.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, with respect, I have been trying although may be quite ineffectively to give my reasons why I am prepared to vote in favour of this amendment. There was some confusion because apparently the amendment had carried. Your Honour has set that straight. The motion has not been put. It will be put in due course. I would be surprised if it carries.

As I was saying before we had to make sure that we had a quorum, the House of Assembly Act, Your Honour, says that there must be fourteen members present.

AN HON. MEMBER: Order please. What heading are we on now?

MR. ROBERTS: We are on 615-03-02, George McLean Rip Off it should be called.

Now, Sir, the minister has given no reasons at all for this. I feel sorry for the minister because I know the position he is in. I think I know the position he is in. I think I can understand it. Orders have come down from on high, George is to get his pound of flesh. George is to get \$40,000 here and as we go through the estimates I am prepared to believe that we will find a few more cents, here and there for Mr. McLean or for his companies. I do not give a hoot for Mr. McLean personally but for the whole concept because there has been a deliberate, conscious decision taken by this

administration to pay off Mr. McLean, to pay him off for the services he rendered the Tory party. That is why I am against this \$40,000. If there were a need for it, if the minister had demonstrated a need, fine, but not only has he not demonstrated a need, he has offered a lame and weak defence. I understand the minister's predicament, I really do and I feel sorry for him, but that is part of being in the cabinet. Heaven knows we had to defend things at times when we were in the cabinet, Maybe we spoke against them in cabinet, maybe we did not. We did not leave the cabinet. The minister has not left the cabinet. Now he is in the unfortunate position and he talks about Ontario, Ontario with its six million people, spends \$4,600 on a film strip, Newfoundland with half a million and a Finance Minister, who cries gloom and doom and woebegone and defeat, spends \$4,000.

That is the comparison, Quebec with its five and a-half million people. It is outrageous. I am surprised at the minister, the minister having a background as he does in audio visual education of this sort. Before the minister came into political life, he worked in adult education and did very well, very well indeed - coming out with this. There is no need for this. There is no need at all for this. If we do not have adequate publicity programmes to let our people know, what are our guidance counsellors doing, if the young people of Newfoundland are not aware of the facilities available? I will say this is a pay off to McLean, that is all it is. It is a cheap, politically patronage pay off. That is what it is. Somebody outside said it is shocking. Of course, it is shocking. It is more than that but it is not parliamentary to say what more it is.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, if in fact there is a need for it and I do not say there is, the minister has made no case, if there be a need for it, then do we have just to give it to one firm? We will. I am prepared to wager fifty-two cents, Sir, fifty-two cents what the honourable gentleman for St. John's Centre is worth for a week's work, fifty-two that every cent of this \$40,000 that in fact is spend will

go to Mr. McLean's companies. It may not be spent but I am prepared to wager that every cent that is spent out of that vote for that purpose this year will go to Mr. McLean's companies. The minister says if anybody wants to send in a proposal, and yet he is not prepared to invite. He says proposals are not invited, He is wrong. He is flatly wrong. No one can call tenders for a matter of quality, but one can invite proposals. Even the Tory Government in Ontario asks for proposals. The minister could write to Atlantic Films and he could write to Tooton's and write, possibly to the CBC would do this. The minister's department further in this subhead, Sir, worked very closely with the CBC school broadcast. We will be asked, a little below, to provide money for it. The CBC might well be willing to lend their expertise. As a matter of fact, I am sure they will be. They might charge for it but I doubt if they would charge \$40,000. What are we going to get for it? Ten film strips, is it? Ten film strips. It is scandalous! It is outrageous!

AN HON. MEMBER: Four hundred slides at \$100 each.

MR. ROBERTS: Four hundred slides at \$100 each. It is dear. It is about the most insane thing that I have heard of in government since the Emperor Caligula made his horse a consul. Somebody said it was the first time a full horse has ever been elevated to office. Mr. Chairman, it really is outrageous. It really is outrageous. I understand I think the need for political patronage; it is a part of the system. But any administration, to ask for \$40,000 for curriculum and propose to spend the same amount, \$40,000, on the rankest sort of patronage and an unnecessary expenditure, completely unnecessary, needless, it will not serve any purpose, just a cheap pay-off of a political debt. I am going to vote against it, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the House ready for the question?

The motion is that Head 615-02-03, films, negative stock, and film strips be reduced from \$240,000 to \$205,000.

Those in favour of the motion please say "aye"

Those against the motion please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it, on division.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would tell us please, last year \$277,000 was spent - that is the estimated figure, it may have not been that in fact - could he indicate to the committee, please, so we could have some indication of whether the \$240,000 - could he indicate what the \$277,000 went on. Or if he should wish, how much of that may have gone to such servants of the public wheel, Mr. McLean and his companies?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, \$20,000 of that amount was NACOM services and the rest was for the regular audio visual material as indicated in the subhead.

MR. ROBERTS: What did we get for our \$20,000 rip-off?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There were five presentations, one on wooden boatbuilding, courses on wooden boatbuilding, techniques of wooden boatbuilding. On child adoption procedures and programmes. One on vocational school facilities. One on safe driving. The fifth one slips my mind, I can undertake to find out. There were in fact five and the total there was \$20,000.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister. Could he tell the committee a little of where these are used, because I have seen none of them. That is not surprising in itself but I have heard nothing. As a rule something like this, one would expect to hear a little about it. What happens to these? Are they used in schools? Are they shown on the television to exultant natives in St. Mary's? You know, what happened? Where are they used?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I have seen the Department of Highway one on television. I am not sure whether there have not been others on television as well. Of course, of those five one specifically was for use within the Department of Education. The rest were budgeted through the Department of Education but their distribution and their use, for example the one on child adoption and one on boatbuilding their distribution and use would be in those departments. The one for which the distribution we would responsible for, the vocational

school one is now in the department and we are planning to distribute it to school boards. We are planning actually with the others that we mentioned earlier, for this year's vote, to have a series of them on just about every aspect of vocational, technical and continuing and remedial education available.

MR. ROBERTS: I see, Mr. Chairman, these are I think film strips which as I understood, are sort of that long and go through a slide projector and are shown on a screen.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: They are slides with a sound track and with this \$4,000 goes the slide projector as well, that is included in it. So there are a series of approximately forty slides with sound commentary and equipment.

MR. ROBERTS: Why do we need ten slide projectors - Now the minister has gotten me to see - we are going to have ten slide projectors is what he is saying, in return for our \$40,000. Is that correct? In addition to the films, I mean these immensely valuable films which will all be winning Oscars with each one we get a complete slide projector is that what the minister is saying?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: Now I am lost. How many schools are there in Newfoundland? How many are there? 1,000? 1,200? 1,500 schools?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Eight hundred and twenty-five schools.

MR. ROBERTS: Eight hundred and twenty-five schools, I thank the minister then. Each of them must have - I would have thought that each of them has a slide projector or if not -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: They are not exclusively used for schools, of course.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, not exclusively for schools. My father has a slide projector, he shows pictures of having gone off on the "S.S. Hope" - when I am not around. I am happy to say. But I mean this is more outrageous as we get into it. I could see having a library of film strips, I could see that. I mean we must have quite a library downstairs now of film strips and films of one sort and another that go posting

out around and a very good thing it is. My friend from Labrador North got his start in commercial life showing films up and down the St. Barbe Coast. I do not know how educational they were but I am sure they were entertaining and informative and enlightening to the people on that coast twenty years ago.

Well for \$4,000 we are going to get a film strip and a projector and it gets carried around. Almost in kindness I should lay off on it. I mean, it is just pathetic. Is the minister telling us that thing we see on the television showing "How To Drive On Winter Roads" and saying Your Department of Highways are on it night and day and they sometimes put sand, and sometimes put salt and sand on the ice, was that one of these ones this year?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That was one of these, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: My God, we paid \$4,000 for that. My Lord, Caesar said Gaul was divided into three parts, I know where all three of them are. I mean that really is astounding, Mr. Chairman, \$4,000 for a one minute film commercial that is amateurish, shoddy, cheap, unrevealing. No wonder the gentleman for St. John's - we paid \$4,000 for that. The minister says, I am wrong, am I? Mr. Chairman, the minister is not with me. I want to wait until I get the minister's attention. The Safety Council apparently have found thirteen safety errors in it. Down below we are going to see where the administration have whacked \$2,500 off the Safety Council vote. Mr. Chairman, it is all very well to go after Mr. McLean politically, he is a partisan figure, and quite a figure he cuts but really, Mr. Chairman, \$4,000 for that monstrosity we saw on the television. I do not know if the gentleman for Labrador West has seen it. Maybe that is one of the blessings of living in Labrador West, because of the bad television service, at least the honourable gentleman did not see that. I am genuinely astounded and I thought there was not much. But \$4,000 for that, for a one minute commercial, Sure CBC or CJON would run it off for \$50 or \$100.

Four thousand dollars, you get a five minute colour film for under \$1,000 with director and with script and cutting.

Now, Mr. Chairman, look -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know anything about film for stag parties. Would the gentleman for Bell Island like to tell us about that?

But really, Mr. Chairman, there is no point in beating a dead horse. The minister obviously is defending an administrative decision and I do not quarrel with him on that point. But I think it is astounding. I know my constituents are going to be a little upset every time they want something and cannot have it, they will be very pleased to know that. Look, for \$10,000 we can get live television into St. Anthony and they have taken \$4,000 -

and that is not parliamentary. Your Honour can take as said the word on this, something in a way unpolitical. That is staggering. That really is shameful. It is staggering, disgusting and nauseating. Perhaps when the wheel turns we should launch a suit against Mr. Nacom, whatever the company is called, to recover money; obtaining it under false pretenses. Any company that would charge \$4,000 for that thing we see on the television is disgusting. It is just absolutely disgusting. What more can I say? I am not going to change their minds. They are like stone walls on that point. I am outraged. Really that is too much. That is much too much. Even the honourable gentleman from St. John's West who says that patronage is an important part of government or whatever it was he did say, I suggest he would find it very hard to stomach that.

MR. MARTIN: Would the honourable minister undertake to provide the committee with certain information before we pass this subhead. First would he find out whether or not (he mentioned here projectors and various paraphernalia connected with these film strips) all of the equipment connected with this paraphernalia has been in fact delivered to the department? Secondly, would he undertake to provide the committee with a breakdown of all the production costs of these film strips?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I can undertake to get that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Has the honourable member requested that Head 615-03-03 stand over?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MARTIN: Is it in order to do that? I am not sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is in order for the honourable member to do it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Request it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To request it, yes.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If the honourable gentleman wish to await passage for the information, that is obviously his right. Will he accept an

undertaking from me that I will provide the committee with that information? Then we could pass it. I give that undertaking. I certainly shall live up to it. As a matter of fact there is one which is left in abeyance for which I have the information here now. All I am asking is, would the honourable gentleman accept my undertaking to provide that information to the committee within the next day or so?

MR. MARTIN: Well not wishing to further delay debate, I think it is rather important that we have this information, I am prepared to accept the honourable minister's statement that he will provide the committee with this information at a later date. I will let it stand as it is.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Before the vote passes, I would like to ask the minister to undertake to get information as to where all of the equipment was purchased from? For instance these projectors, were tenders called for these or were proposals submitted to the government? Where were these projectors bought from as well as all the film and other paraphernalia that go along with these particular series of slides, the sound systems, etc? I assume that audio tape is being used rather than records with these particular series. Where is all the material for these series being bought from? Where was it bought from?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to find that out but actually that is not bought directly by us. That is part of the package. NACOM does the programmes and they provide the tape and this and that. I can ask them where they purchased it. They are a commercial organization. They obviously would not have tendered. I can ask them where they buy most of their equipment.

On motion 03-02, carried:

On motion 03-03, carried.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: On 03-04, when schools write in for audio visual

equipment to borrow it, this or that, or to loan it, this is the cost of shipping, basically.

On motion 03-04 carried.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER On 03-05, this is a twenty-five per cent subsidy which is available to all school boards for the purchase of projectors, overhead projectors, slide projectors, audio visual equipment. The twenty-five per cent subsidy is made available to all school boards on this purchase.

On motion 03-05, carried.

MR. NEARY: This item came under 03-03 but here we have it again on 03-06. Is this the same thing?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Actually I do believe that there are probably too many subheads here. The 03 is the printing of school broadcast manuals which go out and are used by the teacher in the various classes and to the pupils as well. The manual accompanies the radio broadcast. This one here is for payment to those who write the scripts and to those who read the scripts as well, payment to writers and readers of these school broadcasts which are done through CBC but for which we have financial responsibility.

MR. NEARY: Well is this farmed out or is the writing by a permanent staff of the Department of Education?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It would be done in a number of cases by people at the university, by teachers, by people whom CBC has had. The reading is often done by freelance people. The writing is frequently done by people at the university or teachers with knowledge, specific knowledge in that area. This is something which has been going on for years and years.

On motion 03-06, carried.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: On 03-08, this is a vote for educational television. There are a number of programmes being done here. One is the preparation for a series of programmes on Newfoundland history.

There are a whole number of them here. One is a physical education programme - fifteen minutes. There is an "ETV" programme; language, arts programmes; Shakespeare programmes and English Literature programmes. These are educational television programmes in various areas.

On motion 03-08, carried.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, 03-09, I cannot let this vote go through without some comment on it, particularly in view of the amount that is being handed over to George McLean. The amount being handed over to McLean is an identical amount to the amount voted for curriculum development in this province. Sir, that is a pitifully, measly, infinitesimal, tiny amount of money to be going to such an area. Sir, I just want to relate briefly to one of the problems that we have here in Newfoundland with respect to curriculum development. Point number one: We do not have the resources in this province to develop any kind of curricula or curriculums at the primary, elementary or secondary level in our schools. We do not have the resources. The example that I used last year is that one physics course, the PSSC Physics that is now being taught in some high schools costs, the Physical Study Science Committee in Physics spent \$12 million in one year to produce that particular physics course. That is the type of thing we are talking about when we are talking about courses of study in our schools. No longer do we think of courses of study as just textbooks. Unfortunately, this is what we are doing too often in this province. To produce a course of study in any one area is beyond the resource or the financial capacity of this province to do it.

Now, Sir, the other thing that can be done as an alternative is to bring in some of these new courses to be taught in our province such as the American Association for the Advancement of Science, elementary course. There is the Science Curriculum Improvement Study and there are sorts of chemistry study courses, physical science, etc.

I can go through all kinds of different courses in the area of science alone as well as in any of the other subject areas. The important point, Sir, is that these are excellent programmes. There is an environmental bias built into some of these programmes, particularly in the social studies and in the sciences and this sort of a thing. There is an environmental and a cultural bias built into them because they are American oriented or Mid-Western state oriented courses or something like this. There is this bias built in. Consequently, if we bring them into this province, and that seems to be the tendency nowadays in all of Canada to bring in lots of these American programmes because they are excellent programmes - the Americans went flying ahead in curriculum development after the Russians put up their Sputnik. They put out some excellent programmes. The Canadians and the British are taking over these programmes. They are doing something with them, Sir. They are taking those programmes and they are modifying them to suit their own particular environment. The cost of modification is a heck of a lot less than actually developing these courses on your own but they cost more money than in this vote of \$40,000, Sir. This is a pitiful amount. I would suggest that if we want to see the change in our educational system in this province, where it counts, that is in the classroom, in the area of curriculum and instruction, we have to have a larger expenditure of money in that particular department.

Sir, I am absolutely astounded when it comes to my attention that Mr. George McLean is going to get \$40,000 for the production of ten film strips. We only see \$45,000 in the whole of the education budget for curriculum development in this province. It is a shame. It is a strike against instruction and curriculum in our

schools and Sir, there is nothing we can do about it on this side. We cannot vote for an increase in a vote. I do not know how I can voice my objection to it other than to say that it is a pitifully small amount of money. It is a drop in the bucket. It is absolutely meaningless. It is just as well to have zero dollars in that as \$40,000. I am sincere when I say that.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out - the honourable gentleman stands up here and says this is all the department is spending on curriculum development, \$40,000. That, of course, is totally incorrect. This is a specific vote for specific projects. The committee will see that there is \$359,000 in salaries in the instruction division. That is the chief task of the people there and that is to develop curriculum for the schools in the province. One cannot equate this vote of \$40,000 which is opposite head, curriculum development, and say that that is all the money spent by the Department of Education in curriculum development. That would not be the case at all. The salaries of the people in that instruction division come to \$360,000. That is their chief responsibility. There are, of course, projects such as the one at Seal Cove which is not under this vote, where there are approximately 450 Grade IX students, from four schools in the area, taking part of their education in the vocational school. This is an example. I mentioned at the opening vote the kind of diversification of curriculum and curriculum development which is very important. Next year it is estimated that 900 people will be involved in that programme. That will also be brought to several other areas of the province as well. Certainly, it is away in excess of \$40,000 on curriculum development. This is a specific head for these specific projects such as, i.e., introducing a textbook on a trial basis, a specific textbook into one or several classes in the province. Out of this is as well the cost for evaluation

of the project at Seal Cove. While the regular vote came out of the Division of Vocational Technical Education but costs for evaluating the project, specific things in that area, it would not be right to equate that with the total work of curriculum development.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, just before this passes, I cannot help but mention the fact that one exception does not disprove the general rule that has been used in this province for curriculum development. I can say this without hesitation because I do not feel that I am being partisan in it at all. The same method of curriculum selection or construction that is going on in this province today is the same method that has been used for the last two or three hundred years in this province. That is a group of civil servants, with all due respect, Sir. They do not have the money to work with. There are civil servants down in that department, totaling \$359,000 in salary, and their basic job is to get textbooks from publishers all over Canada and the United States and Britain and they sit down there and they do nothing but select out a textbook. Now, a textbook Sir, is not a course of study. This is not an attack and I do not want it to be interpreted as one. This is not an attack on these curriculum specialists that are down in the department because they have no other choice but to do what they are doing because they do not have the money to truly carry out any kind of curriculum development in this province with that \$40,000.

There should be \$400,000. There should be a million dollars in that particular ^{1/2} division within that particular vote so that these people can do the job that they are supposed to do. That is to set up curriculum committees, professional groups of people whose responsibility it will be to look into all the various curricula in the different subject areas at the primary, elementary and secondary levels and they can modify these

courses to suit the needs of a Newfoundland student. Sir, there is no curriculum development in this province with the exception of what some school boards are doing, what some individual teachers are doing, what some individual professors at the university are trying to do and what some parents may even be trying to do. I have seen some tremendous work done by individuals in this province. Sir, the departmental setup neither under the previous administration nor the present administration has had a true blue curriculum division. I have no hesitation in saying that and I am not the least bit embarrassed. This administration was going to have a change in policy. Presumably this is one of the areas where there could have been a change in policy where you would have true blue curriculum, professional curriculum development and we do not have it. I argue strenuously against that vote that is there now.

MR. MARTIN: This is a question, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable member for St. Barbes North may have answered but I would like to put it to the honourable minister before he makes his response. I am not too familiar with the terminology employed here by educators or educationalists or whatever they may be called. It may be that I am not referring to the proper subhead but I would like the honourable minister to tell me and this committee who it is and where it is, who is the man? If we can refer to one person who is responsible for the selection of the kind of textbooks that we have foisted upon us especially in primary grades. I refer to one in particular, which we have given our children, Eskimo children, Indian children, the children of the settlers on the coast and presumably in all other areas of textbooks, relating to a family in middle class suburban America. This we have given to educate children on the coast, Indian children, Eskimo children and others who have no way at all of relating to that kind of thing.

If the honourable minister could point out to me where the salary of that person is who is responsible for foisting that kind of thing upon us, I would be most happy to move an amendment to reduce his salary.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER: (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Chairman, actually there are quite a large number of curriculum committees. All of these work under the general direction of the director of instruction who is the head of that area there. These various committees are usually comprised of teachers and frequently faculty members from the university as well. There is no one individual who decides on this text or that text.

I think that the honourable gentleman is thinking of the relevancy of texts in terms of native people of Labrador or for the settlers there too. We have been in touch with the federal government and the government of the Northwest Territories to get examples of the texts that they are using there. We are waiting for that to come in. Dr. Peacock at the university is doing some work in this area as well and I would hope that in the not too distant future certainly the Eskimo-speaking population would have the option if they wished of being educated in their native language. Obviously one of the big difficulties here is of having the teachers. However, I understand that there are some people who could do that. I would hope that in the not too distant future that this option will be available.

In terms of curriculum in general, there is certainly no one special person. There are numerous committees.

Let me refer as well to the remarks of the previous speaker when he lauded and I think quite properly the work of parents, the university and teachers in the work of curriculum development. There is no doubt that they have made very real contributions there. I think however it would be wrong for me not to point out that, civil servants though they may be, we do have people in that instruction

division who have travelled and travelled widely all over the province and who are making a real contribution. It is a very difficult area, not only in Newfoundland. The relevancy of the curriculum and the need to update and to change with change of peoples attitudes and aspirations, certainly it is a real problem here in Newfoundland but I suppose it is just as real a problem in the richest province of Canada and the richest state in the United States. It is something that is general throughout North America and persumably throughout the world.

MR. F. ROWE: I would just like to mention the fact that I hope my remarks were not interpreted in any way as attacking the work of the civil servants in this particular division. It was the actual structure of the division itself.

On motion total subhead 615 carried.

MR. F. ROWE: 616-02-05, Mr. Chairman. You know, there is no vote. Is it in order to ask a question as to what happened?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I would like to give it. This is not a decrease in any programme. Actually, what was usually voted there is now included in the vote for general grants to school boards. The same amount is still there.

On motion total subhead 616 carried.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, apparently there is a tremendous amount of concern as to the existing facilities at the School for the Deaf out there at Torbay. Sir, I would like to read into the record a copy of a letter that has been sent to me.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Sir, but the public obviously do not know it. This is the very reason that we have the House of Assembly so that the public of this province know what goes on. So, for the sake of the record and for the public of Newfoundland, I would like for them to know the contents of a letter from Mr. L.M. Cashin, president, and Mr. Bud Ozark, chairman of the

New School and Housing Programme of the Newfoundland Parents' Association, for aiding handicapped children. The letter, Sir, is addressed to the honourable Frank D. Moores, Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador. I believe all honourable members of this House of Assembly have received a copy of that letter.

"Dear Sir, our association comprised of parents and teachers of the approximately 140 deaf children attending the Newfoundland School for the Deaf is gravely concerned about the quality of the facilities and educational service available in the province for the education of the deaf and the hard of hearing.

"At our regular monthly meeting, on March 5th, it was unanimously agreed that each elected member of both provincial and federal governments be appraised of the very serious shortcomings in the present facilities and programmes available to our Newfoundland deaf children. The school located in the former RCAF temporary wartime barracks, situated dangerously close to runway twenty-six, is totally inadequate for the intended purposes and should be relocated immediately.

"In teaching deaf children it is imperative that classes be arranged so that the children be able to have a clear, undistorted view of the lip movements of the teachers. The cubicle like classrooms available do not permit a seating plan which would accomplish this. This problem is more particularly acute in the junior department where space does not provide a play area for other children while the teacher is doing individual lesson work with a child.

"In addition to the obvious safety hazard of the school's location near a busy runway, the noise of aircraft operations necessitates the removal of hearing aids and amplifiers during take off and landing, due to the excess of noise. Consider the effect of the amplification of the noise you get on take off or landing."

Sir, I might point out that it is likely that we will have

an increase of traffic at Torbay Airport within the very near future and this is likely to cause even more problems with respect to this particular paragraph which I just pointed out.

"The resident facilities can best be described as barracks and are unable to provide adequate recreational facilities for leisure time activities for the resident children of whom there are approximately 110. The location at Torbay is even more undesirable because of the isolation it imposes on top of what is an emotionally isolating handicap. The resident children have little or no chance to meet and enjoy the after-school hours with normal hearing children. Because of their handicap of deafness, it is essential that they be given an opportunity to socialize in a hearing world and not be relegated to isolation as is now the case.

"The lack of present physical facilities together with the lack of training programmes available to the teaching staff do not permit the present school to graduate a person with employable skills. The level of discontentment demonstrated by the entire teaching staff could one day result in their looking to brighter and more satisfying surroundings in which to earn a living. If this should occur, it would be disastrous as we feel that we have a very dedicated staff both in teachers and house parents."

Mr. Chairman, it would be nice to have a quorum on the other side again because this is a very important aspect.

"In our opinion it is of the utmost urgency that a new facility for the school for the deal he started immediately. In this area two avenues are possible. Either a new complete campus for the education of the deaf children and vocational training of young adults be provided or classroom space could be added to the regular schools which would provide separate

classes for the education of the deaf yet provide an opportunity for the socializing of deaf children with hearing children, through the use of common recreational facilities. With foresight in planning in the mass construction programme of schools, this approach might very well prove a solution to the current situation as it might minimize the total site requirements while providing the necessary socializing and integration with members of the hearing world.

MR. F. ROWE: With this approach, a separate residence would also be required for out of town students. Such a residence could be a single structure or perhaps a more challenging aspect would be to construct homes capable of handling say twenty children with a couple to care for their cooking and housekeeping. This could be on a basis of complete care with a cost comparable to a larger dormitory.

"The above information is only a start and we feel that you, as an elected member, having children from the district which you represent in government attending this school and staying in the residence, should make every effort to bring about changes before there is a tragic loss or accident either by fire or by aircraft.

"A copy of this letter will go to each parent and school authority in Newfoundland. We are waiting for your reply and the staff and members of the Parents Association are very anxious to hear from you and the positive steps you plan to take. We are waiting and we are ready to meet anyone or any group to discuss this programme."

Now, Sir, I do not think there is any need for me at all to amplify upon the message contained in this particular letter and this is basically more eloquently states the same arguments that I would have put up with respect to this particular vote for the Newfoundland School for the Deaf.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the School for the Deaf. There are approximately 140 students there of whom the vast majority live in residence, about 110 students would live in residence and 30 would be from St. John's or nearby and I think every area of the province is represented.

There are approximately 95 staff. Of course that is not all teachers. That is also custodial people who look after the children during play and of course maintenance and cooks and everything in

MR. OTTENHEIMER: that area. I have a copy of that letter. Indeed I believe that all members of the Legislature do. This is the Parents' Association at the School for the Deaf. It is a very sincerely felt letter and one obviously must be and indeed is treated with great respect and recognition of the sincerity therein.

Two points I would like to make: As honourable members may know, an expenditure of approximately a quarter of a million dollars on the facilities at the School for the Deaf is underway now or is about to start, I think it is underway now. This will improve the situation to a considerable extent. It will not change the locality of it obviously nor will it affect the noise but it will broaden the opportunities of the children down there.

Plans are to have included a home economics section, a craft section, woodworking, business education, photography, and additional academic classrooms, provision for four additional classrooms, each to accommodate from twelve to fifteen students.

In the residence section some worthwhile improvement will result from this expenditure, as provision for additional lounge and television room, for additional boarding facilities and for better living in facilities in general.

It would appear that the real answer here, the real answer in education for handicapped in general is that when possible and whenever possible they should be integrated as far as possible into the regular school system. Certainly, probably up until somewhat recently, the idea was of getting people with specific handicaps sort of on their own but certainly informed opinion now is that such children should be integrated with their peers, that they should attend a regular school that has necessary specific facilities and teachers and teaching techniques be used, but that they should be integrated as far as possible into the pupil community of their own age and certainly there are many areas in which they would follow

MR. OTTENHEIMER: a common curriculum and when necessary and as necessary obviously specialized attention would be provided.

To the former heading but just in passing, this has been accomplished to a very large extent in the special education classes where not every school in the province but every school board in the province does have some classes for children who are educably retarded or slow learning children. Of course, a completely different area is that of deaf children.

We have not progressed there with respect to deaf children. I understand and I believe it is for the first time, I stand open to questioning, I believe it is for the first time that this summer the university is giving a course in the teaching of deaf children. I think that is the first time.

Now the long-termed, well I hope not that long-term, one would hope that within a few years one could make strides there. The real solution is the integration of these children into the regular schools. Obviously this cannot be done until we get at least some people with the special qualifications for teaching children with a hearing handicap. But that is certainly what the real solution will be. I think now that the university has started giving courses for people who will be teaching deaf children, that should be possible in the not too distant future.

I should say as well that Newfoundland along with the other Atlantic Provinces has participated during the past number of months in a study which is culminated in what is called the Kendell Report. Dr. Kendell (I met him when he was here about six weeks ago) who is a psychologist, Nova Scotian I believe, I am not sure, and representatives of the four Atlantic Provinces have met and worked together to come up with this report which is an overview of education

MR. OTTENHEIMER: for the handicapped with particular reference to the deaf but not exclusively to the deaf. The Atlantic Provinces, and the four deputy ministers along with whatever professional assistants from their department or from their province they may need, are going to meet over the next few months to work out a common Atlantic Provinces solution to the problems.

I think that the real solution, as I said, is in the integration of deaf children into the regular school system. This should be possible in the not too distant future now that courses are going to begin in teaching techniques for the hard of hearing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I wondered about that myself and understand that last year, for no particularly identifiable reason, there was a great deal of sickness among the teaching staff, in that one or two were off on sick leave for practically the whole year and that there was a great deal of illness, and therefore double expenditures in the sense that temporary and substitute help were needed. But there is no decline in the total staff.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, just one short question and it is with reference to salaries, I notice in the vote this year something like eight odd thousand dollars over 1970-1971. Have we advanced to that stage where we have that much more staff? I am just wondering, I have the estimates for 1970-1971 here and there seems to be a considerable increase. When the member mentioned a decrease, I was just wondering what had happened in the two years.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The honourable gentleman is ahead of me, I do not have the 1970-1971 estimates. But there has been an increase in both student population and staff during that period.

MR. F. ROUE: Mr. Chairman, in view of the contents of the

MR. F. ROWE: letter that I just read to the House of Assembly, Sir, I am really extremely concerned about whether or not this is going to end up being a quarter of a million dollar mistake, I am wondering just how much consultation took place. Well let us put it this way; presumably the administration of the School for the Deaf made a request for some construction and alterations because the facilities were not adequate in that particular area.

But, Sir, in view of the contents of this particular letter and in view of the fact that this airport out there in Torbay, from what I understand, is going to increase tremendously in traffic and in the size of aircraft landing at that airport in the next few months, I am really concerned about whether or not this particular institution, sitting out there under one of these runways, and now this additional expenditure; I do not suppose I will ever stand in this House again and question the expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars in some institution of education.

I am seriously wondering whether this is not going to end up being a quarter of a million dollar mistake and whether a physical start cannot be made in some other area of St. John's or the province for that matter. Well St. John's obviously, being close to the university and this sort of thing and government and the centre of things, it is a logical location. But at the airport, Sir, I am wondering if some other temporary accommodation could not be found and if any new capital works go into a school for the deaf, that it be made from a clean start in a more desirable location, closer to other children and other normal people with respect to hearing capacity and certainly away from a great developing airport that is likely, from what I can understand, to become an international airport in the near future.

MR. F. ROWE: I am wondering about the wisdom of really going ahead with this. I do not suppose I will ever stand in this House again and ask that type of a question.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that there is any fear there that this money will be wasted.

MR. F. ROWE: I do not mean wasted.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Even when deaf children are integrated as far as possible into the regular school system, there will be need for special facilities and certainly the facilities which will be there will continue to be of need and value.

The safety factor from being near the airport, I can see where people might think it is not a good place for a school but I suppose the schools in Gander, they must have planes flying pretty close to go over them just about all day, and other schools in St. John's, I would presume in Stephenville, a lot of schools are on the flight path. You are probably safer there than you would be riding in a good many cars or busses.

MR. F. ROWE: I go along with that.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: So I think that there will continue for quite some time to be a need for services and facilities there and even as children would be integrated into the regular school system, I think that the equipment and facilities there would continue to be of benefit, especially such things as, if you wish general, vocational and industrial facilities which would be there which unfortunately are not in all of our day schools by any means, even in St. John's.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would almost - when do you expect this integration to take place? Is there any time or any indication when this integration of these children is likely to take place?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I would think it would be a few years, given that this is the first year that there is a course going on in

MR. OTTENHEIMER: the education of deaf children, it would probably be say three years.

MR. F. ROWE: I am sorry, I apologize to the House, that I really have not given this the consideration that I think it warrants. But I would almost like to see, with the building of a new DREE school for instance, it just flashed through my mind and I really have not given it any great consideration, with one of the newly constructed schools in the city for instance, it might be an idea to consider putting a wing on that school that could take in that particular kind of equipment that these children would use and then you could phrase in your integration that way.

I just have a general concern about the location of that and the expenditure going into it. I will let it go at that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKEY: (17-01) I would like to make a couple of brief comments. This school is in the middle of my district and I think a couple of things should be pointed out.

I agree with the honourable member for St. Barbe North that the question of the location is one that comes to mind in terms of further expenditure. However, I hasten to point out that the conditions in the School for the Deaf today are a far cry from what they have been. For five years, while I sat in opposition with my colleagues, we continuously pointed out the need for improvements, such basic improvements as fire protection. All to no avail, Mr. Chairman, until this past year have we been able to get the Department of Transport to change the hours of the fire station at Torbay Airport, so as to provide some necessary protection for those children.

I suppose

it is hard to understand that while conditions were much worse than they are going to be now when we find an expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars, certain points are being raised as to whether or not it should be spent, While I agree with my friend for St. Barbe North, it is a pretty big question as to the location of the school. There are probably some questions to be asked as to the general atmosphere and environment of that area as regards to a school but it should also be pointed out that there already has been an expenditure in setting it up. As my colleague the minister has pointed out, the real answer to the problem is to have them in the regular school system.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the important thing that is happening now is that the necessary attention is being paid to the School for the Deaf. As the minister says, we can get most of those children or a fair percentage of those children into the regular school system and over a period of time the facility maybe might be phased out as a school for the deaf as such. But I would hesitate to question the expenditure that is in the estimates for the coming year unless we have another location for them to go into because the conditions that have existed there in the past certainly leave much to be desired, I for one who attempted to convince the former administration for five years to provide even adequate fire protection for those children. I am very pleased and happy to see that the fire problem has been solved and indeed to see an expenditure as regards to this institution take place in the coming year.

On motion 617-02-01 through 717-02-06 carried.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: 617-02-07 - Recreation, I am meeting great resistance from my colleagues I must say. The vote here Recreation, \$1000. could be misleading. This is an additional vote, This does not mean that it is only \$1,000, if you wish, worth of recreation at the school. That is not the case. That is for special projects whereby the children would be taken by bus perhaps to a concert or

figure skating or to the stadium or that type of thing. It does not mean that in the total vote there only \$1,000 is for recreation.

On motion 617-02-07 through 617-09-08 carried.

On motion total subhead 617 carried.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, before we move on to the next heading, the committee will recall that yesterday on 601-02-01 - Travelling, I undertook to give the opposition the breakdown of the \$5,000 in the revised estimates and I have done that. The first portion is my own, because obviously there are two ministers, so this covers two people. Mind actually and this information was already before the House in an answer I tabled earlier in the session, that is the travelling for me outside of Canada, \$1,312.50 and travelling in the province, \$160. This is since mid-December. That total there is \$1,472.50. The remaining, and this is for the honourable member for St. John's North, when he was Minister of Education, his visit to the Soviet Union \$1,695.70; travelling in the province \$556.60 and travelling of his executive assistant in the province \$915.22. The total there, \$3,167.52. The total of both, \$4,640.02.

MR. NEARY: Where did the minister travel outside of the province? Would he give us the details and the purpose of the travelling?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It has been tabled in the House. Yes, one trip to the United Kingdom in late January.

MR. NEARY: What was the purpose of the trip?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: As a member of the cabinet committee the Premier and two other -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now the honourable gentleman is asking a question which has already been tabled. I do not mind repeating the answer but not to have a commentary on it. Accompany the Premier and two other members of cabinet for the negotiations with ECGD.

MR. NEARY: To crack the bottle of champagne on the "Frank D. Moores."

MR. OTTENHEIMER: On the honourable gentleman's head.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 601-02-01 carry?

On motion 601-02-01 carried.

On motion total subhead 601 carried.

Shall 618-01 carry?

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, would the honourable minister inform the committee is there any money in here for the federation of school boards? Is that under a different subhead?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, there has not been any grant to the Federation of School Boards, actually that is an organization formed within the past twelve months and not a year yet I do not think. To the best of my knowledge we have not received any request for an annual grant. I would presume that they are helped out to through the school boards and obviously a lot of money goes to the school boards. But there is no grant. This here is of course entirely to the denominational educational committees and is essentially there salaries, that is what it is apart from the regular expenses. But there is no vote to the Federation of School Boards.

MR. WOODWARD: I do not see how the federation is getting their funds and how is the funding done.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It is supported by the various school boards of which they are in fact the federation. Now whether internally they assess each board so much get a voluntary contribution I do not know because it is internal. They are not parts of the department, we are in fairly close touch with them because naturally our constituency of interest coincides. But I presume they get so much from each board of which they are the official spokesmen. I would presume.

MR. ROUF, M.N.: I notice, Mr. Chairman, there is no salary breakdown in the salary estimates. Could the minister give us some ideas to what the people involved are making in the run of the year?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Their names.

MR. ROUF, M.N.: No, no not their names. The position and the salary

attached thereto.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There are three leading salaries here and they would be at the assistant deputy minister levels. They would be the three denominational educational secretaries, the Roman Catholic, the Integrated and Pentecostal and the rest would be their assistants and their clerical and stenographic people. I think it would be approximately twelve people there. The three major people their salary scale corresponds to an assistant deputy minister. They are all church appointments too. Of course the three DEC's are church appointments.

MR. WOODWARD: Could the honourable minister inform the committee what relationship does the Federation of School Boards have with the Denominational Educational Committee.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: They are separate organizations. The Denominational Educational Committees, because there are three of them, are the official appointees of the churches, the Roman Catholic Church, the Pentecostal Assemblies and the Integrated School representing the Anglican, United and the Salvation Army. They are appointees of the church. However the state pays their salaries, makes an allocation for travelling, office expenses and office rental. So they are appointees of the church, but financially maintained by the state, this resulted after some years ago when the system of having superintendants was changed and this is its substitute.

Now the Newfoundland Federation of School Boards is an organization representing all of the school boards in the province. The school boards meeting annually and presumably, it was only formed less than one year ago, will elect their officers annually, but they are not appointees of the church or of the government but the officers are elected by the school boards themselves. I presume they are financed through assessments to the school boards or contributions from the school boards. But they are separate entities, the DEC's being appointees of the church, whose salaries and expenses are paid

by the state. The other is a regular, voluntary organization not a statutory organization, it voted itself into existence less than one year ago or it could vote itself out or amend its constitution or any number of things. But the DEC's are statutory bodies created by law.

On motion 618-01 carried.

On motion 02-01 through 02-03 carried.

On motion total subhead 618 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall subhead 620 carry?

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the honourable the House Leader is twitching in his seat over there in the length of this debate, this is what the House of Assembly is for to find out what the money is being spent for. It is a large sum of money.

However, Sir, I am prepared myself being the person responsible, the spokesman for education on this side of the House. I am prepared not to spend any great length of time on the College of Trades and Technology nor the Vocational Training nor the College of Fisheries vote here tonight, obviously there will be the odd question to be asked, and my honourable colleagues on this side may have some questions to ask as well. The reason I say this, Sir, is because I do have a private member's bill that covers roughly the same type of a topic and it would be redundant of me to spend any great amount of time speaking to these particular votes tonight.

However, Sir, in doing so I would like to solicit the co-operation of the honourable House Leader on the other side and get some assurance from him that tomorrow we will not have the honourable Minister of Finance spending two hours or one and a-half hours answering questions that he could quite easily table. That is the only proviso that I would like, to seek this assurance from the honourable House Leader in this regard. I think that is a reasonable thing to ask Sir, or else we can go on for the next four or five hours on these three votes alone.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two questions that I want to ask the minister under this heading, Sir, before we pass over. It is quite a substantial amount of money \$3,190,000.

Technical training, Sir, is becoming big business in this province, and rightly so, in my opinion. I think the College of Trades and Technology generally speaking are doing a pretty fair job of it. I think that the graduates of the College of Trades and Technology have a better chance today for securing employment than even the graduates of Memorial University because there is a demand for technicians. I would say that if anything the trend today is towards vocational and technical training.

Now it is unfortunate, Sir, that the facilities over at the College of Trades and Technology are rather limited at the present time. The building is bulging at the seams, Sir. They just do not have enough room over there. Either the College of Trades and Technology has to be expanded --

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member --

MR. NEARY: I am getting paranoid, Mr. Chairman, Your Honour has come down on me like a ton of bricks so often here lately I am getting paranoid. I thought the Chairman was talking to me.

So, Mr. Chairman, the building, the facilities either have to be expanded or the government are going to have to consider constructing a new College of Trades and Technology or, as I said last year in

this debate, either build a polytechnic that we have heard so much about in the last couple of years. I think we even had the site selected up here on top of the hill, up on the Ridge Road. So I would like to find out from the minister just how close we are to getting that polytechnical institute in this province.

Another thing I want to say about the College of Trades, Sir, that the students at the College of Trades and Technology are going to be awfully, awfully disappointed to find out that they are not going to get their dormitory this year. There was a promise made two or three years ago to provide a dormitory or an hostel for students at the College of Trades and Technology to accommodate some of the students that are attending the college from outside St. John's. This promise, Mr. Chairman, has not been kept. I hope I will not be accused of trying to incite a riot when I say that before too long, Sir, you will have several hundred if not several thousand students from the College of Trades and Technology out in front of this building demonstrating. I will carry a plaque card if they want me to, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: If they invite me to address them, I shall be quite happy to do so, Sir, and then the member for Labrador South might have good reason for accusing the member of the opposition of trying to incite a riot. But, Sir, it is a very serious matter. I think the property has been purchased, if I am not mistaken, down here by Holiday Inn, to put up this dormitory and the students will be awfully disappointed to discover that not even a start is going to be made on it this year. I would like to hear the minister's comments on this.

I would also like for the minister to tell us while he is on his feet if the College of Trades and Technology now has its full complement on the Board of Directors and just who the president and the Board of Directors are. I understand that some were

replaced last year but there maybe one or two vacancies there now

I would like to find out from the minister, if there are vacancies, when he intends to fill these vacancies. So apart from that, Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say. I would like to get the minister's comments on some of these points.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I will just give a few basic facts and then comment on the matters brought up the honourable gentleman. There are at present 1,344 full-time students at the College of Trades and Technology and approximately 1,500 students in the evening programmes. Of the 1,344 full-time students 598 are in pre-employment courses of up to one year and 746 in post-secondary courses usually of two and three years duration. There are 255 manpower students in the pre-employment courses. The honourable gentleman asked whether the facility was used to its capacity. I would say in general, yes.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I understood that was the honourable gentleman's question.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, what I said was that the building is bursting at the seams and cannot handle all the students they have over there now. Enrollment is restricted, as I understand it. They just cannot take any more full-time students and I think this is a shame.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There is no doubt that in time, as soon as one can, as soon as the government financially can, one of two things will be necessary, I think. Either that college becomes a post-secondary College of Technology and we will need another facility for vocational education and training below the post-secondary, which would also be available for high school students in the area or that building. Those facilities would contain the latter and we build the other. Certainly there is a need. Now I do think that certainly for the next year and perhaps two

years there is a possibility of maximizing the use of that building further and not by putting in more students but by using a regular three semester year.

MR. NEARY: I am all for it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now during the summer months there are some courses on. The place is not abandoned and left and nobody there as there are some courses on. It is planned this year to have an increased programme there during the summer. Now there were discussions between the College of Trades and Technology people and the IOC, sometime ago, for training programmes which they required and this is going to go on during the summer. I do not have the details on that because I think those conversations were only held quite recently. But it can be maximized further and we should be able to get a regular three semester use out of the building and facilities.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister permit a question? Could not the same thing be said about the other schools, the vocational schools and the university they could operate under the tri-semester system?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The university is doing this already but certainly it would appear for vocational schools and for all of these facilities that the three semester system should be used. In theory you would get a third more use but even if it worked out to be a fourth or a fifth, if it worked out to be twenty-five or twenty per cent it would still be very worthwhile.

Now the couple of matters mentioned by the honourable gentleman on the residence. A residence has been talked about and indeed planned and there are preliminary designs. I would certainly hope that next year we will be able to make a definite start there. Part of the problem and I do not think it is solved yet, has been with the City Council. The zoning regulations or whatever it happens to be of getting permission for a residence, a college residence in that area or on that land which is available there.

That has been part of the problem. There is no doubt that residence facilities would be a great asset in that quite a number of students at this and other institutions have problems finding suitable accommodations.

MR. EARLE: Just on the question of the residence, I can offer some further information which might be of interest to the committee. The whole question of the residence for the students at the College of Trades and Technology came down to something in the nature of a promise at one stage of the game before this government took office and there was a preliminary plan drawn up and I stress that it was only a preliminary plan which cost us \$45,000 to \$50,000 to pay for that plan. The land was to be purchased and it has not been purchased yet for the simple reason that the City Council of St. John's would not agree to the location, as to whether or not it was suitable, and there has been a dispute on between my department and the City Council over that and it is not settled yet.

The other point, which is a very valid one, is that we have found that a number of buildings that were accepted on a strictly preliminary plan basis and were proceeded with on that basis, that the cost has escalated beyond all belief and in some cases one hundred to one hundred and fifty per cent higher than the building should have cost. I guarantee the committee that as long as I have anything to do with buildings, through the Department of Public Works, we will not in future be proceeding on these extemporary plans. The whole system of drawing preliminary plans for a building then going out to tender just to meet an expediency has cost this country at a rough estimate about \$10 million. In future work will not be done that way. This residence is a prime example of what was intended, but fortunately it could not be carried out.

MR. NIARY: The Minister of Public Works of course is carrying on his

usual display of moaning and groaning, Sir. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that this residence should be started this year. Sir, the College of Trades and Technology in my opinion is the shining star in our education crown in this province at the present time.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yes, I mentioned the polytechnic and the honourable member must have been out of the House. Sir, I do not think that the government should be satisfied to just coast along on its laurels, to rest on its oars, because there is a big demand for technicians today, Sir. This is where the employment opportunities are. What I am afraid of, Mr. Chairman, is that the government are just going to sit back and do nothing about expanding the facilities of the College of Trades and Technology or as the minister said in a sort of a backhanded way, as if he were almost afraid to say it, the Minister of Finance is not in the House so the Minister of Education can say what he likes tonight. He might have to account for it in the morning but the Minister of Finance is not in the House tonight and he made the statement as if he were in deadly fear, He looked at his colleagues you know, trembling. The Minister of Education should be prepared to annunciate policy in this House on technical and vocational training without fear from anybody. It is one of the most important forms of training that we have in this province at the present time, Sir.

I would like to know and I would like for the minister to tell me now what the policy of his government is going to be on expanding that - I do not know if the College of Trades and Technology over here can be expanded now or not, Sir, because there are all kinds of portable classrooms over there now and I do not know if there is room over there to stick up any more portable classrooms. Maybe what we need, Sir, is a new institution, a polytechnic. The minister did not answer me when I asked how close are we to getting this. I think the previous administration

had plans to abandon the College of Trades and Technology as we know it today and we even selected a site, Sir, up here on the Ridge Road. I think the Premier and the deputy Minister of Public Works and several officials of the government and from the College of Trades and Technology went up, walked over the site, one of the most beautiful scenic sites I suppose left in the City of St. John's right up here on the side of the hill overlooking Long Pond, looking down on the university campus, A beautiful place for it, Sir, and yet the minister shies away from it when I ask him how close we are to getting this. It is badly needed, Sir, and we cannot waste too much time on it as we have wasted enough time already. Students are crying to get in to the College of Trades and Technology and enrollment has to be restricted at the present time.

I would also like to know from the minister what new courses are going on in the College of Trades and Technology next year. I do not want the Minister of Education to just brush this off lightly, Sir. I want to find out what plans the government have. My colleague here said he was satisfied to let it go through without lengthy debate, well, Sir, the debate will depend on the information that we can get from the Minister of Education. Could the Minister of Education give us a little more information? Maybe when he stands up to answer some of the questions that I have put to him he may satisfy me and I may just sit back and let it go through. So, Sir, I am not going to be satisfied by having the minister stand up and just brush it off, make a statement as if he is in fear of his colleagues when he makes it. It is too important a matter, Sir, to do that.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, it so happens I am not quite sure I can get up. However they are not worried about that, the honourable gentleman on the opposite side. I think I made it quite clear that maximum use of that facility should be used and this will require a three semester course. While it has been used in the summers,

the three semester system has not been utilized as far as possible.

With respect to new facilities, Mr. Chairman, I think it is obvious that the government did appoint a very competent committee to advise on matters of human resource development and the personnel of that committee are known to honourable gentlemen here; Les Harris, Ken Duggan, Ray Barrett, Mr. Bill May, John Acreman, Mr. Gill Pike, Mr. Alex Henley and Mrs. Pratt. We expect to have their report at the end of August. They are looking into one of the areas which is taking up a great deal of their time and this area is an examination of present vocational, technical and post-secondary and continuing education facilities in the province, with recommendations for their improvement. For the government three and a-half months before these people are to make their report, for government to make announcements in this area is more or less like saying, "Well gentlemen, we do not need your report. We just asked you to get this stuff together for something to do." It would not be much sense having these people who are knowledgeable and experienced in this to have them analyse the present situation and to make recommendations to government if we were going to preclude their possible recommendations by stating now what we are going to do. That is one of the important areas they are looking into

and that is the whole training in the area of technology.

Now if the honourable gentleman wish to know what courses, they are multitudinous. If I were to read out the list - I will give some indication perhaps as I do not think the honourable gentleman wants to know all of them. They are general clerical and accounting and typing -

AN HON. MEMBER: The member asked what new courses, Mr. Chairman.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can undertake to find out what courses will be offered next year that were not offered this year. I can undertake to find that out but the list I have is the list of courses being offered this present year but whether they would correspond exactly with the courses that are offered next year I would not know. To a large extent it would depend upon enrollment and whether next year there are to be courses which were not here this year. I do not know and to a large extent that would depend upon demand and if the select committee comes in with the recommendation for denturists I suppose there might be something in dental technology there. To a very large extent it depends on demand and on employment opportunities and on what people wish. Certainly I know of no cases where there have been a sufficient number of people to run a class where that class has not been put on unless indeed it has been impossible to find an instructor. But the college is there basically to serve the people and where there is a need and a demand then the course is offered.

Now there is one other matter. The honourable gentleman mentioned about the Board of Governors actually tabled about a week or two ago, the complete list of the Board of Governors of the College of Trades and Technology. There were three recent appointments to fill vacancies. The three were Mr. John Green, Mr. Newman Kelland and Dr. Les Harris, and they were to fill vacancies but the complete composition of the board was tabled a couple of weeks ago.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, I listened with some interest to the minister when he went on about this committee, high powered committee on human resources or something, education and human resource development and how it would be premature to make any announcement concerning anything affecting education until we got that committee report, yet the Premier of the province succumbing to political pressure does not hesitate to go out in Corner Brook and say they are going to slap up a regional college there and then, because of political pressure from Stephenville, they are going to put up a community college there. So I would submit, Sir, that the honourable minister's argument concerning this committee can hold no water at all. It is just an untenable argument.

Sir, when the last DREE agreement, second DREE agreement, was signed in August of a year and eight months ago, there was a commitment by Ottawa to do certain things. One of the commitments made by Ottawa then, by DREE, was to look into, size up the situation with a view to advancing monies to this province to put in a polytechnical institution. There was no commitment by the Government of Canada to say a polytechnical institution will be going up in Newfoundland, no commitment like that and I would not be telling the truth if I said there was. What they did say was that they looked favourably, and I am paraphrasing what was said as I do not have the agreement before me, on this type of institution and they would welcome studies and investigations and what not from the provincial government to see whether it was something which the federal government would, could or should support financially. Now a year and eight months have gone by and still we hear talk from the honourable minister about a committee on human resource development.

I would submit, Sir, that if this government were really interested in pushing that kind of a much-needed development in the province, they could have had their facts and their figures

together by now and they could have pressed on Ottawa the need for such an institution and Ottawa would by now have given its okay or its veto to their participating financially in such an institution. This government has lagged behind, it has dragged its heels as far as pressing Ottawa on this is concerned. Expenditures by Ottawa for job-producing training and training people in skills which are going to bring them high incomes is always very palatable to Ottawa and I am sure that this type of an institution would be very high on their list of priorities.

The minister said that they cannot do anything until they get this committee report. But since they have already done something with regard to higher education, secondary education, in the field of regional college development and community college development, there is no reason whatsoever, except the lack of interest or aggressiveness on the part of the government. There is no reason whatsoever why they could not have made a similar decision with regard to a polytechnical institution and have pressed Ottawa, pressed DREE to get some financial commitments from them. A year and eight months is long enough to do the work leading up to such a commitment. A year and eight months is more than enough lead time to get together the plans. I am sure the Department of Education probably has already draft plans for such a development, that could be easily put together by a number of experts in months not to mention a year and eight months.

So what the minister has said really can hold no water, Sir. It can only stand as another example of the government not pressing to the fullest the advantages that we have in this province with regard to the federal government. A minister in Ottawa who is a Newfoundlander, Minister of DREE, a man who although he will not go out of his way to discriminate against other parts of Canada in favour of Newfoundland, will certainly bend over backwards to do what he can for his native province within the rules and regulations and within the discretion which he has

as minister. I do not think that this government has shown any tendenancy at all to press that advantage home. I think we could have had a commitment from Ottawa by this time. I do not think it had to wait until a third DREE agreement as such, if it going to take two or three years to get a third DREE agreement, I think it could have been included in the last amendment announced by Mr. Jamieson. I think that in any event a third DREE agreement should have been signed long before now. It was the intention of the governments' concerned to make it a yearly sort of thing, a yearly fresh commitment, a new agreement and we should have had in the third agreement, eight months ago we should have had a commitment from Ottawa on a polytechnical institution. I think they would have gone along with it. They gave every indication in the second agreement that this was the type of field that they would be interested in supporting financially in this province and I think that this present administration stands condemned for lack of aggressiveness, lack of interest in that field and lack of incentive in taking advantage of the great advantages we have in Ottawa at this moment with our own minister there and with the department, with DREE, which is willing and able to put money into education.

We have seen what they have done in the field of high school education and elementary school education. They have made a pretty good commitment in this new amendment. I am certain, Sir, that if they had been pressed a little more by this government with plans, good thinking and good programmes if those had been presented to the federal government and DREE we would probably by now have a commitment for this type of institution which my honourable friend has already mentioned.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, the remarks the honourable gentleman just passed on and the honourable member for Bell Island, knowing the facts of this thing, would really make a horse laugh. Let me

tell the committee the true story of this polytechnic. In 1966 I was the minister who went up on Nagles Hill with the former Premier and selected the site for the new polytechnical institute up there. Actually I cannot claim credit for the name polytechnical because that was thought up and suggested by the late Phil Henley who was deputy Minister of Education at the time. I was a lovely sounding word but if you crossed the former Premier he could roll it off his tongue, polytechnic. This sounded like a polytechnic institute and it was announced that it was going to be built, 1966. This government is accused of dragging its heels after eight months because it did not get the necessary grant from Ottawa.

In 1966 this project was suggested and the Premier of the day went for it and went all out to get it going and said that he would promote it. That is eight years ago and there is nothing up on Nagles Hill yet and this government has been expected in eight months to do what the former government could not do in eight years.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the honourable minister is aware of it or not but polytechnical is a term that is used all over the world. There are polytechnical institutes all over the world. It is not something the former Premier dreamed up, Sir, and this crowd over there had longer than eight months, Sir, to take a decision. They have had fourteen months, going on fifteen months, Mr. Chairman. My honourable colleague here is absolutely right, Sir, the government has dragged its heels on this matter. This crowd are so bogged down, Sir, in committees that the whole province is grinding to a halt, from one committee after another, layers upon layers of committees. This is the first I ever heard of a resource development committee. I was trying to drag some information out of the minister and finally he got up and read out a list of names. I would like

the minister to read these names a little more slowly to me. Would the minister give me these names again until I find out how many representatives of the trade union movement are on that resource committee and how many representatives of business and industry are on the committee. Would the minister give me the names again?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Well, let us hear them.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The members of the committee do not represent every group of interest in the province. The committee is made up of - The names are Dr. Leslie Harris, Mr. Ken Duggan, Dr. Ray Barrett, Mr. John Acreman, Mr. Gill Pike, Mrs. Mary Pratt and Mr. Alec Henley.

MR. MARSHALL: That is the third time that has been given, I think.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I think it is the third time, yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, and they may have to read it a fourth time and a fifth time and a sixth time before we are finished. Not one of these honourable gentlemen, Sir, or ladies have any background at all to advise this government on vocational or technical training. A couple of them are academics, one is an insurance salesman who would be more interested in becoming mayor of the city I would assume than building a polytechnic in this province, backed by the honourable member for St. John's North.

Sir, I would submit that if this is what the government is waiting for, recommendations from this resource development committee, so-called, fancy grandiose name they have on it, if this is what they are waiting for, Sir, I would submit that there should be representatives of the trade union movement and business and industry. Not one of the people the honourable minister named has any background at all, Sir, in business and industry or in the trade union movement in this province, and that is a grave mistake in my opinion. The trade union movement and industry are the people who are more closely associated with vocational training and technical training than anybody else, than the academics or any

of the people that the minister has named on that list that he just read out there. I do not know if it is too late, Mr. Chairman, but I would strongly recommend to the minister that he consider inviting representatives of business, industry and labour to sit in on that committee. The minister said they were going to report -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: What business?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Business, yes put a businessman on there. These are the employers, these are the people of business and industry who will be employing the graduates of that college as well as the vocational schools. I would say it is very important as these are the people that we have to take our advice and our guidance from, Sir. It is not too late, as the minister said that the committee would be reporting before the end of August. Well, I hope that statement is correct, Sir, and I will be one in this province who will be anxiously awaiting the report of the committee. But I think the minister still has time to invite representatives of business and industry and labour to sit in on that committee and take advantage of their experience and their advice. I hope, Sir, that before the next school year commences at the College of Trades that the government will have taken a decision, at least before this House meets again,

to either expand the facilities over here, which I am against, or to build a new institute. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I see that the government are not capable of making decisions themselves, the province is being governed now by committees and subcommittees, with all kinds of fancy names. They have abdicated their authority, Sir. They have put themselves in the hands of the academics and in the hands of committees.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I am not suggesting committees. When I suggest committees I am talking about committees of the House, select committees. We should be dealing with more in committees in the House.

MR. BARRY: What are the royal commissions you are talking about?

MR. NEARY: What royal commissions?

MR. BARRY: The hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to one today.

MR. NEARY: The only commissions of enquiry that we do know anything about are the witch hunts that are being carried out by that crowd since they assumed office in this province. These are the only enquiries we know anything about, Sir. The witch hunts are going to backfire in their faces. What I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the government should also consider a branch of the College of Trades and Technology on the West Coast of this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: In Labrador.

MR. NEARY: No, not Labrador, Sir. They have a vocational school now in Happy Valley. The Premier announced it, despite this committee on resource development, despite the Premier's announcing a regional college and a community college. He has also indicated to the people of Labrador West that they are going to get a vocational school down there. This is just an excuse, Sir. It is a feeble excuse that we are hearing from the minister; we have to wait for the report of this resource

development committee. The minister knows that. The Premier was down there recently, I think trying to endear himself to the constituents. The voters in Labrador West were promised a vocational school. I would seriously recommend to the minister, Sir, that his government give very serious consideration to expanding a branch of the College of Trades and Technology on the West Coast. I am not going to be foolhardy enough to pick the place where I think it should be located. The Premier got himself in hot water doing that. I think it would be a good idea. As a matter of fact, Sir, I would think it would be far better and far more useful to this province if a branch of the College of Trades and Technology were established on the West Coast of this province instead of a regional college and a community college. We have vocational schools. I want to go a step above that. I want to get into technical training. I would like to commend this to the honourable minister. I would like to find out his views.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: What was that? I would like to find out the honourable minister's views on this proposal; if he thinks it worth-while or if it is just foolishness on my part. The minister should know by now and I think he does, that the most important training programme going ahead in this province today, Sir, is vocational and technical training, where graduates are almost assured of employment. I do not know about one hundred per cent, Sir, but I would say ninety-nine point nine per cent assured of employment. There is a good record I understand, a good history of graduates of the vocational schools and the College of Trades and Technology being able to find employment. It is not so, Sir, for the graduates of the university. So, if the government have put themselves in the hands of this bureaucratic setup that they have now, Sir, I would like to ask the minister to consider adding to that committee

getting the expertise that is necessary to advise the minister and the government and not to pussyfoot around with a crowd of political hangers-on.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, may I have a word in response. The committee that has been announced by the honourable minister who has been working in this human resource and educational study have a great deal of expertise. I realize that it is not the kind of expertise that would appeal to honourable members across the House. They are not political hacks. Dr. Leslie Harris, I would like to hear of a more competent educationalist in this province, with a better background, fortunate enough to grow up in Placentia Bay -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not an educationalist.

MR. HICKMAN: He is not? Dr. Leslie Harris is not an educationalist? No?

MR. ROWE (F.B.): He is an historian.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, Dr. Raymond Barrett had the very good fortune to grow up in Old Perlican, to be a fisherman, to have a working knowledge of the fishing industry. Does he have any expertise to give this committee? None, a political hack? Mr. Duggan, an engineer, the principal of the college over here, does he have any expertise? None? Mr. Bill May, does he have any expertise? No?

Mr. Chairman, this government announced, when it assumed office and before, that we as a government would seek the advice and that we would consult with Newfoundlanders who were prepared and who had the capability and the willingness to advise government on particular sectors of this province and on sectors of this economy. This we have done. We have been awfully fortunate to be able to attract these people, these men and Mrs. Pratt, with their capabilities to do this work. I become very concerned when I listen to this kind of debate and comment on their work when we realize that they are doing

this work for nothing. Dr. Harris is seconded to the Department of Education and with the exception of Dr. Harris, all of the rest of them are doing this work free of charge to this province.

MR. ROBERTS: They are all on salary.

MR. HICKMAN: Of course, they are on salary but they are doing it over and above their normal duties which they are performing very well indeed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, they too have called for and I have no doubt that they are receiving representations from any interested party, be it industry, be it the employers, be it the trade unions, be it anyone else, this committee have asked for their input and their ideas before they make their final recommendations. I think that this committee and I think that this House should commend the hon. Minister of Education over his good fortune in being able to look to these people, with their expertise, with their knowledge, to try and give us as a government and to give the minister as a minister a new input and a new approach to the whole concept of education.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been talk about the polytech. I am speaking from memory and I am sure I will be corrected if I am wrong in this. In 1966 or late 1965, the concept of the polytech was first approached. My recollection is that the cost at that time was estimated at \$30 million which was a fair hunk of change then and I assume that at that time it was beyond our financial reach. That was in 1966. The DREE Agreement that the hon. member for White Bay South refers to, I do not recollect any reference to a polytech being in it. I do recall seeing in the agreement a provision for a study to be carried on with a view to establishing an adult education centre in this province. I have checked with the deputy minister and he has not seen it either. I am not saying that it is not there. Be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, I

would suggest that government are being very prudent in waiting for the report of this committee. I would suggest too, Mr. Chairman, that anyone who has had any dealings with the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion in the field of education, if they feel that the work can be done and accomplished quickly, they are in for a pretty rude awakening. I was involved in an experience in November that was almost unbelievable but was absolutely correct. I cite it. I think it is relevant to this debate because the question of the DREE involvement, the haste and push on the part of this administration has been questioned.

In the second DREE Agreement there was provision for a plan for a high school in the Town of Mount Pearl. That agreement was signed I think - I have forgotten when it was. It was at least a year from November past if not before.

AN HON. MEMBER: August of 1971.

MR. HICKMAN: August, 1971 .

The first step the joint planning committee insisted that be followed was to decide on the architect for the new school at Mount Pearl. The recommendation of the school board was that they would use the same architect who had been engaged and who had successfully planned, built and supervised the construction of MacDonald Junior High. It had to go through the joint planning committee, through another joint committee, Department of Education and the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion. Now, Mr. Chairman, remember this: The education specifications for the junior high school at Mount Pearl were to be identical, absolutely identical with the one at MacDonald Drive. When I was (Acting) Minister of Education in October, the consolidated school board came to me and they were very critical, not of this administration nor not of the

Provincial Department of Education, of the fact that it had taken from the time that agreement was signed in August to November of last year to get approval to use the same architects who built MacDonald Junior High. It is a fairy story. You would hardly believe that it could happen. Now this is the snail's pace of this whole administrative programme of going through joint planning committees instead of going to the line departments as had been done a few years ago. That is what you run into.

Then, Mr. Chairman, they indicated to us, the DREE people, with their great anxiety to rush the money in, as to what they called the time-frame for the approval of the plan (remember they are identical plans with the other school) was to be exactly twelve months. I took it on myself to sign some sort of a decree that the plans of MacDonald Junior High were to be taken and used as is. That has now, I am told, been accepted. Some raised eyebrows! There was great concern in Ottawa because the sun-load on the west wing is not identical with the sun load - sun-load is a new phrase which is emanating from -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: The sun load, the strength of the sun-during a particular time during the day on the west corner is going to be a little too intense as compared with the sun-load on the MacDonald Junior High School. We have yet to get a report from the fog factory.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the point I am trying to make is this, that I think it is to the credit of not only this administration but also to the credit of the new Minister of Regional and Economic Expansion, who accepted the suggestion from this government that the approach of joint planning committees going through one department and excluding the line departments was having a disastrous effect on the input of federal funds into this province. Today we now have an undertaking that

the line departments, if it is education, the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion will deal with the Deputy Minister of Education and the others in the educational field. This is good. This is going to save some time. They know what they are talking about. If honourable members will look back to the days of the Atlantic Development Board, when the Department of Highways could deal direct, they would see a great deal more speed in that field than we see now.

Mr. Chairman, what brought me to my feet was what I thought was the responsibility on the government to make clear to these very, very capable Newfoundlanders that we have a great deal of appreciation for the work they are doing for this province and that we as a government are most grateful indeed for their performance to date and they should not accept anything that has been said here today as any indication of anything but gratitude for their work.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the self-righteous, sanctimonious Minister of Justice, Sir, has stooped to his usual low level of debate in this honourable House, Sir. No wonder the honourable minister looks Heavenward and rolls his eyes and asks forgiveness for being so hypocritical. Sir, the honourable minister knows full well what I said and in case he does not know what I said, I will repeat it for him. Dr. Barrett, Sir, one of the gentlemen the honourable minister named, is a very fine and admirable gentleman, an

MR. NEARY: honourable gentleman, well qualified for what he is doing, Sir - no question about that, I have the greatest regard for him and the highest respect for the man and I consider him as a personal friend.

Dr. Leslie Harris, Sir, is an academic, well qualified for what he is doing. Who was the other?

AN HON. MEMBER: Ken Duggan.

MR. NEARY: Ken Duggan, granted, I will concede that Ken Duggan is an expert in that field.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us about Alec Henley.

MR. NEARY: Now then, that does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that all these gentlemen are experts in the task which they have been given, namely to advise the government on all aspects of post-secondary education.

I claimed in my remarks, Sir, that the government were ill advised not to have a representative of business, labour and industry on that committee. Instead, Mr. Chairman, when they had a chance to expand the committee, which may or may not have been a good one, depending on your vantage point, when they had the opportunity to expand that committee, instead of picking somebody whose experience they could draw on, whose expertise they could draw on, they picked a political hanger-on. That is what I said, Sir.

The Minister of Justice knows who the political hanger-on is. It is not Dr. Barrett and it is not Dr. Harris. Do you want the honourable Minister of Education to read the list again? It will be four times.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, Sir, the honourable gentleman from St. John's Centre, sanctimonious as he is, will your Honour - I know Your Honour will, That goes without saying, but does my colleague have the right to be heard in silence? The Minister of Justice was heard in silence. Listen

MR. ROBERTS: to the crackles; they have nothing to add.

The honourable gentleman from Harbour Grace has yet to make a speech in this House let alone one that is in order. Well, if he has nothing to add, Mr. Chairman, let him at least observe the rules of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Leader of the Opposition has raised a point of order, which is quite correct. However, in raising the point of order he is advised not to use unparliamentary language in referring to honourable members on the other side of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: On the point of order: If any of the language that I used were unparliamentary, (I was not aware that it was) I am willing to withdraw it. If it be unparliamentary to use certain terms about honourable gentleman opposite, I shall not use them again.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Chairman, will the sanctimonious -

MR. MURPHY: Instructions, after twelve years in the House, I am just -

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman is in constant and flagrant abuse of your ruling. Sanctimonious hypocrisy is becoming his trademark. I was speaking to a point of order. I happen to have a newspaper in my hand, a very interesting one, it deals with seatings in the Quebec Legislature, where among other things the -

MR. MURPHY: Is that what it stands for I wonder?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman does not seem to realize that there are rules of order. If he would only make some contribution to debate -

MR. MURPHY: I was just trying to pass a dull evening.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman does a great deal to make an evening dull by his scintillating presence. But all I am saying, I have no intention of withdrawing. If I used an unparliamentary term - certainly it is not unparliamentary

MR. ROBERTS: to call the honourable gentleman a sanctimonious hypocrite, that is the truth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With that retraction which the honourable Leader of the Opposition just made - the word "hypocrite" is unparliamentary, according to Beauchesne.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh I am sorry, the Minister of Finance uses it often and has never been called to order but he doubtless will be again. The honourable gentleman then is not a hypocrite. I say definitely that he is a sanctimonious unhypocrite.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the member for Bell Island has the floor, has the right to be heard in silence, a right to all the protections the rules of the House afford honourable members when they have the floor.

MR. NEARY: I am very grateful for your ruling, Mr. Chairman. Now, Sir, what I was suggesting to the Minister of Education when it was kicked up and twisted and distorted by the Minister of Justice, what I was suggesting, Sir, was that when the minister had an opportunity to make additional appointments to that committee, which I do not agree with by the way, I do not agree with the committee in the first place, but if that is the way this crowd are going to do business, Sir, run the country, run the province through a committee system, then if the minister want to do that, when he had the opportunity to put somebody on that committee, instead of putting on a political hanger-on, he should have looked to -

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, a point of order, if we are going to debate the estimates, 620 of Education, I think it is totally irrelevant to be discussing the characterization or the characters, if you wish, and attempting to castigate the character of individuals on committees. I see it now where the opposition member for Bell Island is castigating the characters of committees in going through this debate. I think it is irrelevant and should be called out of order.

MR. F. ROWE: That is very important to point out, Sir.

At the same time I will point out that I have every regard for the capabilities of Dr. Harris but that is not the main point that I want to make.

Another member of that committee is Dr. Raymond Barrett, for whom I have the greatest respect as do all the members on this side of the House. Sir, he is President of the College of Fisheries, which is a very heavy responsibility in this province, an extremely heavy responsibility. He certainly cannot devote his full time to work on this committee.

Mr. May is the Director of Vocational Education I believe, again a very heavy responsibility. He cannot devote his full time to the work of this committee.

Mr. Duggan is President of the College of Trades and Technology, again a very, very heavy responsibility. He cannot devote his full time to work on this committee.

The point I am trying to make, without going on through the complete list, Mr. Chairman, is that this is essentially a one-man committee for all intents and purposes. The royal commission took how many years?

MR. ROBERTS: Two or three.

MR. F. ROWE: Two or three years and we had a -

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: There were more full-time people on that committee. What is the budget of this committee, for instance? What is the budget of this committee compared to the budget we had for the royal commission?

There is no comparison in this world between the Warren Royal Commission and this Committee on Human Resource Development. With all due respect to the gentlemen, I have the deepest and the highest regard for the capabilities of those men but Sir they cannot do the job that they are being asked to do. Look at this, Mr. Chairman, this is a copy of the terms of reference

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the member for Bonavista South, as he has done fairly frequently and quite successfully, has raised a point of order which I believe is well taken. The honourable member, unless he were somehow or another to tie the two matters together, grants-in-aid, we are discussing 620-04 which are grants-in-aid to the College of Trade and Technology. It would appear that there may have been oblique reference or there may have been references to this committee while I was not in the Chair, and this may have brought on this matter -

MR. NEARY: Your Honour was not in the Chair when the Minister of Education told us that there is a committee looking into, I think he called it resource development - human resource development, looking into the matter of a new College of Trades and Technology or a polytech. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable member for Bonavista South does not know what he is talking about, that I am in order, Sir. I would like Your Honour to give a ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With the additional information that has come from the honourable members, it is quite possible that the honourable the Minister of Education may have been out of order in the beginning although that is debatable. Certainly since it has become a matter of record, I see no reason why the honourable member for Bell Island should not continue.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful. Now, Sir, I am relevant, as I was suggesting to the Minister of Education Sir, that instead of appointing, when he had the opportunity of appointing additional members of that committee, instead of appointing a political hanger-on he would have been better advised if he had gotten a representative from business industry or from the trade union movement.

I would submit, Sir, as good as the other gentlemen are, that I mentioned, and I have high regard for these men, did not

MR. NEARY: condemn them in any way, shape or form, as the Minister of Justice would lead the House to believe; master at twisting and turning in this House, Sir. As I said, Sir, I do not think it is too late for the minister to do that. I would like for the minister to reconsider this whole matter and add to the committee representatives of the various groups that I mentioned.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I said that I was not going to speak too often on this particular vote but I feel that I have to stand up here and say a few words in light of some of the statements made by the Minister of Education and by the honourable the Minister of Justice.

Sir, I sat here in utter disbelief listening to the Minister of Education suggesting that the present administration is not prepared to go ahead with the construction of a polytech in this province or in St. John's because the committee report of the Committee on Human Resource Development has not yet been submitted to the administration. Sir, I would ask the honourable Minister of Education to table right here and now any committee reports or studies that have been done on the establishment of junior or community colleges in this province in view of the fact that the Premier has announced both institutions for two cities on the West Coast. Sir, I asked for the tabling of such report during my preliminary remarks on the salary vote for the minister and I have not yet seen any evidence of such studies having been tabled in this House.

Sir, personally the minister brought up this matter of the committee. He said that the committee has not made its report therefore the reason why we have a grant-in-aid of \$3.2 million and we do not have a polytechnical school is because of the fact that this committee report has not been submitted.

Sir, in my view, with all due respect to the people on that committee, that committee is the most useless thing that

MR. F. ROWE: I have ever seen established in this province. I want to separate the committee and the individuals on that committee. It is an absolutely useless committee, established for no other purpose than to delay government action in the field of education in this province, in spite of the fact that the Premier goes gallivanting around the province announcing community and junior colleges when he is pressured into doing so.

Now Sir, let me try to define why I think this committee is useless. I would like for the honourable Minister of Education to correct me on every point where I am wrong and I will state it in the form of questions. My understanding is that there is only one individual on that committee who is on that committee as a full-time person, is that correct? That is Dr. Harris, the chairman of that committee. He is full-time. Is that correct, Sir?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is correct.

MR. F. ROWE: That is correct. He is, contrary to what the Minister of Justice has said, he is on salary, is that correct?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: He is seconded from the university.

MR. F. ROWE: But he is on salary from the university or from the administration?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: His salary is university salary but he is seconded to the -

MR. F. ROWE: Fine. We are okay.

Dr. Harris is a full-time person on that committee. Sir, I have the greatest regard for Dr. Harris but contrary to what the Minister of Justice said, Dr. Harris is not an educator or not an educationalist in the true sense of the word. He is a true-blue academic. He is a historian. His specialization is not in the field of education.

MR. ROBERTS: Ph.D. in history.

of the Education and Human Resource Development Committee, of the task force on planning. Sir, this administration is suffering from planphobia or something, planphilia, Sixteen pages, Sir, sixteen long pages of terms and conditions and there is something in there about everything including community colleges and regional colleges. Sir, this committee has to submit its report by August of 1973, Sir, an impossible task. I submit that it would be lucky if the report is longer than the list of terms and references that I have a copy of here. Sir, that committee, as I said earlier, is a useless committee and in my view it was established for one purpose only to be used as an excuse for inaction on the part of this administration when it is convenient to use it as an excuse for inaction. Besides that, Sir, we have the Premier going out without any studies, without any committee reports, without any submissions from this committee, going out, caving in to political pressure and saying, "Okay boys, a regional college for Corner Brook, a community college for Stephenville," without a stated policy on community or junior colleges in this province. This is the most ridiculous thing, Sir, that I have ever heard of in my life.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the head that we are now considering is the College of Trades and Technology, grant-in-aid, and the honourable member has been referring from time to time and there have been references made from time to time to community colleges and regional colleges which do not come under this heading.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, I have just about clued up my remarks anyway but the point of the matter is that this committee, Sir, is designed for no other purpose than to be used at certain points for convenience, in order to explain away the delaying action of this administration. The case that we are talking about here now is the delay on action in the establishment

of the polytechnical institute. I would also like to say before I do sit down that this is with all due respect to the gentleman on the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect to the point of order raised by the honourable House Leader, the Chair is quite aware that debate has gone on which is not strictly speaking, hardly remotely speaking related to 620(04) - Grants-in-aid(College of Trades and Technology). However certain matters were put forth by the honourable Minister of Education and only by stretching the leniency and latitude and courtesy between members that are so generously extended by the House while it is in committee stage. There are certain times when this extraordinary latitude must be given and this is one of these times. However it is not to be taken as a precedence whereby honourable members may raise matters that are totally irrelevant to a certain head. There will be times as we debate the estimates that this will happen and the committee will find itself irrevocably drawn into irrelevant debate and hopefully this will be at a minimum. It is unfortunate that it happens but I believe that sometimes it is unavoidable.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, one short question. I am at this point somewhat confused, which may not come as much of a surprise to members of the committee. I would ask the indulgence of the committee to ask the honourable the minister to clear up one point. I am not, as I said before, all that familiar with the terminology involved here. I heard reference to a polytechnic or presumably a polytechnical institution. I was under the impression that the College of Trades and Technology is by definition a technical institution and I was under the impression that it was in itself a polytechnical institution. Before the minister goes into his response if he could clear up that point for me I might be able to follow the debate a little more closely.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, one could regard it as a polytechnic.

There are a number of technologies being studied there but it is also a trade school. There are numerous students there who are not post-secondary students. So by a polytechnical institution one would usually mean a post-secondary programme not university but technological but devoted entirely, at least in its regular programme, to post-secondary work while the College of Trades and Technology is not entirely post-secondary.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, a little while ago I was making some comments on the government lagging behind on getting money from DREE for a polytechnical institution. I had said that there was no commitment in the second DREE agreement but that there had been a firm indication given by the Government of Canada in that second DREE agreement that they would be willing to consider sincerely and sympathetically proposals made by the provincial government for support from the federal government for such an institute. I said that the government had been dragging their heels on getting a commitment a firm financial commitment from Ottawa in that regard. I was somewhat surprised to see the Minister of Justice stand up and say that he could not recall anything about that in the second DREE agreement and even worse, Sir, to drag an official who happens to be in the House tonight, assisting the minister, drag an official in and say that he reported him as saying that he had not heard anything about this or could not remember anything about this in the second DREE agreement. Well, I doubt that very much, if that gentleman, the deputy Minister of Education is that lacking in knowledge. I am sure he does remember it and I am sure that he recalls it very well if he read that agreement.

When that agreement was signed, Sir, in 1971, on August 10, and announced there was a joint announcement made by myself and Mr. Marchand. Now I do not have the agreement here because I could not find it in the file and my secretary was home and that sort of thing but I will find it tomorrow. But I have a joint

announcement made by myself and Mr. Marchand at that time and one of the paragraphs of that joint announcement, page thirteen, states; "DREE will also be examining with this government the need for modern educational facilities at all levels including facilities in the vocational and technical education field with particular emphasis on adult education and training for the St. John's Area." The agreement notes that further to this end the federal minister will consider assisting the province in developing and building polytechnical education facilities. Sir, an appendix to that announcement, where it is broken down by special area, in that appendix there are the new present commitments in dollar values, there are the feasibility and design studies which would lead to new commitments and then there are the guide lines and indications given by the federal department as to what they will be getting into in the future.

It states there, Sir, "The examination of the needs in technical education with consideration of assistance in building polytechnical facilities," exactly what I said to this committee, Sir, an hour or so before.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Well, a polytechnical - Not a polytechnical institution.

AN HON. MEMBER: What else would it be?

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Polytechnical facilities.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, the minister is not satisfied with standing up himself and confessing his ignorance, he tries to pretend that also one of the most well-thought-of officials in this government was ignorant on the matter as well. What next, Mr. Chairman? The federal government considers as a high priority, I know, Sir, from my experience, it considers as the high priority in this province the financial assisting of this provincial government with putting in polytechnical facilities or a polytechnical institute or

institution or whatever you might want to call it but polytechnical is the key word. I know they do, Sir, and I reiterate what I said before, that this government should be condemned for not going after the federal government in a forcible, aggressive way and getting

it in the next DREE agreement certainly, the third one, whenever that one might emerge on the horizon, and they should be condemned for not having gone after in the past the federal government in an aggressive way to get this sort of thing committed even in the amendment, at least a commitment to study the situation, have a feasibility study done by the joint planning committee which would lead almost irrevocably to a commitment from Ottawa for polytechnical facilities in this province.

I reiterate that, Sir, and I base my statement on what I had earlier said, that there is a definite indication of no commitment and I did not pretend there was a commitment, a definite indication of priority by the federal government to assist this province, and we have let a year and eight months go by since the last DREE agreement without coming any closer, I would submit, to getting the federal government to put in the necessary millions of dollars for such a polytechnical institution.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a brief comment. Before the honourable gentleman from Bell Island mentioned about there being representatives from union or business on that committee, I would like to point out there have been two advertisements, there may have been more but there have been at least two advertisements inviting all interested parties, union, business, any and everybody else to make submissions and certainly all submissions would be gladly received.

Also I would like to comment on two other things. The honourable gentleman from St. Barbe North stated that the committee was established as an excuse for inaction. That, Sir, is an accusation against the government which honourable members opposite

obviously may well believe if they wish to but it also suggests that those persons would allow themselves to be an excuse for inaction.

I do not see certainly the membership of that committee as being persons who would allow themselves to be part of an excuse for inaction. The honourable gentleman also said that the committee is useless. I think myself that the honourable gentleman would be in a much better position to decide whether it is useful or useless after the committee has made its report and all honourable gentlemen have an opportunity to see it. It would seem to me that is when we should make our decisions on that, whether in fact the work of that committee will be useful to this province or, as the honourable gentleman suggests, useless, the committee is useless. I think we will have to wait and see.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Mr. Chairman, I want to straighten this point out if I may. I never suggested for one minute, Mr. Chairman, that these individuals allowed themselves knowingly to be used as an excuse for inaction. I would not want to leave that impression. These were the minister's words and not mine. Now, Sir, I base my conclusion on something like five plus seven, twelve years of educational experience in this province when I served on, I would suggest, at least fifty educational committees. Sir, I submit that these committees were next to useless for the simple reason that I was a teacher, either at the university or at a high school in this province, as were the other members of the committee and they had neither the money nor the resources nor the time to do the job that they were asked to do. In that sense, the very fact that they neither had the money, the resources, the staff nor the time (they just did not have it as they had a job) the impact of their recommendations were sometimes far short of what they would have wished, because of the lack of the government of this day and the other day to do the things that they asked to be implemented, simply because of the shortage of money.

But, Sir, I want to make that point, these gentlemen who are the top-notch educators in this province, which is far different from an educationalist, cannot do the job that they were asked to do because of the lack of time to do it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if it is eleven o'clock fine, but I just want to say a word or two on this. If Your Honour want to call it eleven we can perhaps go back on it or if I had three or four minutes I could say what I wanted to say. Let us just finish this head as I only want to make a couple of brief comments. I am in the hands of Your Honour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable gentleman may continue.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman! I only want to say one or two things because I think both sides have expressed their point of view, Mr. Chairman. The point I want to make is quite simply that it is one thing for the government to set up a committee and it is obvious, as my friend from St. Barbe North has said, that the people involved have not knowingly allowed themselves nor would they knowingly -

MR. HICKEY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I must say rudeness is hard to take. The gentleman from St. John's East Extern obviously was not aware of what has happened and it is not unlike him. The point is, Mr. Chairman, that the people involved have not knowingly allowed themselves nor would they knowingly allow themselves to be used as an excuse for inaction. Sir, nobody could be against studying but the point is that this committee are being asked to do the impossible. They are being asked to do the job which the government have to do and which the government cannot duck. The point is further and it is quite applicable with respect to the College of Trades and Technology, Mr. Chairman, that the government have no intention of heeding the advice of this committee, not the least in this world, not the least jot or tittle intention of heeding it. The proof of that,

Mr. Chairman, the Premier goes to Corner Brook, and thank heavens he was not speaking in Deer Lake or Rocky Harbour or we would have had a community college there. When the Premier gets up, we will go into it in detail later. But the point is the Minister of Education says the committee is being set up to study these questions, the Premier careens off to Corner Brook, commits us to we do not know what and I submit the Minister of Education does not know what and the university does not know what. The government have no intention whatsoever of making any use of this committee except I submit on the governments' part as an excuse for inaction.

The committee are putting in a lot of work, busy men putting in a lot of work and I think they are being led up the garden path. The governments' education policy will be determined by the Minister of Finance as are all other policies over there and the government have no more intention of heeding this report. The proof of it is they have gone ahead and acted without it. They have committed us to millions of dollars of expenditure and I repeat again and I will end on this and I appreciate the generosity of the committee in letting us carry on -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I know. Is the honourable gentleman aware that this is the first time I have said it? I have listened to dribble from the other side and listen to some dribble from me now, and not all of what I say is dribble. The fact that the Minister of Education has consistently refused to produce any reports showing the feasibility study on Corner Brook. There is one by the university, as Mr. Morgan said that in Corner Brook last week. I say there are no other reports. I say that the decision to establish a community college in Stephenville and the branch university in Corner Brook was a political decision with no, absolutely no study being given, and I defy the Minister of Education to produce the reports and table them.

The final sentence I would make is the minister, as I understand it, has offered to make public the report of Dr. Harris and his committee when it is submitted. I have no doubt it will be submitted and I have no doubt it will be a good report. I expect him to make it public. He offered to do it here in the committee tonight and he nods agreement. It will be a document I will look forward to reading. I only wish the government would indicate some good faith in asking for the report. They have it, by their actions.

On motion, 620(04), carried.

It now being 11:00 P.M. I do leave the Chair until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 11, 1973, at 3:00 P.M.