



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

Volume 1

1st Session

Number 28

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**Monday, June 12, 1972**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL**

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

PETITIONS

MR. C. R. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Harcourt, Monroe and Burgoynes Cove.

This petition is signed by approximately 285 people. The prayer of the petition is that the road from Georges Brook to Burgoynes Cove, the extreme end of the road be upgraded with a view to paving in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I naturally support this petition. Many of the residents of these three communities commute outside of the areas to work, to Clarendville and other areas. The road is used by two school buses.

Also, lumbering is one of the main sources of industry in the area. And, of course, the finished product has to be trucked out.

I respectfully submit this petition and ask that it be referred to the appropriate department.

MR. S.A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition and the members on the Opposition side of the House, we are very happy to support this petition.

On motion petition received.

MR. J. B. HARVEY: MR. Speaker, I would like to present a petition here from the people of Black Tickle, Labrador. The prayer is that they would like a community stage and slipway built in that community, Black Tickle. They complain about not having a community stage, of course, when every other community on the coast, pretty nearly every other community has one. Right now the fishermen there are using their own stages. They are not in very good repair and consequentially they seem to get lower prices for their fish because of its quality at the time of pick-up.

MR. HARVEY: They fish late at Black Tickle, there are lots of longliners from the Newfoundland side coming up, no place to tie up no place to off load their fish.

I certainly support this petition, Mr. Speaker. There are forty names signed to it including my own. I think with a community stage and slipway there it could help the fishermen considerably in what they are doing right now.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, it seems that it might be my last day in the House, with your leave I would like to say that it has been an educational experience and a great honour to have served in this House in this session. I hope to be back, I do not think I will be back for this session possibly but I will probably be back after a by-election if there is one. It has been an honour to serve with the men, a great bunch of men in this House, and I am proud to be with the representatives -

MR. NEARY: Do not be so pessimistic.

MR. HARVEY: Well, I am just saying.

I would like to table this petition.

MR MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take advantage to support the famous last words, if you like, at least he feels it is, he is a bit pessimistic, I think, for this session. But I believe the items referred to are more federal than provincial, but definitely as Minister of Labrador Affairs we will certainly work along with the honourable member to get what facilities we can for the area of Black Tickle.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of a petition for a community stage and slipway for the community of Black Tickle. I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that it is a necessity in the area of Labrador South seeing that Labrador South is in a rather remote area of our Province. I believe we should strive to carry all the amenities of life to these people in Labrador. I fully endorse the prayer of this petition and I trust that the department will do all in its power to have this community stage and slipway come about.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to introduce two petitions, one on behalf of the people of Isle aux Mort the other on behalf of the people in Rose Blanche. Since the prayer of both of these petitions are identical, I am introducing them as one. They contain about 900 names of voters. The prayer of the petition is for a suitable water and sewer insulation, as the government may see fit.

I support these petitions very strongly. These are two fairly large towns, Isle aux Mort around 1,500, Rose Blanche about the same. They certainly have contributed quite adequately to the revenue of this Province and to the gross national product of this country. When we see in this day and age people having to bring water in buckets as they do in Rose Blanche, it does not look just right. Now in Isle aux Mort, the water system was installed by the Atlantic Development Board about three years ago, to the plant, and they forgot the people who paid for it, the tax payers. We hooked up to it on our own but the system is not adequate and we want a decent system put in as soon as possible. I ask that this petition be tabled before the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support this petition on behalf of the opposition members of the House of Assembly. The member who just presented this petition made a very convincing argument to have the prayer of the petition carried out this year. He is only about one foot and a half from the Minister of Finance. He was almost breathing down his neck

there, so I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance heard every word he said. Nevertheless we are very happy. I wish him luck. We are very happy to support the petition.

QUESTIONS:

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I want to table the answers to various questions here. I do not know if it is necessary to read out the answers in the House, there are plenty of copies. Answers to Questions 81 and 98, directed to the Minister of Labour, and answers to Questions 64, 69 and No. 90 directed to the Minister of Highways.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the answer to Question No. 42 on the Order Paper of June 2. It is too long to read, so I will just table it. The answer to Question No. 43, June 2, in the name of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. Is there any new liquor licences and so on? It is not all that long, but I will table it, with copies. There are eight or ten of them.

MR. CROSBIE: Questions Nos: 44, 45, 46, 52, 53, 55,

Question 54: The breweries report sales of 566,585½ dozen for the month of March which would amount in gross sales to all licensed brewers and brewers agents to \$2,175,688.32 approximately. Tabled.

Question No. 56: Cancellation for S.S.A tax by the Department of Finance. Cancellation of her vendor's license.

Question No.57: None were refused.

Question No. 58: There are no such applications for renewal of licenses this fiscal year.

All of these will be tabled Mr. Speaker, there are also copies but someone in the Clerk's office will have to attach the right copies to the original here because they are not attached here in the right order.

MP. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have really a supplementary question to an answer tabled the other day either by the Premier or the member for Ferrvland on behalf of the Premier, with respect to the staff of the Premier's office in the broader sense. I notice on Orders of the Day what is really not topical I notice it is a matter, Mr. Speaker, of Dr. Stuart Peters chief executive assistant to the Premier. There is no information about him. I thought I would just mention it and the member could have the information assembled. We will need it on the estimates if not before Sir.

MR. HICKMAN: Question No. 79 on the Order Paper June 8,

Mr. Hickman.

asked by the hon. member for White Bay South, asked that we table with the House the names of the persons who have been employed with the Department of Justice since January 18 and whether their applications were processed by the Civil Service Commission. I table these. Most of those hired are members of the St. John's Fire Department or the wardens at the penitentiary or the Newfoundland Constabulary and they do not come within the scope of the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation. It is understood, Sir, from an article in Saturday's "Evening Telegram" that a commitment by the former administration to the Inter-faith group in Grand Falls to open a senior citizens home in Grand Falls has been withdrawn. I wonder if the minister would tell the House if this story is correct or if financing has been arranged with the Inter-faith Group so that they can proceed with the senior citizens home in Grand Falls?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that question could be placed on the Order Paper. I do not see any urgency in answering it at this time.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKEY: I have nothing to hide, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Finance and Economic Development. Would the honourable minister tell the House if there are any new developments in the strike at Newfoundland Farm Products or are the government still maintaining the hard line?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, there are no new developments that I can inform the House about at the moment. When there are any new developments I will certainly be glad to inform the House.

MR. NEARY: A question for the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. The minister

Mr. Neary

told the members of the House on Thursday that the government would reconsider the appointment of a commission of enquiry or an industrial enquiry into the safety hazards at the phosphorus plant at Long Harbour. Now that the minister has had the weekend to think it over, has the minister taken a decision?

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, like I stated, a decision will be made after consultation with union and company officials and we are in the process now of getting together with both parties to have a talk with them relative to the ERCO Plant at Long Harbour. Once I do talk to them I will make a decision.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Finance. Would the hon. Minister of Finance inform the House what scale of assistance do the government intend to give the Newfoundland Broiler and Hog Producers who are at this present time losing financially because of the present labour dispute at Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, this is a complex matter that has to be worked out. I have no information to give the House at the moment.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the minister inform the House as to what time he will have the scale of financial assistance available?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot inform the House now. When this is worked out, we will certainly inform the House or I will certainly inform the honourable gentleman. I cannot tell you the exact day and hour yet. It is very complex as I am sure the honourable member understands.



On motion, a bill, "An Act To Incorporate The Newfoundland And Labrador Amateur Sports Federation," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The St. Clare's Mercy Hospital (Incorporation) Act, 1969," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Protection Of Animals Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Revise And Consolidate The Social Security Assessment Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Revenue And Audit Act, " read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting a measure, namely An Act Respecting Succession Duty, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this resolution which I move that the committee adopt, the proposed bill no. 54 is being distributed to the honourable members of the House and this is a resolution that we pass an act respecting succession duty. I believe the procedure that we have agreed or that has been agreed with the honourable Leader of the Opposition, the practice is that I will just speak for a few minutes now on the purpose of this bill and that if the House approves the resolution we would later on this afternoon debate the second reading, which is the principle of the bill, and then go into Committee of the Whole on this bill and another one, the Gift Tax Act, which will also be before the House. The reason why we requested the Opposition to agree to this procedure is that we have today down from Ontario, Mr. Wolf Goodwin

who was a tax specialist and who was retained by the six co-operating Provinces who are introducing this legislation to advise and assist them in the drafting of the legislation. Mr. Goodwin's therefore will be available to the House during Committee of the Whole, if any member wants to ask any questions in connection with any particular section of this quite complex legislation. Now the purpose of the legislation is to raise revenue for the Province. Members of the House will recall that the Government of Canada have withdrawn from the estate tax field and the gift tax field as at the end of December 1971. They have done that because they are now imposing a capital gains tax and therefore feel that it is not necessary for them to have both estate tax and a capital gains tax.

Three Provinces impose their own succession taxes, British Columbia, Quebec and Ontario. Alberta has decided not to impose any succession duty tax at all. Being a wealthy Province, of course, it can make that decision. Unfortunately, here in Newfoundland we are not a wealthy Province. We cannot afford to surrender the measly revenue that we get from the Succession Duty Legislation. Our experience, Mr. Speaker, our Chairman of the past few years indicates that the revenue the Province takes in directly from this legislation is only between three and four hundred thousand dollars a year. It depends whether anybody that has a large estate dies in any particular year, or how well they have arranged their affairs that they can avoid taxes, the estate and gift Taxes. The point is and the reason why we need this legislation is that apart from the three to four to five hundred thousand dollars a year which we might collect in Newfoundland through this legislation, if we did not impose it we would have a loss, an indirect loss, through tax equalization, of about one million and a-half dollars a year, because under the tax equalization formula we would not be imposing Succession Duty Legislation nor receiving any revenue from it and therefore we will be penalized under the tax equalization formula. It also explained to the House, Mr. Chairman,

that the principle of adopting Succession Duty and Gift Tax Legislation was. That principle was accepted by the previous administration, who issued a statement just before the end of December 1971 to that effect. We have decided that that was the right policy in this situation and are continuing that policy. That is why the legislation is being introduced to the House.

Now, it may be better, Mr. Speaker, rather than getting into more detail on the Bill, if I waited for second reading. I think that is what we have agreed upon. I would give a few more details then on second reading. That is the general position. We would lose around \$2,000,000 a year if we do not have this legislation. We cannot afford to lose \$2,000,000 a year. This legislation is similar to legislation now inacted I believe in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. It differs from the legislation being inacted in Manitoba and Saskatchewan in that the four Atlantic Provinces have raised the exemption for estates left by one spouse to the other from \$150,000, which will be the limit for Manitoba and Saskatchewan, to \$500,000 in the four Atlantic Provinces. That is one difference between these four Provinces and the two Western Provinces. Members of the House will remember that before December 31, 1971, the Federal law was that you could leave, if an estate was left by a husband to a wife it was completely tax free.

and under the Gift Tax legislation you could make gifts from husband to wife or vice versa and there was no tax. That is changed in the present legislation with the limit now it will be \$500,000 for an estate, say, left by a husband to a wife or a wife to a husband. Of course when the surviving spouse dies it will become taxable in their hands. The Government of Canada has agreed to administer this legislation for three years so long as the six provinces concerned agreed on the main essentials of the legislation which we have done. They will be making a small charge to us for administering the legislation. So it will not be administered by the government it will be administered by the Department of National Revenue at Ottawa. So I therefore would ask the members to approve the resolution.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, as the minister has told the Committee there have been consultations behind the Speaker's Chair - to use that phrase - accordingly I also reserve such comments as I have, representing this side, until we go into second reading. I may say the understanding that I have I think it is correct, we will ask unanimous consent of the House when, assuming the resolution goes through Committee. For our part we will consent to the necessary agreement so that second reading will come on this afternoon, and we will see how the debate goes on. But what little we have to say will be said then. As the minister said, when we were in the administration of this province the then administration agreed to these Bills. Indeed I believe they are uniform with the other three Atlantic Provinces as the minister has indicated. So there is very little we will say at this stage on them except we will vote for them in Committee stage here.

MR CHAIRMAN: Hon. members have heard the Resolution. Shall the Resolution carry? All those in favour "aye", contrary "Nay" -  
Carried:

Motion that the Committee report having passed the Resolution and recommend that a Bill be brought in to give effect to the same, carried:

MR BARRY: MOTION: That it is expedient to bring in a measure, namely, "An Act Respecting Gift Tax."

MR CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Resolution if we are going to have a succession duty legislation we must also have Gift Tax legislation. The Gift Tax legislation is not a revenue producer. As a matter of fact I understand that the Government of Canada when it had Gift Tax legislation, the maximum revenue that was ever derived from Gift Tax was \$4 million in any one year. But, we must have the legislation if you are to have succession duty legislation because otherwise of course there will be no estates. It will all be given away before the dear departed departs. So, the purpose of the Gift Tax legislation, the reason we are having the Gift Tax is to prevent people just giving their property away so that they avoid succession duty.

This Gift Tax legislation is common to the six provinces that I mentioned. By the way, I forgot to mention when discussing the other resolution that originally the department of National Revenue of Canada wanted to use Halifax as the district office to which Gift Tax and succession duty returns will be forwarded from Newfoundland. We made strong representations to them that we did not feel that this was the right thing, that they should use the district tax office here in St. John's. There would be great inconvenience if it all had

MR. CROSBIE: to go to Halifax and delays. I am happy to say that the Government of Canada have agreed with that and this will all be handled, I think it is being handled now through the District Tax Office here in St. John's.

So this gift tax legislation is complementary to this succession duty legislation. An individual will be allowed to make gifts totalling \$15,000 in a year, so long as the gift is not more than \$5,000 to a spouse and not more than \$2,000 to any other individual. In other words, if you want to give away \$15,000 tax free you could make a gift of \$5,000 to your wife and you could make five other gifts of \$2,000 each to individual people; there would be no tax. But if you give more than that of course you become subject to the gift tax. Now the rate on a gift tax is not accumulative. It is not like the old federal system was where in this legislation you pay tax depending on the gifts made in this year. It is not accumulative. The rate does not increase if you give gifts this year and more next year. The rate next year does not become greater, it is not all added together to get a greater rate. So it is the gifts in any one year, not accumulatively, on which the gift tax rate will depend, the gift taxes on gifts made by a resident of the province.

So as I say, Mr. Chairman, this is complementary to the succession duty legislation. It is necessary because we are going to have succession duty and it will put a tax on generosity, which is necessary for us to get our succession duty.

On motion, Resolution, in Relation to a Measure, Namely, "An Act Respecting Gift Tax", carried:

On motion, that the Committee rise and report having passed the two Resolutions, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, and have direct me to report having passed two Resolutions, recommending the introduction of two measures namely:

(1) A Bill, "An Act Respecting Succession Duties."

(2) A Bill, "An Act Respecting Gift Tax."

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Respecting Succession Duty", read a first time, ordered read a second time now, by leave:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on introducing the Bill on second reading, I have already I think covered most of the general ground. The House will notice, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a tax on the estate, it is a tax on the beneficiary because it has to be a direct tax for a province to impose it. So it is not the same as a federal estate tax, although many of the provisions are the same.

By the way we will have to pay Ottawa about \$15,000 a year to administer this, that is, their fee to administer the three percent of the revenue we will collect. We estimate we may collect \$500,000, so it would be about \$15,000.

Once again, the main reason for us introducing this is the tax equalization reason. We are receiving large amounts of aid from Ottawa in equalization payments and it would be very difficult for us to turn around on the other hand, apart from the revenue lost, and say that we were not going to tax the estates.

This legislation also, members of the House should notice, will be retroactive to January 1, 1972. Publicity was given to the main features of the legislation in December and when the legislation is passed it will be retroactive, as is the case in the other provinces.

If the members just wanted to look at some of the main features of the Act, I will touch on them briefly here. We will be going through it is committee anyway. There does not appear to be a great deal of controversy...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Okay, fine, right, just some of the main sections then, Mr. Speaker. This is not a topic on which you can really make much of a rousing speech. There will be deducted in computing the aggregate value of the property of the deceased, Mr. Speaker, in section (7), any debts that he has incurred or any encumbrances created by him, and I would like to point out that if the capital gains tax is effective, and because of the death of a person there is a capital gains, that would become a debt of his estate which will reduce the value of the estate for succession duty purposes here.

There is not double taxation in that sense for that reason. The duty is imposed on all property of a deceased situated at the time of his death within the province, but if the property (this is section 9) if the property is situated outside the province at the time of his death, but the successor to any of the property is a resident in the province, then duty is paid by the successor in respect of that property to which he is the successor.

In other words, if the beneficiary lives in Newfoundland and



the property, except for real estate, is located elsewhere...

AN HON. MEMBER: In Liechtenstein perhaps?

MR. CROSBIE: Liechtenstein perhaps, yes, then the beneficiary here in the province pays succession duty. But, if for example a person dies here leaving real estate in New Brunswick, the tax on the real estate would be paid to the Province of New Brunswick and will not be paid to the Newfoundland Government. The beneficiaries living here will get a tax credit for the tax paid on the real estate.

The exemptions are in section (12). Estates under \$50,000 are exempt, there will be no payment of duty for those estates.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: No. Successions under \$1,000 are tax exempt. The spouse's exemption is \$500,000. A child's exemption, Mr. Speaker, is in section (15). If the child is wholly dependent upon his parents there is an exemption of \$10,000 plus \$1,000 for each year the child is under the age of seventy-one. The child is not a wholly dependent child, so the exemption is \$10,000 plus \$1,000 for each year the child is under the age of twenty-six. So, if you died and left a one-year old child, his exemption would be \$25,000 plus \$10,000 = \$35,000.

In section (17) there is an exemption for residents of cooperating provinces. Most of the rest of the Act are technical sections trying to stop any loopholes. If a person dies say today, leaving his property to his wife and she dies within twelve months, the succession duties the second time around would only be charged on one-half of the value of the estate, that is section (30).

The rest of the sections deal with appeals and other technical matters of that nature, mostly of interest to lawyers and to those who are about to die, which hopefully none of us is.

I think that is about all I can say. When we go through committee if there are any questions we...

MR. W.N. ROWE: Before the minister sits down, could he mention, Sir, if

in his opinion K.C. Irving, for example, has been able to successfully avoid succession duty with regard to his liquid assets in New Brunswick, by moving down to the Bahamas?

MR. CROSBIE: That would depend, Mr. Speaker, if I speak now I end the debate on second reading.

MR. ROWE: No, this is a question I am asking.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, that would depend. If Mr. Irving left his estate to children who are living in New Brunswick, then the estate would be taxable because the tax is on beneficiaries residing in the province. I do not believe that Mr. Irving's move down to the Bahamas is dictated, only he knows for sure of course, but it is probably dictated less by the succession duty legislation than it is by the new federal income tax legislation.

MR. ROWE: In the capital gains aspect?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the lucid explanation and exposition of the minister has convinced us on this side to vote for the legislation at second reading, and we will. As the minister said in his remarks here in the previous committee stage, Sir, there are two reasons why this legislation in my opinion should go on the statute books. The first is the revenue to be raised and as the minister said it is not so much the revenue that will come from the succession duty imposed by this legislation nor from the revenue to be raised by the complementary tax to be imposed by the gift tax, but rather from the equalization payments which accrue to Newfoundland under the arrangements with the Government of Canada.

As I recall it, the minister might correct me if I am wrong, the Government of Canada say that they will pay equalization on a per capita basis of the population of the province, sufficient to bring Newfoundland's tax yields up to the established standards across Canada, which I believe is the numerical average, the numerical mean of the provincial tax yields from specified tax fields. Any province

which does not levy tax at at least the standard rate loses very substantially. That is how a half million dollars of succession duties could cost this province one and a-half million dollars on equalization grants.

From the revenue point of view, there is a very real reason why this legislation should go ahead. I submit too, Mr. Speaker, that from a social policy point of view, this legislation is good legislation. Perhaps it is significant that today, if I am judge of the temper of the House, we are not going to have a lengthy debate. We may tempt some honourable and particularly learned members of the House to their feet to enter into this.

When succession duty or estate tax was first introduced in England about sixty years ago, Lloyd George's people's budget, it just about brought the constitution tottering to the ground. There were two general elections fought on it and the finance bills in the British House of Commons went on for the better part of a year or over a year. That is a precedent that the Opposition might do well to heed. Mr. Lloyd George was the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Finance Minister. he brought his budget resolutions in early in 1909 and it was sometime in 1910 before they were carried at the committee stage. Then the debate began at the second reading.

The objection in the main was to such things as the death duties which Lloyd George introduced as a deliberate social measure to cut down the amount of wealth which could be passed by inheritance from one generation to another.

I have wealthy friends, Sir, who object to that type of legislation and I suppose if I had any wealth I would object to it as well, but I do think, Sir, that it is a good thing in social policy that fathers cannot pass on unlimited wealth to sons and that wealth in each generation must pay a price to the society from which the wealth is made.

That is why I hope that, for example, K.C. Irving does not succeed in beating succession duties. An earlier example in Canada was Mr. E.P. Taylor who established residence at Lyford Cay in the Bahamas. Mr. Taylor I think at the time was quite open about it. I do not know if he said so specifically, but he went through all the steps necessary to change domicilian law.

I never understood how rules could have been drawn up mainly to cover a marriage that had been legally entered into in Paris, consummated in Belgium between people who lived in England and in the Netherlands, how those rules governed where one lived at law in the term of domicile but they do as Your Honour knows.

However, Mr. E.P. Taylor was quite open in a round-about way about his intention to beat the death duties, the estate taxes, as they then were. I hope he does not succeed, Sir, and I speak not in law but again on the social policy. Mr. Taylor and for that matter Mr. Irving made this money in Canada. I think that they should be willing and indeed glad to repay part of it to society when they die. The exemptions outlined by the minister, the half million dollars which has become standard throughout the Atlantic Provinces, I think it is a very generous exemption. A husband can pass to a wife a half million dollars without incurring any estate tax. I feel, Sir, that there are really very few Newfoundlanders who in point of practise will have to worry about this even with insurance. A half million dollars is a very large estate indeed. I do not know if the minister has any figures but I doubt if there have been very many estates ever probated in Newfoundland with a value of -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: And that was attached at levels far below the half million dollar exemption in this bill. So I do not think it will hit, to use the phrase of the late Bill Keough, it will not hit that last forgotten fisherman out on the Bill of Cape St. George. Indeed probably the only people who will benefit really from this legislation, Sir, I submit are the lawyers. It is a great make-work bill for them because any man now with any amount of property at all, \$50,000 in the case of passing to sons and lesser amounts in the case of the gifts taxes, any man in that position would be well advised to

consult his friendly solicitor. I notice all the learned members of the House looking at me as if I am either giving away the game or if I am about to be charged before the Benchers with commercial huckstering of the trade.

It will create some work for lawyers and I suppose that is a good thing. My colleague from Bell Island is not here to second that aspect of it. He is very big on lawyers, very big indeed on them.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is a very simple bill. It is a standard bill. It is uniform. When we were in the ministry we said we would bring it in and the succeeding administration has the wisdom to confirm our views so we will have no trouble at all voting for it on second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting Succession Duty," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House now, by leave.

Motion, that the House go into Committee of the Whole on bill, "An Act Respecting Succession Duty:"

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we might go on to the gift tax one before it is actually referred to a Committee of the Whole.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that Bill No. 53, "An Act Respecting Gift Tax," be now read a second time.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of the bill. I have already spoken on it in the resolution stage and explained the purpose of the bill. I think I have also had a few words on the main provisions of the bill. There are necessary sections in the legislation to cover the loopholes with respect to gifts or making a gift through a corporation controlled by one individual and the rest of it. The usual rules are present in the Act.

The liability for tax is in section (9) where a donor who is a resident makes gifts in any year, he shall have to pay tax in respect

of the gifts made in that year, calculated in accordance with Schedule (1) on the basis of the aggregate taxable value of gifts made by him in that year. If a donor who is not a resident makes gifts in any year of real property situated within the province, then the tax is also paid in this province. If a donor who is not a resident in the province makes gifts of property that are located in the province to somebody who lives outside the province, they would not be taxable but if it is real property they would be. So it is a tax on the donor who is a resident in the province.

The exemptions are given in section (11) on the computation of taxable value. As I have already said, you can give up to \$15,000 in any one year without paying taxes, \$5,000 to your spouse, up to \$2,000 to any other individuals and that is about all in that section. The returns have to be made every year. If you make gifts in excess of \$2,000 in value you have to make a return to the Department of National Revenue. The other sections are concerned with assessments and appeals from assessments and so on.

Under section (35) where a donor fails to pay the tax then the donee is responsible for paying it as long as the donee is resident in the province. I do not think there is anything unusual about the rest of the provisions in the bill. So as I say, this is not going to produce much revenue because people will avoid paying gift tax by making sure they do not give away too much money but it is very necessary to have it if we are to have succession duties.

MR. ROBERTS: Again, Mr. Speaker, there is not very much needs to be said. The philosophical message of the bill we accept without any difficulty at all, indeed I think we would be very upset if this legislation were not to come in. The technical aspects of it were either dealt with by the minister or, out of sufficient complexity, I think most members of the House will rely upon the experts,

particularly in the knowledge that it is uniform legislation.

Finally, as I said, the people who will be happiest about this are the lawyers. The people who will be unhappy, there will be some accountants who will be happy too because figuring out the taxes according to the formula (1) reproduced in the schedules to these bill, there is a bit of an exercise in mathematics. The only people who will be unhappy are the people who are quite well off and who really think of giving away more than \$15,000 a year. Well, Sir, when in Newfoundland a person has more than \$15,000 a year to give away as opposed to \$15,000 a year for income, when he has that sort of money to give away he will be concerned about this but I really do not think that we in the House need to get that concerned about him. He will have a problem. He will complain about high taxes and he may try to move to Nassau or he may try to move to wherever you go to avoid these taxes but I do not think that anybody in the province is going to feel that his case is very meaningful when one comes to consider the other needs of the people of this province.

So we will go along with the bill. The fact that it does not produce any revenue does not make us any happier because listening to the Minister of Finance talk one realizes that the province needs revenue and listening to all the petitions that are brought in from time to time one realizes where the revenue could go if it were available. So we will support the bill, Sir. We will support it without any hesitation at all.

On motion, a bill "An Act Respecting Gift Tax," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House now, by leave.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:



Mr. Crosbie.

Mr. Chairman, before you start, I wonder if the House would concur, I have Mr. Goodwin here whom I would like to invite into the House in case there are any questions that need technical skill to answer. If it is all right with the honourable members of the House, I will have him sit by me here when it is going through committee.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, a number of us are fans of Mr. Goodwin. It is Mr. Wolfe Goodwin, Q. C., is it not?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: We are fans of his through the Canadian Tax Journal and other mass circulation which some of us read in our lighter moments.

MR. CROSBIE: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that we arranged for Mr. Goodwin to meet with the Board of Trade this morning to help allay their misapprehensions about the bill.

MR. ROBERTS: The brief -

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, no the brief is still here. Of course it has gotten brief attention. He is going to meet tomorrow with some lawyers or whatever lawyers are interested to review the matter with him.

MR. MURPHY: Is the hon. member for Bell Island going to be invited to that meeting?

MR. NEARY: That was the Welfare Rights Committee -

MR. CROSBIE: Not yet. That can be arranged.

A bill, "An Act Respecting Succession Duty."

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, clause 4, would the minister explain why "donatio mortis causa" - it has been a long time since first year "Real Property" with Albert Able.

MR. CROSBIE: Just remember what that is, Mr. Chairman. "Donatio mortis causa" is a gift that becomes effective on the death of a person. Therefore, on the death of a person, if he has made a gift earlier which becomes effective on his death, it will be included in the value of his property.

MR. ROBERTS: - intention of the person giving the gift, donatio mortis causa?

MR. CROSBIE: It must be self-evident.

MR. ROBERTS: No, the death is self-evident. How about the intention? This could be crucial.

MR. CROSBIE: As a matter of fact, it would be determined by the court.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 4, page 14, I move that the words "or held" be deleted on line four.

On motion clause 4 as amended, carried.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, clause 7 may be as good a place as any to ask it, Mr. Chairman, although it is not specifically related to clause 7. There has been some discussion I believe, particularly in British Columbia, arising out of the Woodward Estate. I am not sure I grasp the technical point in its entirety but basically what I am wondering: Are dispositions on death to charitable institutions fully deductible under this? It is here somewhere but I confess I have not annotated my copy of the bill. Perhaps the minister could say a word or two.

MR. CROSBIE: In Section (16), a gift to a recognized charitable organization is deductible but there is a difference between this and the Estate Tax Act. For example, let us say that you are leaving \$500,000 and you left Memorial \$100,000, the tax rate that applies to your estate is based on an estate of \$500,000. In this act here, the charitable gift is not deducted from the value of the estate to arrive at the tax rate. In the Federal Estate Tax Act, the rate would be based on \$400,000 of that situation and not on the \$500,000, if you get what I mean. There is a difference there. The gift to charity is not taxed but it is included in the estate to get the tax rate. The \$400,000 that did not go to charity would pay a higher tax rate because

Mr. Crosbie,

the estate was \$500,000 originally. But the gift to the charitable organization itself pays no tax.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, that may be the matter which lead to the difficulty. I do not quarrel with it. I do not know why it is done. For example, if I had an estate of \$500,000 (It is an unlikely eventually I assure you ) and decided to leave it all to a charitable organization, (i.e., a home for homeless pussy cats, which was recognized and all that) I would then be liable for tax on \$450,000 because the basic deduction would be \$50,000 and assuming that my death expenses had been prepaid and yet if I had left the entire estate to the home for homeless pussy cats, it would reduce the amount presumably paid to charity. There would have to be a charge against the estate. Is there some reason in policy why it is so? There must be one. What is the reason? It is a good question.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the philosophy behind this change is that it was felt by the people who drafted this legislation that the ability of the estate to pay tax was determined by the gross value of the estate and not by the fact that so much is going to be left to charity and therefore the tax rate should be based on the gross value of the estate despite the fact that some of it was being left to a charity. That is the thinking behind it. That is why the change was made. In other words, this estate has the ability to pay a higher rate than an estate that had lesser value even though some of it is being given to a charity.

MR. ROBERTS: Could the minister expound on the philosophy? I am neither a charity nor do I expect to have an estate of such value to attract this sort of interest. But I am quite intrigued. This must be the point then that the Woodward Estate - there is a terrific row on with Premier Bennett in British Columbia about the Woodward one. The last

I heard of it, it was headed to the Supreme Court out there. Perhaps the minister could tell us - obviously an estate that has a lot of money you will say, "we will tax it, it can bear it." There could be some discrimination against charity. To take an example other than the one I took, Mr. Chairman: If the estate were \$500,000 and I left \$300,000 to a charity, it is possible, if it were not drafted properly, that the entire tax on \$500,000 would have to be paid out of the \$200,000 residue. The charity might get their \$300,000 out of the first bite of the apple. Perhaps the minister could tell us - ?

MR. CROSBIE: First the Woodward Estate case had to do with whether or not the Woodward Foundation was a charitable

organisation or not. In this instance here, the instance you mentioned, what would happen is this: Let us say the estate was \$500,000 and \$100,000 is left to Memorial, the tax rate applied to the \$400,000 part not left to a charity will be the tax rate based on an estate of \$500,000. So that higher rate would be applied to the \$400,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: So \$400,000 would have to bear the tax for \$500,000 unless you reduce the \$100,000 proportionately.

MR. CROSBIE: No. Its tax is paid at a higher rate than if the estate had only been \$400,000. Now, we did get a Brief from Memorial University on this because it will have a tendency to discourage. There is less cause to leave some money to charity if the legislation being as it is, Memorial University has presented us with a Brief which we took up with the other Provinces and they are willing to consider that. It cannot be changed this year but it is going to come up for discussion. The effect of this is that it is less attractive to leave some money to a charity because the tax rate on the rest of the estate is higher. The effect is not as bad as the one the hon. member suggests. In other words it is felt that the estate is \$500,000. The tax rate applied to it should be based on the \$500,000 estate. This should be looked at because it is going to discourage.

AN HON. MEMBER: In audible.

MR. W. ROWE: On Clause 11, Mr. Chairman, I realise of course that we, when we were in the Administration, made a public announcement to the effect that we were going to go along with this Bill. I would like to hear from the minister, if I could, some of the philosophy behind the fact that according to Schedule I, the 50 per cent is the maximum take from an estate which starts I believe on estates over \$300,000. Now, why was that cut off point in percentage terms reached? Why not go on with a proportionate increase, the larger the estates gets? Generally speaking what is the whole philosophy behind it? Was this just an arbitrary figure grabbed and agreed to by the

Provinces concerned? Was any thought given to the fact that perhaps there would be a limit on the amount of money which could in fact be left to successors. For example, the McGovern Doctrine in the United States, if it ever comes into law which is highly problematical is that no person shall be able to inherit more than \$500,000 or, I am not sure about this, no person dying will be able to leave in total more than \$500,000, which strikes me as pretty good social thinking, the idea that some son or daughter or nephew or friend or anyone else can get an unearned amount of money of millions and millions of dollars. Now that is not likely to happen here in Newfoundland but in some of the larger Provinces of Canada and the United States, it could happen that people could inherit an unearned amount of millions and millions and millions of dollars, money which was presumably made in the society, money which, a large proportion of which certainly should go back to the government, to the state to the province or the Federal Government whatever the case might be, so that it could be used for some good social purpose. So perhaps the minister would like to comment on this. Why the cut off of 50 percent? Was any thought given to a limitation on the amount of money could in fact be inherited?

MR. CROSBIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think there has been any thought given to the latter. If the hon. gentleman's suggestion were adopted you would come into this world with nothing and when you went out you will be able to leave nothing. You would come in naked and you would certainly go out naked.

AN HON. MEMBER: You cannot take it with you. -

MR. CROSBIE: You cannot take it with you, but if the minister's suggestion were adopted, you would not be able to leave any behind you either.

MR. W. ROWE: A half a million, that is a lot of money.

MR. CROSBIE: The philosophy behind this was the same as the Carter Commission Report, in the old Estate Tax Act, I think the highest rate went to fifty per cent. The Carter Commission recommended fifty per cent. The new Income Tax, I believe, Federal Income Tax, the highest rate is

I think, 60 per cent. So it is in line with that thinking, I suppose, that you are going to damage your accumulation of capital, etc., and partly on the fact that the various provinces had to agree on this. I have no doubt that Manitoba and Saskatchewan, as is evident from the exemptions, wanted to take a much bigger gouge than the four Atlantic Provinces which have Liberal and Conservative Governments. This is just a question of social philosophy. We do not believe, yet anyway, that you should not be permitted to leave anything to your descendants, sons or daughters and so on. The rate is being set at 50 per cent, which is still a very considerable amount of money. It can have a very serious effect on small and medium size businesses and the rest of it.

That is the reason. If Canada eventually becomes a Socialist Republic, such as Russia or Bulgaria or Hungary, of course, then you will not be able to leave anything or very little. While no doubt we are trending in that way, it is still a while off yet.

MR. W. ROWE: The minister might be interested to hear that Senator McGovern thought he was on to a hot social issue when he talked about \$500,000 as a cut off, but some poles indicated to him that even the lowest income earners in society in no way wanted that to happen. He could only deduce that everybody in the United States lives in anticipation that they are going to win a million or a two million dollar lottery at some point in the future.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 12, Mr. Chairman, on page 26 the side note should read deduction of duty to one-half and I move that the word "to" - if it does not have to be amended I draw the committee's attention to it so that it can be included.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not sure. I do not know if it has to be amended, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROWE: It should be changed anyway.

MR. ROBERTS: Let us change it then. Your honour can stay up tonight inscribing it.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 23, clause 2(c). I move that the words in line two "making of the gift" be deleted and substituted therefor the words, "death of the deceased," Immediately before "the making of the gift" the "death of the deceased".

MR. ROBERTS: In other words, if he disposed of the control of the operation, he would be able to get off scott free, with the amendment.

MR. HICKMAN: Except for the gift tax.

MR. ROBERTS: Except for the gift tax, yes, which might be less than the death duties, possibly.

If the minister could say a word - there must be a reason for it. Poor Austin Parsons is blamed for more sins, you know, it is unfair. Anyway, when I am a deceased I do not plan to be contesting the words in the statutes.

On motion Clause 23, as amended, carried:

On motion Clauses 24 through 29 carried:



On motion clauses 29 through 37 carried.

MR. HICKMAN: On Clause 38, page 39, on the second line I move that after the word "deceased" to insert the following words "or information provided to the minister". "Where the Minister is made aware of property of a deceased (in this subsection referred to as 'new property') that was not disclosed as property of the deceased in returns filed by the executor of the deceased or by successors of property of the deceased or information provided to the Minister on the basis of which the Minister made any previous assessments," in other words, I presume incorrect information.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the subject seems to be "the Minister is made aware of property of a deceased that was not disclosed as property of the deceased in returns filed by the executor of the deceased or by successors. then there is sort of another object in.

MR. HICKMAN: "successors of property of the deceased or information provided by the Minister on the basis."

MR. ROBERTS: I am not going to press it, I will never have to interpret it, Your Honour. I say without punning at all, the syntax seems a little interesting.

MR. CROSBIE: "... it was not disclosed as property of the deceased in returns file or in information provided to the Minister." That is what it is suppose to mean.

On motion Clause 38 as amended, carried.

On motion Clauses 39 and 40 carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 41(1), Mr. Chairman, I move the third word in line two, "income" and the word "value" to be substituted therefore. That would appear to be a drafting error.

On motion amendment carried.

On motion Clause 41(1) as amended carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 43, page 43, Subclause (14) after the word "may"

MR. HICKMAN: on the second line, I move the insertion of the word 'confirm,'

On motion Clause 43 as amended carried.

On motion Clauses 44 through 57 carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 58, page 55, 58(b) the second line I move the deletion of the words "The Supreme Court" and substitute therefore the words "a court."

On motion Clause 58 as amended carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 61, page 57, Clause 61(3) the second line I move the following words be deleted "not exceed thirty days." That is fairly obvious, you cannot have a further period-

On motion Clause 61 as amended carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 65, on the end of that clause it should be "forty-nine" instead of "forty-eight" and I move that "forty-eight" be deleted and "forty-nine" be substituted therefore.

On motion Clause 65 as amended carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 70, on page 62, I move that the following clause be added to be Subclause (7), that will be 77. In an inquiry made under Subsection (3) "any successor to property of a deceased whose succession or liability for duty is the subject of the inquiry, and any witness called to give evidence in the inquiry, may be represented by council and the successor may, personally or through council, cross-examine any witness called to give evidence in the inquiry." And on the side note is recommended that it will read "Right to counsel and cross-examine."

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the amendment rather improves this section but I think I should point out, if you like, and the Finance Minister can comment if he wishes, these are relatively standard types of sections, similar ones will be found in many statutes of the province.

Last year, as I recall it, Sir, the House was debating some amendments

MR. ROBERTS: to labour legislation, Minimum Wage and Vacation With Pay Acts. At that time the minister was on this side of the House and he was quite eloquent about it, and I thought with great or considerable merit in his arguments. I was on that side sponsoring the legislation, as I recall it. He was quite eloquent in arguments against this type of requirement because in effect it requires a person to produce a great deal of information so forth and so on.

Now I am not going to make a long speech, it could be made about the right to protection from self-crimination and so forth. But I wonder if the minister would say a word or two on it, if he wishes.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Not to them that is fine. But as I said, last year, Sir, the minister in a different capacity was quite eloquent against this sort of section and I found myself in a position of defending it. Now he is in a position of sponsoring legislation requiring these things. I wonder if he wants to say

a word or two, the amendment introduced by the minister of Justice certainly does make some improvement by guaranteeing a right to counsel. But the fact remains that a person still can be required to produce all sorts of books, records, writings, or other documents so forth and so on.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I think there is a great deal in what the honourable gentleman said. The point here I think is that it is very rare for this procedure to be used. It does not mean there should not be safeguards, but these enquiries are very unusual proceedings, and would only be held if there is strong evidence that there is some devious scheme of tax evasion and avoidance going on. There might have to be an enquiry into that. Of course, as the House knows, Mr. Chairman, the public policy in recent years seems to be not that the onus is on the state to prove that you owe taxes or should pay them but it is the other way around. This in part is a reflection of it.

So, I can only say that I do not think there is any serious dangers in this section. You do have a right of counsel. But in tax matters which are extremely complicated it is sometimes necessary when a devious method of tax evasion has been worked out, not tax avoiding so much as tax evasion, that these powers are necessary. They are in the Federal Tax Legislation. Of course they are reflected in this Act here now. I would be surprised if this is used at all in Newfoundland but it might be necessary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to press the minister because of course the answer he gave is essentially the one which I gave last year, that these powers are necessary. At the same time I think it should be noted that there is an inconsistency in his position. I think he is right, in administering this and much other legislation, this is necessary, but it may point up the need, Mr. Chairman, this clause may point up the need for something which I never got done when I was in the ministry but when I get back there it will be done. That is three or

four years away. The present minister of Justice and the present Minister of Finance would, I do not expect to be back and forth as quickly as the Minister of Finance. He has been in a number of ministries, number of positions, doubtless more yet to come. But,

MR. CROSBIE: Social Credit next time -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I believe the minister would go Social Credit Sir, if nobody else would happen, and that may happen too. But, Mr. Chairman, as I was saying perhaps the present Minister of Finance and the present Minister of Justice could look at this question. It is true not only of tax law that the onus has been put more and more upon the individual citizen who has against him all the resources of the state. It is true in many many branches of administrative law, it may make administration easier, indeed it may be the only condition on which administration is possible.

But the fact remains more and more in this House and in every House across Canada, in Ottawa, the Parliament of Canada etc. etc. etc., more and more the state is infringing upon the rights - Mr. Trudeau did very well when he said the state has no place in the bedrooms of the nation. I submit that the minister has little place in the bedrooms of the province. But that is not a matter of the minister. Presumably it is a matter of good taste. Certainly in my case it is a matter of choice, is it not, as a bachelor.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to press the minister because he gave the answer that any minister would have given in the position. But nonetheless it is a serious problem. It is one that is going to go on and I think perhaps the answer is a general statute governing all of these rules, in effect saying to the state that they shall not use their powers unilaterally, arbitrarily and unreasonably, giving the average citizen some right to fight back. Perhaps when the lawyers talk about legal aid, Sir, in the traditional forms in which citizens

run afoul of the law, the criminal law and what have you, they might extend it a little further and get into this whole range of administrative law. I submit, Sir, that you can have your rights taken away just as effectively by these tribunals and by these ministerial actions, indeed as we all know ministerial action is usually by a clerk, for the action of an under clerk or the fourteenth assistant to the deputy, to the assistant, to the associate, to the deputy minister who advises the minister. Perhaps all of us who are at the bar and are concerned with these things should look further. My colleague from White Bay South has pointed out in earlier debates in this present session a number of provisions.

I do not blame the ministry, the draftsmen do them. They are standard, they are routine, they are boiler plate. But, Sir, the problem is there, when the honourable gentleman was over here last year he was quite eloquent about it. It was more than the N.T.A legislation Mr. Chairman, it was legislation with respect to amendments to the Minimum Wage Act the Vacation With Pay Act, a number of those. I recall it because I was introducing them in place of Bill Keough who at that stage was absent from the House. I am not sure if he died as of then, but indeed was not in his place to sponsor the legislation. The present minister raised the point, I think he did it well. As he says now, he is man enough to admit the argument still have merit.

What I am really suggesting to the ministry, Sir, in respect of this clause is that they might wish to look at legislation covering the entire problem. I think it would be far more important than a lot of the things that we looked at, Of course they could go a lot further and do something about the incredible power of the so-called self-governing societies, one of which I am a member in allegedly good standing, unless the benchers have written me out since the most recent meeting. I notice the law clerk looks up at that, perhaps the law clerk

could defend me, I might need a defence.

Mr. Chairman, this is a problem, all I can do is bring it to the attention of the Committee. I suspect the minister shares my views. I suspect even the Minister of Justice shares my views. I do hope they will do something about it.

MR.HICKMAN: I move Mr. Chairman, that Clauses 79 & 80 be renumbered 80 & 81. I have another amendment to follow to insert a clause 79.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the new Clause 79 read as follows: Section 47 of the Revenue & Audit Act shall mutatis mutandis shall, mutatis mutandis, apply in respect of any duty, interest or penalty within the meaning of this Act.

MR.ROBERTS: Section 47 of the Revenue Act says offhand -

MR.CROSBIE: This is the section that pertains to revenues being received by the province, same laws that apply to revenues being received under this Act.

MR.ROBERTS: There are a number of sections of the Revenue and Audit Act revenues being received - that is the whole point of the Audit Act. The honourable gentleman has two expert advisers could one of them, the Committee will be sitting for a few minutes, could one of them novel out and get Section 47. Or get the office consolidation of the -

Clause 80:

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: There have to be regulations. There will be regulations under the Act but it will come into effect as soon as the Lieutenant-Governor signs it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes. It is not done by proclamation.

On motion Clause 81 carried.

On motion Schedule I and Schedule II carried.

MR. CROSBIE: I have to point out to the House that it took Fiscal Studies two days to work out this calculation. I mean to check it, not to work it out.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, I think that Mr. Goodwin was there while that was being corrected. In fact he is doing a paper on it now.

MR. ROBERTS: I must say this is certainly four year planning with a vengeance. It will take them four years to work it out.

On motion, A Bill, "An Act Respecting Succession Duty."

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, Section (47) of the Revenue and Audit Act has to do with remission of forfeitures, penalties etc. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, whenever they deems right and conducive to the public good, remit any duty or toll payable to Her Majesty, imposed by an Act of the Legislature.

So this deals with forfeiture or remission of penalty.

MR. ROBERTS: In other words the government have the power to remit succession duties or certain aspects of it.

MR. CROSBIE: No, the forfeiture of, not the duty itself.

Motion that the committee report having passed the Bill with some amendments, carried:

A Bill, "An Act Respecting Gift Tax." (Bill No. 53).

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 2, page 6. After (r) there be added, first there be excluded the words "any estate" on the bottom line of that



MR. HICKMAN: page, "any estate or in" from there to the end. The words, "any estate or interest in any such action or right of any kind whatsoever in any chosen action." I move that these words be deleted and there be substituted therefore, (i) "any estate or interest in any such property, a right of any kind whatever and a chosen action." and "(ii) money."

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: I know at least of one Finance Minister who once said what capital gains he paid of his entire estate was in money. It would be a sizable estate.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 2 (aa) (ii), I move the comma be deleted.

It will be comprised in the income right. Why did they take that out, anyway?

MR. ROBERTS: (aa) (i) is the same thing. The income right I guess is defined, is it?

On motion Clause 2 as amended carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 9, page 14, Mr. Chairman, after the word "made", in the second last line, I move the insertion of the words "by him."

On motion Clause 9 as amended carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 11, Mr. Chairman, I move the insertion, (g) to read as follows: "gifts made to a person by a donor in any year where the aggregate value of those gifts made to that person by that donor in that year does not exceed \$100."

On motion Clause 11 as amended carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 12, on page 15, Clause 12(a) I move the deletion of the word "persons" and substituting therefore the word "individuals." It will now read "in the case of gifts made to individuals."

On motion Clause 12 as amended carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 19 (1) I move that after the word "dollars" in the second line there be inserted the following words, "but not including in that aggregate the value of gifts exempt under paragraph (g) of

MR. HICKMAN: Section 11. That is the paragraph we just put in.

On motion Clause 19 as amended carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 24 (2) line three I move the deletion of the word "conclusively."

On motion Clause 24 as amended carried.

MR. HICKMAN: On Clause 28, I move the deletion of the word "conclusively."

On motion Clause 28 as amended carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 31, subclause (14) on page 26, I move that after the word "may"

Mr. Hickman:

the word, "Confirm," be included, added.

On motion, Clause (31) as amended, carried.

MR. ROBERTS: I really think we should have fourteen here. Perhaps Your Honour could count but you cannot count Mr. Goodwin and Mr. Avery until they are elected.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the clerk please count the members?

The members having been counted and there being fourteen present there is a quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, it appears to me the Law Clerk was out asking whether there were any members in the hall. If so, is this part of his duties?

MR CHAIRMAN: I do not think that this is a point of order.

MR ROBERTS: It is. I wonder if Your Honour would call in the Speaker then, because the Law Clerk's duties are to advise Your Honour on law. If in fact the Law Clerk, Sir, was out in that hall suggesting the members, be they ministers, of debate come in, I suggest he is without his terms of reference as Law Clerk of this House, Sir.

MR CROSSIE: If the Law Clerk were out or not - I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that it is proper for his conduct to be called into question like this. If the Law Clerk were out and said to any member that they should get into the House, what difference would it make? The House should have a quorum in any event.

MR EVANS: I saw the Law Clerk and I did not hear him mention it to anyone. I did the mentioning myself.

MR ROBERTS: I asked originally a question. I only asked because I raised the quorum call: the Law Clerk left the House and went outside. Now he may have had a hundred reasons to do it. I am very glad to know from the gentleman from Burgeo - LaPoile that the Law Clerk was not out there. I do submit though that it is proper to call into question the

conduct of any of the House's servants, Sir, if in fact they do not conduct themselves properly, I have no hesitation in so doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I could say to the honourable Leader of the Opposition, I did not question that point. I did question, however, whether the Chair could answer what the Law Clerk was doing when he left the House. This the Chair feels the Chair cannot answer.

MR. ROBERTS: At this stage it is hypothetical. It may not be hypothetical but if it were actual my submission in reply to Your Honour's ruling would be that Your Honour is the officer in the Chair and is responsible for the affairs of the House including the House's servants.

On motion, Clauses 32 to 35, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 36, page 30, paragraph (d), sub-clause (1), I move that "has" be deleted in the last line and "have" substituted therefore.

On motion, Clause 36 as amended, carried.

On motion, Clauses 37 to 42, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 43, page 33, sub-clause (3), the second line, I move the deletion of the words "the Supreme Court" and substituting therefore the words "a court."

On motion, Clause 43 as amended, carried.

On motion, Clauses 44 and 45, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 46, page 35, sub-clause (3) the second line, I move after the word "period" I move the deletion of the following words, "not exceeding thirty days."

On motion, Clause 46 as amended, carried.

On motion, Clauses 47 to 51, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 52, Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment of that clause by adding a sub-clause to be numbered (7) to read as follows:

"In any inquiry made under sub-section (3) the donor and any donee

whose gift or liability for tax is the subject of the inquiry, and any witness called to give evidence in the inquiry, may be represented by counsel and the donor and the donee each may, personally or through counsel cross-examine any witness called to give evidence in the inquiry," and the side note will read: "Right to counsel and to cross-examine."

On motion, Clause 52 as amended, carried.

On motion, Clauses 53 and 54, carried.

On motion clauses 56 through 61, carried.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, as that is the final clause, I think I should congratulate the minister on the able way he has piloted the matter through committee. Has there been a question raised by any of the twenty or twenty-two members? I think the minister has done an admirable job, Sir. Whether they are all satisfied, confused or both.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, my only regret is that this Act will not apply to what the Leader of the Opposition calls a gift to Mr. Doyle of \$5 million. If it were a gift, I would love to impose the rate that would be imposed of \$63,750,000 plus fifty percent. It would be a great help. In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Opposition for their co-operation in this matter, and thank Mr. Goodman for coming along. Also to thank Mr. Cyril Avery who is the head of the Fiscal Studies Division of the Treasury Board for his assistance in this matter. He is sitting here behind me and he is the successor to Mr. David Mercer who was head of Fiscal Studies. They are both very able public servants. I would like to thank the committee..

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the minister is in good hands when he has people like Mr. Avery and I did not know Mr. Goodman was a public servant unless there have been some changes in the Public Service of Newfoundland in the last few hours. Public servants such as Mr. Avery and advisers from the private sector such as Mr. Goodman - I share the minister's regret that the tax does not apply to the gift given to Mr. Doyle, I wonder does it apply to the gift given to Mr. Spencer? No, not Mr. Spencer, Mr. Spencer Lake?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: The minister should not say that, I nearly said Mr. Cheeseman, and withdrew.

On motion, that the committee rise and report having passed

Bills 53 and 54 with some amendment,

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

On motion, report received and adopted.

On motion, amendments read a first time.

On motion, amendments read a second time, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

HEADING VI, EDUCATION AND YOUTH

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I imagine the best way to proceed is for myself to make an opening statement and I imagine there are other hon. gentlemen in this House who would like to make a statement or two. Then eventually we will get into the consideration of the estimates item by item.

My Deputy Minister or associate Deputy Minister is in the wings and I would appreciate the permission of the House that he may be seated.

In the meantime, I would like to read an opening statement that might clarify a few points.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does the minister have copies of it?

MR. CARTER: I can get copies made, both for the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition as well as for the press. At the moment I have only one copy which I intend to read. Mr. Chairman, with your leave I shall begin:

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Education and Youth is the biggest and undoubtedly the most complex of all departments of government. At the present time there are nine hundred employees on our payroll including the administrators and staff in our eleven vocational schools, the school for the deaf and institutional schools. The administrative staff of the department itself totals 223 and these people are accommodated in five different offices in the City of St. John's,

June 12, 1972, Tape 687, Page 3 -- apb

and two outside of St. John's. One is at Grand Falls and the other at Corner Brook.

The Department of Education and Youth is not only the biggest and most complex department, it is the one department which is most sensitive to the needs and demands of our people, and as a consequence of this, possibly the most

2131



Mr. Carter.

misunderstood. It is not often realized Mr. Chairman that out of our population of 500,000, 164,000 are in elementary and secondary schools, another 12,000 are full-time and part-time students at Memorial University and another 5,000 or 6,000 are registered in our vocational and technical institutions. If you add to these numbers the 80,000 or so who are their parents, it can be seen that nearly half the population of this province are intimately associated with the educational institutions that come under the direct jurisdiction of the Department of Education and Youth. When you consider the fact that the services of our department extend further into such community activities as sports and recreation and that the vast majority of our people contribute directly to school taxes and assessments to the cost of education, it is not difficult to understand why every one takes such a positive and often times critical attitude towards education. Because the general public is so vitally concerned with the Department of Education and its operations and because the department is so misunderstood, I want Mr. Chairman, to take a few minutes to outline briefly the major purposes and functions of the department and to describe the kind of organization we have developed to achieve these purposes. Theoretically, the functions and responsibilities of the Department of Education and Youth can be summarized under two headings: (1) the regulatory functions; and (2) the leadership function.

We feel that one of the basic responsibilities of our department is to provide a legislative and regulatory framework within which education can be effectively and efficiently carried on across the province. This function includes the initiation of regulations and policies and the enforcement of them, after they have been formulated and approved. These regulations, i.e., control the distribution of teacher salary grants

Mr. Carter

and of various operational grants to school boards, the awarding of scholarships and bursaries to our students. They also regulate professional matters such as the minimum prescribed curricular for our children, minimum school construction standards, the length of the school year and other such matters which are designed to ensure a minimum level of educational opportunity for all our children.

The second major function of the department is the leadership one. We consider it is our responsibility to give a measure of guidance and direction to school boards, superintendents and other educators working at the district or school level. This direction is given in special fields through our curriculum consultants and supervisors, through our regional superintendents and through our planning office and indeed through all our senior officials. In order to enable us to fulfill this leadership function properly, we have attempted to recruit a degree of expertise in professional competence which can be made available to local school authorities as they develop and improve their local school programmes. At the present time we have seven or eight full-time consultants and specialists whose primary responsibility is to work with these local authorities. At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment briefly on the organization of the department itself and more specifically on the work performed by each division of it. In addition to the deputy minister and associate deputy minister, there are six senior personnel, each responsible for a division. I shall deal with them individually.

(1) The Division of Instruction: This division is an extension of the former Division of Curriculum. Under the new arrangement, the Division of Instruction, supported by three assistant directors, each competent in a different area of specialty, is responsible for the overall direction and co-ordination of educational programmes offered in the schools

Mr. Carter

of the province. This division with its subject area specialists and consultants, not only develops general curricula for the province but assists local school authorities in the development improvement and implementation of educational programmes at the classroom level, as I indicated a moment ago. I should add that the general responsibility of this division includes the handling of audio-visual materials and the promotion of technological media, as part of the process of education. In this respect, I am sure that we are just beginning to make significant revisions in our traditional and orthodox approach to teaching. Included also in this division is the overall administration of public examinations which this year, as honourable members may know, is undergoing radical change. I refer to the new system by which the high school teachers themselves are delegated responsibility for assigning fifty per cent of the pupils final mark in Grade XI, the other fifty per cent being determined as a result of public examinations. All in all, Mr. Chairman, we feel that this is the most important division of our department, in that its operations has a direct influence on what transpires in every classroom of the province. This division, therefore, more than any other determines the quality of education provided for our children.

(2). The Division of Administration: There are two dimensions to the work of this division. The first deals with the internal administrative operation of the department. This includes such things as the appointment and payment of clerical staff and the organization of departmental offices. The second pertains to certain services of an administrative nature rendered to school boards, teachers and the public. Such services include the distribution of various departmental grants to school boards, the administration of student aid and scholarship programmes, certification of teachers, the administration of the Teachers

Mr. Carter

Pension Act and the distribution of statistical and other information on education as well as the administration of youth travel programmes.

(3). The Division of Supervision: This division is responsible for working with school boards in educational planning and general supervision. There are really three sectors to this division: (1) the school planning section which is responsible for assisting school boards in preparing educational specifications and plans for new buildings and for seeing that these plans receive final approval before any school construction is commenced. (2) The school bus transportation section which has been responsible for the approval of school bus contracts and all other matters related to school transportation in the province. (3) This section includes the regional superintendents. At the moment we have only two although our plans call for six. These two operate from offices in Grand Falls and Corner Brook. In summary, I think it can be stated that this division is the one which works most closely with school boards in administrative and organizational matters.

(4). The Division of Technical and Vocational Education: This division did not change as a result of the departmental reorganization which took place in 1969. It is still solely responsible for the development of policies relating to technical and vocational education and for the administration of institutions established under the Technical and Vocational Training Act. An enactment of the College of Trades and Technology Act in May, 1969, changed this somewhat since that legislation makes provision for the administration of the college by a Board of Governors. This board has now been in operation for over a year. For the information of honourable members, we now have eleven vocational schools in the province, and there are six under construction, three of which will probably open this fall.

Mr. Carter.

(5) The Division of Special Education: This is a relatively new division which is responsible for the development and maintenance of special education services as they relate to retarded children, slow learners, the partially deaf and other handicapped children. It is also concerned with programmes for gifted children. In the first three years of operation, this division has concentrated on the promotion of opportunity classes across the province and the development of programmes suited to the needs of children who cannot benefit properly from regular classroom instruction. In addition the Division of Special Education has administered the various institutional schools, some of which were formerly operated by other departments of government. If our present plans materialize within the next few years, this new division will expand considerably, both from the standpoint of staff to be appointed and the nature of services to be offered as there is still urgent need for new services for certain children with unusual learning disabilities.

(6) The Division of Physical Education and Youth: This division which has its headquarters at the Recreational Centre, Torbay,

is responsible for developing a Physical Education programme for schools, for promoting sports and athletics in schools and in the community in general and for promoting all kinds of organizations and activities which are likely to improve the overall educational opportunities of our youth.

I might say that in the last year or two this division has been actively engaged in encouraging the expansion of recreational facilities across this province. Contrary to what people may think, this division is not concerned only with physical education and sports. Here I would like to emphasize that it is also concerned with all youth activities. At the present time, through our Supervisor of Youth and our 4H Officials, who are also an integral part of this division who are attempting to provide a wide variety of youth organizations and clubs which are not athletic in nature but which will enhance the social education of our children and contribute to their leadership development.

Mr. Speaker, everyone is now aware that the Department of Education was reorganized two or three years ago. This reorganization, in our opinion, has proven very successful. However, neither my officials nor I are completely satisfied with the job we are doing and perhaps we should not be. We feel that further reorganisation may be necessary in our departmental set up and newer approaches in the way we perform our daily functions may be imperative, if we are to respond successfully to the legitimate demands being made on us by people of this Province. I would like to say that my officials and I will be vigorously and continuously attempting to bring about these changes and improvements.

During the next two or three days, Mr. Chairman, we will be considering the Estimates for my departments.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two or three weeks.

MR. CARTER: The amount of these Estimates is over \$128,000,000, a ten percent increase over last year's and the highest amount this House has ever

been asked to vote for Education. At first this sounds like an extremely high amount. However, it must be realized that 40 per cent of this amount is being spent on teachers' salaries alone. Moreover, the fact should also be made that this amount is not spent exclusively on elementary and secondary education. Over \$20,000,000 will be on the University, over \$3,000,000 on the College of Trades and Technology and nearly \$10,000,000 on Vocational Education. I make these points only because there is a misconception that the education vote goes entirely for ordinary day school education.

Mr. Chairman, I said at the outset that the Department of Education and Youth is probably the most complex and possibly the most misunderstood of all departments of government. I trust that in the past few minutes I have provided some information and a little detail which will clear up some of that misunderstanding, if it exists, and which will set the stage for a reasonable and mature consideration of the Estimates of my department which so intimately concerns all the people of this Province.

Thank you!

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the minister for giving us an outline of the responsibilities of his department, although I fail to see what this has to do with introducing the Budget of his department. It is something I am sure we could have gotten from the annual report of the Department of Education. Really, I am sincere about this, I fail to see any indication of direction on the minister's part for philosophy as far as education in Newfoundland is concerned. I really cannot see any aim there. The only thing that I can see in the remarks that he has made is that education in the Province and the administration of education in the Province is extremely complex and I hope this is in no way an indication of an apology on his part for what in fact he has been able to get out of the provincial budget as far as education is concerned. I will relate back to that a little later.

Sir, in my speech in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I referred to the insidious plot that the present Administration was embarking upon as far as imposing cut-backs on expenditures in this Province was concerned, for this year, possibly for next year and probably even in the third year. I suggested that this was a cruel game to play. It was a dangerous game to play with the people of Newfoundland, to cut back on expenditures for a couple of years. Blame the state of the economy on the previous Administration and then basically make the people suffer for two or three years and then come in with all guns firing in the third or fourth year for the purposes of getting re-elected. I suggested that this was a cold game to be playing. There was no feeling in it whatsoever as far as the Administration was concerned.

Sir, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition referred to the Budget Speech as a speech of a tiger and the Estimates as that of a pussy cat. In the case of the Budget, as it relates to the Department of Education, I feel that in this case the Estimates represents the estimate of a tiger. Never did I think, Sir, that the field of Education would be one of the areas that this Administration would pick to cut expenditures back on. That is relatively speaking. It is not an actual cut-back. But relatively speaking it is certainly a cut-back in certain areas of education whereby the people who need the help most will end up suffering. And again, I will relate to that later on.

Sir, as we all know, education is one of the most important aspects of our society. It is vital in the broadest sense. Most people would realise that an investment in education by either an individual or by an institution or by government itself is the single most important investment that can be made. As far as the progress of the people is concerned, it is crucial, Sir. This has been the feeling expressed by every economic or sociological or scientific or educational conference that I have attended or that I have read about. For example, the Thinkers Conference back in 1965 suggested, as did other conferences, that an investment in education is



extremely important as far as the economic development of a country or province is concerned.

Sir, if we look at the total vote for education in this Province, we see that this year it is in the order of \$128,000,000. That is the total vote. Last year the vote was in the order of almost 116,000,000. This represents an increase, as the minister suggested, of approximately 10 per cent or \$12,000,000. Sir, I find this peculiar that we have an increase in the total vote for education of approximately \$12,000,000 while at the same time we have the grants respecting student-aid, that is student aid in the schools and in the university appear to be down. We find that the grants to education students, these are the special education bursaries or grants amounting to \$400.00 per student, these have been eliminated all together. We find that the grant to physical education and youth in that particular division of the department that is down as well. We find, if we look at it very carefully, that the operating grant to Memorial University is horribly inadequate as far as the development of that university is concerned, in the accommodation of the students. We find that the capital grant to the University is totally inadequate. It is my feeling that directly or indirectly students will of necessity have to be turned away or they will decide not to come to University this year for one reason or another. We find that the grants for the transportation of school children in this Province, after some controversy, has been brought up to the level of last year. But it is my feeling that again this is horribly inadequate. The Mothers' Allowances have been eliminated all together and there is some question about this now. I will relate to these specific headings a little later. In my estimation, these Mothers' Allowances

MR. ROWE, (F.B.) provisions were eliminated without any thought been given whatsoever to the consequences as far as some of the families in this province are concerned.

Now, Sir, I mention this because although we have an increase of approximately \$11 million, we have a situation where seven areas in education the grant is either down or the vote is down or the vote is inadequate. Sir, it seems to me that the vote for the estimates for the Department of Education are totally inadequate as far as meeting the challenges of tomorrow are concerned in this field of education.

Now Sir, whether this is by accident or by design, I submit that the education budget will hurt the ordinary Newfoundlander, the common Newfoundlander and certainly the poor Newfoundlander. The people who need the help most with respect to certain aspects of education are the ones who are going to be hurt the most, with respect to this particular budget.

Sir the budget does not reflect at all any indication of any formulation of educational policy or direction. This statement that the honourable minister just made, Sir, did not do anything to clarify the situation. There was nothing in the statement that indicated to me that there was any direction or philosophy as far as the minister heading this department is concerned. It reflects the lack of policy, and still worse, it reflects no feeling or no compassion or sympathy for the areas of the province or the people who need the assistance the most.

Now, Sir, everybody knows that educational costs are increasing at an extremely rapid rate. Everybody knows that we have a lot of catching up to do in the field of education in this province. This is not entirely because of the past administration. We have made tremendous strides over the past twenty-three years. But we were

MR. ROWE, (F.B.): years behind as far as education was concerned in this province.

There are certain provinces of Canada where they are taking a very serious look at expenditures in education. I feel there is nothing wrong with that whatsoever and I think we should take a serious look at expenditures in education in this province. But there is no indication on the part of this administration that they are conducting any work whatsoever to try to ascertain the efficiency of spending of money in the field of education.

So Sir, there is a real need for increased expenditures in education in the areas of this province and with respect to the groups of people who need it the most. Basically Sir, what we are finding here is that, if you look at the University and if you look at school bus transportation of school children, if you look at recreation, if you look at physical education and youth, these types of things, it is not the people in these cities or the large communities or the large towns who are going to be the ones that will suffer. It is the rural person who is trying to get a university education or who is trying to get to school, these are the people who are hit the hardest.

Sir, the measure of the sincerity or the power or the success or probably even the potential of a Minister of Education is twofold. First, Sir, it is the extent or degree that a minister can convince his colleagues in cabinet of a need for an increase and an adequate slice of the budget for his particular department.

Sir, what I am suggesting here is that in this capacity the minister has failed utterly and miserably. Sir, the poor mothers, now not all of the mothers, but the poor mothers of this province are not impressed with the estimates for the Department of Education. The people involved in physical education and youth, the people, many

MR. ROWE, F.B. of whom are volunteer workers, suffered a severe blow with the cutbacks in that particular division.

Sir, the students at the University got the shock of their life when they heard the revelations of the budget speech. The

people who are concerned with the running of the residences at the University, the students who are trying to get into residences in the University were certainly not impressed by the budget speech, the vote in the budget department, for the education department.

The dreams of the engineering school at Memorial are quickly turning into nothing but a horrible nightmare Sir. The students may in fact be turned away from the medical school this year. We have heard the President of the University express his concern over this fact that students may have to be turned away from the medical school this year. As I mentioned before, the operating grant to the university is horribly inadequate.

Sir, there has been no indication in the estimate at all as to the future of regional community colleges, at least as far as money being voted for these colleges is concerned. As I mentioned before the vote for the transportation of school children in this province I feel is inadequate for this year.

Now, Sir, I could go on with many more examples where the minister has failed completely to get an adequate slice of the budget pie for his particular department. So, Sir, we see really that in the first measure of the competence of the minister of Education, it is my feeling that the minister has flunked out disgracefully.

The second measure, Sir, of competence of the minister in his capacity to articulate educational policy! Sir, we have not heard a glimmer nor a hint of policy nor direction from the minister since this honourable House opened. What we heard, Sir, were in fact two speeches, one the Address in Reply, he made a brief speech concerning the budget.

Sir, each one of these speeches consisted of a repetition of sly, vicious, sarcastic, low, contemptible remarks. It is all in Hansard to see. If this sounds like a personal attack, Sir, I feel that I have

to make it. I do not think it is a personal attack. The record there speaks for itself. On the two occasions that the minister had to speak in this House of Assembly in order to expound on some educational philosophy, he has taken these two opportunities to direct these sly, vicious, sarcastic remarks at the honourable Leader of the Opposition and the honourable Leader in the House of the Opposition.

Sir, the only thing that these two speeches indicated was a fanatical hatred of the former Liberal administration, anybody who is the least bit connected with that administration. I hope, Sir, before this honourable House closes that this hatred will subside that he will get on with the business of his department.

Sir, in these two speeches that the minister made, the major part of the speeches were really made up of a personal attack on the honourable Leader of the Opposition, the House Leader of the Opposition, in the second speech he reached the honourable member for Bell Island, I believe, in his personal attack.

Sir, the only reference I can remember, we can check Hansard for this, as far as education was concerned, is that education is extremely complex, that primary education is important, elementary education is important, vocational education

is important, university education is important. That is the only statement of direction or policy that we have from the Minister of Education.

MR. HICKMAN: What about his brilliant transportation policy?

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Well, we will come to that later.

MR. HICKMAN: He did not comment on motherhood at all.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): We will come to that later. Sir, I think the minister, if he keeps these tactics up, really owes the people of Newfoundland an apology. We can see, Sir, just how important education is to the honourable minister when in the first instance he has failed completely to articulate policy with respect to his department. Secondly there have been a number of questions directed to the honourable Minister of Education and the most, well we did get a statement from one question, but in most cases what we simply got was an answer that our questioning is extremely tedious and complex. I have yet to hear the answer to the question that I ask him relating to what went on at a university meeting approximately one week before an election. Thirdly, Sir, he has failed miserably to get an adequate share of the budget to meet the educational needs of this province.

The sad thing about it, Sir, is that it is the little man and it is the little community of this province likely will suffer as a result of this budget as it pertains to education. Sir, I strongly recommend that the Minister of Education he shed or molt his cloak of hatred of the Liberals and he address himself to the administration of his department and the articulation of some educational policy which would give us some indication of the thinking of this present administration as it relates to education.

Now, Sir, I am sorry that I had to make these, what could be considered personal remarks but when you sit here day after day and there is an absolute void with respect to what is going on in

education in this province and when you look at the budget, I feel that I had to make them particularly when I had to listen to a few speeches that the honourable minister made respecting certain members on this side of the House.

Now, Sir, getting into the details here. The first thing that comes to mind is this Educational Advisory Committee. I am not quite sure, Mr. Chairman, what you call it, the External Advisory Committee I believe. What is the best thing to do here, Mr. Chairman? The honourable minister probably could jot down the inquiries that I have and come up with the answer a little later or does he want to answer them directly?

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROUE(F.B.): Fine. Well, first what I would like to know is what has happened, if anything, to the original advisory committee to the Minister of Education? Now the reason I ask this is because I have learned from the papers that this External Advisory Committee has been set up, a statutory committee I understand, and this committee consists of twenty-six members from a broad spectrum of our Newfoundland people. There is one thing that I am very concerned about here and that is this, that in the field of education there is a tendency, whether you are at the university or in the NTA or in the school, there is a certain tendency to have a tremendous number of committees set up and what we usually see is a certain amount of redundancy as far as the operation of these committees are concerned.

We have, as you know, Sir, the NTA and they have their various numbers of committees. They have their curriculum councils and their branches throughout the province. We have the Federation of School Boards. We have individual school boards. We have the Denominational Education Committees. We have vocational schools and the College of Trades and Technology and the Fisheries College and presumably they have various committees set up under them. The university certainly



has a number of committees as it relates to education. We have the Adult Education Organization. We have the Department of Education itself which has a great number of committees particularly under curriculum and we have the joint committee and, Sir, there are all kinds of committees all over the place with respect to education.

Now what I am basically asking here is will the new committee that has been set up, this External Advisory Committee, will this duplicate some of the work that is being carried out by these

other committees that I have mentioned. My own feeling, Sir, is that a twenty-six man committee is certainly a horribly cumbersome committee and in my experience I think you will find that the meetings will be tremendously time-consuming and what comes out of those meetings will be very little. This is not a criticism of this present committee, but in my experience with committees of this size, long, tedious meetings with very little coming out of them. I am extremely concerned duplication with other committees that may result with this new committee being set up.

I would appreciate it if the minister could relate to the purposes and the aims of this new statutory committee. I understand that the committee will canvas the opinions and seek the assistance of a wide segment of business and professional people as well as educators in all matters of education. The aim of the committee is to co ordinate all educational services with emphasis on the active participation of public groups and associations.

Sir, I find this just a little bit fuzzy, the stated aims of the committee and I would appreciate some clarification on it.

Sir, with respect to assistance to students. We have a situation at Memorial now and let me say at the outset this: some people may suggest that because my latest job was connected with the university that I may be here to protect the rights and try to get something for the university, simply because of my original connection with it. But, Sir, I am really mentioning it because university education affects every single community, every single family in this province. What I am concerned most about here, is that students now have to borrow two hundred dollars more under the Canada Student Loan Plan in order to qualify for provincial assistance.

It is my understanding and I have been told this by people other than members of the Liberal Association at the university. It is my understanding that one week, approximately within one week before the last provincial election there were a panel of six members from the

other side of the House who were asked whether or not students would have to borrow additional funds from the Canada Student Loan Plan in order to qualify for provincial assistance. I understand, Sir, that one reply, I think from the hon. the Minister of Finance - I stand to be corrected here, but it was from one member of that panel - was that this was a dirty Liberal rumour being spread by the University Liberal Association.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame!

MR. F.B. ROWE: Having been questioned again, I further understand that the hon. the Minister of Education and the hon. Minister of Finance assured the students in public that they would not have to borrow this two hundred dollars extra in order to qualify for provincial assistance.

AN HON. MEMBER: Resign, resign.

MR. ROWE: This meaning was transferred to the students, Sir. On top of that, we have a situation where the special assistance bursaries to education students have been eliminated altogether. That is four hundred dollars eliminated. The reason given for this, at least this was my understanding from what the hon. Minister of Finance had to say, is that there are no longer incentives required to get people into the teaching profession and that we really have enough teachers in the province at the present time,

there is not a shortage of teachers. I will not go so far as to suggest that the honourable minister of Finance suggested that there was an over-supply of teachers. This is what some people could have read into it. Sir, there is not an over-supply of teachers in this province particularly in certain areas. I could mention science, education, reading, mathematics, foreign language, these areas of education, music, in a specialist areas you find that there is in fact a shortage of teachers.

Now, if you are going to take away general incentives, because the feeling is that we have enough teachers in the schools of our province at this time, the least that this administration could have done was take this \$400 special assistance to education students and try to use it as an incentive to get people into certain specialized areas where you have a shortage of teachers at the present time.

On top of that, Sir, we have a situation where the graduate fellowships at the university have been reduced from 130 to 90. These are the \$2,500 fellowships for graduate students. This applies to students of course other than those in education.

Well, Sir, I have been talking with certain people at the university. They feel, particularly in the field of education where we need more teachers graduating at the Master's level than ever before because we have those great new schools going up now, we have all sorts of new curriculum development, we have new administrative problems in developing in the fields of education, there is a great need for graduates in education at the Master's level. A reduction of those graduate fellowships from 130 to 90 can only mean, Sir, that some of these students who are planning to come to the university to do graduate studies, those teachers who have been teaching for a number of years who have families, children, who have mortgages to pay, just simply will not come to university.

Sir, it all boils down to this: We have, supposing if you can

state a hypothetical case, supposing you are an education student. from a very remote area of our province, - there are enough remote areas of our province - that student all of a sudden finds that he has to find \$200 extra, he has to borrow \$200 extra and he is out \$400 in this special assistance, which means he is out a total of \$600. Now, if that does not mean a lot to a student or a child of a family of low income in a very remote community of this province, who has to travel from somewhere like St. Barbe North on no income - there are enough of those - Sir, this only simply means that we have a situation developing for the first time in a great number of years where a student's probability of attending university in this province is starting to depend more on his financial capacity to come to university than on his basic intellectual capacity to study at that university.

MR. CROSBIE: Some thought has to be given to the province's financial -

MR. ROWE: Some thought has to be given but when you get \$2.6 million going to Spencer Lake, being robbed from the mothers and the - Sir, it is a funny thing, you know the honourable Minister of Finance, whenever you try to make a point that involves

MR. ROWE, (F.B.): the poor people of this province, the ordinary guy of this province, it all of a sudden becomes nonsense, absolute nonsense to him.

MR. NEARY: Circular Road will get educated.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Just as long as he is not getting his own way, everything becomes nonsense.

MR. NEARY: Circular Road and Waterford Bridge Road will get educated.

MR. ROWE, F.B. I do not know why the honourable Minister of Finance is so touchy, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Take a pill. Take another pill.

MR. ROWE, F.B. I am relating to the incapacity of the Minister of Education to get a reasonable share of the budget pie for his department. So what is the honourable Minister of Finance being so touchy about?

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Take a pill and go out and go to sleep.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Mr. Chairman, with respect to the operating grant to the university, we see that the President of the University stated that the operating budget for the medical school is less than the minimum required to provide for the planned number of students for this year.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: We will come to the -

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F.B. We are talking about this year.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Why do you all not get back in your cage and -

MR. NEARY: Keep your cool, we will get around to the minister.

MR. ROWE, F.B. The Minister of Finance, Mr. Chairman, at least has admitted that the President did make that statement, whether it was for this year or any other year. He has made it this year

MR. ROWE, F.B. and I believe we are dealing with the estimates for this year, not last year.

MR. CROSBIE: Forget last year's.

MR. ROWE, F.B. That is right. It is pretty hard to forget it with the honourable Minister of Finance over there.

MR. NEARY: If we are going to go back, why go back twenty-three years, let us go back five hundred years.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think it is the intention of this House by agreement to sit tonight, so I thought it might be an idea before six o'clock arrives, if we could settle that matter. I am looking forward to a prolonged -

MR. ROWE, F.B. On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: What is the point of order?

MR. CARTER: Well I think that it ought to be settled prior to six o'clock.

MR. ROWE, F.B. On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. On a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CARTER: I will take instructions from the Chairman.

MR. ROWE, F.B. I do not understand the minister's point of order here.

MR. CARTER: I think it would be a good idea, if we were to settle whether or not we are going to continue this debate now rather than after six o'clock?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The honourable gentleman might wish to look at Standing Orders, it says explicitly; unless there is a motion made before six of the clock, we do not sit tonight. We do in fact sit tonight. For this side, we do not care if we sit or not. The honourable gentleman is going to be presenting his estimates, we are willing to do it tonight, Your Honour. If Your Honour wishes. But there is no point of order and the honourable gentleman -

MR. CARTER: I am delighted to have some assurance. I am delighted to have such assurance.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Mr. Chairman, I was relating to the operating grant to the university as far as it effects the medical school. Sir, the Minister of Finance suggested that any rumors or hints suggesting that students will have to be turned away from the university in the coming year is nothing but a tissue of deception.

MR. CARTER: A Liberal plot.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Now, Sir, this is one instance where students are going to have to be physically and directly turned away from the university in the coming year. It is my feeling that indirectly there are other reasons for suggesting that students will decide not to come to university or will in fact be turned away from the university.

Sir, the fact that we have to turn medical students away from this university in this coming year obviously suggests or means that there will be a corresponding decrease in graduating doctors in four or five years time.



Sir, everybody in this province realizes and knows the great need for doctors in many of the communities of our province and I think this is a sad thing when we have a medical school just starting at the university. The new physical plant is actually starting up now but we do have a medical school in the temporary buildings and it is a very sad thing indeed when we have to sit here and listen to the fact that students are going to have to be turned away, medical students are going to have to be turned away from the university this year.

Sir, as far as the capital grant to Memorial University is concerned, the estimates suggest that only \$1.35 million is available in capital grants to the university. Now, Sir, -

MR. CROSBIE: What about the medical school?

MR. ROWE(F.B.): I am talking about the grants other than those to the medical school.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Well, I mean anybody could see that.

MR. CROSBIE: The medical school is not at the university. That is not part of it.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Oh, it is very much a part of it. I just related to the medical school and what is going to happen there, a reduction in students this year. Sir, there are about 7,300 students at the university, full-time students and about 3,300 part-time students for a total of about 10,000 students and we can normally expect 500, 600 or 700 additional students each year. Sir, the library facilities there are really only adequate for 2,500 students. The physical education facilities are really only adequate for approximately 1,800 students. Sir, the minimum amount required by the university this year in order to meet its needs as far as capital works are concerned, the minimum amount was \$8. million. But, Sir, we only have \$1.35 million and out of that has to come the \$450,000 that is required for completion of

payments on the engineering building, Block C and D.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable -

MR. ROWE (F.B.): So, Sir, what this really means -

Oh, I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I can -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable member adjourn or care to continue later.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Okay, Mr. Chairman.

On motion that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply report that they have considered the matters to them referred and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It being now six o'clock I do leave the Chair until eight o'clock this evening.



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

Volume 1

1st Session

Number 29

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**Monday, June 12, 1972**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL**



The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON SUPPLY

HEADING VI - EDUCATION AND YOUTH

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, I was in the middle of my remarks this afternoon when we reached six o'clock. For the benefit of the minister I would just like to pass over a few of the things that I would like for him to comment on when he gets an opportunity to do so. One was the purpose, function and aim of this External Advisory Committee and the possible duplication with many of the other educational committees that exist. Secondly, I alluded to the fact that we may be reaching a situation now where a student's probability of attending the university may depend more upon his financial capacity to go to the university more than his intellectual capacity to attend the university. I suggested that because of the fact that the students have to borrow \$200 more under the Canada Student Loan Plan before qualifying for provincial assistance. The special grants or assistance to the education students have been eliminated and we have a situation where the graduate fellowships have been reduced from 132 to 90. If you could comment on that, I would appreciate it.

I suggested that there is a distinct possibility that medical students will probably be turned away from the university this coming year because of the inadequacy of the operating grant for the medical school. I think this is a sad situation when, as a result of this, in four or five years time we may have a corresponding decrease in the number of doctors graduating from the university in a province where doctors are so badly needed. I also suggested that there appears to be something a little peculiar or strange when we have a ten per cent increase in the vote for the Department of Education, an increase of \$12 million, when

Mr. Rowe (F.B.)

in fact we have a reduction as far as the aid to students is concerned. We have an elimination of the grants to education students, the grant to the Physical Education and Youth Division of the department appears to be down, the operating grant for the university is certainly inadequate, the capital grant to the university is certainly inadequate.

That is the point I was on before six o'clock. It is my opinion anyway that the grant for the transportation of school children, although it has been changed in the last several weeks, still remains inadequate. I mentioned also the elimination of the mothers' allowances. If he would be kind enough to comment on some of these things a little later, after I deal with them specifically, I would appreciate it.

Sir, I was dealing with the capital grant to the university this afternoon and I mentioned that the total grant, excluding, of course, the medical school, comes to \$1,350,000. I suggested

that with 7,300 full-time students and 3,300 part-time students, with an expected increase this year of 500,600 to 700 students that this grant can only suggest that the facilities at the University, the actual physical facilities, have to be inadequate, with so small a capital grant to the University.

I also mention the fact that the library facilities are only adequate for approximately 2,500 students. The Physical Education facilities for only about 1,800 students. Now, Sir, I think I know for just about a fact that the capital grant required by the University this year, was in the order of \$8,000,000. The University received \$1.35 million. Of that capital grant \$450,000 has to be used for the completion of payments on the Engineering Buildings block "C" - that is the temporary buildings at the University at the present time. Sir, this only leaves \$900,000, less than \$1,000,000 for capital works at the University. Now what I am really concerned about here is that one of two things really has to happen. If the University is to accommodate the increased numbers of students that we will have come into the University next year, with this small capital grant for the increasing of the actual physical facilities at the University along with the other things I have mentioned, I can see only one thing happening if the students are accommodated, that is those 500,600, 700 extra students. That is a danger to the teaching standards and the quality of instruction of the University, I can see this suffering. I can see the standards going down. Now this is the last thing that we want to see happening to a relatively new university. This new university, although we had the university established in 1949, really the great beginnings as far as higher education in Newfoundland, as far as university is concerned, really started in 1960 when we had the new campus established at the present site. I feel that for such a young university to have to risk the lowering of standards, instructional standards in that institution in order to try to accommodate the number of new students that we are going to

have this year, I think this is an extreme serious situation and I would like for the minister to give us some indication of whether or not there is a possibility or what his department intends to do about making sure that the quality of instruction at the University does not suffer. On the other hand, Sir, in order to maintain the quality of instruction at the University that we have at the present time, the quality of the facilities, I am afraid that directly or indirectly the University is going to have to adopt some sort of a mechanism for in fact turning students away from the University this coming year. I am not just talking about the Medical School now. I am not just talking about the Engineering School. I am talking about the general ordinary undergraduate student who comes in from all over this Province of ours, on the faith that there is a distinct possibility that one or two things have to happen, a reduction of standards if they are to accommodate the number of students or if they are to maintain these standards, a reduction, not a reduction in the number of students but a reduction in the annual rate of increase of students attending the University.

Sir, I was extremely disturbed over the comments and I



quoted the "Daily News" following the budget speech when the minister of Finance was asked to comment on what would become of these would-be students in the coming year. His answer was "I guess (the university) will have to realize they cannot take in everybody." Now, Sir, I do not know what the Minister of Finance meant by that. Of course, neither myself nor my colleagues nor the university nor I am sure the government feel that they have to accept everybody in the university. There is certainly some standards that will have to be met. What I am afraid of is that there are unqualified students in this province today who, as a result of the increase in the amount that they have to borrow as a result of this elimination of this \$400 grant to teachers with this reduction of the number of graduate fellowships, I am sure that there are young Newfoundlanders, qualified Newfoundlanders in this province today who will in fact not attend this university when they should.

Sir, another complicating factor may contribute towards the reduction in the annual, usual annual rate of increase of student enrollment at the university, is this whole business of the residences at the university. The United Church Conference is quoted as suggesting that the provincial budget is disastrous, that is with respect to the monies available for residence or housing at the university.

Sir, there are accommodations at the university for only 1,500 students. A total full-time enrollment of the university, as I have already mentioned, is 7,300 students. So there is a desperate need for more adequate housing or residences at the university. I am sure we are all aware of the horrible accommodations that some of the students have to put up with in many of the boarding houses in this city of ours, here in St. John's. I myself undertook a little test a few months ago when I took the trouble of ringing up

a number of vacancies and advertisements, phoning and asking them if in fact I could be accommodated. I mention the fact that I was a university student. For some strange reason, Sir, about ninety per cent of the people just said I am sorry or hung up when I mentioned the fact that I was a university student. I do not know what the reason for this is but it just goes to point out the great need for the establishment of adequate housing facilities or residence facilities at the university.

I would like for the minister to comment on this when he gets an opportunity to do so. Sir, as far as regional and community colleges are concerned I am afraid that we have a kind of a developing monster as far as off-campus university education is concerned.

Sir, in some areas of this province we have grade XII. These grade XII's can qualify for credit towards first year university work. We have the extension of the Department of Extra Curricula Studies at the university. This particular department is offering courses off campus through educational television. This particular division is offering courses off-campus in various areas such as Corner Brook, Gander I could mention a few others but instructors qualified instructors who are able to do so are teaching university courses alive in certain sections of our province, through this particular department.

Mr. Rowe (F.B.):

As I mentioned we also have the same thing happening through educational television. Sir, besides that, by the way, I might add that the university summer school is now extending itself to off campus. We have off-campus courses being taught through educational television and live, both during the academic year and during the summer school session.

We seem to have university education heading in all directions as far as that is concerned. Now on top of that we have this concept of regional community colleges being bartered around and who should get it, Corner Brook or Stephenville, Grand Falls or Gander and this type of thing? Now, Sir, this is a very expensive undertaking, the establishment of junior colleges or community colleges or regional colleges. What I am really disturbed about is that we are getting certain public statements, being made by the honourable member for Port au Port, Humber East and Humber West, suggesting that a community college should go in a certain place. Now I can understand honourable members of this honourable House, Sir, arguing for the establishment of a junior college in their particular district. That is reasonable. This is what these people are here for, to argue the case for their own particular district. But, Sir, if I can quote again, if that is allowable, "We have some confusion here with respect to policies as far as the establishment of these particular colleges are concerned." This is a quote from the hon. the Premier, Sir. "I have always said that as far as the West Coast is concerned, a regional college should go in Corner Brook and a community college approach should go in Stephenville. The community college is with the idea of training people in heavy industry for industry in a technical or almost polytechnical field and the regional college is basically an adjunct of the university which will be mostly academic in programme for most intents and purposes."

Mr. Rowe (F.B.)

Sir, I would like for the hon. Minister of Education again when he gets an opportunity to try and relate to this House, to the committee, what exactly the policy is of this administration with respect to community colleges or regional colleges or junior colleges or vocational or technical colleges. If this article in the newspaper is correct, it seems to suggest to me that the present administration is not distinguishing between vocational schools or technical schools and between regional or community colleges or junior colleges. Therein lies a lot of the problems with respect to the publicity that is given to these colleges. The one thing I am dead set against is the idea of just an extension of the university to the various parts of this province, just narrow academic departments of the university to the various parts of the province. I think it should be broad. It should be as broad as this concept of the community colleges, which brings in the adult education, adult in the sense that you bring in the adults from the various communities up there and you give them some sort of an education with respect to the running and administration of their own communities and this type of thing. But this article here seems to indicate that there is some confusion, certainly on the part of the hon. Premier,

MR. ROWE, F.B. with respect to what community colleges, regional colleges, vocational colleges, technical colleges and that sort of thing are all about, once again, I would appreciate it very much if the minister would clarify the government policy with respect to the extension of community or regional colleges or extensions to the university throughout the province.

Just touching on this business of student-teacher ratio for a few moment, Sir, recently we heard certain regrets or concern or disappointment expressed by the Newfoundland Teachers Association with respect to the refusal of the present administration to decrease the student-teacher ratio.

Sir, the one thing that we have to realize is that over the past few years we have managed to solve a lot of the nuts and bolts problems of education in this province. Finally, we have roads connected up to central schools. We have a reasonably good system of bus transportation. We provided reasonably good facilities in most of our schools although there is still a lot left to be desired.

Sir, we have reached the point now where we can tackle some of the more philosophical aspects or problems of education, for instance this whole business of proper curriculum development. I would dare to say that the educational authorities of this province have been so concerned with the nuts and bolts problems of education in recent years that they really have not had time nor money to become concerned about proper curriculum development in our province (K through 12) Kindergarten through to Grade XII and possibly right into university.

Sir, the modern emphasis on education is this business of the inquiry approach or the discovery approach. Now we have had varying emphasis on education as far as instruction is concerned over the hundreds of years. We have had different educators coming up with different phrases which basically all meant the same thing, that a student best learns how to learn by learning the process of learning itself. This is the modern emphasis in education, where students

MR. ROWE, F.B. are given the opportunity to become physically and mentally, mentally involved, actively involved in their own education rather than this passive business of having a teacher teaching at the students.

Now, Sir, I can go into some detail on this but I am sure nobody is interested in Education 240 or Education 100 lectures here tonight. Let me simply say this that if we are to have instruction in our school that is comparable with modern trends in instruction, we simply have to reduce the student-teacher ratio. There is no way out of it. There is no way that a teacher can teach thirty-five or more students in the modern approach to instruction in our schools.

Sir, on top of that we are extremely fortunate here in this province and in Canada, in fact, because the Americans and to a lesser extent the British

have conducted, since approximately 1957 or 1958, a tremendous amount of research in curriculum development. If I can just take one simple area alone, in the area of instruction in physics which is a very narrow aspect of curriculum development. In this area, in 1958, the physical science study committee which had the support of the National Science Foundation and the American Association for the Advancement of Science, they spent \$6 million that year, \$6 million in the development of physics curriculum. (do not find that interesting?) \$6 million in the development of a single science curriculum.

Now, Sir, this is the same sort of thing that is going on in all other areas of curriculum development in English, in mathematics, in foreign languages, in the social studies and in science. What I am basically saying is this, we in Canada and we in Newfoundland do not have to devise our own curricula nor construct our own curricula. We can use the experiences of the Americans and the British and we can conduct pilot projects, experimental projects, using modified versions of these various programmes. In order to do that, Sir, we have to have a reduction in the student - teacher ratio. So, Sir, I would ask the Minister of Education if he would be kind enough to try and indicate to this House whether or not there is any chance whatsoever of reducing the student - teacher ratio; not only so that we can have more adequate and better instruction in our schools, but so that we can experiment with and have trials and pilot projects of these various curricula that have been developed by other countries.

Mothers' allowances, Sir, an awful lot has been said about mothers' allowances in the past. I am not sure whether I entirely agree with this business of providing mothers' allowances to every single mother in this province, because I am sure, Sir, that there are many families who just do not need the mothers' allowance.

MR. NEARY: On Circular Road for instance.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Well any, there is Circular Road...

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE: Right. I do not think people have to accept the twenty dollars a year, that is an important aspect of it, but, Sir, the crunch came in the Budget Speech when we were informed that the mothers' allowances had been eliminated, wiped out altogether.

Sir, this again indicates to me something that I mentioned this afternoon, that the Minister of Education was negligent in his duties. He showed a certain degree of incompetence when he did not fight, claw at the Minister of Finance ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Who said he did not?

MR. ROWE: Oh ho! now we hear the truth. the other day everything was beautiful.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE: Right, right.

MR. NFARY: We did not see any dissension in the ranks.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not fight very hard.

MR. ROWE: He did not fight very hard, he never lost any weight.

Sir, an important point I am trying to make is this, that there was no thought whatsoever, I cannot see any indication of any thought being given to the simple fact that there are many mothers in this province of ours, not just in the outport districts and the more rural districts of our province, but right here in St. John's Centre, for example, there are many mothers who could certainly benefit from twenty dollars a year for



each child that she has and benefit greatly. I know low income families in my district and I am sure you do.

MR. NEARY: The little fellow from Flower Hill has his feet in the swimming pool these days. The mothers over in St. John's Centre do not mean anything any more.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Sir, all I am suggesting is this, what I suggested this afternoon, that in this whole area of expenditures, the estimates for the Department of Education, there are certain components of it or certain aspects of it where we just got the axe treatment. No thought given at all to the possibility of deriving a formula whereby the poor mothers or parents of this province would derive some benefit or some help for the education of their children during the school year. The excuse that the Minister of Finance gave, with respect to the increase in family allowances, I do not think covered the ground at all as far as providing these parents with the assistance that they so badly need.

Sir, in this area, I would like basically to hear from the Minister of Education here as to whether or not he is attempting, he and his officials in the department are attempting to work out some sort of a formula whereby the people who need it will get some assistance during the coming school year. Sir, the transportation of school children: - Sir, the minister, shortly after the House opened some weeks ago, came in with what was called, I believe, a policy statement with regard to school bus transportation in this province. Sir, that formula or policy statement turned out to be a complete shemozzle. The minister suggested basically that the school boards would get an amount equivalent to \$100.00 per student for the purpose of operating buses during the school year and certain consideration would be given to certain mean temperatures being below certain levels. I think he actually named an actual, was it zero degrees fahrenheit went into the formula.

Now, Sir, the only factor that the minister used in this formula was basically numbers of students. No consideration was given whatsoever to the distribution of the student population at the time. We have a situation up in Gander, for instance, where we have the school population in certain parts very concentrated and a bus just has to whip by and pick up the kids in a matter of a few minutes. We have a situation in the other rural parts of our province, where the student population is spread over tens of miles where some kids have to spend an hour or an hour and a-half or more aboard a bus, where it takes that amount of time to pick up all the students, an hour to two hours. No consideration given whatsoever to the distribution of the student population. Neither, Sir, was there any consideration given in the derivation of this formula to the existing road conditions in a particular school board area.

We know in some areas we have well paved roads, roads that are plowed practically all of the time during the winter and in other parts of the province we have dirt roads, roads like in St. Barbe North that take sometimes days to be opened and on the Labrador Coast the same thing where students miss days of school, many days of school because of road and weather conditions. Sir, it costs a heck of a lot more to bus a child to school in St. Barbe North or in Labrador or up along the North West Coast than it does around the central part of the province.

Sir, there was no consideration given to these very important factors in the derivation of the formula. Now, Sir, I asked myself at the time, is the minister that dim that he would come up with a formula so inadequate that does not take these factors that I have mentioned into consideration? I was beginning to think, Sir, that he might have been that dim but then it struck me that -

AN HON. MEMBER: It could not be.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): No, it just could not be. What I think happened here, Sir, is that the government, the present administration was grasping for ways to reduce expenditures in this province. I am sad to say, of course I mentioned this earlier, that education was one of the areas that they decided to pick to put the axe to. Sir, I have a funny feeling and it is just a suspicion that this policy statement by the honourable Minister of Education some weeks ago was a deliberate statement to frighten the life right out of the school boards with respect to where the money was going to come from for school transportation, school bus transportation next year. Some school boards, Sir, as I have already mentioned, stood to lose between twenty and eighty thousand dollars in the transportation of their students to school.

I have a funny feeling, Sir, that the technique used here was to announce a formula that would indicate to the school boards that most of them, not all of them, were going to have great massive cuts for the purpose of school bus transportation. Then having announced this the minister would gradually revert back to the original formula used by the previous administration for funds to school boards for school bus transportation and the school boards he thought would be forever grateful. When in fact, Sir, every school board, practically every school board in this province realizes that this year they will need more money for school bus transportation, there is a natural increase in the cost of such things and there are more schools this year, central schools therefore there is going to be a greater demand placed on school bus transportation. So practically in every single case school boards are going to require more money this year than last year for school bus transportation.

Now I have a funny feeling that in the controversy surrounding the original formula announced by the minister that a lot of people in this province of ours might have forgotten this natural increase in bus

transportation. Sir, there is another thing that I cannot understand. The estimates, if I am correct, indicate that there is \$5,910,000 for the purpose of school bus transportation in this province during the coming year. Now in answer to a question the honourable minister tabled in the House some days ago a breakdown of the grants to the various school boards for the purpose of bus transportation. Sir, when I added it up it came to \$6,051,705.06 which is not consistent with the amount voted in the estimates and on top of that there is a plus or minus five per-cent which means that this grant could be \$5,650,000 or it could be \$6,351,000.

Now I am not an expert in finances here but there seems to be some inconsistency here as far as the estimates are concerned and as far as this breakdown of school bus transportation for next year. So again, Sir, I would appreciate it if the minister could explain to the House number one, what this means exactly in terms of the estimates and secondly, whether or not he has taken into consideration the fact that there is going to be a natural increase in school bus transportation and the fact that there is going to be an additional demand on school bus transportation this year because of increase numbers of central schools?

Sir, as far as school tax is concerned, I understand that the Roman Catholic and the

Avalon Integrated School Board will or have already recommended that a school tax be instituted in St. John's. I do not know whether this recommendation has actually been made or not yet. There are approximately 50,000 students of the 165,000 students in this Province who are within school tax areas. I believe there are something like eight school tax areas. Sir, as you know, the taxes are collected in one of two ways, a Property Tax or a Poll Tax. We also have these assessments being administered by the various school boards. Sir, I am sure that the city of St. John's, the Municipal Council of St. John's and other municipal councils will probably be somewhat disturbed about this business of some other agency cutting in on the tax revenue. That is no reason however why there should not be a school tax. There has been, I understand, some concern by the City Council and I would like to know from the minister whether or not he has any representation from the City Council in this regard and what he intends doing about it.

Sir, the important thing is this. I think that it is time now that government take a stand with respect to school taxation. I think we have reached that point in our educational history.

AN HON. MEMBER: The time has come!

MR. F. ROWE: The time has come! Precisely. Now, Sir, the only thing that I am concerned about as far as collection of school tax is concerned is going to be the cost of the administration of it. If you have a great number of school tax authorities all over the province, setting up their own administration for the collection of school taxes, I suggest, Sir, that the cost of collection may reduce drastically the benefits to be derived from the taxes that are collected. What I would like to see, and I would like for the minister to touch on this for a few moments when he again gets a chance -

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Why do you not get back into your cage.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: I can speak for exactly as long as I want to.

MR. CROSBIE: Get out your pill. Get out your pill.

MR. F. ROWE: I can remember sitting, Mr. Chairman, as a spectator in the House of Assembly for two solid years and listening to the hon. the Minister of Finance going on hour after hour after hour after hour. "Jonnie the Lip". Listen to Erasmus or Camanea over there. You prefer to be Erasmus?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Erased.

MR. ROWE: Erased, yes. Just a point of clarification, Mr. Chairman, how long do I have to speak?

AN HON. MEMBER: As long as you like.

MR. F. ROWE: The hon. members on the other side of the House are getting itchy, Mr. Chairman, they want to go out and do their summers fishing. They want to have their holidays.

AN HON. MEMBER: I would rather spend the summer listening to you anyhow. It is delightful, really!

MR. F. ROWE: I am glad you are enjoying it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, I am extremely sorry if the Minister of Finance cannot listen or cannot understand some of the points. Good! Mr. Chairman, what I am suggesting here is that I would like to have an explanation from the Minister of Education as to the direction that this present Administration is going to take with respect, if any, to school taxation. I would like for him to give some consideration to the possibility of centralizing the collection agency as far as collection of school tax is concerned, if in fact we are going to have school taxes throughout the Province. Because, as I suggested, I feel strongly that the cost of collection will out-weigh the benefits if we decentralize that particular agency.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the member for Green Bay put quite clearly the need for collective bargaining for teachers, in his speech in reply to the Address from the Throne. I will simply say that I will expect during this debate or the dealing with the Estimates for the minister to give us some assurance in this House that teachers will be given some assurance that collective bargaining will be brought into this House during this session.

AN HON. MEMBER: Even if we have to stay here all summer.

MR. F. ROWE: Even if we have to stay here all summer. I will just touch on one other thing that I would like for the minister to comment on, Mr. Speaker, and we will have an opportunity to deal with each one of these things as the Estimates come up.

I notice that the grant to the Physical Education and Youth Division is down from \$2,500,000 to \$1,200,000 this year. Sir, there are an awful lot of towns and communities outside of cities like St. John's and Corner Brook and towns like Gander and Grand Falls who still have a great need for the improvement of their recreational facilities. If this is the vote that these types of things come under, I would like for the minister to indicate to us whether there is any possibility at all of the vote being increased in this particular area because there are just quite a few communities that have horribly inadequate, if any recreational facilities whatsoever.

I think the best thing I can do with this point is, seeing the hon. Minister of Finance is getting horribly twitchy over there, to allow the minister a time to relate to some of the points that I raised this afternoon and tonight.

MR. CROSBIE: The Minister of Education will be replying to all points made in the debate in due course. Now if we are all like the hon. gentleman opposite, this will be around Regatta Day he will get a chance to speak.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to speak at any inordinate length, so I will try to keep my remarks brief but there are one or two misconceptions that I would like to refer to in connection with the remarks the hon. gentleman opposite who, for a maiden member of the House, is doing very well. He is doing his homework and we find him to be a very valuable member of the House even though a bit misguided. Nevertheless it is obvious that he is working hard at his subject and education happens to be his subject. So I imagine we are going to hear from him quite a bit this evening because I am sure we will

do the education estimates this evening.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman said the mothers are not impressed with this budget, not impressed with the ministers' estimates and the rest of it. What mothers? I have not had one letter from a mother yet who was not impressed with the Budget. Not one.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Those were done by the hon. gentleman, himself. The Budget was hard on smoking mothers. I have not even heard from a smoking mother.

Mr. Speaker, let us put this thing in perspective. The question before this Province and before this House including the education estimates, is this Province going to survive as a viable entity or not? That is what we have to consider when we are discussing education, whatever it is. If the expenditures of the government are allowed to continue apace as they continued in the last five or six years and those trends are continued into the next five, we will not survive as a viable Province. It is just that simple. Anyone, Mr. Speaker, who wants to read the Budget and the facts that are in it, with an unbiased eye, can see that staring him right in the face. I will be referring to this again when I speak in the Budget Speech. There is a five year forecast that was prepared before the hon. gentleman opposite left office, as to the financial position of this Province and what faced us in the next five years



Mr. Crosbie.

if present trends continue. They are familiar with it. I will be coming back to it. That is the position. The position is: Do we want to survive as a viable province with a government of its own or do we want to go on spending without giving some consideration to what is happening and just go down the drain that way? Now we opted for attempting to make ourselves a viable province. That is what we opted for. Do you think any government, Mr. Chairman, wants to do away with a mother's allowance or do away with anything that people are getting? Do any government want to do that? Is it something they do carelessly, carefree, happy-go-lucky, not caring at all, not caring about the political consequences? Obviously not. There is no government in this world who want to do away with a programme that is giving the voters something that most of them want to have.

MR. NEARY: What about the expensive propaganda the Premier is setting up.

MR. CROSBIE: Never mind now. I want to talk seriously. You can jeer with me a bit later on. I am just deadly serious. No government want to do away with that, Mr. Chairman. If for no other reasons than political reasons, I would not want to do it. Why do this government feel that they had to do it? I would not be one darn bit surprised, Mr. Chairman, if honourable gentlemen opposite were forming a government they would have had to do the same thing. If we are to get extra assistance from the only area we can get it (that is the Government of Canada, when we have the House in order) we had to do away with certain programmes that this province has that no other province has, even the richest, so they could not point their finger at us and say, "you are already getting \$120 million tax equalization, but you are using it to institute programmes that even the richest provinces do not have. We cannot go on giving you more special assistance to carry on in that way." That

Mr. Crosbie.

is the reason. That is the approach. You do not think you can go to Ottawa today and get any amount of money that you want for education, health or anything else in the province. The attitude is exactly one hundred per cent the opposite. They are saying that we are fed up with the "have not" provinces. We are fed up with the Newfoundlands. Ontario is fed up with them. British Columbia is fed up with them. Alberta is fed up with them. The federal government is fed up with them because they have been getting millions and millions of dollars in special help and wasting it. We do not get a very sympathetic hearing when we go to Ottawa. That is why we have to tighten our belts and control spending and why we felt that we had to discontinue the Mothers' Allowance Programme which we were able to contemplate doing because the Family Allowance Programme of Canada is to be vastly expanded and improved, we thought this year; by the end of this year at the latest. If it is not by the end of this year, certainly it will be next year. The mothers of Newfoundland who need the assistance are going to be getting far more of it from the Government of Canada next year than this twenty dollars a year that Newfoundland mothers were getting for each child in school.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Pardon.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: As I said, if we discover that that is the case, we will have to review the situation. Now, Mr. Chairman, what about education? Are we to believe from the honourable gentlemen opposite that this government are not interested in education or not giving it priority? What utter piffle! There is a table on page fifty-five of the Budget Speech that shows the situation. What is the situation? In 1972-1973, \$146 million is going to be spent on health by this government, current and capital

Mr. Crosbie.

account, 23.2 per cent of our expenditures this year. What percentage did the honourable gentlemen's government spend on it last year? It was 22.9 percent . We are spending point three percent more in education this year. They spent \$135 million which was 22.9 per cent of the budget. This year, Mr. Chairman, a higher percentage is being spent by this government on education than back to 1965,1966 - 23.2 per cent. So whose government is the one not giving enough emphasis to education? The last government which spent from 17.1 per cent of its budget, 17.4 per cent up to 22.9 last year on education or this one that is spending 23.2 per cent of what we have this year on education? Does that show we do not care about education? Does this show that Memorial University is falling down, cracking up? What is Memorial University? Is Memorial University to be "the tail that wags the dog." The honourable gentleman was in this House talking about Memorial - "shocking, poor old Memorial University, what it is going to get on capital account this year." What is it going to get? It is going to get almost \$16 million. His heart bleeds for Memorial University. What about the elementary and secondary schools which are going to get \$8 million on capital account from DREE,

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, at no point in my remarks did I talk about poor old Memorial University. Every reference that I made to Memorial University was in relation to the students who are going to that university, the students who were coming from the more remote areas of the province and who might have to be turned away. At no time did I talk about poor old Memorial University.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order.

AN HON MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Well it is not a good point of order even if some unsavory member of the other side made it, savory or unsavory. Mr. Chairman, the whole burden of the honourable gentleman's speech opposite was about how badly treated Memorial University is going to be this year, not just

Mr. Grosbie.

the students. He complained about the amount allocated on capital account to the university only \$1,350,000, his heart bleed for that. In actual fact, what are the figures? Let us look at what the honourable gentleman's government did in the last four years for Memorial University, whose heart bleeds for Memorial University tonight. What did they do? What did those great friends at Memorial do during the last four years? In 1968-1969, the total they spent on capital account was \$2,307,000. In 1969-1970 what monumental, magnificent, gigantic, gargantuan sum did they spend on capital account for Memorial? It was \$569,000 in 1969-1970. In 1970-1971 what did they spend. They spent \$2,062,000. In 1971-1972, what did they spend? They spent \$3,549,000. This is the crew opposite who would have the people of Newfoundland believe tonight that we are throttling poor old Memorial to death. What are we spending? We are spending \$16 million. What did they spend in total in the last four years on capital works at Memorial? They spent \$8,487,000. They would have the people of this province believe that we have old Memorial down. She is down. We have our foot on her throat. She is choking to death. She is starved for money. She is finished. She is done for. Well we are spending, in one year, twice what they spent on capital account in the last four.

Now why waste the time of the House with that tripe - \$14.5 million on the medical school alone and \$1,350,000. We would like to spend more than \$1,350,000 on the other things at Memorial. Memorial made its bed and Memorial has to lie in it. Memorial chose the medical school. The medical school had the greatest priority at Memorial. They wanted the medical school. They fought for the medical school. They did everything they could for the medical school. They did not want to stop it once it started. Now Memorial has to realize that if the priority is on the medical school, other things have to suffer because the people of this province are not just made of money so that they can build engineering schools, vivarium this, that, the other, life sciences and medical schools all at Memorial at the same time. There are a lot of other needs in this province, apart from the needs of Memorial University. Memorial University is not going

Mr. Crosbie,

to be the tail that shakes this dog. This dog is not going to be shook by Memorial University. We are going to allocate to Memorial University everything we can reasonably do but we are not going to be bluffed by talk that admission will have to be restricted at Memorial University. We say to Memorial University; "prove it." What is the situation on the medical school the honourable gentleman referred to? The situation on the medical school is that they asked us for \$2,487,000 exactly and we are voting them \$2,300,000 and that is \$187,000 less. That is the only cut that the medical school is having on capital account, \$187,000

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: No, this is current alone. We see a statement in the paper that this might mean that eight first year students and four second students cannot be accepted this year if they have this cut. I say prove it, that they cannot be accepted because we reduced their budget request by \$187,000. We say prove it. We are not going to take that on face value, we are going through their budget item by item to see why that \$187,000 means that they cannot take those twelve students. If they can show us reasonably and convince us that is so or that they need another fifty or seventy-five or eighty to take the twelve students, we will not be long agreeing to that, if that turns out to be the case.

AN HON. MEMBER: Write a personal cheque.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh no, we will not write any personal cheques. We will have a countervailing saving somewhere else in "Gussie's department." Good news for "Gus." But we will do it, but we are not going to fall over and play dead because someone at Memorial says; "You cut a few cents from us and we will say that we will not take the students." We say; "Prove it."

Mr. Chairman, apart from the medical school, the university has not said that we have cut them this year in their spending so that they have to refuse admission to students this year. They have not said it, because it would not be true. It is not true. Why is it not true? Because now listen to this, look at what we have done, this hardhearted Minister of Finance. I remember the Premier used to be over here when hon. gentlemen opposite talk about it. "You cannot dispute the facts that are in that Budget Speech, so all we have had to listen to are personal diatribes about me."

How did this hardhearted Minister of Finance, this man who has no blood in his veins and all the rest of it, this man from Circular Road, this rich man whose children will not suffer if they will not get

the twenty dollars mothers' allowance; that is the kind of raw sewage that we hear from across the House when we are discussing the Budget Speech.

What happened to Memorial University? Let us look at that. What did they get last year from the Liberal Government, that magnificent government, those friends of Memorial? What did they give Memorial last year in current account, forgetting the medical school? 1971-72 they voted Memorial, on the basis of full-time student equivalency, \$1,910 per student. That is what they voted them last year, the number of student equivalence times \$1,910. What did this government do that is strangulating Memorial, that hates Memorial, that hates the poor, that hates education? What did this government vote them this year? \$2,030 per student for 9,200 student equivalence. That is \$1,910 per student last year, \$2,030 this year, that is an increase of \$130,00 for every student over there. That is what they are voted on current account to operate Memorial, forgetting the medical school this year.

We are not hearing, there is not one word, not one syllable not a sound, not a squeak from Memorial saying that they cannot accept students there, because of our budget, next fall. They are not saying it because it would not be true. Now, how does that compare? I would say that we are spending more money at Memorial this year than the Liberal Government did last year. I say that on capital account this year, one year alone, we are spending four times what the Liberal Administration spent in the last four years. Then for them to get up and loud, loudmouth and poormouth and accuse this government of being against education and against Memorial and trying to do Memorial is a travesty of the truth. There is not a word of truth in it. I would not ask for an apology, Sir, because we would not get it.

Let us talk about the students' allowance. An honourable gentleman opposite got up the other day and asked a question or said: "I was at a

meeting at Memorial University several days before the last election when he said; "You will not have to borrow two hundred more dollars from the Canada Student Loan, it will not go up from four hundred to six hundred." "Some genius, somebody with a crystal ball asked me a question at the meeting and said; "If the Canada Student Loan amount goes up to \$1,400," which was announced that day, "Are you going to increase the \$400 we have to borrow, up to \$600?" That is what he wants us to believe, but it was never asked. I think the question was asked at that meeting, spread by the campus Liberal Club, ever faithful, ever truthful, the story being spread about Memorial was that when the P.C.'s got in we were going to eliminate, assassinate, trample on and vanquish the whole Student Aid Programme. That is what we were asked about. We said; "No, it is not going to be eliminated or interfered with." And if we were asked, and I cannot remember it, but if I had been asked and had answered, I would have said that we had planned no changes.

Now, I will assume for a minute that I said it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can prove I did, but I cannot remember exactly. It turns out that two months later we had to increase the amount to be borrowed from \$400 to \$600 before you get the provincial assistance. Well, two months later, Mr. Chairman, we are much more well aware of how this province stands financially. All we can say is, a change had to be made.

What about hon. gentlemen opposite and their party? In 1965 free tuition and salaries for Memorial. Students in third, fourth and fifth years would get salaries and that would go on to second year and first year, and there was going to be free tuition for all students. That was 1965, 1966 the general election of 1966. What happened in 1968? The budget came down and there was a needs test put on it. Away went the free tuition and away went the free salaries and the salaries were never extended from fourth, fifth and sixth years, or third, fourth and fifth to first and second. Why not? Conditions changed and no matter



whether that policy was honestly adopted in the first place, it had to change because of the financial position of the province.

We have had to make a slight change this year. What is the change? That a student going to Memorial who needs assistance to go to university has now to borrow \$600 from the Canada Student Loan Fund rather than \$400, before he becomes eligible for provincial assistance. It is not nice, we would like to put them all through for nothing, for zero, we would like to have the student salaries and free tuition for them all, could we afford it. But the province cannot afford it, unfortunately. The budget proves it irrevocably. We have a deficit on current account, Mr. Chairman, this year of \$3 million despite these cuts and despite putting up the cigarette tax. Where are we going to get it from? If the hon. gentleman wants to increase the allowances for students, if he wants to give the mothers' allowance, if he wants to give other services and if we do, then we have to get other revenue. Where can we get it from? Only by putting up the S.S.A. Tax., only by putting up the gasoline tax, only by putting up the personal income tax and the corporation tax. When you do all that, what do you have here in Newfoundland? Another twenty-five or thirty million dollars, a mere drop in the bucket.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the extra cost to the parents?

MP. CROSBIE: Extra cost to the parents, there is no extra cost to the parents. It just means that the student who attends Memorial must pay back \$600 instead of \$400 after he is finished university. It would be much better for him if that did not have to change, but we are still ahead of New Brunswick. We are ahead of P.E.I., we are ahead of Nova Scotia. There they have to borrow the whole \$1,400. That is the plan in the other three Atlantic Provinces and here are we, the least well off one of the four except perhaps for P.E.I., with a better programme than theirs. We did not want to change that. No government that wants to be re-elected wants to change anything that is giving people something. But, if we are going to have a viable

province and a viable provincial government, it does not matter whether the Liberals are in or the Tories, we are only going to do it if we make these kinds of changes and show the people, the people who loan money, the Government of Canada, that we are trying to do the best with what we have and we have some sense of priority.

Regional colleges; the gentleman mentions regional colleges. They are necessary, we are going to have to consider that in our four year programme. We are going to have to decide this year, what can we allocate to the university in the next four years? Of that money, should regional colleges come first or the engineering school or the vivarium or the life sciences? Because we do not have the money. Memorial wants \$100 million over the next four or five years in capital account. We do not have it. Look at what they want on current account. Look at what they forecast as their need on current account. What is the forecast for Memorial?

This year they wanted \$19.7 million, (This is forgetting the medical school) they are getting \$18.6. They forecast \$23.9 million for next year, \$28.7 million the year after, nearly \$34 million 1975-1976 and the year after that \$39.8

million on current account, This is excluding the medical school. In other words on current account they forecast that we will have to pay them double in four years time on current account alone and their capital account is something extraordinary. So there is no way that this province can just go blindly on without making some decisions. If we are going to have regional colleges we may not be able to have life sciences or if it is life sciences we cannot have regional colleges and so on. This is the kind of choice that has to be made and it has been made in other provinces, Mr. Chairman. Other provinces are doing the same thing. They are not giving their universities everything they are looking for as they cannot, they cannot afford it.

I was reading an article in "Harper's" last night, a real sensible article where a man pointed out it would cost three hundred and sixty billion dollars a year in the U.S. to develop their education facilities so that they could train and give everybody an equal chance for high school and university education, three hundred and sixty billion in the U.S. alone. We cannot do it. The U.S. cannot do it. We have to do the best with what we have.

The university, we have to try to balance the university and the elementary and secondary schools and their demands and requirements. I think the honourable gentleman put too much emphasis on Memorial, far too much emphasis on Memorial, forgetting the rest of the problems we have. The honourable gentleman suggested the standards of university were going to go down next year. What utter nonsense. They are getting \$2,030 per student compared to \$1,910 last year. They have all the faculty hired they need to hire. They have given them increases in wages. Now how are their standards of instruction going to go down? The honourable gentleman mentioned their library, their library facilities are pitiful for a university that size. The honourable

gentleman's government did nothing about it for the last three or four years.

The engineering school is going to be proceeded with and that was supposed to be underway three or four years ago but the honourable gentleman's government did not proceed with that and they leave us in a position where we do not have the spondoolicks to proceed with it. Yes, library facilities are poor there, are not what they should be for a university that size but I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, there is hardly a university in the world that cannot make the same claim unless it is Harvard or Yale or Oxford or the University of London or somewhere like that.

What about residences? Oh, the honourable gentleman's heart bled about residences and it is a serious situation. He gives the figure, 1500 have accomodation at Memorial, in residences. This is bad, a bad sign. But, Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the Minister of Education mentioned it in his introductory remarks, we are including in the estimates \$400,000 this year, hopefully our share of the cost of proceeding with this residence development up here on Elizabeth Avenue. We are hoping to get ninety per-cent of it from CMHC, ninety per-cent of the cost was started in the last gentleman's administration. I am not sure whether we have heard from -

AN HON. MEMBER: Will tenders be called?

MR. CROSBIE: You are darn right, Sir. There has been a Cabinet decision that tenders are to be called. It is not going to be given like the honourable gentleman's government was going to give it. You are 'darn-tootin'' they are going to be called. Now ninety per-cent we hope will come, Mr. Chairman, from CMHC and we have \$400,000 in the Budget which hopefully will meet our ten per-cent. So the students residence at Memorial has not been forgotten, in fact we consider that to be priority. We feel that comes ahead of the engineering school. We

feel it comes ahead of a vivarium. We feel it comes ahead of the life sciences. I feel it comes ahead of the medical school but that is there anyway, it is started. There is \$14.5 million for that. So that is very much in our mind and residences are one of the things badly needed at Memorial.

The honourable gentleman in finishing his remarks touched on physical education facilities. Oh, the vote for that is down, \$2.5 million last year and this year \$1. something million. We remember last year's scandal. We remember last year you had to have track shoes if you lived outside St. John's to get away from honourable gentlemen opposite coming with cheques in their hands for recreation facilities. A cheque given out to the Southern Shore, and they did not even have negotiation there.

MR. THOMS: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I did not offer a cheque to anyone.

MR. CROSBIE: You did not?

MR. THOMS: No, I did not.

MR. CROSBIE: I am delighted to hear it.

MR. THOMS: I want you to withdraw that remark, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, if the honourable gentleman takes it personally, I will withdraw it. I said honourable gentlemen opposite.

MR. THOMS: You did not say honourable gentlemen, you said the honourable gentleman.

MR. CROSBIE: I said honourable gentleman opposite and I am delighted to hear the honourable gentleman for Bonavista North did not give out any cheques.

MR. THOMS: Not one.

MR. CROSBIE: Good.

MR. THOMS: I might have wished I had them to give them out.

MR. CROSBIE: He would have, had he had them.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman is more useless than a putter. That is all he is, is a sputter actually. Now, Mr. Chairman, we all remember that great recreational programme not based on any study or any sense of priority. Lash out the cheques, and they were lashed out and the money is not here this year to lash out on recreation. We have to do what we can to repair the damage honourable gentlemen opposite did last year with their recreation programme. We remember Tors Cove where Dancing Dollars got caught and he turned into Dancing Cents after that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, we remember Spars too.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, remember Spars, yes. What is that I wonder? I do not think anybody here really knows of your allusion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, would the honourable gentleman yield and I will tell him all about Spars.

MR. CROSBIE: No, when you speak you can tell me all about Spars.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us go back about -

MR. CROSBIE: Oh yes, go back. It is very touchy, Mr. Chairman. We dare not go back beyond last January 18. They are terribly touchy. They have no sense of history. They do not want the last five years referred to but occasionally we have to refer to it. So, Mr. Chairman, when you boil it all down it is very disappointing. I thought there was a chance this year in this session of the House with an election at least four years away that the Opposition might become a little more statesmanlike, might discuss the issues, might take a responsible position but you would think an election was a month off with the nonsense and the partisan poppycock they are getting on with instead of waiting. We can expect the year of the election or the year before they are nervous and jumpy and touchy and getting political but no. Right at the start, despite the heavy burden they must have on their

conscience as a result of the wreck they made in the last three to five years, there they are getting up with the same old cheap political quackery. Quack, quack on the education estimates, attack the minister, do this, do that, hold up the House, go on about the mothers' allowance, wail about Memorial, all of this in the face of the facts. So I say; wail on, quack on. There is no-one in the province listening to your quack, quacks. It will be forgotten if they do listen, the day after tomorrow, They are interested in the summer. They are interested in seeing this government get on with its work. They are interested in seeing us being given a chance. They are not interested in this side show up here on the ninth floor of Confederation Building.

Let us pass the Education estimates. Let us pass the Health estimates. Let us pass the Economic Development estimates. Debate them for three or four hours, ask any questions you like about what we have done for the last four months, but let us get on with it. This is not going to help you in the federal election, it is not helping you at all.

MR. NEARY: The honourable minister will not get down South. He will have to sit down and take his pill and go back to sleep.

MR. CROSBIE: This honourable gentleman never needs look for a holiday. He is not afraid of work and he never will be and he is quite prepared to wait until September for a holiday. In fact he can think of nothing better than listening to the honourable gentleman opposite all summer. It will be a real trial and cuckooland but I can tell the honourable gentleman that the people of this province are not interested in your political partisanship. They are interested in your either making some sensible comments that will help this province or letting us get on with our job and wait for a year or two and then let us see what your criticisms are.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Leader of the Opposition -

MR. ROBERTS: Did the Chairman call the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I called the honourable Leader of the Opposition first and if I made an error I stand to be corrected by the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I had not really intended to enter this particular debate quite this early and indeed when the honourable the Minister of



MR. ROBERTS: Finance first got to his feet he began some comments that I thought were quite well taken. I still had not intended to get into it, I made a few notes that I might want to refer to a little later. I realize that the honourable the Minister of Finance was merely coming to the defence of the poor and the helpless. I understand that, if I were the Minister of Education and I were in the position that the present minister finds himself, I would ask for all the help I could get and I would be glad to have a man like the Minister of Finance there to defend me.

But, Sir, the Minister of Finance went steadily downhill in his remarks. It is amusing, Sir, it is amazing the blinkers that man wears. I speak not of him personally, I speak of what he said in this committee in the last few minutes. He goes on at some length to talk about partisanship and all these adjectives that he dredges up. The man is almost a walkie thesaurus. Then he tries to drag the holy cloak of the seamless garment about him.

Sir, that man cannot have it both ways. He cannot stand in the House, whether it be in committee or whether it be in the full House, and say, get on with the business, no partisan, no politics, That man more than any other man in this province and that includes the man who used to sit there and was Premier of this province, That man has done more to bring this House, and I do not say to bring it down, I have nothing against partisan politics. Sir, we are sent here representing parties. Every man elected to this House, Sir, stood representing one party or another, pledged to support a Leader, pledged to support an administration, pledged to support a concept, a platform, a programme. Not to pretend we are about partisanship, Sir. Partisan politics may not be the best way, but it is the only way we have found anywhere in the British Parliamentary System to make the British Parliamentary System work.

But, Sir, that man, the Minister of Finance, the member for St. John's West has done more to bring partisan politics in here, When

MR. ROBERTS: he talks about the estimates we are on now. I think it is, Your Honour, the twenty-third or the twenty-fourth or the twenty-fifth sitting of this current session of the House. Last year we spent thirty-three or thirty-four sittings on just the estimates. I have not checked out the pages of the minutes or whatever you want to call them, Sir, but I will bet my sessional indemnity against the honourable gentleman that he spent at least half of the time, at least half of the time of the committee was occupied by him personally. I do not begrudge him a minute of it, but I find it most interesting when we chose to debate it at some length and we are going to, Sir, unless they want to bring in closure and try that. Thirty-three will out vote nine.

But we are going to debate these estimates. We happen to think that the minister is incompetent. It is not personal. I do not think he is incompetent personally. It is merely his policy. His record to date, short though it has been, has been lamentable beyond belief. We think the man is a menace to education in this province. And merely having the Minister of Finance stand in his place, when it is well known in fact that he is catering to the gallery - now I can do that. I would rather not play that game. This House, Sir, does not exist to cater to the people who come to watch us. We are here to speak for a half million Newfoundlanders, on two sides, back and forth. I do not want to play to the gallery. If people are good enough to come and watch, I am not going to try to get a laugh with cheap sarcasm. Let the honourable minister, if he wants, he is good at it. He is not the only one who is good at it. He may be the only one who wants to try it.

Sir, then he gets off with some further nonsense he got off with, some of the falacious arguments, \$16,000,000 for the capital, on account of the university, for the medical school. Sir, the House knows better than that, because that money includes the initial vote and about

MR. ROBERTS: two-thirds of it will be, two-thirds of the amount voted for the medical school complex will be for the hospital, and only one-third for the medical school building itself. That grant was carried in the estimates of the Minister of Health, not in the Minister of Education.

Sir, that money at the university is not for the university, it is for all the people of this province in the form of a new general hospital, the basic referral facility for most of the adult services in this province. It would not be obstetrics, I do not think unless they have changed the functional plan. It will not be dermatology, it will not be, a number of the specialities that will not be done at the General, they are not now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: It will be the main teaching hospital and also the basic referral hospital. It is both. The other hospitals will - Carbonear will be a teaching hospital, it is not the main one, it is now. The Curtis Hospital at St. Anthony, I hope the Western Memorial Hospital at Corner Brook, the Grace General and St. Clare's are both affiliated with the university. Indeed, I notice the bill that the honourable minister brought today for first reading provides that the University Board of Regents may appoint one man or a woman for that matter to the Board of the St. Clare's Mercy Hospital. Sir, there will be many teaching hospitals. There will be many hospitals.

But for the Minister of Finance to stand and I submit, Sir, that he knows better, I think in the excess of debate he is getting carried away. He is trying to destroy the case we are putting up. Well, Sir, he will not do it. He cannot do it because the facts are against him. When he says, when he stands and says, I will not attempt to emulate his sarcasm. When he attempts to say there is plenty being voted

MR. ROBERTS: for capital account for the university and he drags in the medical school and he drags in the new General Hospital and he pretends that is for the university, Sir, he knows better than that or he should. I think it is just the excess of debate. He realizes his colleague, his friend, his cabinetmate, the Minister of Education, is in trouble. The minister is over there being knowledgeable, in a moment we will hear from him. It is a pleasure I am eagerly anticipating. The minister tries to confuse the issue. He talks about Memorial and what the Liberals did or did not do.

Well I agree not enough was spent in the last few years and I saw, I do not know they might not be the same figures the minister has, nevertheless we are involved in the capital programmes for the university and they would frighten you. Because, Mr. Chairman, either the government of this province and that means the people of this province find between \$100 millions and \$120 millions for the university in the next few years or the university must change drastically in what it is trying to do, one or the other. The minister will agree with that, either we find the money in this province, either we do or the university cannot go on as it has been. Now that is not death, that is not even the death of Memorial. It is a decision the government of this province must take though. That is what my colleague and friend from St. Barbe North was getting at. His government cannot have it both ways - either the government of this province find the money for the university, \$100 million or \$120 million in the next five to ten years, plus the capital account items which will go to \$33 millions, and keep going, or they will bring in a new policy that says that no longer is university admission in this province open to anybody who meets the university standards.

Now, Sir, that can be, that can be the state of affairs that one can envisage. It is not fantasy, it is not unreality but it is a valid question whether or not it is good policy in this province. We have in Newfoundland today, about five percent, from memory, of

MR. ROBERTS: our eligible students in the university age bracket, are at the university, one-half of what it is across Canada. If we want to develop Newfoundland, we are going to have to educate our people. Nobody knows better than I do, Sir, that education is more than Memorial. The whole post-secondary education spectrum has to be looked at. If the Minister of Education is worth his salt, he would be looking at it now, the whole question of vocational education and technical education.

I can tell the minister he has the facts, He is an indefatigable and tireless worker, he masters his brief. He would make the greatest Deputy Minister this province has ever seen - maybe one of these days he will, because he is tireless, he does his work. He gets blinded by a little partisan excess. He gets carried away by the exuberance of his own verbosity, a quaint cliché

MR. CARTER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, three points of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Hurrah!

MR. CARTER: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition has blunder into the estimates on health rather than the estimates on Education. I will confess that he did bring himself back to the estimates on Education, so perhaps that point has been answered. Also, he is repeating himself and repeating himself and repeating himself. I know there is a rule of relevancy here. Surely there must also be a rule to prevent constant and nauseous repetition. At the same time, although this

honourable House is well provided with amplifying systems, he seems to find it incumbent upon himself to be shouting and roaring and bellowing like a bull. Mr. Chairman, I would like you to take the honourable the Leader of the Opposition to task and see if you cannot get him to control his behaviour.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I would submit that my decimal level is not a decimal of a fraction higher than that reached by the gentleman from St. John's West, the Minister of Finance. As for his point about health or not, I am dealing with points raised by the honourable gentleman's colleague. If he cannot take the heat let him get out of the kitchen. As for his rule about repetition he might look at the rules about reading. He stood today and read his speech, I can only assume had been written for him, it could not have been Mr. McLean, Mr. McLean can read and write. But read the most pedantic textbook, high school lecture - maybe the honourable gentleman takes it home and reads it to his children. I hope there are a more attentive audience in the House. There was a gentleman in the gallery this afternoon, who was asleep, that is not counting the assistant of the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, who was deeply engrossed in "Time Magazine". He was doing well at \$12,000 a year, \$1,000 a month, He was sitting up in the gallery reading, I think it was "Time Magazine" I could not tell what it was, it was not "Playboy". If it were, he did not have the picture, you know, in it.

But anyway, Mr. Chairman, the minister of Finance, he talked. He was quite eloquent again, he waxed eloquent about the fact that the per student allotment at Memorial has gone this year from \$1,910 last year to \$2,030 in the current financial year. That is the full-time student equivalent allocation. That is \$120 which is about five per cent. I would submit Mr. Chairman, that that is barely enough to enable the university to stand still. Because as we all know any of us who have

dealt with any of these problems, fifteen per cent, \$1900 to \$2.030 is \$120 -

(inaudible)

MR.ROBERTS: Oh, that is because there are more students, but I am talking about the per student equivalent at this stage, I will come back to the more students. But the per student equivalent is going to be about five per cent. That is barely enough, Sir, to enable the university to stand still, even to mark time. Indeed I would be very interested if we could have a select committee. Well, there is a resolution, I will come back to that. I would be very interested to have the officials of the university, Mr. Morgan, the vice-president and some of the financial people and some of the academic people, if they could tell us. But I recall being told time and time again both in the hospital field and in the university field that five per cent was not enough. The five per cent would not even meet the inevitable escalations. True the number of per student equivalents have gone up. I have not worked out the mathematics of it. The minister may have them there. There would be about 9,200 students this current year, student equivalent. Last year it was 8,500 so they are allowing 700 student equivalents. That is one of those phrases that crop up in the bureaucracy, an inevitable one, it happens to be a term of art student equivalent, Your Honour. I guess Your Honour knows it is not necessarily a student, five courses by one art student equal one full-time student equivalent. If there are five individual students, each taking one course in extension, or one course at night school, one course in the summer schools, they constitute a student equivalent.

So we will have 700 more student equivalents this year than there were last year. When the minister talks about the vast increase he

neglects to point that out Sir. I say there is not enough money in these estimates being asked for by the minister, we are talking about the minister's salary the general debate, general heading, there is not enough to enable the university to do much more than to mark time. Because Sir, every year their first-year intake is higher than the year before. Every year, maybe the member for St. Barbe North has some figures., but the enrollment keeps on growing. To say that the rate has gone from 1910 to 2030 and to pretend that is a big increase, somehow the minister is being generous, that he is being magnanimous, Sir, that is to mislead this committee, because a five per cent increase is no increase, Sir. What are professors gone up. ten per cent? They have a tighter trade union than even the lawyers have. I do not know what professors' wages are. They may be two-thirds of the total, Sir. Perhaps two-thirds of the total expenditure is for faculty's salaries, the people who teach over there.

Well, if they have gone up ten per cent and they are two-thirds of the total then, Sir, six and a-half per cent of the total global budget must go just for that one. If you have only gone up five per cent you have to cut back somewhere else. I can tell the minister, he knows that over the past three or four years what fat there was in the university estimates got taken out, squeezed out. The whole purpose of the going-on the formula financing such as we have now, the whole purpose of that was to squeeze the fat out. The university came in and they asked two or three years ago for it, I think it was \$2000 per student, They got about \$1800 by the time the officials in Treasury Board the Finance Department, the Education Department got through with them. Now it is up \$2,030 next year it will be \$2,150 or \$2,160 or \$2,180 or perhaps \$2,200. It will keep on going. Partially the inflationary factor, which means the real dollar value is reduced, partially the inevitable rise in prices, inevitable upgrading of salaries



and of facilities. So it is hardly any increase, Sir. All the minister's eloquence, sarcasm in fact cannot hide that. You cannot hide the fact of the medical school. Sir, that is not for the university. You could say that maybe a third of it will go for the teaching facilities, maybe a third. But if the government want to end the medical school, if their priorities are different let them cut it. It can be done. It will take an order of the government, a decision in cabinet, decision by the Premier and the ministers to do it, but it could be done. What I say, and this is the point made so well by the gentleman from St. Barbe North, is what we are saying in this administration's approach to the university hypocrisy of the rankest sort. They must do one or the other, Sir. On the one hand they must say to the university take

everybody. Take everybody who qualifies by your standards, we will provide the money. They can say that. That was the policy we followed in the years. Now you can attack that. You can say it is wrong. You can attack it on political grounds. You can attack it on grounds of educational policy. You can attack it on any number of grounds. It is a policy. It is a statement. You either do that, Sir, or you say to the university, we can give you 'x' millions. Spend it as you will. Take as many students as you will. We will make as many tests as we can to make sure you are getting your moneys worth. You cannot have it both ways. Now the Administration owe it to the university, Sir, to take that decision, if they wish to continue the policy. The minister asked what the Liberal Administration did for the university. I will tell you what the Liberal Government did over the years, Sir. They built it. That is what they did. They used the people's money. It did not come out of the pocket of any individual in the government except in a share of Income Tax and SSA. That is all that the Liberals did in 23 years.

When my friend spoke in the Throne Speech debate, somebody questioned them and said, neglect, neglect. He read the record of neglect in education. Some record. If the Minister of Education can do as much in four years as any Liberal minister did in four years even as much as the member from Fortune Bay did during his tenure. The gentleman was Minister of Education for. What? A couple of years. Two and one-half. If the hon. gentleman from St. John's North, the present Education Minister, could accomplish as much in the four years he may get as the member for Fortune Bay, the punitive minister accomplished in two and one-half, he will be doing well. Judging on his record to date, he will not even come close to it. Sir, when the Minister of Finance gets up and attempts to rescue his floundering colleague who will shortly get up and come off with some of the sarcasm that he is so noted for, some of the digs and the eloquence and personal attacks, let him deal with this. When the Finance Minister says that, what did the

Liberal Administration do? Sure, he picked four years of figures. Let him go back ten years when the new campus was built. Then the years the residences were put there. The same plan the hon. gentlemen are using now, borrowing the money from Central Mortgage and paying it off over the years. Let him go back to the days when the Engineering building was closed in and had a fourth story added, and all the other things that are done. I agree not enough has been done. No man in this House will say that enough has been done for the university or for any part of education. The hon. gentleman cannot have it both ways. The hon. gentlemen opposite get up and talk of petitions, of neglect and they speak in the Throne Speech and they will speak now in the Budget Speech. I have no doubt we will hear from almost all of them. I hope so. It is their duty. They will speak of neglect. They will speak of roads not being built and schools that need to be built and hospitals. The gentleman from Trinity North was quoted on the television the other evening as saying it is not a question of whether there will be a hospital in Clarendville, but when. I agree. I would like to see a hospital in Clarendville. The member for Bonavista South, who is absent. He has not been here this week. He promised one in Bonavista Town. It is going to be interesting. The Minister of Health will be having some words on that. We would like to see all sorts of facilities. The member for Ferryland wants to see the Southern Shore road paved. Fine. So do we. They cannot have it both ways, Sir. The Minister of Finance, and this brings me back to the start, it brings me back to where he began, where he made a lot of sense before he got swept away in trying to defend his colleague. I agree his colleague needs help, but he will not get it that way.

When the Finance Minister began, he made a lot of sense. What he was saying was important. Every Newfoundlander should listen to it and answer the question posed. I say the question is not; is the Province going to survive? Newfoundland will be here after we are all gone. Newfoundland was here long before we were and she will be here long after we are all gone and forgotten. For most of us, Mr. Chairman, we will be forgotten a week, ten days, two weeks after we leave office or leave the House. None of us should

be under any illusions about that. We all think we are great and mighty now. We all think that we are one of the 42 men who govern this Province in the House of Assembly or one of the fifteen or sixteen, or how ever many there are in the ministry. Ministers come and go and members come and go. If we all died tonight, it would be anything but a catastrophe for Newfoundland - it might be a great blessing in many ways. But after, the member from Port au Port shakes his head. Let him shake his head. He does not think that his passing will make any difference. It would not really, any more than mine would not nor any hon. member of the House. Newfoundland will survive, Sir.

The real question is what kind of Newfoundland we are going to have. Here the Minister of Finance was speaking from his heart, and I suggest close to the question in politics today. The real question is what kind of Newfoundland and who is going to pay the price? That is why on this side of the House we are against this Budget. We are against the parts of it we have criticized. Other parts we have not criticized. We may quarrel with particular small aspects of policy, we may question the minister. The Minister of Social Services has not heard us criticize some of the policies in his department. We think they are good. Indeed some of the changes he has made are ones we wish we could have made. There are others we think he should make, but I know he is working on them. But there are things we do criticize. One of the things we criticize, Sir, is the decision taken by this administration to make the poor people in this Province pay the price, to take away the Mothers Allowance and not to put it back in education anywhere. They could have used it up elsewhere in education. They could have put it into welfare, into social services programmes. I have no doubt the minister and his officials could use \$3,000,000 to good advantage down in that department. I have no doubt the minister, well not the Minister of Education, but the people who counted in that department, the deputy minister and the other officials, could use that \$3,000,000. It reduced the pupil-teacher ratio, which everybody says

must be done, but we will do it. That is our quarrel. Not with the sarcastic bit. I know Newfoundland cannot have everything. I said it in my few remarks on the Budget. I will say it here and I will say it again. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen opposite realise it. The Minister of Finance does. He knows it. I believe the Minister of Designated Intergovernment Relations realizes it. I really doubt if there are any others who do, who realize that, who realize the implications of it, who realize that all the four year plans in the world will not change that.

The Minister of Fisheries went to Gander the other night and read a speech that was intended to be read by the Premier, who was absent on other business. I have not got a copy. I hope I will. Information Newfoundland has not hooked up their telex to my place yet, but maybe the hon. gentleman will send one over to me. I would like to read it. I have only read the reports in the papers. They are not always accurate and they are certainly not full and complete. The hon. gentleman in that speech, Sir, tells us, and this is the Premier of the Province speaking, that next year's budget is going to be the same as this year's. I am not quoting word for word, but is that not the thought. That is what the gentleman read to the Chamber of Commerce. Last week in Corner Brook the Premier made a statement, and for this I rely upon the press. I was not there, Sir, and I not know if he was using a text. If so, I have no copy of it. He made a statement that next year's budget will be a Tory Budget. I use the word Tory because it was in the headline.

So, we cannot have it both ways. Hon. gentlemen opposite have got to realize that. It is not a matter of cheap politics. It is a matter of who is going to pay the price for Newfoundland. Are we going to wack it off the mothers? We can do it. Indeed we will do it. This government have decided to do it. This House will then do it because 33 out votes 9. That

nine may be even eight. For the time being it will be back up to nine. They will do it if they want to. They have decided in Cabinet, and ministerial solidarity will carry the day. Fine! I submit, Sir, that is wrong. Not just taking it away! If they are going to do it, that is their decision and they will answer for it. It is not my place to tell them what they should do and should not do. I am not the government. I am not in the government. I am in opposition. Anytime I forget it I merely look across at the eager and smiling and open faces of the gentlemen opposite and I know I am in opposition. I know why.

Mr. Roberts

If they are going to take this money, let them put it elsewhere in education. Let them work out a coherent policy. Let them provide us with some answers. Let them tell the people of Newfoundland whether the university is to carry on as it has or not. Because, Sir, unless there is money put on capital account, the university cannot carry on, not as it has. It will carry on. It can have 8,000 or 9,000 students but it can no longer be the dream of any student in Newfoundland to go to Memorial, provided he can only get the sixty per cent and matriculate or whatever you need to get into the place. That is what we are against. We think it is hypocrisy on the part of the administration. I think it is hypocrisy on the part of the minister, until he makes a statement. Now he may make it this evening. If I shut up, we will let him make a statement. He has been waiting patiently for three or four hours and has not had an opportunity yet. He will get his opportunity. It will be tomorrow that we will be on his estimates and probably, I am willing to bet, next week. I do not begrudge a minute of it. I think it is worth every moment - \$140 million is it? That is a lot of money, Mr. Chairman. It is one-quarter of the vote, the entire vote for the province. It will be worth every minute no matter how quickly the Minister of Finance wants us to put it through. We are not going to put them through that quickly. We were sent here to speak and we will speak. He is being hypocritical when he tries to rush them through. Last year the great champions of the opposition, of freedom, the Minister without Portfolio and the Minister of Finance, but how their tails have turned now that their tails have turned.

They look at it differently now. The Minister of Finance is trying out the Premier's Chair. The Premier cannot be in the building tonight. It is very comfortable but the Premier cannot be in the building tonight or the minister would not dare sit over there.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I have seen him up here, Mr. Chairman, when he thinks nobody is around, trying it out for size. I have seen him try it out. He may be a while getting there, Sir. The gentleman who occupies that Chair -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I do not intend ever to take the chair the honourable gentleman has. I do not ever want it any more than I would not want the chair of the member for Burgeo-LaPoile, the \$2.6 million -

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, I could not afford it. I can tell you Newfoundland cannot afford it, Mr. Chairman. But, Sir, they did, and we will be paying for it a long time to come. That is a lot of fish that has to be sold, Mr. Chairman. We will come to that. That is a pleasure ahead of us yet, the Fisheries Estimates. It is a real pleasure. To come back to Education.

In my preliminary opening remarks - I mean it we are going to be here - the hon. member for Twillingate wants to say a few words and my hon. friend for White Bay South can doubtless be coaxed into the debate. I am willing to bet the hon. member for Bell Island probably has a few things to say. The hon. member for Labrador South dismisses his tentative swan song, will get a word or two in. The hon. member for Bonavista North - of course, the member for St. Barbe has just begun. It is but a beginning, Mr. Chairman. We have been waiting for weeks. The minister will not answer questions in the House. We are going to have to pry it out of him, inch by inch, and we will. He might ask his officials to have ready a statement showing the number of students in each of the school boards in this province who are bussed? How many are bussed in the Green Bay Integrated School District and in the Exploit's Vally School District and so forth? We would like to have that information. The minister



Mr. Roberts

might ask his officials to burn a little midnight oil or else will have it ready. We will need it. We will need it so we can decipher this bus policy that he dragged out. I know it is a crime, Sir, to look at the poor carcass of a policy. Sir, it was a poor policy to begin with. We are going to have to because the minister came on and said that it was a great thing. I will come back to that another time. We will have loads of time, Sir, in this debate. It is just beginning. The Minister of Finance can be as anxious as he is. I have nothing to do this summer except to -

MR. CROSBIE: We are not anxious, we want to go on.

MR. ROBERTS: Well we are going on but the minister stood a few minutes ago Mr. Chairman and said, "let us vote." He wanted Education voted tonight. He wanted Health voted tonight. I think he wanted Economic Development started tonight.

MR. CROSBIE: If you do not want to that is -

MR. ROBERTS: No, we do not want to do it. No!

Is the minister surprised?

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I hope the minister loves it.

MR. CROSBIE: There is nothing more entertaining than listening to the honourable member.

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad the minister agrees and I wish I could return the compliment, Sir, but I cannot. I find him amusing but not entertaining. It is far better than "Get Smart." It is the minister who needs, "Get Smart."

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. Leader should get back to the student busses.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, we did go a little off tangent there but with such targets it is hard not to. The minister might have that table ready. His officials could drag it. Maybe he will refuse. Maybe he will say that he cannot get it. He never has admitted that his bus policy was a shambles and that he has withdrawn it completely, and yet he has.

Mr. Roberts.

He doubtless has some formula. It would make the formula in the Gift Tax Act look like simple algebra. Maybe he will tell us what the secret formula is. Maybe all the superintendents who have been in touch with us can find out that, when they cannot find out any other way. Indeed until we made the minister, in response to a question, table how much boards were getting - The honourable minister did not know how much they were getting. I suppose to this moment there are some who do not know how much they are getting or why? Perhaps the minister could get that ready, Mr. Chairman. It will be interesting. I am sure the honourable minister's officials have it. I am sure they have it. It is not in the annual report of the department. We have looked there. I am told it is not. I have not looked myself but I am told all is there is school attendance districts. They are not called truant officers any more. They are called school attendance officers. He might perhaps favour the committee with this.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion of phase one of part one of act one, volume one, let me say that I thought the Minister of Finance, when he started, was making a very real contribution. I would like to see - maybe the government could put a Resolution on the Order Paper, Sir? Maybe we could have a debate. It would be one of the great debates in Newfoundland's history, not the way we normally debate, which is very partisan, very much off the cuff and all of us are guilty of that. Maybe guilty is not the word. There is no other way one can keep up with it. We are sitting twice a day now and I do not begrudge that. I understand the House Leader's problem. It was not so long ago that I had them myself. It is not so long in the future that I expect to have them again.

MR. CROSBIE: Twenty-five years.

MR. ROBERTS: Twenty-five years.- No, it will not be twenty-five years before the government changes hands, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: You do not want to see the New Democratic Party?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, because I know what they would do to the Burgeo settlement. They would expropriate it without a cent and, by God, I vote for it! Yes I know it is too late. Spencer has the millions. He has it in his pocket now and he has gone to Gloucester on the "Reefer" and that is it. That is where the money is gone. It is sad. The honourable member says that it is good.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I probably know an apartment he could rent in Clearwater. If the honourable gentleman wants to get into ad hominem attacks let him. But, Mr. Chairman, the minister made a very real contribution. I am perfectly serious. I would like to see the administration put down a motion that we could debate. Maybe we will do it on private members' day. That is only once a week. We have to wait our turn. We have other private members' resolutions - a very real debate. Maybe it will come when the government produces the four-year plan.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier has already said that next year's budget will be much like this year's.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, it is going to be a dandy.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I have no doubt. The only unanswered question is: Who will be the Minister of Finance a year from now?

MR. CROSBIE: He is going to be a dandy.

MR. ROBERTS: Then obviously it is going to be changed, Sir. There is going to be a change. The rumours are correct.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: That the present Minister of Finance is going to become Minister of Community and Social Development. The present Minister of Community and Social Development becomes a class II cabinet minister and some other gentleman becomes Minister of Finance and another gentleman becomes Minister of Economic Development, etc., etc.

Mr. Roberts.

The honourable gentleman is heading for a very grand fall indeed, Sir. So, Mr. Chairman, the estimates of this department may take us a few minutes. I think they are important enough. There is not a family in Newfoundland who is not affected by them. I never know if the House Leader is being attentive or if he is just exquisitely feed up with it all.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad he is greatly amused.

My life would be a little better, Sir, at the thought that I helped to amuse the honourable gentleman. Normally, judging from the look on his face, nothing amuses him. Really nothing does.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is fine. He will have to take that matter up with his parents. I really had nothing to do with that, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Could be. Could be. The honourable gentleman would be big on fruit-fly genetics, would he not?

MR. CROSBIE: I am pretty good on - I will not say what.

MR. ROBERTS: Is that the vivarium?

MR. MARSHALL: We are going to have the genetics -

MR. ROBERTS: I am all for that and perhaps an animal psychologist for the Minister of Finance.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, we are thinking of a vivarium for a motel.

MR. ROBERTS: That would be rather good but I hope the honourable gentleman has better success with it than some other motels with which he was involved, as a minister

But, Mr. Chairman, the debate will probably go on for a little while yet. The minister, if his colleagues will trust him on his feet and I guess they will now as he seems to be gathering himself, will now say a few words and it will probably take us close to eleven o'clock. The minister speaks slowly. He presumably speaks as he thinks. We will adjourn then at eleven o'clock and then we will be back here either eleven tomorrow morning or at three tomorrow afternoon we will be back on his estimates and we are only on head (1), or it is 601(01) but it is the first item in it, and that is where there will be a long debate. But I do not think the minister begrudges. I think he is eager to get at it. So, without any further ado, I think we will let him get at it. So have at us, Mr. Chairman, have at us and then we will be back at the honourable gentleman again.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, as a former teacher and involved in the educational process to some extent over the last nine years or so, I feel it incumbent upon me to get up and say a few words about education. I think now, Mr. Chairman, we have reached the stage in this House where we have added another honourable member for university, that is the only member for St. Barbe North, who I think, can quite legitimately be called the honourable member for Memorial seeing that the other side saw it in their power to label the honourable gentleman for St. Mary's as the honourable member for Cambridge because, Mr. Chairman, about sixty-five or seventy per-cent of the speech of the honourable member from Memorial centered around that glorious institution.

The honourable member began by once again reiterating a statement that he made earlier in this House about the insidious plot that this government has devised, that sinister, eccentric, mad, evil plot that this government has over the last three or four months behind closed doors devised to do the people of Newfoundland in in every possible way

that they can. Mr. Chairman, I reject that statement utterly, totally without reservation. I think that the honourable member for Memorial is being extremely unfair --

MR. ROWE(F.B.): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Can a member of this honourable House refer to another member out of context as a member for Memorial?

MR. MURPHY: The honourable member for Bell Island is the authority on that.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): I am not talking to you. Mr. Chairman, would you rule on it please?

MR. PECKFORD: May I continue, Mr. Chairman? This is a very shallow --

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling on this. Can a member of the House on any side of this House refer to another honourable member as a member for some place other than the district which he represents?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to this point of order. If Your Honour will recall sometime last week in a debate I referred to the honourable member for St. Mary's as the honourable member for Cambridge and the Chairman, or I think it was the Speaker at the time said that this was unparliamentary and that it was not to happen again. The honourable member for St. John's East is nodding his approval, Sir, so I think that the honourable member for Green Bay should retract and apologize to the honourable member for St. Barbe North.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Order please! The member from Green Bay will refer to the member from St. Barbe North only, please.

MR. PECKFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, what I was saying was I think that this is an extremely unfair statement especially coming from the honourable member for St. Barbe North. Considering the fact that I had always recognized him as being an

objective and even sometimes leading educator of this province to find him stoop so low as to come up with a ridiculous statement of that sort really leaves me speechless. But I was more saddened by his speech, Mr. Chairman, in the fact that he continually referred to the present government and the present minister as not formulating any philosophy or policy in education.

If we can take the honourable member's speech as indicative of educational philosophy and planning and policy in this province for the next five or ten years, then I am sure we would really be in a mess in education.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): That is your job, not ours.

MR. PECKFORD: Your job is also to be constructive as well as destructive, I have you know.

But I was very saddened that he continually harped on a few particular items rather than suggest, because of his learning in the education field, especially in the teaching field, some proposal, some suggestions to this government, to the Department of Education, that might help formulate policy and planning in the future. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but it seems to me rather odd that the honourable member for St. Barbe North must be totally aware that to formulate philosophy in education or policy and planning in education takes more than two or three months to formulate. He is only too well aware from his knowledge with the university that to formulate even a particular part of a curriculum for a grade six science class, a philosophy to develop some kind of a new teaching technique for that particular class takes months to formulate, and then there will not be total agreement. Yet for him to come out and criticize this new government that they have not formulated a total overall philosophy of education in three or four months is totally ridiculous and he is being intellectually dishonest with himself in doing so, because he knows full well that it is an impossibility.

Mr. Chairman, it saddened me a great deal to hear the honourable member for St. Barbe North talk so much about the university. I had a feeling all along from the time of his election that he still sat behind the desk in Memorial but I hoped on hope that when I heard him get up and announce on education that we would find an objective, impartial observer on the education scene who could contribute to this House immensely in the next three or four years. But the first thing, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable gentleman must do, if he wants to do that, is to forget about partisan politics and to remove himself spiritually and morally from the university. There is no place here now for pies in the skies, for having your head in the clouds. Now he must try to take that theory that he learned so well at Memorial and put it into some practicality. This he has failed to do and he still remains a part of the university.

One could almost suggest, Mr. Chairman, that seeing he had the audacity to say that there was some insidious plot underway by this government in regards to financial commitments in the next three or four years, that there is some kind of insidious plot between the honourable member for St. Barbe North and his cohorts gleaming in gold at the university.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, I demand the member for Green Bay retract that statement and apologize to this honourable House. There is no insidious plot or deal or agreement or anything else between myself and the University of this province. I stated in my remarks this afternoon, Sir, that my main concern with respect to any comments I made relative to university was where the students were spread all over this province of ours and every time I mentioned the university I mentioned that fact, that my concern was over the possibility or the lack of possibility



MR. ROWE, F.B. of a student, a qualified student of this province being able to attend this university if he wishes to do so. I suggested that we are turning to a point now where a student's probability of attending the university -

MR. PECKFORD: What is the point of order? Mr. Chairman, what is the honourable member's point of order?

MR. ROWE, F.B. will depend upon his financial capacity instead of his intellectual capacity and I demand that the member for Green Bay retract his statement immediately. There is no deal, I repeat, between the university and myself in any speeches or any representation I make in this House.

So I ask again, Mr. Chairman, for you to rule that the member retract his statements.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, if I may speak on the point of order: The honourable gentleman from St. Barbe North stated that I said there was an insidious plot or a devious plot between him and some of his cohorts at the university. I did not say that. I said that it could very well be.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Well, Mr. Chairman, there could not very well be.

MR. PECKFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Mr. Chairman, I asked for a ruling on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. DUNPHY): The member for Green Bay is asked not to make insinuations along these lines.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PECKFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I can continue now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, is the honourable member for Green Bay going to retract and apologize to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would wish the honourable member for Green Bay would explain the insinuation, if you would.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, because of the honourable gentleman's emphasis upon the capital grants, the library grants, the fellowships, the bursaries for education students at Memorial University, I went on to conclude from that because the evidence is overwhelming that it could very well be.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Thank you very much. If I may continue, Mr. Chairman.

I think and thought that the honourable member for St. Barbe North would place most of his remarks all across the full spectrum of education. This he failed to do. Memorial University is his baby. He is now the spokesman for Memorial in this House for the next four or five years.

MR. ROWE, F.B. If I may rise on a point of order again. This is the third time that I have been accused of representing the university only, in the field of education. Now the university is my baby. I wish I could stand up and say the university was my baby because it is something to be proud of.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, what is the point of order?

MR. ROWE, F.B. That is the point of order, he is accusing me of the university being my baby and that is not so.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Then, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member for St. Barbe North went on to talk glowingly about the people of this province and how this government must commit itself to the majority and to the poor people of this province. This he mentions this afternoon in his speech.

May I suggest to the honourable member that the majority of pupils and students and people of this province do not enter through the doors of Memorial University. That if he is concerned about the education of Newfoundland in total that, if he wants to be concerned about the majority of students and the majority of parents, he will

MR. PECKFORD: find that the majority of parents do not have students that go to university. So at the same time, as he said, that he will support the poor people of this province, the hon. member for Bell Island squirmed in his seat, this afternoon.

He knows and does not agree with what the honourable member for St. Barbe North was talking about. He knows that there are many hundreds of thousands of people on this island who will never go to university, as it was already stated by the Leader of the Opposition, about five percent of the students of this island go to university.

This government must not commit itself totally to five percent of the students of this province. This government must put its priorities right, which means that, if there is going to be a cut in education, if when the facts are all given - Lo and Behold! there is not a thinking Newfoundlander around today, Mr. Chairman, I suggest, that would debate the fact that we are in a financial crisis and therefore that this government must tighten its belt. If we once establish that we must tighten our belt and if we once establish that we must also tighten our belt in the area of education, are we going to tighten our belt on the ninety-five percent of students who do not go to university? Or shall we tighten our belt on the five percent that do?

If the honourable member for St. Barbe North is concerned about Flower's Cove, is concerned about Salvage and Anchor Point and Plum Point, all in the honourable member's district, he will not take the time of this House talking about five percent of the students who have to get education in this province, rather he will talk about the ninety-five percent. To me it sounds rather sound that if there has to be a cut in education, there is where it should come.

The honourable member is also aware, from research no doubt, that he has done at the university, you do not have to do much research to find this out, that basically the majority of students there is a highly positive correlation - let me put it that way. There is a highly

MR. PECKFORD: positive correlation between the students who go to university and their status in society. But for the most part those people who reach university, not only in Newfoundland but in other parts of Canada and the United States, are of the middle class and upper class of our society, sad as that may be.

So if we are really to talk about the common "Joe" of this province, the common students, the ordinary poor people that the honourable member adhered to, then we must be concerned more not with the university, albeit that that is important in its own right, but also with the other ninety-five percent. Is it not much better to see, Mr. Chairman, a cutback on this five percent rather than a cutback in primary and elementary education in this province? If there has to be a cutback, and I submit that if all honourable gentlemen or just the honourable gentlemen from the other side went into committee and left out partiality and looked at the financial status of this province, that they would agree that there had to be cutbacks this year in this budget and that there even had to be cutbacks in certain areas of education. Where better then to make these cutbacks, although we do not want to do it, although it is unfortunate, although it is tragic, it had to be done.

I was a little dismayed that the honourable member when he did start to speak, like I thought he would, about education that he did not come forward with more positive and constructive criticisms especially in the area of proper curriculum development. When he started to talk, and I agreed with him when he said we need to have a more of an approach, a teaching technique based on the discovery method or the inquiry method, team teaching, this idea and that in order for this to really happen on a full provincial scale there has to be a lowering of the student-teacher ratio.

But I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in my years in education, which

MR. PECKFORD: are not that many but they branch over eight or nine years, that it is a blanket statement that there is a good deal can be done as far as teaching techniques go within the school as they now are constituted, albeit the pupil-teacher ratio is too high. This has been tried out with success, as you know at the school that I taught at last year and a few years previous to that. There is much that can be done in this curriculum development which would not cost this province one cent but it takes a lot of professional endurance and responsibility on the part of teachers. There is where the real problem lies essentially. It is still no good, Mr. Chairman, if the Education Department of this province announced the policy on proper curriculum development and went around with pilot workshops throughout this island if we do not have within each of the individual schools, after that pilot project is finished reliable competent teachers, responsible teachers. Here, to my way of thinking Mr. Chairman, is somewhere that the N.T.A. plays a big role and teachers as such play a bigger one, albeit the teachers perhaps still need a raise in salary. There should be a greater emphasis upon true professionalism among teachers rather than the overemphasis it seems to me, even to this date, on salaries and money for teachers. There is where the big punch as to come, albeit perhaps pilot projects would help to get across these new teaching techniques. But a lot can be done now in the schools of this province, in the field of curriculum development, at the school that I taught in, in many fields, three or four subject areas, we brought in courses and studies that were no

which

y

ation

: to \$293,000

are

ucation,

dents

what

ely

y

iment

er

,500

ight

on

who

.

z

ough

ount

he

itally

i

these

i look