



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 1

1st Session

Number 30

VERBATIM REPORT

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! I would like to welcome to the honourable House today, the President and Vice-Chancellor of Memorial University, Lord Taylor, and his nephew. Also, a group of fifty-seven grade VII students from the Davis Elementary School at Carbonear with their teacher in charge, Mr. Ern Cole, and some others to help them, Mrs. Emma Noel, Mrs. L. Samms and Mrs. Milton Samms. I would also like to welcome any other visitors who might be in the galleries today. We trust that your visit here is most informative, educational and enjoyable.

PETITIONS:

MR. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Rodger's Cove in Fogo District. The prayer of the petition is that they express desire, the need for deep wells to be drilled in their community.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to elaborate on this petition, because, Sir, practically ninety percent of the communities in Fogo District are having or if not, certainly will have within a very short time, if we get much dry weather a very serious problem in the drinking water situation there, which is going to be aggravated by the fact that in most all of those communities where we have this problem with water, there is the terrific problem of dust.

It was only yesterday I visited the settlement or the community of Horwood. I saw lying in a yard there, well drilling equipment which has been lying idle since January, and the nearby communities are screaming out for this machine to get to work to provide them with some pure drinking water. The communities of Stoneville, Horwood, Wing's Point and I can go on all around Gander Bay.

Sir, I strongly support this petition and I earnestly ask the government to take due notice of it, before the Minister of Health has a serious problem on his hands, brought about by an epidemic caused by

impure drinking water. I asked that it be received on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Northwest River. The prayer of this petition, Mr. Speaker, is that the twenty-one miles of road between Goose Bay and Northwest River be upgraded and paved. I speak in support of this petition, Mr. Speaker. This road was started in 1962 I believe, no. 1956, and it has served the community of Northwest River since that time. There was some upgrading done on it last year and the year before. It is one of the oldest sections of road and one of the few sections of road in Labrador that connects two communities.

Sir, I support this petition and I ask that the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Highways see fit to provide money to do this work this year.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition from the residents of Northwest River. The prayer of their petition is, to be granted improvement in twenty-one miles of road. I remember, Mr. Speaker, in 1950-51, walking along this road (of course it was not a road then, it was only a bulldozed path) as I was a member of the forces in Goose Bay.

MR. WOODWARD: the only way that we had to get to Northwest River was either by boat or by this old bulldozed road. I am quite sure things have changed since 1950 for the residents of Northwest River. I wholeheartedly endorse their petition that this road be upgraded and paved and I trust that modern facilities of this kind will come to all the residents of our Labrador Area.

MR. J. G. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and support the petition presented by my friend from Labrador North. I think the whole question of roads for Labrador will have to be given some serious consideration in the years ahead. Perhaps this might be a good starting point, as this road has apparently been on the drawing board now for some number of years.

It gives me great pleasure to support this petition.

MR. E. W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I feel now pretty bound to support this petition because in my term of office in 1956 or it was just prior to that when this road was opened, I would say it was one of the most crookedest roads, if there is such a word, even built in Newfoundland. The excuse that the contractor used to use, after the road was finished was, "Well, this is the way the road had to be built because of the American Base and if there was ever a time when the base had to be evacuated, it would be much more difficult for aircraft to trace this winding road." I think that held some logic during the war.

Mr. Speaker, this road is perhaps the oldest road in Labrador. It was built before even Wabush, Churchill Falls or any of those communities had very much road there. It was also during my term that we arranged for that Goose River to be bridged. Any of the honourable members who might travel, I am sure the honourable member for Labrador North will approve that they have permission free of charge, to cross that bridge which is known as "The Winsor Bridge."

MR. WINSOR: So I certainly support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and ask that serious consideration be given to having that stretch of road upgraded and paved. It would be something that the government would feel very proud of, to provide a paved road from Goose Bay to Northwest River, especially to that side of the river where there are between 300 and 400 Indians living. There are a great number of people working at Northwest River, on the American Base, and I may say at stevedoring work at Goose Bay.

So I think, Sir, now that the government, the previous government, built the road, built the bridge, at least the present government can upgrade and pave it.

On motion petition received.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter affecting the privileges of a member of the House or indeed the whole House and this is the first opportunity I had to do so because petitions were presented immediately.

Sir, apparently this morning the Supreme Court handed down a judgment declaring an election in Labrador South null and void. I am wondering, Sir, if Your Honour has received, has had that judgment transmitted to him or whether Your Honour has taken judicial notice of the decision or whether it is now in order for the honourable member to come into the House and sit here until such time as the judgment of the court is transmitted to Your Honour?

I ask the question, Sir, on a point of privilege because the honourable member is outside the House now. He does not want to come into the House and be ordered out, because that would be slightly embarrassing to himself and his constituents or his recent constituents. I am wondering if Your Honour could give us some information on that. Has he received a transmission of the judgment of the Supreme Court or does he take judicial notice of it?

MR. SPEAKER: I have not received any official statement only what I have heard from the press.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Then, Sir, I take it that the honourable member can resume his seat until such time as you have received the transmission?

MR MARSHALL: If I may, the rights of the member from Labrador South - I do not want to infringe on his rights - would be

governed entirely by the provisions of the Election Act and the actual effect of that decision at the present time. I am not completely sure, but I think if the hon. member would allow, perhaps your Honour might like to take a little while to bring in a ruling while we check. The Election Act can be checked relatively quickly.

MR. SPEAKER: I will try to find out as soon as we can, to bring in a ruling or some information on it.

DR. A.T. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table for the information of the House the answer to questions asked on the Order Paper of the 2nd June by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Question 39, Question 40 and Question 41.

MR. CARTER: I would like to table the answer to a verbal question. This was a question relating to student allowances and a statement that I made last night. There are some copies here and also a glossary of examples of the rather complex calculations.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table an answer to Question 91, asked by the hon. member for Labrador North. Nothing applies.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I have a series of answers to question that I have been asked by - that is the story of my life. One good friend is more than most of us have.

I have the answer to many questions that have been asked by the honourable member for Bonavista North. I would rather table them than read them all out, and save the time of the House. I should quote the numbers -

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other answers to questions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance namely the current labour-management dispute at Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation, which is placing the Newfoundland Broiler and Hog Producing Industry in jeopardy. At the present time, three broiler producers have for sale at give

away prices 68,000 broilers. These 68,000 will mushroom within two weeks to 140,000 broilers, bringing a total loss to broiler producers of approximately \$300,000. The close down of the abattoir has already caused lay offs of men at both the broiler producer level and the local hatchery level. These lay offs will multiply tremendously within the next week and the next four weeks, with a possible lay off of some 400 men directly and indirectly involved. Should the dispute not be resolved in the meantime, within days three broiler producers may have to declare bankruptcy, should this situation be allowed to continue.

MR. SPEAKER: I will take this motion under advisement. When the House goes into Committee of the Whole, I will ask the committee to rise as soon as it can; and will make a ruling on it.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, before Your Honour adjourns to make a ruling, I would like to address a few words to Your Honour.

The motion is to adjourn to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, and what Your Honour has to decide is whether you think this is in order and of urgent public importance, after which you have to ask for the leave of the House in this matter.

MR. CROSBIE: Your Honour I submit that although this is an important matter, it is not of such urgent public importance that it should now be debated in this House as an emergency. This is a strike taking place in the Crown Corporation at Pleasantville. It is a strike that has been underway for some three weeks. It is a matter that can be debated in this House. When the estimates go through the House there will be plenty of opportunity for it to be debated. Therefore, Your Honour, I submit that this is not the kind of motion that Your Honour should deem to be, to meet the requirements of Beauchesne and the rules, that the motion is not in order at this time.

In addition Your Honour it is a mischievous motion. It is a motion that it is an attempt by the Opposition to -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. The honourable gentleman may speak to the question of urgency, he is now debating what he considers to be the merits about the motion. I am suggesting, if he is going to debate it, Your Honour, we expect to debate it on our side too.

MR. CROSBIE: The matter is not urgent it is mischievous.

MR. SPEAKER: I have taken the matter under advisement and I will make a ruling, as I have mentioned. I think debate should not continue on this.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question of urgency only, I do not want to debate the matter at all until and unless Your Honour rules that it is in order. I merely wish to say that the rule is quite clear, the precedents are clear, both in this House, Sir, and in Beauchesne. The question to be decided by Your Honour is whether the matter should be debated urgently, and the honourable gentleman, the

Minister of Finance, says that it is not urgent, that we can debate it on the estimates.

Mr. Speaker, the reason we raised the matter now and submit that it must be debated urgently is that the only Head under which it could have been debated and on which it was debated, Sir, namely: the Head, I think it is Head VIII but the Mines, Agriculture & Resources Head that has been disposed of by the committee of the whole, Sir. Therefore, if the matter is to be debated it must be debated upon this motion. We submit, therefore, that the necessity of the debate is urgent and accordingly my colleague has made the motion.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in reply to that I would point out to Your Honour that the estimates for the Department of Labour have not yet been debated and there is no reason why any labour matter cannot be debated on the estimates for the Department of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that debate on this matter should cease until I have had a chance to bring in my ruling. Otherwise, we would be here all afternoon on this.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance and Economic Development. In view of the radio reports, Mr. Speaker, that the number of construction workers on the linerboard mill in Stephenville is being reduced drastically, I would like to ask the minister to inform the House what steps have the government taken to recruit and train permanent staff for the linerboard mill at Stephenville? Will our Newfoundland workers be sent out of the province for training? Or will trained people be brought to Stephenville on a temporary basis to start up the mill then turn the mill over to an all-Newfoundland work force? Has the minister consulted the vocational training branch of the Department of Education, Canada Manpower and the unions concern to work out a critical path system of hiring the permanent staff, with preference being given to Newfoundlanders?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member opposite knows quite well that this is not the kind of oral question to ask the House. This is a long involved question that should be put on the Order Paper. As far as the linerboard mill is concerned, I know of no great layoffs there. The only layoffs that there will be there will be in the course of construction. As construction gets completed the people will be laid off. We are still aiming for a start-up date in October. The recruitment is underway. People at that mill there, the joint project manager is Donald D. Dick, Kates, Peat, Marwick are engaged in this recruiting campaign. Some persons had been recruited, highly skilled persons. It is the intention of course to have employed at the mill as many Newfoundlanders as possible, who are residents of this province. For the rest of it the question should be put on the Order Paper. I will get the answers.

MR. SPARY: Mr. Speaker, this is

Mr. Neary.

a rather complicated question. It is impossible to put a question like that on the Order Paper. I would like to direct a question now, Sir, to the Minister of Community and Social Development. Has the minister received a copy of the Grosse Report which was undertaken for the Atlantic Development Council on Economic Development in Newfoundland and Labrador? If so, will the minister table the report in this House and distribute copies to individual members of the House?

MR. SENIOR: The answer to that question is that I have not received the report.

MR. NEARY: I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Labour. Would the minister indicate to the House what the prospects are at this particular moment of adverting an all-out confrontation between employees and employers in Labrador West, thus crippling the whole economy of the area and tying up transportation in the region?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is not really a question. It is a statement and it is a statement containing argument and it is not the type of question. It is out of order for these two reasons.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I submit that that is a proper question. It is an urgent matter. A strike may occur this week and I would like for the minister to indicate to the House what steps the Provincial Department of Labour are taking to avert that strike.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think that an honourable member could answer a question in anticipation of something that might take place in the future, so I think the question is out of order.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, maybe a double or triple-barrelled question. Has he received a telegram from the Town Council of Fogo? Has he replied to that telegram and would he inform the House what his answer was?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I received a telegram and my officials are

Mr. Collins

in touch with the Town Council in Fogo this afternoon. It is a very involved problem down there, as the honourable member must know, in relation to the Clean, Air, Water and Soil Authority. It is a subject of concern for us and something which we are looking into and just as soon as the thing can be resolved we will let the people know and the honourable member.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Would the honourable minister inform the House if the oil spill in Conception Bay is now under control, if it has been cleaned up, if there has been any damage to the fishing gear in the area?

MR. DOODY: That should have been mine.

MR. NEARY: I am sorry. The question should have been directed to the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, the oil spill in question has been localized to an area of the beach near North Arm. Unfortunately, there are quite a lot of globs of oil on the beach in that area. There are no oil slicks to be found on the bay itself. The Department of Transport, the Federal Department of Transport, are in the process of cleaning the beach at the present time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Would the minister indicate to the House what recourse the fishermen have in the area whose nets were affected by this oil spill?

MR. DOODY: I am afraid that I do not have the answer to that question.

MR. NEARY: Will you get it?

MR. DOODY: I will try to get the information as quickly as I can.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier or the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Due to the severe nature of the water supply in Happy Valley over the weekend, I learned that there have been a number of cases of hepatitis

June 13, 1972

Tape no. 727

Page 3

in the area and I was also lead to believe that there was a government official in the area looking over this situation.

2260

I found out that there has not been anyone visit the area to correct the serious nature of this water supply. I am wondering if the Premier or the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing could tell me what action has been taken on that very serious matter.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a DREE study being conducted at Happy Valley right now. They are looking at three alternatives. One is a new water supply for Muskrat Lake, the second alternative is the 15 RCAF treatment plant with modifications and the third is the existing facilities with modifications and a new water treatment plant. There is supposed to be an official from Canada Engineering Corporation, Limited, who are doing the study for DREE in the area this week, and we are waiting for his report.

MR. GILLET: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I have had so many requests from the residents of Twillingate concerning the new hospital, I wonder if the honourable Minister of Health could find out and let me know, say tomorrow or as soon as possible, what time construction will commence on that building. I have been in talk with the architects and also the construction firm, and there seems to be a passing of the buck somehow. I would like to have an answer as I have had many requests in fact I had a call from the radio station today, and I would appreciate it very much.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, there are two points. First of all, as the honourable member is aware, the House has confirmed the fact that the hospital in Twillingate will be a reality. Secondly in the early days of construction there was considerable problem with the excavation of rock. The contract for this was not completed last year. It is about to get underway now but I will advise you within the next two or three days exactly when it will start. The problem is not now in construction. The problem is to excavate further rock before the construction can actually start. I will give you the exact starting date within a few days.

MR. GILLET: Thank you very much, Sir.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

On motion a bill, "An Act Respecting Succession Duty," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion a bill, "An Act Respecting Gift Tax," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

Heading VI - Education and Youth:- 601(01):

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned late last night or eleven o'clock, last night at any rate, members were making some general remarks on the general incompetence of the present Minister of Education and his disability really, I suppose, on grounds of incompetence to be minister of that department and the whole of that portfolio which is without a doubt, Sir, the most important portfolio for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, the most important portfolio of the whole government of this province.

The minister himself and some of his colleagues tried to come to his defence, not too successfully in my estimation and in the estimation of my own colleagues over here. The minister himself made a statement last night, well he made a statement in introducing his estimates which was a sophomoric dissertation on the nature of education. He subsequently made a statement, supposedly and allegedly in answer to some remarks made by the honourable member for St. Barbe North and by the Leader of the Opposition, a statement that was noted for its inadequacy, a statement which did nothing to try to say that problems affecting education in the province.

are in any way being solved or that there is an attempt to solve some of the problems. During the very few remarks I made last night myself, in about five or ten minutes, I mentioned that obviously what has happened to the Department of Education is that the honourable Minister of Finance and the government have run roughshod over that honourable Minister of Education and his department, have bowled him out of the way and flattened him as far as the government expenditure this year is concerned.

We have seen a spectacle, Sir, where all of the major cuts by the government in expenditure have come directly out of programmes administered by the honourable minister's Department of Education.

We have seen evidently a case where the Minister of Finance has considered his colleague to be a soft touch and easily run roughshod over, as far as cutting out the heart and soul of some of the very important programmes of his department are concerned.

If the programmes were of no use, of no utility, of no social value to this province, to the people of the province, then they should be cut out and we could not accuse the honourable minister of allowing himself to be bulldozed out of the way in the onslaught of the honourable Minister of Finance in his desire to balance the budget.

But, Sir, these programmes are important to a vast number of the people, parents, children and students of the province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

We have seen, Sir, this subhead of new bursaries. We have seen that cut. We have seen graduate fellowships cut. Remarks were made by my honourable friend the member for St. Barbe North on that yesterday. Sir, we have seen the parents subsidy, so-called mothers' allowance, obliterated, annihilated, just wiped off the face of the earth, as far as the present administration is concerned.

Some feeble attempt was made by the Minister of Finance and I believe by the Minister of Education yesterday and last night to undermine

the philosophical reason, the policy reason for the mothers' allowance by saying: "Well, the rich provinces do not have such a distribution of wealth in their education or social policy programmes, why should one of the poorest provinces have a mothers' allowance or a parents' subsidy?"

But, Sir, for some strange reason these honourable ministers fail to realize that it is precisely because we are the poorest province or one of the poorest provinces in this country that it was deemed necessary by the previous administration to bring in some programme whereby there could be a more equitable distribution of such wealth as we have in this province and that the people who need an extra bit of income, the mothers of children going to school, the children themselves, could have a little more income to allow them to get read for the process of attending school.

In richer provinces of Canada, Ontario where there is at most a four or five per cent unemployment figure, where they have a much better welfare programme, I believe I am correct in saying this, better in terms of amount which go, more generous in the amounts that go to the recipients, in a province like Ontario, or Alberta, or B. C. they do not need a mothers' allowance. They do not need a mothers' allowance because of the generosity of some of the other shared cost programmes and because of the fact that their economy is far more buoyant than our economy, allowing many more people to be employed. They have their own family allowance system in Quebec, as the honourable member points out.

The honourable Minister of Finance and the honourable Minister of Education and the present administration as a whole either do not realize, Mr. Chairman, the effect that the abolition of this programme is going to have on a considerable, a substantial number of parents in this province, either they do not know or, Sir, much worse in my

estimation than ignorance would be they do not care. They do not care what effect it has, they are heedless of the effect that the abolition of the programme has on a substantial proportion of the parents of school children in this province.

Again, there was a feeble attempt made in the budget speech, by the Minister of Finance, to say that the reason the mothers' allowance is being wiped out is because there is a more generous allowance under FISC, Family Allowance, more generous family allowance coming into effect from Ottawa some time in the next year or so.

An attempt, Sir, to, in the cliché, an attempt to rob Peter to pay Paul, an attempt to wipe out a good and salutary provincial programme by taking advantage of a federal programme which everybody knows is much needed, very greatly needed in its own right.

In a province like ours, which has the lowest income or the second lowest income, I believe it is still the lowest income in all of Canada, Sir, we need something like the parents' subsidy, the mothers' allowance to allow us to provide a little extra income, to allow parents of school children to do the job of going to school a bit better.

In a province, Sir, which I would submit, which in terms of numbers of students graduating in terms of numbers of schools in existence, in terms of all the criteria which go to make up an education system, in terms of those criteria a province which I would submit has the lowest educational standards in Canada, the parents and the students, the children of this province, need all the encouragement that they can get to attend school, to make sure that they go to school and get an education. They need that kind of encouragement and the encouragement can come from a variety of sources. One of the sources of encouragement Sir, would be this small financial subsidy to the parents of school children.

Sir, there is a divided opinion on the benefit of family, of mothers'

allowances, of parents subsidy. Perhaps a parents subsidy should not go to the rich and the poor alike. Perhaps it should not go to the well off families as well as the poorer, lower income, families in the province. If that is so, Sir, I am willing to concede that that is a valid point of argument. If that is so, then there should have been an attempt by the Minister of Finance, in conjunction with the Minister of Education under whose department the programme comes, there should have been an attempt, Sir, to formulate some policy whereby the best aspects of the parents' subsidy, the mothers' allowance programme, could be kept in effect and in operation in the province this year and in succeeding years. They should have done that, Sir. They should not have treated the rich and the poor alike in this respect. They should have tried to formulate a policy whereby parents of low incomes, with large families of eight and ten children in some cases, could get this additional financial incentive and encouragement to permit their children to go to school in a bit better fashion than they would be ordinarily permitted to do .

I will say, Sir, from the talks I have had with parents of my own constituency, from telephone conversations and from letters which I have received, I will say, Sir, that the abolition of this parents' subsidy, completely, will have a very bad effect upon the education system among certain portions of our population, the lower income groups. I will say, Sir, that we will see young men and young women, perhaps at the age of fourteen or fifteen, who do not in some cases need much encouragement to get out of school anyway. I will say that we will see more and more in the school, high school dropouts or elementary school dropouts, for that matter, junior high school dropouts, as a direct result of the abolition of this programme. If my talk with some of the parents in my own constituency and around the province can be deemed to have any credit whatsoever, I think, Sir, that the government was wrong to abolish the mothers' allowance, and the

Mr. ROWE (W.N.)

amendment proposed by the hon. member for Fortune Bay and the hon. Minister of Education, to the effect that it was brought in by a Liberal Government just prior to an election as a vote grabbing spectacular, may or may not be true. I do not know. I was not part of the administration as the Minister of Finance was at that time. The hon. member for Fortune Bay was "the" Minister of Education at the time. That was 1965 then. It was not prior to the election. I can only go by the hon. Minister of Education who said it was brought in or the hon. member for Fortune Bay who said that it was brought in just prior to an election. I mean I am going by his word in the House. Assuming it was brought in just prior to the election -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, it may well have been an election gimmick. It might have been. I do not care if it was or not. This is surely the nature of the electoral process in most democratic countries. You try to get votes by putting out programmes which are attractive to people, rational and attractive programmes to the greater number of the people in the province. Surely, this is what it is all about. In any event, Sir, the hypocrisy of honourable members standing in this House and saying that the mothers' allowance can be abolished because all it was was a vote-getting programme anyway, the hypocrisy of that kind of an approach when we all saw two or three months ago, five or six months ago, the present administration coming out weeks or months before an election and announcing welfare increases, (It is much needed. I am in total agreement with them. They came out just prior to an election and announced increases in certain welfare benefits) the abolition of taxes in respect of children's clothing, just prior to an election. Again I am all in favour of it. We looked at the problem when we were in the administration and we hoped that we would be in a position to do

Mr. Rowe (W.N.)

something about it. So, Sir, do not let us hear any of those arguments about this is a vote-getting gimmick and therefore it is no good per se.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not forget the price of beer.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Well the price of beer is where the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs got his comeuppance when he came up against the Minister of Finance,

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, let us not hear this kind of silly, foolish argument. If a programme is good or bad, it is good or bad on its own merits, it has nothing to do with politics or anything else. I am glad to see the tax off children's clothing. I am glad to see welfare benefits increased. I am sorry to see the mothers' allowance wiped out completely. I am even sorrier to see it wiped out in respect of the lower income groups in this province. I do hope that the Minister of Finance and his colleague, urged on by the Minister of Education, if he ever gets any competency in his portfolio, will see fit to reinstate at least a portion of the mothers' allowance in succeeding years, that portion which would be in respect of parents who are below a certain minimum income in the province.

Now we saw the parents' subsidy cut by the Minister of Finance, cut out of the estimates of the hon. Minister of Education. We saw university construction cut to the bone. We saw a current account amount for running the university cut to a level which, in my information, is completely inadequate to take the normal growth of the university over the next year and certainly in succeeding years.

Now, Sir, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition said last night, it is a valid, philosophical or a policy position to take that the Memorial University of Newfoundland is not a completely open university, that there will be constraints and restrictions on the enrollment at the university, directly as a result of the amount of finances provided

Mr. Powe (W.N.)

to the university. That is a legitimate, valid, philosophical and policy argument or position. Our position, when we were in the administration, was that this university is an open university and as long as students met certain academic and intellectual requirements, then there would be no financial constraint on the enrollment of students. All students who meet certain minimum levels set by the university itself, not set by us, would be admitted to that university. That was our policy decision. We had many meetings with Lord Taylor, who I see in the gallery today, and we had these arguments back and forth and as a result of arguments put to us by Lord Taylor and by Mr. Morgan, we often found ourselves in the position of forcing upwards the amount that we were originally to give the university so that this open policy promulgated by the Liberal Administration would be upheld, the policy that all students who were academically qualified could go to the university.

Now I think, Sir, that as a result of the capital account cut backs, the construction cut backs and as a result of the current account cut backs or at least not the necessary increment in the current account, that the time has come where the university can no longer have this open door policy. All I ask of the honourable minister, Sir, is that he have some guts and stand up in this House and announce what the government policy is. What is the government's policy? Is it going to be to allow, as we did, and provide the finances for this, to allow all academically suited students to go to that university or has there to be some financial constraints on the enrollment of students in that university? Why does he not stand up and say it? We will not necessarily at this point in our history have Newfoundland disagree with such a policy statement, if it can be shown to us, as a result of severe financial problems facing Newfoundland generally and the Government of Newfoundland, that this kind of a cut back is necessary, this

Mr. Rowe (W.N.)

kind of a policy position is necessary. We listen to those arguments and we have our own arguments to propose on the merits of that position. But, Sir, let the minister stand in his place and tell this House and the people of Newfoundland what the policy of this government is in respect of the university, Memorial University of Newfoundland?

The hon. member for Green Bay tried to paint my colleague the hon. member for St. Barbe North as the member for Memorial University. This was his hobby horse. This is what he was interested in primarily or solely, which is obviously not true from statements that the honourable member has already made in the House. But, Sir, when anybody looks at the averages across Canada, concerning university students, that person who looks at those statistics cannot be but concerned about any restrictions on university education in this province. It was because of looking at those statistics and because of realizing the serious implications that we, as an administration, had this open door policy. We have, Sir, according to statistics which I looked at a couple of years ago, (they are probably still true) we have one-half of the national average, one-half of the national Canadian average going to university in this province, in Newfoundland. We have, Sir, one-quarter of the number, proportionately speaking, one-quarter of the number of students going to university as do the richer Provinces of Ontario and Alberta. If we were up abreast with the national average or somewhere near the richer provinces of Canada, certainly I would agree with the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Education. Sure, let us reorient our priorities. Let us start putting money in other directions outside of education altogether. But as long as that dismal statistic remains in this province, one-half the national average, one-quarter of the average found in Ontario or Alberta, then Sir, expenditures on the university must remain a priority. I commend these few thoughts to the honourable minister and I

Mr. Rowe (W.N.):

hope he does have the courage to stand in the House and articulate for us and for the people of Newfoundland the government's position and policy in respect of the university.

Now, Sir, we saw a cut, a complete wipe out of the assistance to pupil-teachers who would be attending the university. The specious argument given by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Education and one or two others of his colleagues was that there was an over-supply of teachers

MR. ROWE, W.N. in the province, an over supply of teachers. There may well be more persons wishing to go into the teaching profession than there are positions open to those numbers of persons. But, Sir I doubt very seriously, I doubt very seriously whether there is an over supply in this province of good, qualified, academically trained teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador. I doubt that statement and, as a matter of fact, I am willing to contradict it flatly.

I have been to schools around this province, especially in some of the smaller areas where the teachers, in my estimation, while conscientious and eager and anxious to do a good job, were not adequately qualified to do the job, as far as teaching the students was concerned.

But, Sir, even assuming that there is an over supply of general teachers in the province, even assuming that case, that fact is a fact. Certainly it is incumbent on the government and on the Minister of Education to try to come up with a new programme with regards to teachers. Surely it is incumbent on them, Sir, to try to use the money which they have now cut out of the pupil-teacher vote, use that money as a financial encouragement to get more teachers into speciality education in the province.

The member for St. Barbe North mentioned this and the member for Green Bay has mentioned it. Use the money to get speciality teachers into university to train them, to encourage teachers to get into special fields of education. In that field again, Sir, the Minister of Education has shown no direction, no hint whatsoever of any kind of a policy to be presented by his government in the next several months.

Sir, we have seen a cut by two-thirds of the community sports facilities grant in the votes of the Department of Education and Youth, cut from an expenditure, I believe, of \$1.7 million last year to \$600,000 this year. And, again, the Minister of Finance tried to

MR. ROWE, W.N. say that this was an election gimmick, that it was not well thought out, that it was ill-conceived and all of this. Sir, I would say that the Minister of Education cannot conscientiously say that, if he has discussed the matter with some of his senior officials, Mr. Graham Snow, for example, who heads up the Physical Fitness Division of the Department. It was not an ill-conceived or ill-thought out programme at all, Sir. It was one programme which was very appreciatively received by the people in this province.

These are some of the cuts Sir, the parents subsidies, mothers' allowances, pupil-teachers, university slashed, some of the cuts taken directly out of the Department of Education to allow the Minister of Finance to try to balance the budget for this year. For these alone, Sir, I would consider the Minister of Education to be incompetently administering his department.

But there are other reasons as well. The minister comes out shortly after this House was convened, came together, comes out with a transportation policy, a bussing policy for the school children of this province and within a day or two thereafter he retreats. Sir in complete disarray, As a result of pressure from this side of the House, articulated again by the member for St. Barbe North, as a result pressure from school boards throughout the province, he comes back to this House with some more gobbleygook about how he has rethought the whole bus transportation thing and how he is going to now bring in some kind of another formula.

It is self-evident, Sir, that we on this side of the House are not experts in bus transportation policy. But it was blatantly obvious to everybody on this side of the House, and I submit to members on the other side of the House and everybody at large who has a passing interest in education, that the original policy put out by the Minister of Education concerning bus transportation was a tissue of nonsense. It could not stand up to the least bit

MR. ROWE, W.N. and as a result in a few days afterwards he came back to the House, his tail between his legs, and had to reverse his policy.

That, Sir, as far as I am aware, that transportation policy is the only serious policy statement made by the Minister of Education in the five months that he has been in the portfolio of Education and Youth. He has made one or two statements in this House of Assembly concerning honourable members on this side of the House - frivolous, nonsensical statements, statements which were the reverse of serious, vexatious and tedious statements of a personal nature, concerning members of this side of the House.

After five months as Minister of Education he has articulated no policy whatsoever on behalf of the government concerning problems in education or educational matters generally. No hint of any policy coming from that honourable minister. No hint of any new directions to be taken by his administration in the educational field. No hint, no clue whatsoever as to new trends to be developed by his administration, on the advice of his department, concerning education in this province.

After his administration and government had received an overwhelming mandate from the people of Newfoundland to represent their interests, he sits over there in the House or out of the House, as the case might be, does nothing about trying to grapple, at least in the public way, with some of the problems affecting the education of this province. He, along with his other colleagues, asked the people of this province for a political mandate for power to implement new policies. Sir. Having asked for that power and having gotten that power, he now sits there and apparently has no idea whatsoever as to what he should do with the power he now has in his hands. Even his feeble attempts on the bus transportation policy blow up in his face. I suppose because of that, because of that explosion of that policy, because of that he is slightly unnerved about coming forward publicly and

MR. ROWE, W.N. making some further policy statements affecting education .

I cannot blame the honourable minister, education is a thorny problem in this province. It is fraught with problems and difficulties of all kinds but at least the Minister of Education, in having sought the present position he now holds, should make some conscientious and genuine attempts to grapple in a manful fashion with the problems that do confront him.

Now, Sir, we have another crisis apparently in education in respect of school taxation, district and school boards. I understand that a number of members have received telegrams from certain school boards or taxation authorities asking for a meeting in Gander to go over this whole problem of money being voted for school boards or the collection of taxes for school boards and this sort of thing. The honourable minister has to deal with that problem.

But in five months, Sir, we have heard no policy from the honourable minister in respect of taxation for education at all. Does he agree with the present, in my estimation inequitable system of taxation for schools, where you can have a rich school taxation authority district, which can raise money, its proportioned share for the building of schools and in other poor districts they find it very difficult to raise the necessary money as a result of poll taxes or property taxes. Does he agree with that system of taxation or does he think another system of taxation should be brought into play in this province? Should the present taxation system in respect of education be wiped out completely and say an income tax, a proportion of income tax, be added to the present income tax to take care of education, where those who are able to bear the blunt of the taxation are required to pay more and those who cannot bear the blunt are required to pay less. Is that his policy?

MR. ROWE, W.N. No policy, Sir, after five months, an idealistic minister comes into the department, a brand new political mandate, an idealistic, energetic minister comes into the department and we hear nothing about one of the most important fields of education namely: the ways and means of raising more money in this province to cope with education expenses. Not a word from the honourable minister. Not a word, Sir, except as I mentioned, sophomoric remarks.

Not a word about the curriculum, the direction which the curriculum, the content of what is taught in our schools, should take in the future at the elementary or secondary school level, or high school level. Not a word, Sir, to that, not a word! Perhaps one of the most important, along with the financial requirements one of the most important problems facing schools and education authorities, not only in Newfoundland but in Canada and the rest of the technological world. Not a word about what is going to happen. Any new trends, any new directions in curriculum or what is taught in our schools. Not a word, Sir! Not one new approach articulated by the minister. Not a statement made on any field except the abortive bus transportation policy. Not a statement made, any new trend any new direction in the field of education. I can only conclude, Sir, reluctantly, and this is not personally, not to be taken personally, that the hon. minister is not competent to handle the exigencies and the problems of that great Department of Education. It is too big a job for him. He is not equipped either psychologically or intellectually. He is not equipped to handle the drastic decision-making that has to be taken in that particular department. Incompetent and, Sir, inept, not as a man, not personally, but as a Minister of the Crown, responsible to this House and through this House responsible to the people of Newfoundland. He is showing himself to be incompetent as a minister, Sir, and I am afraid that I am going to find it very difficult to vote for the honourable minister's salary when that occasion arises.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, some of the remarks that have been made by our friends on the other side of the House, I feel to be so outrageous as to deserve some comment.

The question of Mothers' Allowances has been handed very heavily by speeches from hon. members on the other side and it is an attempt, Mr. Chairman, to blindfold the devil in the dark. We all know what the Mothers' Allowances were. They were a bit of money handed out by the previous Administration starting eight to ten days before the election in 1966. They were a vote getter. They

were known to be a vote getter, thought to be a vote getter by the Regime that brought them into being. Now we hear them spoken of as a programme. To me a programme, a government programme, to spend public money is something thought out. It is money spent where it will do good. It is money surely spent with some degree of selectivity, so that in a case such as that the wealthy do not necessarily receive it while those who need it do. I cannot think that any member of this House would want to see families that cannot afford to send their children to school or at least can afford to do so only with difficulty penalized because they have to send their children to school. I do not think any member of this House would object to moneys being given on a selective basis to people who need them. Surely, you do not call it a programme. You do not call it a reasoned thing, twenty dollars a year thrown out to every family or every mother in the Province who have children going to school, without any more thought than that.

AN HON. MEMBER: You had to apply for it. - You had to make an application.

MR. WELLS: Had to make an application. As someone said last night, you offer somebody a \$10 bill or a \$20 bill, they are going to take it. That is human nature. We are not going to change it by any amount of talk. Mr. Chairman, the philosophy or the approach which I am talking about has at last become apparent in the Federal Legislature. The House of Commons is in the process of doing something about the same type of thinking with Family Allowances, so that they are not given out across-the-board but that there is some degree of selectivity in it so that the money concerned can go, hopefully, in greater amounts to the people who need it most. Surely, if there is money to be given out to mothers or to families, to help children go to school, surely that is the approach we must take in Newfoundland. I think that the only, especially as the Family Allowance is going up, that this was the time to stop that ridiculous political gimmick and to come up, hopefully,

as I am sure this government will, with a worthwhile programme of helping people send children to school, whether it be called a Mothers' Allowance or whether it be relief from taxation, whatever it might be.

Now, we have heard an awful lot too about Memorial University. I heard my hon. colleague from White Bay South say that under the Liberal Government, under the previous regime, there were no constraints on enrollment at Memorial University. I want to quote for you, Mr. Chairman, from an address given within the past two or three week by Lord Taylor, the President of Memorial University, at one of the Convocation exercises. He said, "Since I have been at Memorial, our total academic building has increased by 18 per cent." I believe he has been at Memorial something in the order of five or six years. "Our total academic building has increased by 18 per cent, in the same period our numbers have increased by over 110 per cent. It will be obvious that this enormous burden of work is placing an unforeseen and immensely heavy burden on the physical structure designed for 2,500 students. Accommodation is now in use for three semesters and for summer school, from nine in the morning until ten at night. It is small wonder that the problem of maintenance is rapidly growing."

Now, in six years, five or six years, the physical plant that was built to teach, to deal with 2,500 students, was increased and allowed to increase by the government under this policy of no constraints, the previous regime, until it has arrived now at something of the order of 8,000 students, full-time students, and then, with part-time and other students, something approaching 10,000, for a physical plant that was built to accommodate and handle 2,500. No constraints on education. The previous regime apparently just was prepared to pay whatever money, not what was required necessarily, but what they could for maintenance, but they were prepared to watch this situation, to watch the upward curve of enrollment but to do very little, little or nothing, 18 per cent as against 110 per cent, to provide physical plant for them. Now they can look across this hon. House and say there were no constraints on enrollment at Memorial. Yet there was a very policy or

lack of policy which would have to mean and very close, very soon, now, unless some serious steps are taken, that Memorial will absolutely burst at the seams and will not be able to handle the enrollment that is in it. There were no constraints on education. Oh, no! No constraints on enrollment at Memorial. "We will just let it go. We put it there for 2,500 students and we will let it go." That was the type of planning we have seen in Newfoundland for 23 years.

Bread and circuses. I well remember the opening of the new campus in 1961 when we had parades galore and bands from Jamaica and it was a great civic occasion, a great public occasion. Bread and circuses, that is the diet we have been treated to. How much real planning was there behind Memorial University? You see what happened, Mr. Chairman, It was shortly after the building of Confederation Building that Memorial University, the new campus, was put there. It was after the discovery of the lease-back. The lease-back went hand-in-hand with what one columnist called, "The Golden Age of Cost-Plus". Memorial was put there. It was done on a lease-back basis which was found to be a handy and convenient way to do it. I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, it cost more than it ought to. It cost more than it ought to because we were in the golden age of cost-plus. Friends of the government got all sorts of contracts and the buildings went up. How do we know? What proof have we that it was put there at a cost that it ought to have been put there? But then it was put there and left and the regime of the day beat itself on the chest and said: "What a wonderful government! Look what we are doing for education! Look at our great university!" It is in a lot of ways, no thanks to them, that the university is as good as it is. I wonder if many people in this Province realise that Memorial University today is one of the larger universities in Canada. It is larger than Dalhousie. It is larger than any other university in the Atlantic Provinces. But in all this development, and by development I mean physical growth which, after all we are not educators in this House, we are not teachers, we do not, I hope,

pretend to know necessarily how the business of education should be gone about. but it is our duty to find out from people who have a specialized knowledge and it is our duty to use public funds in such a way that the best possible development of education can take place. That was not development, that was putting something there, giving them the money to run it and letting enrollment rise without provision for additional physical plant or necessary physical plant, until a real problem was created. Then the successors of that regime, who are now on the other side of the House, look over across here at this government and say; 'My what a terrible thing you are doing. Instead of having a great new policy of education, within two months of being confirmed in office, look at what you are doing. Education is going to suffer.'

What has this government done in this budget, in education? It has increased the educational vote all in all by \$12 million. It had to increase it, because the very system of education which we have the very system means that every year there is a regular escalation. There has to be a pause in which it is considered by this government and this House, what it is going to do. What direction is education going to take in Newfoundland? What is Memorial University going to be like in ten years time? It is now the biggest in the Atlantic Provinces, bigger than Dalhousie. Is it going to be another U.C.L.A. in ten to fifteen or twenty years time? Is it going to go on and on and on until it gets to be one of these great, huge, unwieldy campuses and unwieldy universities that are like factories?

What direction is vocational and technical education in Newfoundland going to take? How much thought has been given to that in the last few years? I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, not much. When the previous regime found that money was available for trades colleges; 'Oh we will build trades colleges, we will build them until they are everywhere.' Of course, again the old system, friends of the government were used until the Federal Government had to step in and

make sure that tenders were called. So, the trades colleges for the previous regime served a two-fold purpose. "It is, spend public money and spend it in the way that pleases us most to spend it," that is what they said. But planning for vocational training schools and technical training, what planning? What emphasis? How much emphasis in future in Newfoundland, when we consider which way we will go in education? How much emphasis is going to be placed on elementary schools? I suspect myself, from hearing people talk who are familiar with education, that - I remember myself when compulsory education was brought in, I could not have been more than six or seven years old, so we have had it a long time and I suspect we found, just as they found in England, even after more years of compulsory education, that there are a good many people who reach adulthood today without being able to read and write.

What is the future going to hold for Newfoundland in education? With the available dollars that this province has or can get or can borrow or can scrounge if you like, are we going to concentrate more on elementary education? What about vocational education or technical education? Are we going to do as they had to do in England a few years ago, decide at a fairly early age in a child's life, such as the English eleven plus, whether the child is going to go into academic work or into vocational? All these things have to be considered and they have not been considered in the past twenty-three years, Mr. Chairman.

The policy of the previous regime was to keep the denominations happy, keep a flow of money going and do not say a word and let us hope that everything works out all right. You can carry on with that policy for a while, but the time comes when all these things have to be looked at.

Our learned colleagues across the House and other colleagues have said, this Minister of Education, this government should now have come in with a great new policy of education. That direction should have been taken, new directions, things which obviously and by implication

were ignored by the previous regime, all of this should now be cured. As I say, two months after being confirmed in office this government should now have a policy that is going to set education right and on a proper road for the coming ten, fifteen or twenty years. What rubbish, Mr. Chairman! How dare they say it? How dare they say it when what we have had is, I suggest, fairly reckless spending of money, putting a physical plant in various places, failure to think things through in a lot of cases in education? This government has inherited that situation, and they can look across and say: 'Where is your great new plan, where are the new directions we are going to take, this is sterile?'

Mr. Chairman, it is going to take a year, two years and possibly longer of very careful thought, a great deal of dedication and a great deal of listening to advice of people who know this field of education, to determine the new priorities for education and the direction that our institutions in Newfoundland will take from the elementary schools right on up through academic training, technical training, vocational training right on up through to university. This process is beginning and it is beginning with this government. Please God it will bear fruition, but it is going to take a year or two or three for it to bear fruition. How dare anyone who was associated with the regime that allowed things to drift and cried out that the expenditure of money meant that you were concerned with education. That was their cry; 'How many millions have we spent? Look at the millions. Since we have been in office so many millions on this, so many millions on that.' We heard it until we were sick of it, Mr. Chairman, but the criteria of an educational system is not necessarily the millions you throw into it.

It is like the old adage or proverb of the drunken sailor; 'Anybody can throw around money,' But it takes a bit of thought and a bit of care to spend money wisely and correctly for the greatest good of the citizen.

MR. STAGG: I cannot let this opportunity go by without putting in a plug for my area, the Stephenville - Harmon Area. I want to bring to the attention of the House and to the attention of the people of Newfoundland again, as forcibly as I possibly can, that at the present time on the Harmon complex we are housing and educating approximately 2,000 students. Half of these are in buildings that were converted from dormitories, office space. We successfully converted them into classroom facilities. We are also utilizing the previous school facilities that were used by the American people.

I want to say this because our government, indeed, Newfoundland as a whole is very interested in saving money and it has been broached in some quarters that buildings that are built for one purpose are impossible to convert to another purpose. I want to say that every building that is converted is not like the Janeway Childrens' Hospital. It does not escalate four or five times. We have successfully converted in Stephenville many buildings from dormitory space to classroom facilities. We have on the immediate area a very modern rink, arena, ballfields, swimming pool, new curling club a theatre and buildings that could be made into an arts and culture centre. It is within a stone's-throw of the airport.

I do not particularly like to take issue with the President of Memorial University. I did on one occasion, But I think that the people who are involved in higher education must become more aware of what is realistically available in Newfoundland. Realistically, we have to utilize what we have and that which is very cheaply available. I am not talking necessarily about a junior college or a technical college or whatever, but there is a crying need for facilities for education and the Stephenville Area is able to absorb a great deal of that need.

We in that area have had a tough job in getting our point across but we are not totally unaware that there are other centers which are vying for the economic benefits that accrue from an institution of this sort. However, and I must admit that our arguments are tinged somewhat with the side effects in that it would create jobs for our people, but it must never go unnoticed that we do have something to offer. We have petitioned this government, we have petitioned the previous government and we expect action.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say, at the present time we are successfully housing in dormitories about 700 or 800 students at Stephenville and this does not even bring into play building 360 and 361, those six storey buildings that are there and were used as dormitories for American servicemen. These are spectacular buildings but they are in no way the only ones we have. Now I just want to go on record as stating that the Stephenville area can solve an awful lot of problems for higher education or any other level of education for the Province of Newfoundland, but it must come as a result of a concerted effort on the part of government and on the part of Memorial University and on the part of any other technical, vocational or community college institutions that might be interested

The issue is a contentious one economically or it is one that will not cease to be contentious. Thank you.

MR. GILLET: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak very briefly to these estimates, not to deal with figures, because I have left that naturally with the experts, and not to deal with curriculum because that again I would leave to the experts. But I have been thinking since sitting here yesterday and today that in actual facts we are dealing with our most precious possession, our most precious resource, the human resource. So I would like to look at it in terms of an industry, if you want to call it such, where you have feeders all

around the country, feeding into the university, and that university will eventually turn out what we hope to be a finished product, suitable for export if needs be, but we hope will not have to be but if needs be, suitable for export. The most precious, as I say, possession we have and the most precious resource we have.

Forests can burn, they can be infested with insects and what not but unless the pill is used too extensively this is a resource that will never dry up and one, I think, which we have to nurture and be very careful with. Therefore, I shall content myself with saying that no matter what cuts had been made or had to be made in any other department of the government, cuts should not have been made in education. Highroads possibly, yes. Other industries maybe, yes but not in education.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. GILLETT: Yes, you could have cut that. It has been cut, has it not.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. GILLETT: I would sacrifice it for education, yes.

However, there is one thing, I think, that needs mentioning and I mention this because I have had so much comment and criticism of it by the constituents in my area who are on long-term assistance and it has been mentioned here this afternoon and that is the school tax. Apparently each school board area makes its own set of rules. One area I know deals with every individual case and if a family cannot afford to pay it they are exempt. But the school board covering the area in which my district is, they have an across-the-board ruling apparently that everybody pays and if he or she or a family does not pay they are taken to court. As many as fifty cases at a time, I think, are heard in Twillingate.

Now I would certainly suggest to the government that some legislation be brought down or some uniform means of collecting this

taxation be made, exemptions made, particularly in long-term assistance people who just can ill-afford it, and lots of them have no children going to school. I think that we have all to agree, we must of necessity agree that these poor souls cannot afford to pay this school tax. I have letters in my brief case now and I can present them to anybody and I hope I will some day when the opportunity comes. But I think for the sake of decency, for the want of a better word, we should consider these people the least able to pay their school tax. As I say again, I would urge the government to meet with these school boards and direct them in the way they should go and have them have a by-law or some legislative authority by which to prohibit them from collecting school tax from people who are on long-term assistance.

I just want to mention that, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that it will come up later on, as I presume it will, when the estimates are gone through item by item.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Minister of Education and Youth has left his seat and there are a few brief comments that I would like to make. One of the things that are very disturbing, I suppose, is the fact that when we hear the talk of having a surplus of teachers in the province this year, I would like to hear later the honourable minister's comments on what is going to be done in remote communities and no doubt we have some of them on the island portion of our province as well as on the Coast of Labrador. We have in one particular school, a seven room school in the community of Nain, Mr. Chairman, seven teachers from Boston. When we think in terms of having Newfoundland teachers available, as I mentioned before, I was wondering if the honourable minister could see in his wisdom some way to encourage Newfoundland teachers to go to that part of our province, which it is indeed, Sir, a part of this province.

June 13, 1972

Tape 734

JM - 4

We have a number of teachers that we have to import from the United Kingdom to fill those vacancies. I would like to see some sort of a

2288

Mr. Woodward:

system or some incentive be given to teachers or qualified teachers, Sir. No doubt in some of the systems when you think of curriculum coming from schools across the way or even indeed coming from schools in the United States and going into communities where you first are confronted with language problems such as Indian and Eskimo, no doubt it is very difficult. I doubt very seriously if there is any great accomplishments made in those schools. I think that this is indeed a very serious problem and even though we think of the cuts in expenditures, maybe the hon. Minister of Education and Youth can see in his wisdom some way around it, Sir, whereby he can encourage and if need be set up some sort of a seminar and interview people especially to look after the needs of those people in those communities so that they can get the same opportunities and have the same calibre of teachers possibly, not being derogatory towards the calibre of teachers that we import from other nations or from other parts of the world. It does indeed, Sir, seem very strange. This does not only apply to the coastal communities. As you know in the Community of Happy Valley and Goose Bay and indeed North West River, we have teachers from as far away as the Philippines teaching in those schools.

So I think, Sir, this is a need and I would like personally and I am sure if the honourable minister has taken his job serious that he will indeed look into those problems. I have another very serious problem that has been brought to my attention and I consider it gross neglect on the part of this government, this administration. It was brought to my attention a couple of days ago. This is dealing with recreation, recreation and youth in the Labrador area. I will recite this particular problem, Sir, and I think that after you hear it, (you may not be aware of it) - then again there should be some means whereby functions of government should be co-ordinated through the means of cabinet or some other means of government, senior officials.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

Mr. Woodward,

We had an incident, Sir - going back last year, there was a recreation facility on the Grand Lake above the Community of North West River. This facility was built by the American - it was not solely a government function but a part of the non-appropriated funds, institutions in that area. This facility was abandoned last year and indeed turned back to the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources. The Community of North West River, through its Board of Trustees and its chairman, being prompted by the different organizations, the Girl Guides, Boy Scouts and other organizations in the area asking if they could have this facility from the government - it was turned back to the government maybe for \$1, Sir, and maybe for nothing but indeed no more than \$1. I discovered two days ago, after having a delegation from North West River, that this facility had been sold to a private operator and the people of the North West River Area were denied the opportunity. They did bid on it. I have a letter here where they offered up to \$1,000 for that facility. Today, in checking with an official of the Department of Supply and Services, I have been told that the facility was sold to a sports operator and will be abandoned. The people of this particular area have been denied the use and right of that facility that was indeed, Sir, given to this government for \$1, if not less than \$1. I can understand the hon. Minister of Finance, in his wisdom, trying to collect a few bucks. I do not think it is right that we should collect dollars on facilities that we do not own or that were given to us at the expense of depriving the youth of Happy Valley, Goose Bay, North West River Area, of a recreation facility that was ideally built and suited for this particular purpose.

I have been informed today (the hon. Minister of Supply is sitting in his seat) Sir, that the operator who bid on this facility, and it was given to him, agreed to turn it back to the province, if it is to be

Mr. Woodward

used for the purpose of which the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of North West River. If the facility will be used for the purpose of recreation for the groups, the Girl Guides, the Boy Scouts, that he will indeed, Sir, turn it back to the province, if the province will see, in its wisdom, to turn it over to this particular organization.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is a great injustice on behalf of the Department of Supply and maybe the hon. Minister of Education is not aware of this particular thing happening. I am sure there are officials sitting in this House today, Sir, who are aware of this and maybe the hon. Minister of Finance says, "well you know if you can get me another \$10,000, why not do so?" Why do it at the expense of those poor people? I say, Sir, that I would like to hear from the hon. Minister of Education and Youth and see if he is going to allow this sort of a thing to happen.

I personally over the years have gotten greatly involved in recreation facilities. We have in the Happy Valley, Goose Bay Area, a youth camp which was almost wholly and solely financed through personal donations. I might add that I was a great contributor towards that camp. When I think in terms of the government actually taking money, actually taking the money for a facility that was given to them by a foreign nation and then turning around and selling it to some private sportsmen and having him abandon the thing and use the buildings to put up or to erect a fishing lodge some place, Sir, it is indeed sickening and distasteful. I am not saying anything derogatory towards that particular operator, Sir. He acted as a businessman and I am sure his intentions were good.

I have been informed that this particular person - I am sure that the hon. Minister of Supply and Services, sitting here today, is quite familiar with this particular person. I would like to see this whole transaction reverted back and then indeed this facility, Sir, turned over to the authorities at North West River for the utilization of the

Mr. Woodward

youth of that community, for recreational purposes.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Chairman, may I make just one or two comments on the Grand Lake area property which I think the honourable member was referring to. Some of his information is correct and some of it is a little bit erroneous. The price that the government paid for it was not \$1. It was offered to the previous administration but the offer was never taken up. When the property came into possession of this government, open tenders were called for. We received applications from various youth groups in the area, both Boy Scouts, Girl Guides and some other organization which I do not remember exactly and also several private operators. We accepted the highest tender on condition that the facilities would be made available to the Boy Scouts, Girl Guides in the area when they needed it. We have in effect made the facilities available without cost to the Girl Guides or the Boy Scouts. The Government of Newfoundland have been in the rare position of being paid for some of its own property and I think all in all we received a rather happy solution to a problem. I do not think the attack was warranted. The gentleman to whom you are referring, the operator is in St. John's at the present time. I am sure he will only be too happy to tell you the whole story on it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that the gentleman who acquired that property must be a very honourable man when he agreed to pass it back for the use -

MR. DOODY: Some of the buildings are made available for the use of the youth groups.

MR. NEARY: He has not agreed to pass it back.

MR. DOODY: Not to my knowledge. He may have agreed with the other member.

MR. NEARY: We had to wait until this afternoon when the hon. member for

Labrador North, ^{to} raised this matter in the House to get some information on this matter.

MR. DOODY: The information was available each time anybody was in the House, another unusual occurrence.

MR. NEARY: It is awfully funny, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOODY: It was not meant to be funny, Sir. It was a statement of facts.

MR. NEARY: The Premier comes into the House once in a while, drops in occasionally, drops in once in a while and then he tries to be witty. Mr. Chairman, completely disinterested in the affairs of the province, could not care less what goes on in this honourable House, drops in every once in a while to say hello and to see the boys are behaving themselves and then away he goes, again off on another jaunt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Discussion is limited to the general management of the department whose estimates are being debated.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of what the discussions concerns and I am well aware of the wide ranging debate that has taken place on these estimates so far. I am well aware of that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will remain within the bounds of relevancy in his debate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am as much within the bounds of relevancy as the other members who have spoken in this debate and I appreciate Your Honour's reminding me of that. I appreciate it but when I am provoked, Mr. Chairman, from the other side, I will give them as good as they can send. I do not intend to tolerate any of their nonsense, Sir. We have heard in this debate about the excuses that they have given for taking away the mothers' allowance, Ottawa would not approve of it, big hearted Uncle Ottawa. When honourable ministers go up to

Ottawa they would say, "Go home and cut out the mothers' allowance then we will give you financial assistance in your little province." What hogwash, Mr. Chairman, what hogwash. I doubt very much if that has ever been suggested in Ottawa. It is a figment of the imagination of the honourable Minister of Finance, Sir, that is all it is. It is hogwash and the honourable minister should be ashamed of himself coming into this House with such a flimsy excuse for picking the pockets of the mothers of this province, Sir.

The honourable minister said a lot of things in his Budget Speech. One of the things that he said was that the mothers' allowance was being dropped because Ottawa was bringing in the family income security plan the first of January. The next day, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the mothers in this province I rose in my place in this honourable House and I ask the Minister of Finance that in view of the fact that the implementation of the Fisc Programme was delayed for one year, if the government would reconsider implementing the mothers' allowance so that the mothers of this province could receive assistance for the school year commencing September coming. The honourable minister's answer, Mr. Chairman, and it is recorded in Hansard and any member who was interested enough to sit in this House the Thursday following the bringing down of the Budget will recall what the minister said, "As soon as it is confirmed from Ottawa that the Fisc Programme is delayed by one year the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador would reconsider." That is over one week ago, Mr. Chairman, over a week ago. We have ask the minister on Orders of the Day if the government had reconsidered, if they had taken a decision and the minister says, "No, when we have taken a decision we will announce it in the House." Right up to this very moment, Sir, the mothers of this province do not know if they are going to get the mothers' allowances in September or if they are not going to get the mothers' allowances in September.

Mr. Chairman, they do not know, they only know what the honourable minister said in his Budget Speech on Budget Day. In other words, do I interpret now, Mr. Chairman, from what the honourable minister is saying that they will not get, they definitely will not get the mothers' allowance in September.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The position is quite clear now, there will be no allowance in September.

MR. CROSBIE: There will be no allowance unless the policy is changed.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, we can assume then as of this moment that there will be no mothers' allowance in September. I am not assuming it because the honourable minister is stating it as a matter of fact.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I would say that is too bad. I am awfully sorry to hear that, awfully sorry to hear it, Sir, because, as has been pointed out by various speakers on this side of the House that the mothers' allowance has been of tremendous assistance to mothers in this province, especially those with large families. I am sorry, Sir, that the government has not reconsidered this matter and during this debate on the estimates of the Department of Education are not able to announce that the mothers' of this province can now expect to get the assistance in the school year commencing September coming. It is a shame, Sir. It just goes to prove once more, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Finance has ice water in his veins and I can tell the honourable minister that the mothers of this province will not forget that for a long time to come.

The minister reminded us, Mr. Chairman, 'I think it was yesterday in this honourable House, that anything "let us forget politics, keep politics out of education," he said. "There is no election on now,

forget it. Why politics? Sit down and let us put through the estimates of the Department of Education and the Department of Health and the Department of Municipal Affairs. Let us railroad them all through the House." No election on the minister reminded us. "What you say now will be forgotten," he said, "two years from now."

MR. CROSBIE: It will all be forgotten tomorrow.

MR. NEARY: The honourable minister says it will be forgotten tomorrow. Well, I have news for the honourable minister, Mr. Chairman. That is what he thinks, that is only what he thinks. Any minister that will walk into this honourable House and pick the pockets of the mothers of this province, and he expects to be forgiven, they will forget it tomorrow. What a rude awakening the honourable minister is in for, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, like the other speakers on this honourable side of the House I was hoping that the Minister of Education would give the people of this province some indication of where we are headed in the field of education. What the Tory philosophy is on education. Where are we going? Are we on the right track? Are we doing the right things? Are we keeping abreast of the times? In a changing world, Mr. Chairman, is it necessary for us to rethink our educational policies, or should we allow ourselves to drift into a sort of a buttoned-down mind that is so characteristic sometimes of civil servants?

Mr. Chairman, personally I think that a great many parents and a great many employers and indeed, Sir, a great many taxpayers of this province have asked the question of where we are headed in education. They expected the minister to come into this House during his estimates and give them some idea of the effect that the compulsory education legislation, which has been in effect for so many years, is having on the children of this province. By law, Sir, children are required to go to school and I would think, Sir, that the average child goes to school for at least ten years and yet, Mr. Chairman, from my vantage point,

our children are still not properly educated and I would think, Sir, that governments, not only here in Newfoundland but right across Canada, and educators themselves must assume some responsibility for the inadequacy of parents to meet the demands of rearing families and earning a living in today's world.

Mr. Chairman, we hear the academics, the educators talking about educating the whole child, and they do not even offer reasonable competence, Sir, in what used to be called the three "R's." They talk again about educating the child for today's rapidly changing world and de-emphasize or eliminate such things as homework, gradings and standings. What kind of conditioning, Sir, are the educators of this province giving our children today? What kind of conditioning, Mr. Chairman, are our children getting as they enter into an employment market when we are told by the experts that by the year 2000,

seventy-five percent of the people of Canada will be paid for not working? What future do these children have that are coming out of our present educational system, Sir? Are the witch doctors in education, Mr. Chairman, burying their heads in the sands of rapidly passing time? I would submit, Sir, that they are. I wonder sometimes, Mr. Chairman, how on earth this came about.

In my opinion, Sir, and I have said this publicly before and it brought the wrath of the academics at the university down around my ears, I would say, Sir, that this situation has come about largely through the ambitions and power-hunger of those who have established a certification racket as a substitute for education.

Mr. Chairman, employers, both public and private, in our American and Canadian economy, for some years now have hired pieces of paper, certificates, diplomas and degrees instead of people. It is just now, Mr. Chairman, that they are beginning to realize that they have to look behind these certificates and they have to look at the hurdles which the diploma holder jumped over in order to acquire that certificate. Sir, it is my contention that the bottom is beginning to

fall out of the certification racket, the certificate market.

Sir, I think that hon. members of this House will remember, I think it was last May, "MacLeans Magazine" carried a front cover story; 'The Graduate That Nobody Wants.' A month later, Sir, in "Time Magazine," there was a similar feature on the desperate plight of B.A.'s, M.A.'s, M.B.A.'s, and Ph.D.'s in the United States, who were having unprecedented difficulty in fitting into the economy, in revealing any skills, attitudes or aptitudes saleable in a highly competitive employment market.

Mr. Chairman, this has a very demoralizing impact upon the people of this province. We have already noted the increasing number of young men and women who have to go to the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation for assistance. A lot of those, Mr. Cahirman, have passed through our education system, graduated from high schools, some of them even have credits and have diplomas. I think when I was Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, one of the most heart-breaking experiences that I had was people arriving in my office, journeymen, with their journeymen's ticket, Sir, unable to find employment. You must remember, Mr. Chairman, the great campaign that was carried on in the last few years; "Do not be a drop-out, do not be a drop-out." The promise of nice comfortable jobs, fat pay cheques and with little work, that was the outcome of staying in school. This Mr. Chairman, I submit to the committee has fallen flatter than any promise that has ever been made by any politician in this honourable House.

So Mr. Chairman, the point that I am trying to make here is that we are going to have to find new ways of dealing with this kind of situation. It is bad enough for people who are uneducated and unskilled to have to go to the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation for assistance. You know, Mr. Chairman, you can explain to that kind of person why he is in the situation he is in, but, Mr. Chairman, how in the name of God are we going to be able to explain

to people who have certificates, who are graduates of the Vocational School, the College of Trades and Technology and the University, how are we going to explain to these men and women, when they come looking for social assistance, why they are in the situation they are in? Why is it that they cannot find a job? This, Mr. Chairman, I suggest is what this committee should be looking at, not playing petty politics, Sir, not playing petty politics.

There have been many editorials written in the last few weeks Mr. Chairman, about the goings on in this honourable House. Members on both sides of the House have been accused of playing petty politics. Members on the opposite side have criticized the previous administration. Those of us who were in the previous administration trying to defend the policies of the previous administration, and so you get dickering back and forth, Sir. Not facing reality, not getting the business of the House done as it should be done. We see this happening again as we start the estimates on the Department of Education. We have been almost two days now, Mr. Chairman, on the minister's salary. I do not know how long more the debate will last.

I know there may be sufficient reason for not getting off the minister's salary, but, Mr. Chairman, I make a pledge in this honourable House right now, that I am not going to stoop to the level of personalities. I am not going to bring petty politics into this debate. As of now, Sir, as of now, this moment, I am going to stick to the issue. I am going to try, as much as my ability will permit, to try and search for solutions to the kind of a problem that I just outlined, that we are encountering in the

certification racket. In my opinion, Sir, education will have to be rethought in this province from kindergarten up. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that it is the responsibility of every man, woman and child in this province, if we are going to prepare our children for the traumatic shock of the realities of an adult life, that we must, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to survive, we must rethink our educational policies in this province. We must recognize the problems, Sir, and we must custom-tailor the solution to the individual. We must try to rehabilitate those young men and women, Sir, that have been forced to drop out of the system as we know it now, we must try to rehabilitate these young boys and girls.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is the problem as I see it and it is in my opinion one which will grow to gigantic proportions over the next few years. Sir, I am sorry to have to say this, but I think it is a problem that has been tossed right into our laps by a society which has been conned into giving a blank cheque, something that has never been defined but something which is foisted upon us by the academics, foisted upon us under the disguise of education.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to delay this debate. I had no intention of entering the debate, but after listening to the bickering back and forth, Sir, I felt that it was my duty as a member of this House to put in my two cents worth for what it may be worth, Sir. Maybe the hon. minister does not think too highly of what I think of the education system in this province, but I could not care less, Sir. I am quite sincere in my remarks and I hope that the honourable minister, when he is winding this debate, will stand in his place in this honourable House and tell the people of Newfoundland just where we are headed in the field of education in the decade just ahead.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on the estimates of the Department of Education and Youth. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to hit on one of the most real and mean things

the Minister of Education has done to the vast majority of the voting population of our province, that is of course, his act in abolishing the Mothers' Allowance or the Mothers' Subsidy, as the estimates stated.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not again!

MR. THOMS: Yes, again, and again and again, and again if you really want it. Mr. Chairman, I certainly wish some hon. gentlemen on the other side of this House would squirt a little oil down in the corner because we are continually getting an awful squeak from that corner.

Mr. Chairman, it is all very well for the member for St. John's South, for the honourable Minister of Finance, to look across the street on some street in St. John's and say to himself; "the Mother across the street does not need this extra twenty dollars a year for her child to go to school." It is all very well and it might be true, it possibly is and I agree with their thinking along this line. But, the person across the street from these hon. gentlemen is probably quite wealthy, quite well-off, has a fabulous income and really does not need this extra allowance that our Provincial Government in the past have paid our mothers of this province.

Take, for example, the small income man of our province. I know one family in particular, a family on St. Brendan's Island, and if the honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs were in his seat he would agree with me. This family at the present time has nine children in our educational system going to elementary and high school. This person has a total income, annual income of less than four thousand dollars per year, less than four thousand dollars. This little extra sum of money which is not all that amount, it only cost our Provincial Government \$3.2 million last year, it is not all that great an amount, it was a good gesture on the part of who ever thought up the idea of helping the minister. I am sure the present member for Fortune, who I believe was Minister of Education at that time, (is that correct?) I agree with him when he earlier stated that he partially disagreed with it, because the wealthy people of our province who really did not need it should not have received it. It

should have been done on a means test, I agree with him there.

But, for the little person on St. Brendan's Island who needs this extra little amount of money in the fall of the year and in the spring, this amount of money, Mr. Chairman, enables our mothers to give these children the little extras that they need in preparing them for the cold Newfoundland winter which we experience. There is no act of mercy so great as this, there is no kindness so good that can be given to our children. I was speaking to one of my constituents not too long ago and he told me, he said; "This is not an austerity programme they are bringing forth, this is a hostile programme." The words he used were, 'It is hostile against our children.' I agree with him, I agree with him wholeheartedly. I would go further, it is not only hostile against our children, it is also hostile against the mothers of our province, it is also hostile against the students of our province. In general, Mr. Chairman, it is hostile against our toiling masses.

This past forty years, this past twenty years, we in Newfoundland have been trying to build up an educational system and it is useless for any member across the House to try to compare Newfoundland with the rest of Canada, it cannot be done. The rest of Canada have been building their educational system for sixty, eighty or one hundred years. We really have only been building our educational system for twenty-three years. The past administration have nothing, nothing

to be ashamed of, I only hope and pray that this present administration will have as good a record the next two, three, four five years as this past administration had.

Now, when I was a boy and when many of the gentlemen across this House were also boys, you could look down, it was not down the street, because we had no streets in Newfoundland these times, let us face it. We had no streets, but you could look around the path, around the harbour if you saw two boys going down, one a merchants son, another the son of any other gentleman, you could look at them and tell them apart, just because of the types of clothes they wore. The merchants son wore fine clothes the other children, some of them many times did not have, had very little clothes at all on. But this twenty dollars mothers' allowance was one factor, one little factor in eliminating this condition. I defy any man today, if two or three children walks down the road to try and pick out a merchants son, a lawyers son, a doctors son or my son. You cannot do it. They are all dressed alike. One is dressed as good as the other. One is fed as good as the other. One is housed as good as the other. In other words today we are on a more equal basis than any other time in our history.

This Mr. Chairman, is improvement. This is a blessing. If the past administration has to be blamed for anything like this well, I say; yes blame them for something like that, because it is a wonderful thing to be blamed for.

So, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge upon the Minister of Education I directly urge upon the Minister of Finance to reinstitute the mothers' allowance. Try to have a little feeling in your heart for the children of this province this fall and winter. Try to imagine if you were a child of some family with \$4,000 or less income, how you would feel, because the vast majority of our province today has an income of less than \$5,000. I submit to you that this twenty dollars per child per

year is needed by any person who has an income of less than \$5,000 and less. Maybe we should instigate a means test. I agree with it as does the honourable member for Fortune. I do not see why some doctor's son lawyer's son maybe some of our school teachers' children and many other people in high income categories need assistance from our government.

But let us put it on a means test, let us put our priorities where our priorities should be. Let us give it to the poor children of this province. I urge upon the Minister of Finance to reinstate this mothers' allowance, if it is at all possible to increase it. I am sure it would be one of the best things that the present Minister could do.

Mr. Speaker, I am also very disappointed in the decrease in grants to our university. Here again I believe we are discriminating against the poor people of our province, the poor boys of our province. If you go back twenty years in this province, you can go back twenty-three years when any young chap coming out of our elementary schools with a Grade 11 diploma could not, I repeat, could not get into university. It was simply impossible because I, myself, came out in forty-nine and it was impossible for me to get any university education. Today, because of the policy of the past administration, any student from any category of family whatsoever in this province can find ways and means of entering our university.

We had one young girl from Middle Brook who came from a very low income family, only this past seven or eight years, and proved during her last year in school to be one of the smartest children in our province, and her excellence was carried on into the university. She is now I believe a professor in the university. This person came from a very low-income family. Had not such a policy of the previous administration been brought forward, this child would not have reached the university.

Mr. Chairman, the whole educational policy of the present government appears to be one to help the rich and forget the poor, because this is simply what they are doing. This will place the educational system in Newfoundland back at least forty years, when only the rich man's sons can get to university and the poor man's son will have to go back in the ditches. I am quite surprised at the assistance that the previous administration had given to our pupil teachers. This has been drastically cut, cut I believe by something like 900 per cent.

In Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, we need to produce the best educators that money can give us. We need to give incentives to our young people so that they can go to college and to improve their educational standards, which will be second to none. We need these people in Newfoundland because Newfoundland, not only has to keep up with the rest of Canada, we have at least eighty years to pay up for yet. Therefore it is a fast rate and we must do it as speedily as possible. This will cost us money, sure, but investing money in education is a good investment indeed, one that no government will ever be sorry for.

I am quite surprised, Mr. Chairman, to see that our present Minister of Education have not seen fit to lower the teacher-pupil ratio. Our schools today all across our province are inadequate, over-crowded. We have so many problems in our elementary system

MR. THOMS: that I failed to see how this present government will ever go near to solving the problems that we face today. Our bus transportation at the present time is in a mess. Our Minister of Education came out with a policy statement on bus transportation. If you look at this statement you more or less get a bit confused. The statement read that he would pay \$100 per pupil that was outside of the one mile limit, from any high school or elementary school. He also stated that the government would pay \$40 for any pupil within this one mile limit. But he also stated that there had to be a mean temperature, zero. Now I could never figure out what he meant by a mean temperature of zero. Was the mean temperature based on a twelve month basis? A ten month basis? Because if it were on a twelve month basis not one school in this province, including the schools in Labrador, would qualify for such assistance. He did not say, mean must, he did not say mean anything - he just said mean temperature.

There was no clarification as to what he meant by mean temperature and this always amazed me, why our educational minister should come out and make such a statement.

Mr. Chairman, the tremendous reduction in the Physical Education and Youth Programme it is a vast reduction, one which I believe our Province of Newfoundland cannot afford. While we need elementary schools we need high schools, we need universities, we also need physical education. Every little community in this province is entitled to as much attention per pupil or per population as any other community in this province. Why should not little St. Brendan's or Green's Pond have a hockey rink or a playground? Why should they not as well as any other centres, such as St. John's, Gander, Corner Brook or Grand Falls or Gambo? They need it. They have children the same as you or I. They would like to enjoy these facilities the same as your children or my children.

MR. THOMS: How are we going to provide for these facilities, if we continue to slash left, right and centre in the estimates for Physical Education and Youth. Just imagine over \$1,100,000. taken off of sports facilities for this coming year. Just one item alone.

Mr. Chairman, to meet the needs in education of our population today we must approach the problem with our eyes wide open. We cannot come forward with a set policy of plans, we cannot plan for

five or ten years from now, it is impossible because our whole population...

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. member would permit a moment I would like to move, for the purpose of the Speaker's ruling, that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion committee ordered to sit again presently.

MR. SPEAKER: I have rulings here on two matters which came up earlier this afternoon and I shall read them.

One - earlier in the day the hon. member for White Bay South raised by way of a Point of Privilege the eligibility of the hon. member for Labrador South to take his seat in the House. He stated that apparently a judgement had been given this morning in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland rendering the election in that district null and void. He asked if I had received any notification from the Court regarding this. Section 143 of The Election Act states and I quote: "At the conclusion of the trial, the judges shall determine whether the candidate whose election or return is complained of or any or what other person was duly returned or elected, or whether the election was void, and shall forthwith certify in writing such determination to the Speaker, appending thereto a copy of the notes of the evidence."

The answer to the hon. member's question is that I have received no communication from the Supreme Court.

I have also been asked to rule whether or not it is proper for the hon. Member for Labrador South to take his seat. If the information that the hon. Member for White Bay South has given to the House is correct, it would appear that if the hon. Member for Labrador South has actual notice

of the judgement it would not be in order for the hon. Member for Labrador South to sit.

I cannot rule on this, however, since I have not received any official notification of the Court's decision and since the hon. Member for Labrador South has not attempted to take his seat.

Earlier in today's sitting, the hon. Member for Bonavista North asked leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance. I will not repeat the entire motion since honourable members have already heard it, but it concerns the labour management dispute at Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation.

Beauschene, 4th. edition, Citation 100 (3) on page 90 states, referring to the rule relating to these motions that urgency within this rule does not apply to the matter itself but it means "urgency of debate", that the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the House do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough should public interest demand that discussion take place immediately.

According to our Standing Orders, (Standing Order 23(c)), the member so desiring to move the order shall hand a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to Mr. Speaker. If he finds it in order and of urgent public importance, he reads it and asks whether or not the member has the leave of the House. It should be noted that the word urgency refers not to the urgency of the matter itself but to the urgency of debate on that matter.

In the present case, the debate on the Budget is before the House and matter can be debated there. The Estimates of the Department of Labour are also on the Order Paper and it could be debated when these are called. Also the matter is one which could be brought on by Notice of Motion and I, therefore, rule that it is not urgent that all other business of the House be laid aside and the matter debated now.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Heading VI - Education and Youth.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, would the honourable House Leader be agreeable to calling Department of Labour - Heading XVI.

MR. MARSHALL: No, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member for White Bay South is raising this presumably because of a ruling in the House by the Speaker relating to the urgency of the debate. It is perfectly competent for the honourable the member for Bonavista North to bring in a motion before the House to have this matter debated in due course and there is no reason for us to deviate from our course right now. We are on the education estimates and we will continue on.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman. In that case we will move that Your Honour now call Head XVI instead of Head VI, that motion, Your Honour.

MR CHAIRMAN: The Chair will take a moment to consider the motion.

MR MARSHALL: May I be heard on this, Mr. Chairman? I just want to speak to the motion.

MR ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, do I speak to the motion first?

MR MARSHALL: I speak to a point of order then, Mr. Chairman. The point of order is that the business of the House, the order of the business of the House is determined by the government. Procedure is set forth in the Standing Orders, page 17, which refers to the fact that final authority as to the general progress of every government project as to the time to be given to its different stages and as to any application of closure.... General business of the House lies in the government itself and consequently I am not aware of any such similar motion having been taken and I feel that it is probably out of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the point of order:
The reference which the honourable gentleman made to our Standing

MR. ROBERTS: Orders, is not the Standing Orders as such but rather to annotations made by Mr. Speaker Sparks, at least the Standing Orders were published under (I guess *pari materia* would be the right word) the authority or the signature of Mr. Speaker Sparks, some twenty odd years ago.

I suggest, Sir, the motion is in order. We do not pretend to call the order of business. That is the exclusive prerogative of the House Leader except on Wednesdays when other provisions prevail by Standing Orders.

Your Honour has before him a motion made by the House Leader, that Head VI be debated in committee, all we are doing is amending that motion. I add too, to provide that Head XVI which is the head under which Labour estimates come, that head be called. I submit the motion is in order, Sir. I believe that it should be debated, not at length but it should be debated briefly and it should be then put to a vote. I fear I know what will happen but I cannot anticipate and surely, Your Honour, the House, the committee are the master of their own business. If the majority of the committee wish to do something, unless it is against Standing Orders, then I submit, Sir, it is in order. I think we should put it to the test as to whether or not the majority are in favour of this.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, if I may just add a few more words. This is really an attempt by the honourable members on the other side in effect to overrule in committee a ruling that has been made by the Speaker in the House, to get a matter discussed.

Now the point of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is this, that we are more concerned with getting on with the business of the country and if it is on the understanding that it is not creating a precedent we can put it to the vote and we will carry on with education. I think it is incumbent upon us now to proceed on with the business of the country and the business before the House and get on with it as

MR. MARSHALL: soon as we can.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I reject the honourable gentleman's contribution. We accept without any question the ruling of the Speaker, that the Motion under Standing Order 23 should not go ahead. His Honour made that ruling, there is no question at all about it. All we are suggesting now is -

AN HON. MEMBER: We will not even try to appeal it.

MR. ROBERTS: We will not even try to appeal it. We have a right. We members of the House may appeal, we have not done it nor will we. We happen to think His Honour will accept that. But, Sir,

the honourable minister goes on about the business of the country. Is not head XVI the business of the country? Is not head XVI as much the estimates as head VI? We will eventually come to head XVI, they cannot put the Supply Bill through, the Appropriations Bill through without considering head XVI at some point. I mean, that is unworthy of the honourable gentleman, Sir, when he talks about the business of the country.

Now, if the motion is in order, I would like to say a word or two in support of our motion, but I will await Your Honour's ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are still considering whether the motion is in order.

MR. ROBERTS: Shall we have an adjournment of a second or two while Your honour considers it, Sir? I do not want to rush Your Honour, because it is a - it is not the most usual. Have a ten minute adjournment? It is a little late for tea.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us adjourn it until after...

MR. ROBERTS: We will adjourn it, call it six o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I think we have a right to a ruling on a motion. I mean, if the motion is out of order, it is out of order but if it is in order, it is in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair considers the question as to whether the motion is or is not in order to be one of some importance in that it will establish precedence, whichever way it is decided. With the leave of the Committee, the Chair would ask that the time be given for consideration of it until after the dinner break, if this is agreeable to the Committee.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, as one member of the Committee I will agree. Would Your Honour be in a position to bring in a motion, a ruling say, at eight of the clock when we assemble after the dinner break? Is that Your Honour's hope? I mean, I for one will give consent and I assume my colleagues will. I cannot speak for the other side, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair reserves its decision until after the evening

break or rather, until the next sitting of the Committee, which would be the proper way of putting it, with the understanding that this will be subject to the leave of the House immediately after the dinner break.

Heading VI, Education and Youth 601-01.

MR. THOMAS May I point out to the minister, Mr. Chairman, that in order for our children and in order for the whole population of Newfoundland in the future to be a well educated and sophisticated people, we must be on a par with the rest of the North Americas. We must be able to hold our own in this great North American Continent. We must be able to claim that we are as well educated, as well dressed, as well housed, as well provided for as any people in North America. This, Mr. Chairman, we can only do if we have a Minister of Education who can go into a cabinet meeting and thump his fist on that round table, if he has to, and demand from this government that it provide for our children of the day the necessary funds to carry out the educational programmes that will give to our people an equal education that will be on a par with any other educational system in this world of ours.

No government in this province, no education minister in this province, in his right mind can aim for anything less. No people on this North American Continent can be satisfied if its government aims at anything less. In order to do this, Mr. Chairman, our Department of Education and particular our Education Minister is going to have to provide now and in the future vast sums of money to provide this opportunity for our young people of today and our young people of tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, one of the ways that our educators of this province provide some of the money is true the regional tax authority. I was quite surprised today, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact I was disappointed when I received a message from the Executive Secretary of the Regional School Tax Authority, District 1, Gander. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read to you this telegram: "We respectfully request your attendance at the next meeting, June 22, 8:00 P.M., Hotel Gander to discuss necessary steps to solve present financial predicament of five school boards, caused by the lack of governmental support of tax authority." It is signed by the Executive Assistant.

Mr. Chairman, this condition that is quite apparent between the Department of Education and Youth and our tax authorities is disgraceful. Just imagine the lack of governmental support! The lack of governmental support, from a government that claimed that they would be a government of action! How complacent can they be? How irresponsible can they be? A bunch of two year olds can do just as good because they will do nothing the same as the present Minister of Education is doing, "The lack of governmental support," it is the lack of governmental doing! It is the lack of governmental activity. It is the lack of doing something, anything, but why cannot this present administration do something?

Mr. Chairman, such a condition, when such a secretary has to write off such a message, it is a grave situation indeed. I failed to see how

any Minister of Education can pretend that everything in his department is all nice and tidy, everything taken care of, and he completely forgets about the tax authority.

I wonder if governmental support does not come. Mr. Chairman, I understand from speaking to one of the members of the Tax Authority in Gander that the Minister of Education is also invited to this meeting. I will certainly look forward to his participation in the discussions and I sincerely hope and trust that he will have something concrete, something to offer to this tax authority district so that it can solve its financial problems.

I sincerely hope it does not end up like the two school boards operating out of Gander who I have been told are at a tremendous loss as far as bus transportation is concerned this year. I understand from the chairman of one of the boards that they are expected to lose something like \$80,000 this year alone.

Mr. Chairman, every year there is a normal increase in expenditure and every aspect of education in our province, not only in education but in everything else, in government, in industry, in everything. If even this normal increase in expenditure is not met and it is quite obvious that in many of the articles in the estimates that these normal increases are not met, then how can we expect to increase the standard of education in our province? How can we expect to increase the opportunities for our young people of this province? How can we expect to give them the same opportunities as are given to many hundreds of thousands of children, the millions of children across this continent of ours. Every child in this province, whether he be from a rich family or a poor, from our largest city in the province or from the smallest cove, bay or inlet, is entitled to an education the same as anyone else in this province, and it is the responsibility of the Minister of Education to see that every child from Cape Chidley south in this province, gets a good, sound and sophisticated education.

If our present Minister of Education continues in his present dealings with that department, if he should bring forward estimates for next year which would resemble the present ones which he is bringing

forward and possibly a decrease here, cutting somewhere else, a slashing somewhere else, then education can be considered in Newfoundland to be on the down grade again.

Education, twenty-five years ago, and if we go back to forty years, was a very small item in Newfoundland. I remember reading where the Minister of Finance in 1933 stood up in this House and boasted, he actually boasted

that the government of that day was going to spend the total sum of \$1 million on education. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are well over \$1 million something like \$128 million. The vast increases of this expenditure has been brought about this last twenty-three years. To the people who brought them about, to the people who made them possible, to the people who built the vast amount of schools in our Province, the people who envisaged Memorial University, our great number of elementary schools and our high schools, our trade schools, our technical college, our fisheries college, to the people who saw these, who brought them to reality, our province will ever be thankful.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is only a base, this is only a bare foundation on which to build a great educational system. We, in this province today and the members of this government, should take it only as a base, should take it only as a foundation and build on that foundation, build up on this foundation but build with some planning, with some foresight. Put the planning of a committee of three together and come up with a long-range policy on education expenditure. Put them to work. Make them earn their keep, do not let them rust in the back rooms of Confederation Building. Do not let them go mouldy. Make use of them. Let us get some action out of them. Education in Newfoundland is the most important thing in Newfoundland. Too long in our past history our people have been ignorant. Too long in our past history our people have been uneducated. Our province has suffered because of this.

Mr. Chairman, I submit we should spend many more millions of dollars on our educational institution than what we are spending today. Our physical education in Newfoundland, we have just scratched the surface, barely scratched the surface. I can only think of something like seven communities where physical education has touched, the other twenty-five communities, as far as I know, at the present time have never received one cent from our physical education and youth programme.

I am quite sure the same thing applies to the other districts of our province. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that these people, these little people, in the bays, coves of our province, are entitled to this as much as any other child in the greater centres of Newfoundland. This present

Mr. Thoms

administration, especially before October 28, 1971, was preaching across our province that they will take the government to the people. I sincerely hope and trust that they will also take physical education to our children, they will take modern education facilities to the vast number of outports of our province. I sincerely hope and trust, Mr. Chairman, that the Educational Minister will, when he comes into the House, if he comes in, with his estimates, when this House opens in 1973, that he will come in with a more realistic set of estimates and that expenditure along these lines will be expanded; that we will not have to put up with such estimates as the community sports facilities which are cut this year by \$1,100,500. Almost every item under the Physical Education and Youth is slashed. There is only one item, Mr. Chairman, that I know in these estimates that is not slashed and that is the estimate of salaries, particularly to a minister, which is up something like \$4,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not the minister's salary.

MR. THOMS: Well it says, salaries, minister's office, \$27,600.

Of course, if you come down to general administration, you get a huge increase.

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

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion committee ordered to sit again presently.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 6:00 P.M. I do leave the Chair until 8:00 P.M.