



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

Volume 2

2nd Session

Number 48

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**Friday, April 6, 1973**

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

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Gentlemen, before commencing today's proceedings, I would like to welcome to this honourable House grade VI students from The Sacred Heart section of the J.R. Smallwood Collegiate in Wabush with their teacher, Mr. Lloyd Snook. They are accompanied by six students from St. Pius X who are hosting the visiting group. I trust that your visit to the House of Assembly will be interesting and informative.

HON. JOSEPH ROUSSEAU: (MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AND RECREATION): Mr. Speaker, I have a ministerial statement. I wonder if I could ask leave of the House to make it after the questions because I have one more page coming up?

#### PETITIONS

HON. DR. A.T. ROWE: (MINISTER OF HEALTH): I would ask the indulgence of the House to make an apology for an item appearing in this morning's "Daily News". This statement on the health of the province emanated from the Division of Vital Statistics within my department and I apologize. It should have been tabled to the members of the House beforehand. I saw it this morning in the news and asked my officials what was the reason that it had not been tabled. I understand that the senior official of the Division of Vital Statistics is ill and this is the reason why the matter has slipped through to the press. Copies will be tabled to the House today.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

DR. ROWE: The number of people who died from heart disease, cancer? You should have had it before it got to the press. I am sorry.

MR. C. BPETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of communities in the southwest arm of Random. These communities are as follows: Northwest Brook, Queens Cove, Long Beach, Hodge's Cove, Caplin Cove, Little Heart's Ease, Butter Cove, Gooseberry Cove and Southport. The petition reads as follows. It has been signed by 932 people and

they respectfully request that an effort be made this year to improve road conditions in this part of the district of Trinity North. There was a question directed to the Minister of Transportation and Communications some days ago regarding this. He wanted to know if any representation had been made on behalf of these people. I guess that he was referring to this particular petition. It goes on to say, Sir; "Whereas the distance from the Trans Canada Highway to Southport is approximately twenty miles and at its best travelling over it is anything but comfortable, the road passes through every other settlement and during the summer months the residents of these settlements are enveloped in dust and since the dwellings are built along this road, windows and doors of these dwellings must always remain closed due to the air becoming polluted with dust from passing motor vehicles.

"There is always a continual flow of traffic over this road and millions of pounds of fish are transported over it annually. All supplies and provisions must be brought in by this road also. Sections of this road have never been upgraded and especially in the eastern section there are many bad and dangerous curves. Other roads in the province which do not serve as many settlements and as many people as the Southwest Arm Road does have been given priority especially where the roads through the settlements have been paved. We contend that we have been unjustly neglected and humbly request that the road in question be upgraded in 1973 and at least the sections of road through the settlements be paved. We respectfully request that our petition for road improvements be given sympathetic hearing by the honourable members of our Provincial Government, for which we shall forever pray."

I think to add to that, Mr. Speaker, that there must be in excess of one hundred people who commute daily over this road to work at Come By Chance. There are in excess of 2,000,000 pounds of fish trucked over it yearly. I heartily endorse this petition. I ask that it be placed on the table of the House and referred to

the department to which it relates.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented on behalf of 932 residents in the Southwest Arm Random area in the District of Trinity North. I think that it is a reasonable request. I trust that the government will be able to respond to the prayer of the petition in this fiscal year. Apart from the safety hazards that the honourable member mentioned, Sir, I do not think that the people should be forced to eat dust in this day and age and women hang out their clothes on the clothes lines down there with all the dust that is flying around. So, we have no hesitation, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of some 2,000 students from Memorial University of Newfoundland. Sir, the prayer of the petition is a very short one and simply reads, "We the students of Memorial University totally condemn the action of the government in the alterations of the Students' Aid Programme." Sir, I think the students at the university certainly meant the mini-brief that they presented to the honourable members of the House of Assembly and to the Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Education to be given some consideration along with this particular petition.

Sir, last night during the consideration of the estimates on the salary vote to the minister, I reviewed briefly the contents of this mini-brief and Sir, nothing can change the simple fact that the students this year -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the honourable member will permit, the Chair would like to inspect the petition. From hearing what the honourable member said, it does not appear as if there is any prayer to the petition. It seems to be a statement only, with no prayer. By definition of petition, you must have a prayer. Maybe there is a prayer to the petition that the honourable member wishes -

MR. F. ROWE: With due respect, Sir. I have seen some pretty fancy

pretty complex and pretty comprehensive petitions come before this honourable House. I have seen something as simple if not more simple than we see here, Sir.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER: (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): On the point of order that the honourable the Speaker brought up, I would suggest that - with all due respect, Your Honour - that whether there is a prayer or not to the petition - and I fully understand that petitions strictly and legally interpreted should have a prayer - whether there is or is not a prayer, that we have the leave of the House that the document be tabled. I realize that Your Honour is perhaps correct that a petition must have a prayer but whether one agrees or disagrees with what the document reports, certainly I think that we should give leave of the House that it in fact be tabled, and leave the technicality in abeyance.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable the Minister of Education's point is well taken and the honourable the member may continue.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In speaking in support of this petition, Sir, nothing can change the simple fact that the students this year have to borrow an additional \$800 up to \$1400 through the Canadian Student Loan in order to qualify for free tuition or for allowances. Sir, I feel quite strongly that this can only result in a decline in student enrollment at the university during the coming year. As honourable members already know, Sir, the per capita attendance in this province is one point five per cent compared with three point one per cent with the rest of Canada. Sir, the only thing that this can result in is inequality of educational opportunity in this province as far as the university education is concerned.

The students of lower, middle and no income families, particularly in the more rural parts of our province, are going to find it much more difficult to come to university and I submit, Sir, that when a student is

confronted with the possibility of having to borrow or go into debt to the tune of \$7,000 over a five year period in order to get a Bachelor of Arts or a Bachelor of Science or any bachelor degree with that low earning power. Once he graduates he is going to think twice before going to university. So, Sir, I give this petition my every support.

I would like to point out the three proposals that the students do make in their mini-brief to the government: (1) The government initiate an independent study into the effects of any changes in their student-aid policy and that these be considered before any changes are made and that the report by the independent committee be made public. (2) The government immediately consult a joint committee of student affairs to discuss the student-aid policy. (3) That any and all changes in the student-aid programme be delayed at least until the fall semester.

Sir, I think that these are reasonable requests. This government have mentioned time and time again the need for long-term planning and the establishment of priorities. Sir, we can only assume that people seeking an university education also lay out their long-term plans. I would submit, Sir, that their plans were such that they were assuming that next term they would only have to borrow \$600 in order to qualify for assistance. Overnight, Sir, they find that they have to borrow up to \$1,400. That certainly would interfere with their long-term plans.

So, Sir, I give this petition my every support and I ask that this petition be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I may point out that obviously, according to the rules of the House, one can only speak in support of a petition. Obviously one would not speak in support of a document, the main point of which is condemnation of

the government, if one is a member of the government and if one has confidence in the government. What I wish to point out is that obviously this restricts what I can say without getting into a procedure of wrangles. I understand that later today when we get back to the ministerial salary vote, the honourable member will be continuing and I would appreciate then, when he has finished, the opportunity to speak on it. There are some matters in actual fact which I think have been misunderstood. What I am saying now is that in order to avoid the necessity of a procedural wrangle I would be very restricted in what I could say. I would appreciate that when the honourable gentleman has completed his remarks under the heading of minister's salary in the Department of Education estimates, I will have an opportunity then to comment on this area and I think to give some facts which are probably not clear.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of the petition. It is an important petition. I only want to make one or two points and very briefly. First of all, Sir, I am worried about the psychological impact of this measure on particularly the students from outside of St. John's. I know of some bright, intelligent young people from my own district, for example, living in small communities, fishermen's sons and daughters who, in the ordinary course of events, under the old scheme would go to university. The thought of having to borrow and go into debt to the extent of up to \$1,400 a year or more - I mean there is no indication that a student can come from outside the province and live in St. John's here and pay tuition, pay board etc., etc., and live on that amount of money per year. There is no indication of that at all. There is a great likelihood of having to go into debt, up to \$1,400 a year or more, and that psychological impact on a lot of our students from outside the province, coming from our less well-off families, is likely to discourage some of our best

young people from proceeding to the university.

MR. MURPHY: I am sure the honourable member means from outside the province.

MR. W. N. ROWE: No, from outside St. John's. I mean St. John's. People who have to come in and live in St. John's. If I said outside the province, I withdraw that, Sir. I mean outside the capital City of St. John's. The second point, Sir, is that there seems to be inherent in the new scheme propounded last year and this year by the Minister of Finance, on behalf of the government, a certain discrimination against university students. I realize that certain things are outside their jurisdiction but there seems to be a certain discrimination, not because of their fault but because of federal programmes which is the point I am trying to make, where manpower students, i.e., get paid salaries and get paid this and that and the other thing, whereas university students do not get that, Sir. The third point is the shocking statistics which have already been cited by my colleague, the member for St. Barbe North, that in this province we have one-half the national average going to university and about one-quarter of the average going to university as seen in our more affluent provinces like Ontario and Alberta. Whatever we do in Newfoundland, Sir, we should not do anything to discourage the people who are likely to be the leaders of our society for some time to come, people who are going to certainly put back more into the common economic pool of this province than they have taken out by having a portion of their university education paid for.

With those few brief remarks, Sir, I would like to go on record as supporting wholeheartedly the petition or at least the thought which is inherent in the petition that the students condemn this action by the government, and implicit in that, Sir, is the reverse; namely that the government reinstitute the programme which



had been in existence for the last number of years.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this petition. I sincerely support the will and the wish of the body of students at our university. Mr. Speaker, I have to bring a personal problem into this really because maybe not every honourable member of this House has faced it as I am faced with it at the present time.

1974 will bring a year in my life when I hope to send at least one child to university. In 1976 I will send two others to university. In 1977 I will send another to university. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am confronted with quite a financial problem here because, if my figures are correct, either I or members of my immediate family have to borrow at least \$1,400 before they can get any aid from the provincial government. Now if (I hope that this happens. I hope that my four children do attend university) you give them an average of four years each in university, which would be the very minimum, this would come to well over \$22,000 within the next six or seven years that either I or members of my immediate family have to borrow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you consider the income of my family, that is my income, you realize that this is impossible. It is impossible and really this counts me out as far as sending my kids to university. Not only does it count me out but it counts also at least eighty-five per cent of the people of Newfoundland out. Anyone with an ordinary, average Newfoundland family will find it virtually impossible to send their children to university.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Yes, it is okay for the hon. member for St. John's Centre.

MR. MURPHY: I have a son and he has started paying back now. He does not pay back until six months after he goes to work. It is no obligation on the honourable member.

MR. THOMS: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member for St. John's Centre wants to speak on this, he can. Please give me a chance to speak.

MR. MURPHY: The honourable member is distorting facts.

MR. THOMS: I am not distorting the facts. The figures I presented to you are accurate and true to the best of my knowledge and if they are not, will some honourable gentleman jump up and correct me.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The hon. member for Bonavista North has the right to be heard in silence and he has the floor.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the present policy of our present administration is followed this will be probably one of the greatest set-backs in our educational institutions in Newfoundland that we have seen for a long time.

MR. SPEAKER: Under Standing Order No. 97, "there shall be no debate on a petition unless the House has it under consideration." The honourable member has made his point but now he is entering into a debate. The honourable member may clue up his remarks but may not enter into further debate on the subject.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, since I am limited to debate on this petition, I do want to go on record as supporting this petition wholeheartedly and also that I will do all in my power to have the prayer of this petition brought before the government and hope that they will see fit to change their present policy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition, if for no other reason, Sir, because it discriminates against the poor people of this province. It discriminates against the poor, Mr. Chairman, or the Minister of Social -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member can draw from Standing Order no. 97 with regard to debate on the petition, there can be no doubt that the honourable member is entering into debate. The honourable member will have to confine his remarks to those which fit within the Standing Orders.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if my remark that this policy of the government, this announced policy does not discriminate against the poor, Sir, I feel that that fits within the rule that Your Honour just quoted.

MR. SPEAKER: Again the honourable member is using a device which he uses particularly often when the Chair makes a ruling. Without directly challenging the ruling, the honourable member resumes his place and continues in the same vein as when he was interrupted. The honourable member is very experienced in the House and knows full well how to proceed and I am quite sure he is capable of doing so.

MR. NEARY: I am in the hands of Your Honour. Would Your Honour, tell me how I can support the petition without saying that it does not discriminate against the poor?

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That I support the petition and congratulate the government for bringing in this measure for doing away with the students' allowance?

MR. WM. ROWE: I rise on a point of order. A petition was brought before this House and the Speaker said that it might not be a petition which is appropriately received by this House. By universal consent of the House, the petition was in fact received. The prayer of the petition is that the signees to the petition condemn the government action. That prayer has been accepted as a legitimate topic for discussion in this House.

My honourable colleague is now rising to support the petition which has been received universally by this House, Sir. The discussion on it has been universally by this House, How can my colleague then discuss something which condemns a government action without Your Honour calling him to order for entering into debate? That is a legitimate question which has been asked by my colleague, Sir, and I would submit that discussion now being permitted in this House by everybody's consent, that he be permitted to make his remarks which are in support of the prayer of the petition.

MR. OTTENHEIMER, Minister of Education: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the unanimous consent of the House concerned the tabling of the petition but that the rules of the House which preclude debate on a petition, no matter what it asks for, that unanimous consent did not effect the rules of debate, it did effect the tabling of the document.

MR. SPEAKER: I think honourable members will admit that the point which was raised by the Chair initially, pointing to the flaw in the petition in that there was no prayer, has obviously led to this difference of opinion on both sides of the House. I am inclined to agree with the Minister of Education on a point which he raised, in that the unanimous consent was that it be deemed in order or the petition be deemed appropriate for tabling within the House, even though full consideration of it does not reveal any prayer.

So far as it then becoming open season as it were, to condemn the government, further remarks of this nature will be ruled out of order.

MR. F. ROWE: Question please of Your Honour - it is just a simple question, I just wanted to ask whether the Speaker in fact did rule that the petition did not contain a prayer? Did His Honour rule in that regard?

MR. SPEAKER: I presume I must reply to the honourable member even though hypothetical questions are not answerable. This is probably not a hypothetical question. The Chair is not called upon to rule whether or not there was a prayer to the petition. The point brought up by the Chair and by unanimous consent of the House it was, the petition was received. There was no request to adjudicate on whether there was a prayer or not.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it is rather unfortunate that this policy should have been adopted at a time when the government is in the process of making arrangements for building a regional college in Corner Brook. Is that in order, Mr. Speaker? Can I say that? Am I allowed to say that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member deserves to be interrupted. He will be interrupted. The honourable member knows that the Chair has no hesitation in interrupting him, it has interrupted him on numerous occasions. However the Chair does not take kindly to being bated into interruptions by the honourable member.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the next item of business is the Education estimates, when this can be debated in full, as the honourable Minister of Education pointed out when the petition was presented. Therefore, all of this discussion on what you can say and not say in the petition is quite irrelevant. The whole matter can be debated in a few minutes time and the honourable gentleman can get on any relevancy he likes then. So why not wait for a few minutes?

MR. F. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is true of any petition that is brought into this House. Now I undertook yesterday, I promised the students that I would present this

MR. F. ROWE: petition to the House and this House has to deal with this particular petition in spite of what the Minister of Finance has said.

MR. SPEAKER: To quote perhaps a hackney phrase, I think the time has come to cease debate on this petition. Under Standing Order 97 this is quite in order. There has been debate on the petition -

MR. NEARY: No, there has not been debate on the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island has exceeded the question throughout the debate.

MR. NEARY: Throw me out. Throw me out.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, there can certainly obviously be great differences of opinion here, but when an honourable member shows what is quite obvious to all to be contempt for the Chair, whoever happens to be in the Chair, who says, "Throw me out, throw me out," what is the inference? "I will do what I want to. I want the Chair to throw me out. I want the headlines. I want to be the martyr." I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is impossible to proceed with any kind of order whatsoever, if any honourable member on any side shows such contempt for this House, the people here, the people who sent us here and you, as to continue in that vein. I call upon some of the honourable gentleman's colleagues who I think obviously will be very embarrassed to do so, obviously they would be very embarrassed to do so, and that is not fair. But I am quite sure that they know that it is impossible to have a sensible, logical approach to anything if any honourable member should show such contempt for all of us as to continue in that vein.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, may I go on with the support of the petition?

MR. SPEAKER: The debate on the petition that is before the House has now ceased. Are there any further petitions?

MR. B. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from 186 voters of Red Head Cove, Bay de Verde. The prayer of the petition is that the government undertake -

AN. HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member for Bay de Verde certainly has the right to be heard in silence when he is presenting a matter of some importance to him and to his constituents. The honourable members both to my right to my left should bear him the courtesy that his petition and the honourable member deserve.

MR. HOWARD: The prayer of the petition is, "the petition of the undersigned, being residents of Bay de Verde District, do humbly show that cattle raising and pastoral farming is one of the few potential industries in our district capable of bringing in new dollars and boosting the economy of our area.

"(2) Cattle roaming at large is becoming an unpopular nuisance and an expensive project. Increased motor traffic, coupled with physical and geographical hazards make the morality rate too expensive an adventure to promote or engage in. (3) We firmly

believe that a controlled fenced and cared for pasture should eliminate much of the financial risk involved and tend to promote the cattle industry in this district with its abundant marsh land and best grazing grounds. (4) A random survey shows that about 200,000 pounds of meat is consumed in this district and the greater part of this amount is brought in from outside. This means 400 to 500 head of cattle which in terms of buying, breeding, pasturing, butchering and selling constitutes a sizeable industry to our already lean economy in this district.

"Your petitioners pray that government in line with this present industrial philosophy will take heed of our request and proceed without undue delay to set in motion the machinery whereby a cattle industry in this district will soon become a reality. Your petitioners further pray that some tangible action will result from our petition."

I fully support this petition and ask that it be laid upon the table of this House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House to humbly support the petition presented by my hon. friend. Mr. Speaker, in so doing I trust that both the Department of Rural Development and the Department of Forestry and Agriculture will take this petition and take a very close look at it. The beef production in Newfoundland today is practically nil when you compare it with the consumption of production within our province. Now this has been caused really because we have not been a farming community in the past and we have only been this last ten years really partaking in this new industry of farming of all sorts. For years, Mr. Speaker, we had a vast population of sheep in our province and this last forty years this population have dwindled to almost nil. It is on the verge of recovery at the



present time. But the main reason why our sheep population disappeared was because of the epidemic of dogs that we have had over the years and this epidemic is still with us today. Only last week I had an experience of losing two geese which were destroyed by six dogs in my backyard in Middle Brook.

Now we have an epidemic of dogs most definitely not only in my community but throughout the whole Province of Newfoundland even in the City of St. John's I may say. Mr. Speaker, not only do these dogs attack the sheep but they also attack young cows. If you were to speak to some of our farmers they would give you proof of this. So, Mr. Speaker, while these two departments are looking closely at this petition I hope and pray that the Department of Justice will also take a close look at it and see if there is any way possible that we can control the epidemic of dogs which now exist in our province.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House, we wholeheartedly support this petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further petitions?

HON. J.C. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AND RECREATION): I have what I think to be an important statement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, for some time the government have been concerned with the position of the employees of the United States Air Force Base at Goose Airport, especially with respect to their future employment opportunities, their existing pension rights and their termination benefits. In view, therefore, of the pending transfer of employees and in order to clarify the provincial government's position on this matter and to assist, we hope, in advancing their cause, I feel it incumbent upon me to make a statement to the House concerning the government's position in this whole matter.

For the past three or four years a representative group of employees of the United States Air Force Base have been concerned

with such matters as pension rights, severance pay and other fringe benefits, especially in the light of long-term service, and as well with the fear which existed among many employees with respect to the future of the air base, plus the fact that certain employees had benefits and others did not. While it is my understanding that representations have been made by these employees in the past, it was, however, not until March, 1972, when it was decided by the United States authorities that a review would be made of pensions and related benefits. Upon representation to the provincial government, the employees were granted the co-operation of the government in that advice was provided for them as to the appropriate course of action to take with respect to their pension and other fringe benefit review.

Through the offices of my colleague, the member for St. John's Centre, when he was Minister of Provincial and Labrador Affairs, and upon the direction of the Premier; Mr. Alec G. Henley, C.L.U., Insurance Consultant of A.G. Henley Associates Limited; and Mr. Fred Bishop, of the Justice Department, were requested to proceed to Goose Bay to meet with the employees and to discuss with them and advise them upon representation with respect to their pension and other requirements. This was completed in February and March, 1972, and as a result, in July, 1972, word was received of improved benefits and of the extent to which the United States Government were prepared to go.

Upon review of the improvements in the plan and in the light of anticipated change of status within the base, as it is now well known to the members of the House, employees involved were still concerned as to the problem they faced within their employment, their future prospects as well as the lack of benefits in certain areas. As a result of representations by the same committee to the government, it was agreed that Mr. Henley should

be asked to completely review the problem in the light of changing circumstances and report to the government with recommendations as to a reasonable course of action in the light of the issues raised by the employees. Mr. F.J. Fitzpatrick was seconded to assist Mr. Henley in reviewing the employees' situation.

On January 22, 1973, Mr. Henley filed his report to the provincial government, which was endorsed completely by cabinet and, as a result of the acceptance of the recommendations in the Henley Report, I communicated on behalf of the government to the Honourable Mitchell Sharp, Minister of External Affairs, and the Honourable J. Marchand, Minister of Transport, on February 22, 1973.

In this communication I outlined the history of the endeavours of the employees and stated the exceptional circumstances which prevailed in the present situation, highlighting the element of uncertainty with respect to employment and the lack of continuity in employment as having decided psychological effects upon all employees. It was because of this fears were raised with respect to the options open to employees and the resultant withdrawal from participation in the pension plan and the forfeiture of certain rights.

After reviewing the rights of the employees and outlining the various inequities that existed, it could be stated that the following recommendations indicate the position of the provincial government:

(1) That as of a date to be agreed upon, which date would precede the present decision to reduce forces at Goose Air Base, the Excelsior Pension Plan be changed to correspond in formula with respect to benefits to that of the United States Civil Service Pension Plan, and that this apply to all appropriated fund and non-appropriated fund employees.

(2) That because of the restriction placed upon the employees by the employer, their participation in the Canada Pension Plan now be dated back to January 1, 1966, or their eligibility date if later, and that the cost of this adjustment be borne by the employer in view of the circumstances.

(3) That all employees, appropriated fund and non-appropriated fund, receive benefits under the pension plan in relation to their service, especially those with restricted past service as a result of compulsory participation in 1968.

(4) That for those employees moving to the Ministry of Transport for future employment, the pension attained to date on a final average basis with the United States Air Force as employer should be funded immediately for those employees, with the appropriate vesting provisions.

(5) That consideration be given to improving the severance pay of all employees in view of the particular circumstances.

(6) That in view of the uncertainty of future employment, especially with the announced intention to renegotiate the lease in 1976, voluntary retirement be considered involuntary retirement unless otherwise assurance is given to employees as to future security of employment. This is essential, as the uncertainty of future employment may force employees to seek more secure employment.

This, in effect, can be considered involuntary separation..

(7) That all employment, continuous and non-continuous, be used as a credit for employee service.

(8) That if the Excelsior Pension Plan is not improved comparable to the United States Civil Service Plan, provision be made for the following:

(a) In the even of involuntary retirement, complete vesting in the employer's contributions should be extended whether or not the employee withdraws all or part of his contributions. Such vesting should provide for a pension benefit accrued to date as a percentage of the employee's pension assumed to be received at age 65 in relation to his potential career service, less consideration for the employee withdrawing his contributions. This would provide equity because of the fact that in early years the employer contributes very little into the plan in the purchase of units of pension.

(b) Involuntary retirement provides, at the present time, at age 55, with 30 years service, full pension. Consideration should be given to retaining the age but reducing the years of service, as on the present basis it would appear that one per cent of the employees could only benefit from this after 1982.

(c) Involuntary retirement should permit actuarially reduced pensions below age 55, tied to a period of service. (2½ per cent is presently being used.)

(d) Unused sick leave should be credited towards service time for computation of pension upon separation, either voluntary or involuntary.

(9) That assurances with respect to better communication, administrative support and a representative residential officer where employees may seek information with respect to their benefits in the event of complete withdrawal of the United States Forces as employer from the area, be given. This could be as a result of registration of all information within the given office in the Capital City of St. John's, or with a department of the provincial or federal

government.

I concluded this communication by urging upon the federal government the need to immediately make representations to the American authorities to have the position of the employees improved to their satisfaction.

The whole purpose of this exercise, Mr. Speaker, was to impress upon the federal government that these employees have a reasonable case which we feel our letter to the Honourable Mitchell Sharp illustrates and which was based upon the report submitted to government. We are in communication with the federal government, waiting to hear from them as to their position upon the representation. However, as time is passing, we feel that we should make our position public in order that the employees may be fully aware what is being done on their behalf.

This government is concerned that the employees involved, who have legitimate rights, should have these rights protected. While we realize that a transfer of employees to the Ministry of Transport will look after certain employment needs, we, nevertheless, feel very strongly that those employees who have no rights at all should also be protected. We are concerned further with the uncertainty with which certain employees are faced as well as the economic needs as a result of the government uncertainty as illustrated in the communication of March 5, 1973, and I quote "Basically, the Ministry of Transport will provide an opportunity for employment for up to three years at Goose Bay." However, we are limited in our ability to deal directly with this problem and we look forward to favourable action by the federal government to our representations.

Let me state emphatically that we concur with the observation of Mr. Henley that the pension plan as a continuing pension plan of those employees involved is not unreasonable under ordinary circumstances, although there is a need for some improvements. We also concur with his observation that these are extraordinary circumstances in which the employees now find

themselves. And, in view of this, we concur with his observations as to the reasons for and the recommendations to improve the benefits of the employees to reflect a compassion for their peculiar situation, especially for those employees who do not now enjoy benefits. We are concerned about the loss of rights under the vesting provisions of the pension plan, especially if employees are forced to withdraw their own contributions. We are further concerned with the problems of rolling over pension rights into the federal government's superannuation plan where employees are so transferred, and, most important, we are concerned for those non-appropriated fund employees.

There are three groups of Canadian Civilian employees who are employed at the United States Air Force Base. Those are the Canadian Civilian, appropriated fund employees who are in the United States Civilian Pension Plan. There are then the Canadian Civilian appropriated fund employees who are in the Excelsior Plan and there are then the non-appropriated fund employees, that is, employees who are not paid directly from the United States Air Force's Base Vote but are paid from funds generated within the Base itself, such as the PX, the laundry, etc., who have no benefits whatever except participation in the Canada Pension Plan.

It would be most regrettable if the United States authorities, in view of the excellent relations which existed between Newfoundlanders and Americans during the years, from that day in 1941 when the Edmond B. Alexander came in here with the first contingent of United States Troops, were now in an era where they are about to phasedown and possibly phaseout from this area and were to leave under circumstances and conditions that would leave a sour taste.

Mr. Speaker, this statement is made to inform the House of what has transpired and what this government is doing on behalf of the employees as well as to inform the employees at Goose Air Base. It is my sincere hope and wish that I will be able to inform the House

in the near future of some good news as a result of representation by this government on behalf of the employees of the Goose Air Base.

Thank you.

NOTICE OF MOTION

DR. A. T. ROWE, (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of this honourable House to present a bill, an "Act To Amend the Mental Health Act."

HON. H. COLLINS (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce a bill, "An Act Further To Amend the City of St. John's Act."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

HON. A. J. MURPHY (MINISTER OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE): Mr. Speaker, I have a few answers to questions. I am going to table them. All the information is here. There is one particular question that I would just like to mention one or two things on it. This is Question No. 13, on the Order Paper of February 22, asked by the honourable member for Bell Island. It asks for the cost of repairs to houses by electoral districts during February, 1972. The reason I want just to bring to the attention of the House there are three large ones particularly; Gander, twenty-five cases, this is a project under a LIP programme that is undertaken in Peterview. There is another one St. John's South, \$16,000. This is the LIP programme on the Blackhead Road or Shea Heights; and St. John's North, \$7,000 - eighteen cases, twenty-one on Shea Heights actually and twenty-five in Peterview, eighteen -

MR. NEARY: I thought Bell Island got \$23,000.

MR. MURPHY: Perpetual lip.

St. John's North, eighteen cases which is the Mundy Pond special projects, \$7,000. The rest, Mr. Speaker, I will table that one. Question No. 7, asked by the same honourable member, on the



Order Paper of February 21. Answers to the member and also for the press, so as the people can be informed. Question No. 185 on the Order Paper of March 21. Question No. 141.

HON. A.T. ROWE, Minister of Health: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 196, Order Paper, March 26, asked by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and the answer to Question No. 199, on the Order Paper of Tuesday March 27, questions asked by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

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

HON. H. R. V. EARLE: (MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES): Mr. Speaker, before calling Orders of the Day I should just like to report to the House, in Buchans the schools and hospital, everything is under control. Four boilers have been installed. The officials of the Department of Public Works have worked far beyond the call of duty, more or less on a twenty-four hour basis, and everything is in good operating condition and conditions are quite satisfactory.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Premier. In view of the facts, Sir, that it was announced this morning that food prices across Canada have gone up another point, what is the provincial government doing to deal with possible causes of this increase that come under provincial jurisdiction?

HON. F. D. MOORES (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, not just those food prices have come under provincial jurisdiction because the food prices, in this province particularly, are due to very high transportation costs.

We have had a series of meetings with the three Premiers from the Maritime Provinces and on Monday we are meeting with Mr. Marchand and Mr. Jamieson, in Ottawa, regarding transportation costs to this area. Hopefully, some benefit will come from it whereby there will be a reduction in the cost of living in the province. It is a very great concern of this government and one that we will do our utmost to try to cure.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker - oh the Minister of Health is not...

MR. NEARY: There he is. He is back in the House again.

MR. WINSOR: I will wait for the honourable minister.

MR. NEARY: You have to put your question. We will have to get seat belts for the ministers to keep them in their seats.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable Minister of Health. It came to my mind when he made a statement about the error in the press about births and deaths and what have you. Can the minister inform the House if there are any cases or any known cases, if so, how many victims that are suffering from the effect of the Thalidamide drug? It is quite a concern now in North America and I wonder if there are any known cases existing in Newfoundland?

HON. A.T. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge I do not think there are any cases in Newfoundland of disabilities or congenital abnormalities resulting from the use of the drug Thalidamide. I have not heard of any but I will make absolutely certain. I think if there had been a case I am sure I would have heard about it from one direction or another. I do not think there have been any but I will check specifically.

AN HON. MEMBER: Were there any in Canada?

DR. ROWE: In Canada, yes. The drug was used in Canada for a number of months before it was taken off the market. I do not think we have one but I will specifically find out, definitely.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations is not in his seat today so I would like to direct a

question to the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation. In view of the statement that was made this morning by the minister, can he inform the House what is taking place as far as provincial assistance is concerned that is being given to the employees of Goose Air Base? Is the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations involved in the phase out? Are they assisting those people in getting work with the M.O.T.? Is there any involvement whatsoever by the Department of Manpower and Immigration or any involvement by the minister's department?

HON. J.G.ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF RECREATION AND REHABILITATION): The important point to mention here is that, well, as a member for Labrador, of course, I am very concerned with the transfer of employees from the United States force to the M.O.T. The point of the ministerial statement this morning concerned mainly pension rights. This was our concern and this is what the statement concerned this morning, not the transfer of employees.

As I understand it, there is a committee, made up jointly of the provincial and federal governments, with the honourable member I believe and the federal member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador as ex officio members. To the best of my knowledge, that is the extent of the provincial government's participation; by participating in this group, this task force, to ensure the smooth transfer of personnel from the USAF force to the M.O.T. force.

MR. WOODWARD: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Department of Manpower, federal, have offered assistance on a consulting basis to that particular group. We have no one in the group on the provincial side that is involved with manpower or industrial relations and I feel very strongly about the roll over of the Excelsior Plan into the Superannuation Federal Scheme. I think the Provincial Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations should give some assistance in this respect, to see that it is done.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Quite apart from the task force which I previously mentioned, of course, I cannot speak for the Department of Manpower and

Industrial Relations, but I think on past evidence, in their involvement in any area which is struck like this, I do not think that the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations will leave these people in the lurch if there is anything they can do. As I say, I cannot speak officially for them but on the basis of past evidence, where they have become involved at the Octagon Plant when there was a lay off there and so on and so forth.

I think this has been a continuing policy of government when such an occurrence is precipitated as will be precipitated at the Goose Bay Air Force Base. I am sure that the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations will give every consideration as to any help they can provide in the area.

MR. WOODWARD: A supplementary question. Maybe I am directing the questions to the bottom tier of the cabinet, perhaps I should direct them to the Minister of Industrial Relations, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Industrial Development. As mentioned in the minister's statement, a number of people that have been employed with non-appropriated funds and funds derived directly from businesses on the base who are not involved in any particular scheme whatsoever, I was wondering if maybe the honourable minister can tell us if either his department or the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations are prepared to get involved in negotiating on behalf of those people to see that they are placed in some type of employment. There could eventually be 150 people without jobs in this respect.

MR. DOODY: As the honourable member is aware, there was a joint task force appointed by the Premier and the Minister of Regional and Economic Expansion. There are four provincial departments represented on that now. There has also been a liaison officer appointed from each of the other - they have had two meetings so far as I understand it in Goose Bay. The honourable member who is asking the question is a member of that committee. I have read the minutes of both meetings but I have not seen the questions nor the

points that you have asked here raised on these minutes at the meeting.

If you were to suggest at one of these meetings of the joint Federal-Provincial Task Force in Goose Bay, I am sure that the various departments which you mention would be only too happy to appoint representatives or to bring these points up. Anything that can possibly be done at that level we will certainly do.

The old Department of Labour which is now the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations are quite willing and anxious to assist in any kind of job transfer or job assistance or placement, just as they were, as my colleague has pointed out, in the close down of various mines and so on.

Should the joint Federal-Provincial Task Force request that kind of participation, the people are available.

MR. WOODWARD: A supplementary question to the Minister of Industrial Development, Mr. Speaker. I feel that there is a great need - I do not think we can do it on the level of the people that the minister has appointed to that particular task force. They are not the senior civil servants of his department and they are not on the ministerial level...

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to interrupt the honourable the member for Labrador North...

MR. NEARY: Sit down.

MR. MARSHALL: I hesitate to...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Any member has the right to rise on a point of order at any time. Of course, in doing so his remarks should not be anticipated by any of the other members. He has the right to be heard in silence and that is a general courtesy that has grown up over the centuries and it should be extended to all sides.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think courtesy is a foreign word to the honourable the member for Bell Island.

On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to interrupt my friend from Labrador North, both because he is an old client of mine as such and the fact that he is relatively new to this House. The point of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member, in asking questions, is really entering into debate, which is not really allowed.

MR. WOODWARD: I will refrain from entering into debate and go directly into the questions, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the honourable Minister of Industrial Development if he can reassure us, and I do not think that possibly a person with this task force is sufficient. We would like to have a representative of Manpower and Immigration to go into Goose Bay to sit down with the different groups and help solve their differences.

They can assess some of the problems that were made in this statement today. So, I am wondering if he can see fit to ask his colleague, the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations to have someone represent him in the area now during this particular phase in and phase out of USAF.

HON. W. DOODY: (MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT): As I say, the representation should be made through that joint task force. As soon as that request comes in, we would be only too happy to act on it. The terms of reference were supplied to the honourable member before the committee was appointed and I feel that had you felt it necessary or had your colleagues in Ottawa felt it necessary that that particular government department be represented on it, I am sure that would have been the case. Right now I do not think it is too late. I think that we can probably still convince Ottawa to go along with what you are saying. I have no objection to it. I think it is a good idea but I cannot give you an assurance right now. I will have to consult with the other people.

MR. M. WOODWARD: Just another supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, Manpower saw fit to bring a consultant to offer services to this particular group, not only this particular group but also any group in the area, like N.P.F. people that were having difficulties. So, could we get the same assurance, that this will be done, from the minister?

MR. DOODY: Certainly.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, may I have leave of the House to table this document. It is a report on the births, deaths, marriages and the problems in the year 1971 as referred to in my earlier statements.

On motion the report tabled.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as this is Friday again, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Industrial Development. How is the going-out-of-business sale down at the Octagon coming along?

MR. DOODY: It is in good hands. We had another meeting this morning.

I notice that you are glancing at the galleries as you ask me the question. There are various interested parties. We are trying to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion as quickly as we can. I know that there is a great deal of pressure. I am sure that the honourable member is aware that there is a great deal of pressure but we are doing the best we possibly can under the circumstances. Bear with us for another few days and I am sure we will have the whole thing resolved.

MR. THOMS: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industrial Development. Could the minister inform this House if there are to date any loans being awarded under the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge there have been no loans awarded under our scheme. There are quite a number now being processed. I understand that Mr. Spencer and his people are interviewing and talking to and researching various applications that are in. To the best of my knowledge, there have been none actually granted as yet.

MR. THOMS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the honourable minister inform us how soon any loans will be awarded?

MR. DOODY: No.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the - I do not know if I should direct it to the Minister of Industrial Development or the Minister of Mines and Energy or maybe the person is the Minister of Finance. I have difficulty in deciding what responsibilities those people have or who is doing what, Mr. Speaker. I am sincere in saying this. I would like to ask the minister, in the change-over of management at Labrador Linerboard which I welcome, as of late, with the new management coming in and streamlining the operation, how many people will be losing jobs that are now permanently employed in that operation?



HON. J.C. CROSBIE: (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, as a result of reorganization of the operations at Goose Bay, there have been thirteen terminations, seven transfers from salary employee status to hourly employee status, two persons relocated to Steenville and one resignation. That is twenty-three all together. The people from Forestal are all moved out now. They were all finished on April 2nd. I believe that is the total.

As a result, this is to reorganize the operation, cut costs and hopefully to make it more efficient. The net savings because of this at Goose should be \$190,000 in a year. The new organization is now there and we hope that it will produce results.

MR. WOODWARD: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will this be the final reduction when those twenty-three people are either transferred or terminated?

MR. CROSBIE: Well, this is a matter of course that is up to the management to decide but from a conversation that I had this morning, I understand that this is it. They now have there new organization at Goose and now we have to have some time to see if this works. We see no reason why - this will be the organization as long as it works properly and everybody does a good job. So, this is the final change at the moment.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Premier and also the Minister of Fisheries. In view of the fact of the severe ice conditions on the Northeast Coast this season and because of this the fishing season is going to be somewhat late, has the minister taken any consideration as to giving our fishermen on the Northeast Coast some assistance and if not, have they been in contact with the federal government as to some possible programme of assistance to the fishermen?

HON. F.D. MOORES: (PREMIER): I was absent from the House when the question was asked. Would you repeat it please?

MR. THOMS: In view of the fact of the ice conditions on the Northeast Coast this season, the fishing season will be somewhat late. Does the

Provincial Department of Fisheries or the province plan on giving the fishermen in that area any assistance and if not, have they been in contact with the federal government as to coming up with some kind of a programme on a cost-share basis to assist these fishermen?

MR. MOORES: We have tried to come up with the federal government on a fishermen's insurance, Mr. Speaker, and have been turned down continuously on it. It is on-going. We will continue to do so. I am afraid the government cannot be responsible for the ice conditions on the Northeast Coast. We know it is unfortunate and we hope that the wind will change and the ice will blow off. There is no time lost yet in the fishery on the Northeast Coast as the honourable gentleman well knows and until such time as there is, there is not much that we can do.

On motion of the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Forests, a bill, "An Act To Revise And Consolidate The Law With Respect To The Marketing Of Natural Products," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Department Of Labrador Affairs Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the honourable Minister of Industrial Development, A Bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Indenture Entered Into Between The Government, Newfoundland Steel (1968) Company Limited And Lundrigans Limited With Respect To The Termination Of The Agreement Forming The Schedule To The Government - Newfoundland Steel (1968) Company Limited - Lundrigans Limited (Agreement) Act, 1969, And To Make Statutory Provision Respecting Matters Connected Therewith," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the honourable Minister of Health, A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Health And Public Welfare Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs And Housing, A Bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Made Between The Government And Kennco Explorations Canada Limited." -

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind ratifying and confirming and adopting agreements but there must be an error here somewhere, I believe this Bill should be in the name of the Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. MARSHALL: When it comes to second reading we will sort that out. It was introduced by the government anyway.

On motion of the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, A Bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Made Between The Government And Kennco Explorations Canada Limited," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the honourable Minister of Justice, A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Dog Act, 1966," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the honourable Minister of Finance, A Bill, "An Act To Further Amend The Gasoline Tax Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, A Bill, "An Act Respecting Proceedings Against The Crown," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, A Bill, "An Act Respecting Allowances For Certain People In Private Homes For Special Care," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Highway Traffic Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Welfare Institutions Licensing Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The City Of Corner Brook Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, A Bill, "An Act Respecting Tenancies Of Residential Premises," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

HEAD 601-01: (Education)

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, last night I was just getting to my few remarks on this particular vote under the Department of Education. I was trying to point out the simple fact that as far as university education is concerned in this province now as it relates to the assistance and tuition a student can get and the fact that they now have to borrow \$1,400 before qualifying for such assistance, that we come full circle back to pre-Confederation days as far as educational opportunity is concerned for a higher education.

Sir, we now have a situation where it is not the intellect of a student or the

magnitude or the size of the brain of a student that counts nor is it the ambition nor the drive nor the industry of a student that qualifies him for a university education but it goes right back to the size of his wallet, Sir. I said that, Sir, in full realization of the fact that students can borrow up to \$7,000 over a five year period, and many of the degrees now are joined degrees and some of the professional degrees are five year degrees, I say that in full realization of the fact that students can borrow this money and they do not have to start to pay it back until six months after they have gained employment or after they have graduated from the university.

But the point is, Sir, and I ask this question quite sincerely, how many people in Newfoundland, how many young people in Newfoundland who are from middle, low income and no income groups are going to put themselves \$7,000 in debt to get a single degree, an undergraduate degree from a university, when most of these undergraduate degrees do not give students or graduates a high earning power? I submit, Sir, that many, many students will take a second look at going to university under these circumstances. Sir, it was just over the past couple of years that the hon. Minister of Finance garnered the support of just about every single university student in this province in his leadership campaign and in the two provincial election campaigns and the students of this province were instrumental in getting the Liberals defeated and they voted for a change of policy and this is the gratitude that is shown by the hon. Minister of Finance. He has stuck the machete or the knife in the backs of the students. Last year the hon. Minister of Finance raised the amount by, I believe, \$200.00 that they had to borrow and this year he raised the amount by \$800.00 up to \$1,400.00. Sir, that is gratitude if ever I saw it; a stab in the back. The wheel has come full

circle, Sir.

Now the hon. Minister of Finance mentioned on television last night that there are certain figures and facts that hon. members on this side of the House and the students are not aware of. Sir, the obvious time for the Minister of Education and the Minister of Finance to pass out these facts was to the delegation that met with the two ministers yesterday. We have not heard these facts yet and I am very interested in seeing them. The hon. Minister of Finance also mentioned that studies have been carried out as far as the effects of this change of policy are concerned. Sir, I ask the hon. Minister of Education if he would table all of the reports of the studies that have been carried out with respect to what effect this would have on the students as a result of their change of policy.

Sir, the students were also disappointed that the Department of Education and the Department of Finance did not consult members of the students' union or the university administration on this decision and feel that the present situation could have been averted had this been done. Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Education whether or not the students' union, the executive of the students' union himself and a certain segment of the university administration were consulted. Sir, perhaps the most immediate problem is the fact that this change of policy or this new policy starts next semester and the students have already planned on returning to the university for the third semester and have made their plans for financing their education and they have made their plans in light of the original policy with respect to the amount the students had to borrow.

Sir, the students are simply asking in their brief that any and all changes in the student-aid programme be delayed at least until the fall semester. Now, Sir, I think this is a

legitimate request. As I pointed out earlier this morning, this present administration is very big, very strong on the need for long-range, long-term planning and short-term planning and presumably any student who is going to university does precisely the same thing. He plans on a long-range basis and short-range basis as far as his financing is concerned, and now we have a situation where overnight there is a dramatic policy change with respect to financing their university education. I think the only fair thing that this administration can do is to put this change of policy off until the fall semester and not implement it during the third and summer semester.

Sir, I could go on at great length as far as this student's tuition is concerned but the points were made last night, they were made again during the presentation of the petition this morning and now I just referred to it once again briefly and I am awaiting with anticipation the remarks of the hon. Minister of Education with respect to that particular vote of 604(05).

Sir, another question, relating to policy I guess, that I would like the minister to answer, is this whole business of the financing of school boards for election expenses. Now we have had a change of policy over the last year or so, couple of years where school boards can now elect a certain fraction of their members. Sir, certain chairmen of school boards, the Avalon Consolidated School Board, for example, say that it is grossly unfair for the government to expect school boards to pay the full cost of the election of their members. He says, Sir, that the board, and this obviously would go for other Boards of Education in this province, is already desperately in need of money and just cannot afford to finance the election of members of the school board. So, Sir, I would like the minister to give the House, this committee, some information as to whether or not the government or the minister's department is prepared to

help the school boards to finance their own free elections.

Sir, there is another point that I would like to refer to in the regulations. There is a section of the regulations relating to the election of school boards which stipulates that those people in arrears to a school board or school tax authority, with regard to unpaid taxes or assessments for more than twelve months, cannot vote or they cannot be a candidate for election to school boards. Now, Sir, I submit that the proper place for this kind of a thing to be taken care of as far as being in arrears and the payment of taxes is concerned is the courts of the land and I think it is grossly unfair that citizens of this province cannot stand as candidates nor can they vote for the election of members of school boards simply because they may be in arrears in taxes. Certain publicity has been given recently to certain council members, for instance, who are in arrears in taxes and there are many citizens - I suppose myself, I have been in arrears in taxes from time to time as have all hon. members of this House, for some reason or another, and behind in bills. The simple fact of the matter is, Sir, that we are depriving them of their democratic rights in this regard. So I would like for the minister to relate to that if he would, please.

Sir, another point that I would like to bring up at this time is the services to school boards as far as the salaries of teachers and superintendents are concerned. Last year the vote in this particular head was \$55,700,000 and this year it is \$64 million, a difference of plus \$8 million. Now, Sir, this increase in the vote for the salaries of teachers and superintendents will just barely cover, number one, the normal yearly increments that are paid to teachers and it will also just barely cover the raise in salaries that individual teachers would expect to have as a result of their increased qualifications. Sir, this additional \$8 million will not increase, number one, the overall salaries of teachers. I understand that the teachers are presently negotiating



with the government for the purposes of salary increases. Neither, Sir, will it reduce the student-teacher ratio, although the Minister of Finance, I believe in his budget speech, suggested that this thing would be dealt with in the year coming, not this year.

Now, Sir, what I am concerned about is not so much that we will not have an immediate increase in teachers salaries or an immediate decrease in the student-teacher ratio, however desirable these things may be, but what I am concerned about is the press release put out by the hon. Minister of Education just a few days ago. The minister, if I can just quote two sections of it, said that related to this (this is the pupil-teacher ratio for the academic year beginning 1974) the government has decided to amend irrelevant regulations to allow an additional year of grace to school boards before the number of teachers need be reduced when enrollment decreases in a particular are due to natural causes.

Now, Sir, most school boards can see the wisdom of this and can see the meaning of it but, Sir, there is a second part to this particular release that a number of school board members have told me is most confusing to them. This does not mean that the school boards will be allowed to retain the same number of teacher salary units in a school if its enrollment decreases significantly as a result of school reorganization or administrative decisions of the board, such as a redefinition of attendance zones. Now, Sir, it has come to my attention from a number of school boards that this is extremely confusing. Sir, what we have is a situation like this: If you have a school board that has five say one room schools or five extremely small schools, and we have a number of school board areas that have a number of school board areas that have this kind of a situation, and each one of these schools have something like thirty-eight students per school, each one of these schools are allowed to have two teachers, which gives a total of ten

teachers who can be employed under that particular school board because of these five existing small schools.

Now at the very present time many school boards are in the process of phasing out such schools and they are bussing these students now into larger, central, all-grade schools or regional high schools or junior high schools. Consequently, Sir, when this happens that school board finds that in replacing these ten teachers, according to the salary unit regulations, only five or six teachers can be employed by that school board in place of the original ten teachers. Consequently most school boards in this province today, as a result of even the amendments that the minister mentioned, will end up having to reduce the number of teachers employed by these school boards and consequently, Sir, we will have during this coming year a layoff of teachers from some of the school boards in this province.

Sir, a principal of a junior

high school just last year said that teachers should take very strong action, including strikes if necessary, to lower the present student ratio. Sir, the year before these same teachers went on strike for salaries and a suggestion was made by a prominent educator in this province, just one year ago, that this year the teachers should strike for the good of our students.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is ridiculous.

MR. ROWE, F.B. What is ridiculous? I am not talking about whether it is ridiculous or not, Sir, I am simply pointing out the fact that there are prominent educators -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F. B. I never heard the honourable member a year or so ago saying how ridiculous or any honourable member on the other side of the House saying how ridiculous it was for teachers to be striking for salary increases. As a matter of fact they were aided and abated by some of the honourable members on the other side at that time. They were encouraged but now all of a sudden the wheel is turned fully around and we have a statement from the honourable for -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F. B. I did not say any such thing and the honourable minister knows full well that he is twisting the facts and he is twisting words.

AN HON. MEMBER: I am just asking a question.

MR. ROWE, F. B. I did not say any such thing. I am merely pointing out that there is a prominent educator in this province who last year suggested that the year before they struck for higher salaries, and this year, for the good of the students, they should strike in order to get a lower student ratio. I am just pointing out the seriousness of the situation, Sir. The Minister of Finance knows full well that this is exactly what I am doing.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Mr. Chairman, the honourable members of this opposition are not responsible for formulating nor implementing government policy. It is the honourable members on the other side who are responsible for doing this. It is cheap, childish, cynical, simple-mindedness for them to ask honourable members on this side of the House whether or not they agree with such action.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Ask the Minister of Finance why he changed his mind this year from last year? Last year he was all in favour of it.

MR. ROWE, F. B. The honourable the Minister of Finance has about-faced, on just about everything he stood for, over the past two years.

MR. NEARY: A default in credibility.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudibility.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Oh, yes, where was the honourable Minister of Finance, he was not down on the steps of the Confederation Building yesterday? And neither was the opposition inciting a riot. Yesterday the honourable Leader of the Opposition took pains to point out to students that they should use every legal available means to state their case. Both the honourable Leader of the Opposition and myself took pains to point out to the students what the rules of the House were with respect to the waving of placards and with respect to conversation in the gallery.

Two years ago the honourable minister would have loved to see a riot in the galleries. All of a sudden, he is pure and simple, Mr. Clean.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The subject under discussion is not relevant to the topic which you started, from the beginning here. The subject is not relevant to what you started out to discuss in regards to teachers. It is the feeling of the chair that you continue and that you have the right to be heard in silence.

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

Another point that I would like the honourable Minister of Education to relate to is this whole business of transportation of school children to the schools. Sir, last year the vote for this particular heading was \$6,300,000 ( rounded off), this year it is \$6,900,000 an increase of only one-half million dollars.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F. B. I did not say any such thing.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Mr. Chairman, if I have to be continually badgered in this House of Assembly while I am trying to make a few points, make no wonder I get off the main topic every now and then. Now, Sir, I ask this simple question, do I have the right to be heard in silence or do I not? The honourable the Minister of Finance will have plenty of time during this debate to stand up and make his weak points -

MR. CROSBIE: He is very touchy. He is very touchy.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the story? Am I going to have the right to be heard in silence or do I have to squelch the honourable Minister of Finance again.

AN HON. MEMBER: If he cannot stand the heat.

MR. ROWE, F. B. I love the heat. I love the heat.

Now, Sir, number one, I did not say that there was a decrease last year. I said there was probably a decrease in the rate of increase, which is a totally different thing. I did not say there was a decrease. The vote last year was almost exactly the same as the year before. There is an increase this year of \$590,000.

But, Sir, the only point that I would like to make is that school boards have informed me that this is simply not enough money to operate the school buses, particularly in the rural areas of our province, in Northern Newfoundland and in Labrador. We have to take consideration of a safety factor as far as the operation of these school buses are concerned.

Sir, the formula announced by the original Minister of Education last year did not take into consideration to the extent that it should have the whole business of population density, the road conditions in the various areas and the weather conditions. Now, Sir, what I am suggesting is that the government should underwrite the total cost of school bus transportation as was the original policy, under the previous administration.

Now, Sir, the reason why the administration does not want to do that is that they realize that there may possibly be an abuse of the formula under these circumstances. Sir, surely the school boards of this province can be trusted to do a reasonably

MR. F. ROWE: job in the organization of school bus transportation in this province and they can be trusted that the situation will not be abused to too great an extent.

So I would like for the minister to indicate whether or not there is any possibility of reinstating the original policy of the administration and that is to have the government underwrite the total cost of school bus transportation because we are going to end up with a very serious situation in this province if we continue to give school boards an inadequate amount of money for the proper and safe operation of school buses in this province.

Sir, another point that I would like the honourable minister to relate to when we are dealing with the estimates is this whole business of operational grants.

The operational grant this year was increased by an amount of \$1,044,000 and once again, Sir, because of the severe winter, the use, consumption of fuel oil by the various school boards, the great number of broken sewer lines and the thawing of water lines that had to be undertaken in many schools, and due to the increased labour costs, many of the maintenance personnel that are employed by school boards have had raises in their salaries over the last couple of years and consequently the operational expenditure of school boards has risen dramatically over the past couple of years and we have not had a proportionate increase in the operational grants to these school boards.

Another thing, Sir, is this whole business of DREE schools. These DREE schools are basically a good thing but it imposes a great burden on school boards because the school boards are responsible, obviously, for operating these DREE schools and consequently this is another reason for an additional burden as far as the operation of schools are concerned, and we have not had a proportional increase in the operational grants.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Sir, this whole business of erection and equipment of schools: The vote, as I understand it, for services to school boards for the erection and equipment of schools is identical to what it was last year - \$8 million - with the exception of the grant which came from the Department of DREE for the erection and building of some of the DREE schools.

I think that we have come to the point where this administration or any administration has to take the bull by the horns. We got a situation now where we have many school boards who simply do not have enough money for capital expenditure. Sir, to give an example, educational authorities have estimated that Newfoundland schools requirements in the period to 1975 will cost in the vicinity of \$70 million for about 2,000 new classrooms, 1,200 classrooms will be required in so-called non DREE areas at a cost of more than \$32 million. An estimated \$38 million is needed and has begun to be spent in DREE special areas to build between 700 and 800 other classrooms.

Sir, the St. John's Roman Catholic School Board is in desperate need of three additional schools capable of accommodating 600 students each but, according to the Chairman, Aiden Woodford, the school board has borrowed to the limit of its capacity and is presently \$7 million in debt. "At present," Mr. Woodford says, "we have three new schools under construction and this will lessen the problem of over-crowding but the only solution is construction of three additional schools that can accommodate 600 students each. However, the board does not have the money necessary to undertake such construction."

Educational authorities suggested that they needed \$70 million extra up to 1975, this means that they need approximately \$23 million per year.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Okay, the total expenditure capital from governmental



MR. F. ROWE: sources, both provincial and federal this year, quite correctly, this is what I said, that the provincial grant was \$8 million, precisely the same as it was last year with the exception of the fact that there is a grant coming through the Department of DREE.

But it has been stated by authorities that \$23 million is needed for new construction. Now that is not taking into consideration the fact that school boards, like the Roman Catholic School Board here in St. John's or the Avalon Roman Catholic School Board, is \$7 million in debt and much of the money that they are receiving from governmental sources is used to service the debt. That \$8 million that is being passed out to the school boards this year will not go for new construction. It will not go for new construction.

AN HON. MEMBER: To the debt.

MR. F. ROWE: Most of it or a huge quantity of it will go for servicing the debt. This is why I mentioned, Sir, to the honourable Minister of Finance, when John Turner announced \$24 million for this province through an adjustment in the equalization formula, that this money should go directly into education in order to write off the debts of the school board, so that money granted from the provincial authorities and the federal authorities for capital expenditure and education can go for the purpose intended, that is capital construction.

Now, Sir, what does all this lead up to? Where is the revenue coming from? From school boards, number one, from the provincial authorities, to the tune of \$8 million, from federal authorities, that is approximately \$11 million, coming from DREE, the other source. Sir, there are a couple of other sources, this whole business of assessment and the establishment of school tax authorities.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Sir, school tax authorities, as far as I am concerned, is a last ditch desperate attempt, a very inefficient means to collect revenue for expenditures on education.

School tax authorities are having great difficulties in collecting money from people through poll taxes or assessments or company taxes or what have you.

Sir, for instance, at a recent meeting with the Provincial School Tax Authority and the Minister of Education, the items for discussion were things such as this - the collection of school tax from recipients of social assistance, the possible collection of school tax from recipients of social assistance. Should this be done? Question number one, and question number two, how is it to be done? Number three - to what extent should it be done?

Another topic for discussion was payroll deduction of the poll tax from government employees. How, and how much? Another topic - the institution of property taxation for school tax purposes in additional communities, a very, very controversial subject. Another thing - the imposition of poll taxes on owners of businesses or other properties where no property assessments are available. Another topic for discussion - the imposition of poll tax on occupants of tax-exempt property where grants in lieu of property taxes are paid. Another topic - the collection of school tax from recipients of manpower allowances for attending vocational or upgrading schools. The inspection of employers' payroll records by school tax authorities - should we have this or should we not?

Sir, if ever there were a controversial and a difficult method of collecting revenue for purposes of education, surely school tax authorities must be one of the most controversial, one of the most difficult, one of the most inefficient means of

MR. F. ROWE: collecting such revenue. Sir, on top of that it can be very unfair and certainly inequalities or inequities result.

Nobody can tell me that a school tax authority established in St. John's has an identical capacity to pay taxes as a school tax authority established say on the Great Northern Peninsula where you have a great amount of unemployment, where

the assessment of property is a difficult thing, where simply the capacity to pay taxes is not at all the same and we will have gross inequalities of educational opportunity if money were to revert back to school tax authorities according to the capacity of school tax authorities to pay.

Sir, there is a definite need for financing of education by the government itself. The Provincial Government should take immediately, not in one or two or three years time, the full responsibility for financing education in this province.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Where is the money coming from?

MR. F. ROWE: Now, this, therein lies the problem. You might say: "Where is the money coming from anyway?" No matter what system of collection of revenue for purposes of education we establish in this province, whether it is school board assessments, whether it is the establishment of school tax authorities, whether there is a Provincial School Tax Authority or whether the government accepts full responsibility for it, no matter what system we have - the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing asked where the money comes from. It comes from your pocket. It comes from my pocket. It comes from the pockets of the people of this province. That is where the money comes from. Therefore, what should we do?

The government under these circumstances - since no matter what system of collection is established, the money ultimately comes from the pockets of the people - should establish the most efficient, streamlined, non-controversial, equitable and fair system that you can establish. The only system that qualifies according to these descriptions that I just gave is for the government to establish a Provincial School Tax Authority or (why, you can call it that) the government accept full responsibility for collecting money for purposes of education in this province. Now, obviously this will take a bit of study. What do you do? Do you put a couple of more percentage points on the sales tax? I do not know whether that

the matter is that I said that no matter what system you use for collection for purposes of education in this province, the money comes from the peoples' pockets anyway. I am saying that the most fair, equitable, streamlined and efficient means of doing this is to make the government fully responsible for it.

Well, if you know all about that, Mr. Chairman, why does the government not, now that they are in power, simply abolish all school tax authorities? I have been talking with members of school boards and they would love to see the abolition of school tax authorities in this province and have the government accept full responsibility for financing education. Sir, we can get into that in greater detail a little later on.

Now, Sir, I would like to - this is the only place that I can bring this up - I would like to get into this whole business of assisting the poor parents of this province to pay for some aspects of education of their children in elementary and primary school. Sir, I would like to trace developments over the past year or so with respect to assisting the needy mothers in our province. Sir, I do not know if I should ask for a ruling on this. I realize that there is no vote for mothers' allowance. Is there a head there.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: There is a head there.

MR. F. ROWE: There is a head there. So, I am well within the rules to discuss this particular topic.

Sir, an editorial in a daily newspaper on August 16, 1972 states that Premier Moores has taken the right course in taking a second look at the proposal to drop mothers' allowance. The proposal should not have been made in the first place and should not have been allowed to be caught up in the middle of a political rankle. The truth is that the mothers' allowance is very useful to most mothers in this province, not all mothers but most mothers. They need it, especially at the beginning of the school year when there are extra

expenses to be met and every cent counts. Those who argue that the allowance does not count likely have never been in a position where they had to search for a dollar to take care of extras. Anyone that has not known need can hardly be expected to understand what the mothers' allowance means, meager though it may seem to be. Our advise to Mr. Moores is to reinstate the allowance and do it now in time for the new school year, especially since the federal governments proposed new family income plan has gone astray. Sir, we still do not have this programme implemented.

Sir, on August 30, 1972, there was a delegation of mothers in to meet the honourable the Premier and the heading of this item in the newspaper was, "Mothers get commitment. New school allowance scheme being considered by Cabinet." This was in August of last year, Sir, and I might point out that this was just prior to one by-election in Labrador South. Shortly afterwards the entire group of mothers and children were invited into the large Cabinet room where the Premier announced something would have to be done. A loud outburst of applause greeted his announcement that the Cabinet was to consider a proposal offered by Social Services and Rehabilitation Minister, Tom Hickey, and that the government would take a position on the issue before the end of the week. Sir, I do not know whether this is misleading or not, whether this is misrepresentation, whether this is trickery. I am just asking the question. Is it? Just prior to a by-election in Labrador South, Peddle says, "Mothers allowance should be reinstated." "One of the honourable member's federal colleagues, Ambrose Peddle, M.P. for Grand Falls, White Bay, Labrador, said today that in view of the fact that this programme will not be going through this year, the only honourable thing now for the Provincial Government to do would be to reinstate the mothers allowance." Support, Sir, from one of the federal

colleagues of honourable members on the other side. They will get their answer on Friday. "Moore meets mothers" Sir, I am quoting from a newspaper this is why I am using the name of the honourable the Premier. "The provincial cabinet hopes to have hammered out a new formula for the payment of mothers' allowances only to needy families and to unveil the new programme by Friday." Just before the provincial bye-election, Sir, in Labrador South. "Premier Moores gave this assurance to a group of St. John's mothers who marched on Confederation Building Tuesday morning, claiming the twenty dollar annual payment per school child was badly needed by poor families.

"Social Services and Rehabilitation Minister Thomas Hickey has a proposal for paying mothers' allowances only to needy families, prepared for cabinet study, and Premier Moores says a decision shall be available by Friday, details of the proposal have not been revealed.

"One honourable member of the opposition, the Liberal Party spokesman on education welcomed the news that the government is reconsidering paying some form of mothers' allowance but he hastened to add that he hoped it was not a partisan move by the Progressive Conservative Party to gain support of the needy families in Labrador South in the bye election on Thursday."

You talk about misrepresentation, talk about being led up the garden path, Sir.

MR. NEARY: It is downright dishonest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member may not talk about misrepresentation or similar unparliamentary words. The honourable member knows full well that these words are quite proscribed by the rules of all Houses of Parliament.

MR. MARSHALL: Sit down while the Chairman is speaking, sit down.

MR. F.B. POWE: Oh shut up. I will abide by the ruling of the honourable Chairman. I was not looking at the honourable Chairman. If he asks me to sit down, I will sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of all honourable members, the rule with regard to standing and sitting is that when the Chairman or the Speaker stands, anybody automatically sits if he happens to be standing at the time. The honourable member's attention is being drawn to the unparliamentary phrases that he is uttering and perhaps the honourable member would like to rephrase some of the things he has said.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I ask this honourable House, is this not misrepresentation? Is this an honourable thing for the honourable the Premier and his honourable ministers to do just a day or so before an election? Is this not leading the people of Newfoundland up the garden path?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. F.B. ROWE: I am asking a question. Premier Moores again; "Protest march of mothers to greet Premier Moores."

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh my!

MR. F.B. ROWE: Oh it hurts, Mr. Chairman, it hurts.

Mr. W. N. Rowe: Smarting under that.

MR. F.B. ROWE: "Mrs. Johnson says that the Premier broke his word. Premier Moores said that while the government will not reinstate the mothers' allowance, it will initiate a study of the needs of low income families in this province. He said the study is a priority item for his government and will be handled by the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation." Backtracking, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: Who is their clipping service?

MR. F.B. ROWE: Oh listen who is speaking, Mr. Chairman, the king of the clippers himself. He used to have it passed in by the truck load...

MR. W.N. ROWE: Peckford got arthritis from clipping out newspapers.

MR. CROSBIE: I never had a clipping service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The honourable member from White Bay South, a veteran of this House, should realize that he is to refer to honourable members by the district which they represent and not by



their surnames.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I am sorry, Sir, I forgot.

AN HON. MEMBER: He was carried away.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Outraged, I was outraged.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Back on or front on it is the same answer, no mothers' allowance. September 13 - "The Premier said that the \$3.6 million saved the treasury by cancelling the mothers' allowance is being used to improve the educational programme."

MR. NEARY: Where? I would like to know where?

MR. F.B. ROWE: I would like to know where the \$3.6 million are in this estimate for improving the educational programme, when we have had an obvious policy of retrenchment as far as expenditures in education are concerned.

"Premier Moores promised that something would be done, Mrs. Evans reminded Mr. Carter. He made this commitment when we met him in the cabinet room and presented him with the names of 5,000 mothers who signed the petition saying the programme should be reinstated.

"As late as yesterday, September 16, 1972, as late as yesterday it was being reviewed and we had for many reasons virtually decided to reinstate the programme for this year," said Mr. Moores, "but yesterday afternoon, Thursday, I made a decision which even though unpopular I feel is right and that is that the programme will not carry on this year nor in the future."

Sir, I cannot describe this kind of tactic without using unparliamentary language. I simply read it into the record to show the hypocrisy of this administration when dealing with the good, the common good of the people of this province. I would like for the honourable Minister of Education to point out a number of things, since the honourable minister is responsible for the welfare of children seeking a primary, elementary or high school education in this province. (1) can he point out specifically in his estimates where the \$3.6 million saved by throwing out the mothers' allowance

is being used to help education in this province? The Premier said definitely that the \$3.6 million will go into the education estimates.

I would also like to know, Sir, what the status of that special study is, "To study the requirements of the needy mothers in this province?" This new programme.

AN HON. MEMBER: New programme?

MR. F.B.POWE: No, that is the study now, the study.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, the study.

MR. F.B. ROWE: I would also like to know, from the honourable Minister of Education, what the status of this new programme is that was to be announced by the original honourable the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation. So much for the mothers' allowance.

Junior colleges, Sir. I am not quite clear on this, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to know, is there is a vote at all for the construction of the junior college in Corner Brook during this coming year? I am totally confused as a result of the statement made by the honourable the Premier and now that I look at the estimates, as to what is the status of the community college, particularly in view of some statements that have been made by the Mayor of Corner Brook.

There is one thing that I cannot fathom at all and that is how the honourable the Premier can go gallivanting about this province making announcements about the construction of a junior college in Corner Brook and a community college in Stephenville without having defined a definite policy with respect to education in these particular areas. What is the policy of the administration with respect to junior and community colleges? I was astounded when I was doing some research on my private members' bill with respect to educational facilities in Stephenville. For instance, there is the vocational school in Stephenville Crossing (the honourable the Chairman can correct me because he may be a little more familiar with that area than I am) but I believe there is a vocational school in

Stephenville Crossing, there is an adult education centre in Stephenville, there are all kinds of extensions of the university out there in Stephenville, through E.T.V., through live courses, through the extension service and the honourable the Premier has suggested that he is going to stick up a community college in the Stephenville area which will be very - not an extension to the university, mind you, because that is going to go in Corner Brook, but it will be more like the kind of thing where you would take your vocational education and trades education and this type of a thing; when there are many areas in this province that could do with such an institution to a much greater extent than the Stephenville Area.

I am not coming out and saying that no community college should go in Stephenville. For instance, Sir, we have a task force now presently studying human resource development in this province. Presumably, they will come out in August with some sort of a policy with respect to, amongst other things, the direction of post-secondary education in this province, community and junior

colleges.

But before this report has come out, Sir, the Premier is going around the province caving in completely to political pressure from a certain area, did not have the guts to meet the people out there in Corner Brook without the announcement, so got up at the Chamber of Commerce meeting and announced a junior college for Corner Brook.

Sir, if one looks at the map of Newfoundland one can quite easily see that probably Corner Brook is not necessarily the most reasonable place to stick a community colleges. Number one, will the Minister of Education, before he gets to location, try to indicate to the people of Newfoundland what the policy of this administration is with respect to community and junior colleges. Will the minister define what a community college is and what a junior college is? Because, Sir, the more I look at reports from the Gander Conference, from people interested in education in this province, the more that I am convinced that we do not want extensions of this university in this province. We do not want extensions only. Now let us get this perfectly clear, perfectly clear.

MR. CROSBIE: Try again.

MR. ROWE, F. B. I will repeat exactly what I said; we do not want only physical extensions of the university in this province. We need extensions of the university, but we do not want physical buildings in Corner Brook or in Grand Falls or in Labrador or in Burin or anywhere in this province, a building which only contains only university professors,

university courses, university students. In order to meet the needs of education in this province, we need a much broader institution, a community college, a community college which has a university competent built in.

AN HON. MEMBER: A good programme.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Well naturally that goes without saying; a good programme.

Now, Sir, the announcement made by the Premier contradicts that policy. The honourable the Premier says, Mr. Chairman, that there will be a junior college in Corner Brook and a community college somewhere else in Stephenville. What we need, Sir, I maintain is a community college system and I will get into that in my private members' resolution. So what I am calling for, Mr. Chairman, from the Minister of Education, is a definition of policy as far as further direction of higher education in this province is concerned. A specific definition of community colleges or junior college or what their policy is going to be. I cannot see for the life of me how the government can go on sticking up structures all over this province, which they are not going to do anyway, Mr. Chairman, in the coming year, but give the impression they are sticking up structures all over this province without defining what their policy is in this regard. I think it is incumbent upon the minister to say what that policy is, in this House, during the consideration of his estimates.

Sir, I went in and I looked at the map of Newfoundland and Labrador the other day and I looked at the density of population and assuming that we had a community college system developing in this province, you know what I found out? It does not take a task force or any great amount of brains to figure this out, that if we had a community college system develop in this province probably Corner Brook nor Grand Falls nor Gander nor Stephenville are the most logical places to stick up these particular institutions. The main reason for locating a community college in a particular area of this province should be accessibility on the part of the students in the various parts of our province, the accessibility of that particular institution to these students.

Sir, I found out, for instance, I mean this is just my opinion now and it obviously could or would or should not be the opinion of other people but it certainly bears consideration before the honourable

the Premier says to the Chamber of Commerce in Corner Brook, "Okay boys take it easy, you have your college here in Corner Brook, that satisfies my district, that satisfies Corner Brook." Before we have these types of announcements, Sir, we should at least consider where the most logical location is and if we have a community college system in this province, which I submit we should have, who is to say that Corner Brook or Grand Falls or Gander or Grand Bank or any of these places are the best locations just because they are the biggest population centres? Who is to say that people in Grand Falls could not drive to a community college outside of Grand Falls? They have perfectly good roads in the Grand Falls Area. Probably they should be given a bit of the taste of what other people have to endure. Why should they not drive over a nice paved highway and probably one mile of a gravel road to get to a community college?

Sir, in looking at the map, I came to the conclusion that probably a community college in Stephenville, or Port aux Basques would be a nice location. Why could not the people of Stephenville drive down to Port aux Basques so that the people of Rose Blanche could drive over to a community college and all those other communities along the South Coast, why should they not be able to drive over to Port aux Basques to attend a community college?

What good, Sir, is a community college or a junior college in Corner Brook going to do the people on the southern half of the Great Northern Peninsula? The most logical location for a community college, Sir, on the West Coast, to serve the Great Northern Peninsula, is in a place like Deer Lake.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F. B. It does not really matter. Mr. Chairman, it would not be bad to have a quorum in the honourable House while I am speaking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the clerk count the House, please. We have a quorum.

Mr. Chairman, the point that I am trying to make here is that before the Premier goes running around the province making announcements about structures being built some very careful consideration should be given to the location of such institutions. I gave as an example that Deer Lake seems like a very logical location for a community college so that the people of Corner Brook could drive to Deer Lake. That is not a tremendous drive. The people of Corner Brook could drive to Deer Lake to attend classes and this would enable people up the Great Northern Peninsula for a certain distance to drive down and attend such a community college. Probably the community college should be located somewhere like Wiltondale, I do not know. Just because there is not an actual centre of population in Wiltondale does not mean that there could not be a community college there, because the main reason that you should have a community college at any specific location is accessibility, accessibility on the part of the many people in a region. Just because Corner Brook or Deer Lake or St. John's or Gander or Grand Falls is the centre of population is no reason why a community college should go in that area.

Mr. Chairman, I looked at the Great Northern Peninsula and to the horror of my honourable leader I came to the final conclusion that a community college should go in Plum Point.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Plum Point, and this could serve the St. Anthony Area and it could serve the Roddickton Area, the Englee Area, the Main Brook Area and it could go south and serve the area down as far as Port au Choix, Port Saunders and Hawkes Bay.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Brig Bay?

MR. ROWE, F.B. Brig Bay. I think the people of Brig Bay might support that. It is not too far away.

Sir, as far as Central Newfoundland is concerned, a logical location in my estimation would be a place like Lewisporte and this could serve adequately the Grand Falls Area, the Gander Area, the Bishop's Falls Area, all of New World Island and all of Fogo Island

Instead of bringing all the people in off the islands, all the way into Grand Falls or Gander, why should the people of Gander not get aboard their cars and take a leisurely little drive down to Lewisporte to attend classes. I am putting this forth, Mr. Chairman, quite seriously, that before this government goes around rip, ranting and roaring about sticking up junior colleges and community colleges in Corner Brook, some very serious consideration should be given to location on an overall scheme as far as the establishment of junior colleges.

So I am hoping, Sir, that the Minister of Education will indicate what the policy of his administration is (1) respecting whether we are going to have junior colleges or community colleges and what the definition of these things are. We need the definition. And also what the flight plan of this administration is with respect to the establishment of junior colleges; (1) when and (2) where. The least that this administration can do is put that thing forth.

Now, Sir, it might be very interesting to know that if we had one-half of the present university population in Newfoundland, one-half of the present university population in Newfoundland is composed of the first two years of university. Now supposing we had a



number of extensions of the university established in say six centers during the term of office of this administration and the majority of that one-half of the student population at the university ended up in these junior colleges or community colleges at the South Coast, the West Coast, Central Newfoundland, Labrador and what have you, the Northeast Coast, that means that the university population of the main campus here would be cut virtually in half. That may or may not be a good thing. I am dead serious about that.

Sir, I am now going to quote from the "Financial Post" for October 29, 1972, an editorial, "A certain amount of hesitancy, "(it is called) "for all the hugh outpouring of money into facilities for higher education - it is now abundantly clear that Canada's universities are approaching zero growth.

"Preliminary estimates of this year's full-time student enrollment show that the increase from last year is a bare one-half of one per cent. Final figures, available in December, are likely to reveal that even this tiny increment is no more. Outside the Ontario and Atlantic Region, there is an absolute drop in student numbers.

"These facts from a telephone survey of registrars of forty-three universities (with ninety per cent of Canadian student enrollment) make all the more significant a report on university dropouts released by Statistics Canada last month. It states that there is a high correlation of shortfalls in expected enrollment with the dropout phenomenon. The data clearly reveal that the optimism of the 1960's has now been replaced by a certain amount of hesitancy on the part of young Canadians."

Hesitancy is hardly the word. It is more like an exodus. "The percentage of students in first, second or third year university dropping out averages 9.2 per cent nationally. It ranges from a high of more than twenty per cent in British Columbia to a low of about five per cent in Ontario. The answers are still to be analysed. But one overall

result is clear: there is no single answer. The quality of university teaching and course content is cited often as a lack of financial aid. And there are positive reasons - opportunities to travel or a rewarding job offer - as well as negative ones."

Now, Sir, it might be worth pointing out that there is a tendency now here toward a reduction in the rate of growth of universities and one of the reasons is the lack of financial aid, and this has been further reinforced as a result of the Minister of Finance's budget. Sir, we are extremely fortunate in this province in one sense. We did not have the money over the past twenty-three years to go wholesale into setting up university structures. We did not build a great enough university on our campus, as far as physical structure is concerned. We did not have the money to set up all sorts of regional colleges or even a second university on the West Coast and, Sir, in retrospect that might be a good thing because we may find, as a result of the retrenchment policy of the present administration, a reassessment on the part of university students as to whether or not they even want to go to the university and, as a result of building branches of the universities throughout this province, we may find in three or four years time that we have a nice big campus up there with no students for it. I think this is a real possibility.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Well, that might very well be, but I think the hon. member for St. John's Centre will admit that that is not just the case for Newfoundland and if it were, of course, we could quite easily blame it on the present administration. This is universal. This is world-wide, not just Canadian, not just North American. It is world-wide.

So, Sir, the point obviously that I am trying to make is that there is a great need for the hon. Minister of Education to get up in this House during the consideration of his estimates

and define specifically what the administration's policy is with regards to higher education in this province. Students'

Residences: Sir, in November of last year it was stated that the provincial government hope to be in a position to call tenders for construction of ten students' residences for Memorial University at such an early date that construction can start early in the new year, I would like the minister to indicate in his remarks whether there is a vote for that specifically in his estimates or not. Engineering school , Sir, I would like for the Minister of Education to indicate who is going to service the short-term borrowing by the university for the purpose of building the new engineering school. I would like for the minister to indicate who it is that is going to service the short term borrowings that the university is getting into for the specific purpose of building a new engineering school. There was an announcement made there last August that the government was going to allow a situation where the university could get into short-term borrowing for the specific purpose of building an engineering school and I would like to know who it is that is going to service that particular debt.

I would also like if the hon. Minister of Education could give some indication as to the progress of talks on this whole business of working out a collective bargaining agreement between the Newfoundland Teachers Association and the Newfoundland Government. I do not want to jeopardize any negotiations that are going on by getting into a long harangue on that but I would like the minister to give some sort of a progress report, if he could, on that particular topic. Also, Mr. Chairman, in closing here, on this part of the debate anyway, I would like for the Minister of Education to give some indication as to what plans the present administration is making with respect to the special training of our Newfoundland people so that they can become employed on the offshore mineral

and oil exploration endeavours around our province. Also, Sir, what special plans are being made for the purpose of training people to work in such areas as oil refineries, because I have a funny feeling that the Province of Nova Scotia is getting the jump on this province as far as setting up special institutes for the training of people in these particular areas.

Sir, I will have further comments in dealing with the various votes under consideration, but that will just do for an opener, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a few words -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, if the minister wants to go up and down like a jack-in-the-box we have dozens and dozens of questions to put to him.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that the hon. gentleman did ask for some specific information on the student aid and the situation with respect to the university. It is up to him and his colleagues whether he would like to have that now or if the hon. gentleman wants to go ahead.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor and I demand that the rules of the House be followed. Do I or do I not have the floor?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member of course has the floor. It is a general courtesy between members, as done by the Minister of Education, to request the floor but, of course, it is in order for the hon. member to refuse it.

MR. NEARY: I am not refusing. Mr. Chairman, that is not the proper way to put it. I was on my feet, had the floor when the hon. minister interrupted me, Sir, and according to the rules of this House he is not

MR. NEARY: supposed to do it. I am not refusing -

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, no one has the floor until one is recognized by the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees. The Chairman of Committees has not recognized anyone and the custom is that if somebody speaks from the other side, that the speaker from this side should follow, and the Minister of Education should now follow to answer this garrulous series of remarks that we have heard.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is a very legitimate point of order because no member does have the floor, technically speaking, until granted that privilege or recognized by the Chair. On this particular occasion neither speaker was recognized. However, had the Chair to rule on who did have the Chair, it would have to rule - this is hypothetical now and not really necessary to adjudicate on it but if the question had to come for a ruling, the honourable the member for Bell Island would have been recognized.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance is wrong again. He should go down and stay in his office so we can get some work done in this House, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of points that I want to raise. This one has to do, Sir, with the training of qualified dietitians in this province. I do not know if members in the House are aware, Sir, but there is a very serious shortage of dietitians in Newfoundland. Qualified dietitians have to be brought in from outside the province.

This means, Mr. Chairman, many of the places that are serving food, especially the large institutions, Sir, and in some instances hospitals, do not have the services of dietitians. I think, Sir, that the time has come in this province when a little more emphasis should be placed on training more students in this field and in the field of home economics and related

MR. NEARY: subjects.

There has been a change in our philosophy, Sir, I suppose in the last few years, regarding education. I think that the Department of Education, when it is considering changes, I hope will reach right down to the classroom level, Sir, that the minister and the department will lay a little more emphasis on financing of home economic programmes in our schools, Sir.

I would like to see also in this connection, I think the two things are probably related, that a little more emphasis be placed on consumer education. Sir, I do not believe there is a programme at Memorial University, and I am subject to correction on this matter, there is no programme at Memorial University, so I am told, to educate home economists and I believe, Sir, that this is long overdue.

As I said in the beginning, Mr. Chairman, many positions of employment in this province are going begging for home economists to fill posts and I think, Sir, that the Newfoundland people are the poorer because of this. I would like to see a little more emphasis placed on this in the curriculum of the Department of Education and I would like to hear the minister's comments on this matter when he rises to participate in this discussion.

Now, Sir, there is another matter that is probably a little more important than the one I just raised, and that is in connection, Mr. Chairman, with the use of alcohol and drugs in this province. Now that we are on the 1973-1974 budget of the Department of Education, Sir, I would like to ask the minister what steps his department is taking to lay more emphasis on the abuse of drugs and alcohol that is getting progressively worse in this province, Sir.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to deal with

MR. NEARY: very serious matters effectively, our main focus has to be on education. Our main thrust, Sir, has to be on prevention and rehabilitation. The Alcohol and Drug Addiction Foundation of Newfoundland, Sir, are doing magnificent work in this regard.

The Alcohol and Drug Addiction Foundation of Newfoundland is reaching a substantial number of young people with education on drug abuse by involving the teachers in drug abuse education. But it is only a beginning, Mr. Chairman. I do not think, even with the good work that the Alcohol and Drug Addiction Foundation of Newfoundland is doing, that they have yet reached enough of the students, and not enough teachers have been involved. I hope in the coming year that the minister will be able to tell us, Sir, that more teachers, more students, more parents will be involved in a programme in the schools, that more groups will become involved in the setting up of facilities, for instance for the problem drinker.

The need for these facilities, Mr. Chairman, is great. The Alcohol and Drug Addiction Foundation of Newfoundland has set up an excellent movement, in my opinion.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, while the Minister of Finance is talking out loud in this House, Sir, I cannot carry on my speech. I am asking Your Honour to send the Minister of Finance back to his own seat in this House before I can continue my speech, Sir. These are pretty serious matters we are dealing with.

Mr. Chairman, would the minister come back to his -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The honourable gentleman has taken his seat.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance has taken his seat in the House. He is not supposed to be up there in the Clerk's seat.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure he can. Anybody.

MR. NEARY: Well I will continue my speech, Sir, when the Minister of Finance is sent back to his seat or some other

MR. NEARY: seat in the House. I do not care where he sits.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, any member of the House, on either side, has the right to sit and consult with the Chairman or with one of the officers of the House or the Clerk or Law Clerk that is my understanding. I await Your Honour's ruling.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, if the Minister of Finance want to consult with Your Honour or Clerk of the House, then go out in the office and do it, because he is distracting the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member's point of order is, I do not think it is substantiated in any of the Standing Orders, certainly not in our Standing Orders and probably not in any of the authorities. The honourable the Minister of Finance has every right to consult with the Chair whenever he wishes as does any honourable of the House.

If the honourable the Minister of Education wish — I have recognized the honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. NEARY: For what, Mr. Chairman? For what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the member for Bell Island relinquished.

MR. NEARY: No I did not relinquish my seat.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It is the Chairman who will have to decide that.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour that is what I am saying. The Minister of Finance is distracting His Honour and he cannot control order in the House. Send the minister back to his seat or go out into the office and discuss business with him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is being quite irrelevant to the debate. The honourable member has relinquished the floor.

MR. NEARY: Favouritism in this House, Sir, favouritism.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the member has relinquished the floor, however —

MR. NEARY: I did not relinquish the floor, Mr. Chairman, I raised a point of order and the Minister of Education was speaking on a point of order. If the Minister of Finance is going to sit there and



discuss business with the Chairman, then I would suggest that he do it in silence so that I can carry on with my speech. I am dealing with a very serious matter here, Sir, alcohol and drug addiction in this province.

Sorry for the Minister of Finance and a few other millionaires in this province! If you are a millionaire in this province, Mr. Chairman, you are an alcoholic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the member for Bell Island is supposed to be addressing himself to head 6-0101. He has digressed into things that are certainly irrelevant, raised a point of order that was not a point of order, relinquished the floor and has now -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I did not relinquish the floor and I ask Your Honour to withdraw that statement. Who do you think you are, Sir? I did not relinquish the floor. I had no intention. It was a point of order. I did not, I sat down because the Minister of Education wanted to speak on a point of order. It is time we got a bit of common sense in this House, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member from Bell Island intimating that the Chair has no common sense?

MR. NEARY: I was referring to the Minister of Education. I said it is time we got a bit of common sense in this House and the members on the government side stop trying to muzzle debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable the member please resume his place. On numerous occasions the Chair has been challenged. The Chair's impartiality, the credibility, the Chair's common sense, the Chair's competence, the Chair's intelligence and practically any type of adjective or adverb can be described, has been challenged on various occasions by the honourable member for Bell Island. On each of these occasions the Chair has, at least of its own opinion, reacted with sometimes bemusement, at least extended great toleration to the member. However, this toleration eventually will lead to the House itself being held in disrespect. While the Chair may wish to engage in frivolous

debate with the honourable member, it cannot go on indefinitely. The honourable member is directed to and directed in the most strong terms to refrain from these aspersions which he cast with impunity upon the Chair in this honourable House. The honourable member may resume his debate but he is directed to head 6-0101 and he will be as he should be called so far as the rules of relevance are concerned and so far as rules of respect are concerned.

MR. NEARY: Gentleman, the only thing that I can say to that is that I have always abided by the rules of this House, by any decision that Your Honour has made. All I have asked, Mr. Chairman, is that the rules be applied to that side as well as to this side -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the member for Bell Island is again indulging in the device that is practically identified with him, that of the challenging of a point, whether it is in a point of order raised either by other members in the House or by the Chair itself, and attempting to circumvent it by comments that are completely out of order. Now, the honourable gentleman is directed to head 6-0101. The honourable gentleman has the right to be heard in silence but he must be relevant.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, is that what the honourable minister - no, Mr. Chairman, I demand that I be heard in silence. So, I want a ruling on that right away. Mr. Chairman, can I have the rules of the House enforced, please, as far as the Minister of Finance is concerned? Could I have the rules enforced, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the member for Bell Island is due the curtesy that all honourable members are due. He has the right to be heard in silence. This of course does not need to be reiterated by the Chair. It has been said many times today and undoubtedly will be said many times in the future. However, honourable members to my left will have to restrain themselves.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour. Now, Mr. Chairman, I was

talking about the great movement that the Alcohol and Drug Addiction Foundation of Newfoundland have in some of the schools in this province. It is called the Allied Youth Movement. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the Alcohol and Drug Addiction Foundation in the province should be given the necessary financial assistance so that they can expand this movement. Presently I believe, Sir, there are 2,000 young people in this movement, in forty schools in Newfoundland. With more government support, Sir, from the Department of Education, I think this could become a viable avenue to reach all school-age children in this province. I commend this to the Minister of Education, Sir, for consideration in this discussion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with a matter that I could not deal with once before today and that is the matter of the increase in the students' loan at the university. Mr. Chairman, first of all, before I deal with that, I want to deal with a headline in the morning news. I think, Sir, that this headline was unwarranted and uncalled for. I sat in this honourable House yesterday afternoon, Sir, through the whole piece when the students were here and, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the students behaved reasonably well. I sat here and I observed as I do everything that goes on in this honourable House, Sir, whether it be good, bad or indifferent, whether I agree with it or do not agree with it. I am pretty observant in this House. Sir, this is the peoples' House and I was glad yesterday that the galleries were filled with students and I was glad that they behaved themselves the way they did, Sir. In my opinion it was a credit to Newfoundland. You have several hundred students. It was a credit.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, there were several hundred students on the ninth and tenth floor yesterday afternoon. There were at least two hundred on the ninth and I would say there were probably another - well, there were three hundred - the future minister. There

were three hundred and seven by actual count. Well, Sir, that is a fair number of students.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes but it is not two thousand, is it?

MR. NEARY: I am talking about here on the ninth floor and on the tenth floor yesterday afternoon, and I was proud of them.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Now, Mr. Speaker, I never saw such a spectacle in my life.

MR. W. ROWE: On a point of order. It takes two doctors to certify a man as mad in this province. I wonder would the Minister of Health ask his colleague, the Minister of Highways, to come up and attend to the honourable Minister of Finance. He has obviously gone off his head, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is not a point of order.

MR. W. ROWE: No, what is it? It is a point of privilege and protection of the House, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I make a ruling on that point. I am sure that that point does not need a ruling.

MR. NEARY: I know, Mr. Chairman, that this is a very touchy subject for the Minister of Finance and his colleagues in the government, Sir, this matter of student allowances. Sir, as I was saying, I was rather proud yesterday the way these students behaved themselves. They did not come up here to riot. This is the peoples' House, Sir, and they have every right to occupy the peoples' House providing they observe the rules and regulations that apply to the public galleries, which they did, Sir. If there were a little laughing yesterday in the House, it may have been outside of the House. It certainly was not in the House, Mr. Chairman, and therefore, I think that this is a gross exaggeration of what happened in this honourable House yesterday. Big black headline in the morning news, "Students Jeer Speaker". Sir, what will the people across this province think when they look at that? They will think the students

have gone mad; they are all on drugs. They are all hopped up.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is true.

MR. NEARY: It is not true, Mr. Chairman. There was no jeering in the gallery. There was a bit of laughter outside of that door up on the tenth floor, not to much, very little for the crowd that were here, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The mess was on the main floor.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Chairman, that is why we employ janitors in this building.

Mr. Chairman, I think that that big headline in the morning news was unwarranted and unjustified. I do not know if it is unheard of. I have seen headlines for less than that before. Just imagine, "Students Jeer Speaker", "Talks With Crosbie Totally Useless"; if that has been the headline, Sir, "Talks With Crosbie Totally Useless", that would have been the truth. That is not the truth, Sir, "Students Jeer Speaker." Your Honour knows that. If the students had jeered the Speaker, Your Honour would have cleared the galleries. Your Honour did not clear the galleries. He did not have any reason to. I hope that the "Daily News" will correct this wrong impression that has been left. It is another attempt at sensationalism, Sir, and it is not true. If it were true I should be the first one to stand in this House and condemn the students. But there is no way, Sir, that we are to have any semblance of democracy in this honourable House and in the galleries, and I would say that sort of thing has to stop.

The students came up here. They were well behaved. They made their point. They probably did not go away satisfied but we will hear more about that in the future. I hope that the "Daily News" will correct that wrong impression because this paper goes right across Newfoundland, Sir, and the poor little taxpayer, the poor little fisherman with a son or a daughter at the university is saying to himself, "My God, what is happening in there? Have they all gone mad over at that university? What about my poor old son or

April 6, 1973

Tape 1088 (morning)

IB-6

daughter?"

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It now being one of the clock, I do  
leave the Chair until three of the clock this afternoon.

The Committee resumed at 3:00 P.M.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the member for Bell Island,

MR. S. A. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabour the point but before we adjourned for dinner I was dealing with this headline in the "Daily News" and I asked to have the impression that was left corrected because I think it probably left a wrong impression and did a disservice to the students.

Since then, Sir, I have gotten the "Evening Telegram" and the report in the "Telegram" I must say is much better. Now, Sir, arising out of that little demonstration yesterday all sorts of things have happened. The opposition have been accused of playing politics with this matter of an increase in the students' loan.

Sir, may I point out to the committee that estimates of this government are approved in this House and the students at the university, Sir, have no recourse in this instance but to appeal to the House. I do not know what other way they can air their grievance, Sir, but have the matter brought to the attention of the members of the House of Assembly and debated on the floor of this House in a hope, Sir, that the government would reconsider its position. If that is playing politics, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how it can be avoided. We are politicians. We have been asked by the students to take a position on this matter. The opposition is taking the position that we are opposed to the increases in the amounts that students have to borrow and the government have taken an opposite position.

So I would say, Mr. Chairman, it is rather naive of anybody to say that members of this House are playing politics with the students because, in my opinion, Sir, it is not true. And anybody who says otherwise, Sir, in my opinion is either being very naive or is playing politics with this situation himself.

Also, Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Leader of the Opposition, out in front of this building, was invited by the students to say a few words to the couple of thousand students that were gathered

out front. I was there, Sir. I was there and my colleagues were there. I think just about everybody on our side of the House was there. There was nobody there from the government side. I saw the Minister of Social Services, Sir, coming in with his bouncer behind him, elbowing his way in through the front door without stopping to speak to the students. Even if he disagreed with them, as a matter of courtesy, Sir, you think he would have stopped to bid them the time of day. They are honest, decent Newfoundlanders, Sir. There was nobody there as far as I know unless Your Honour was there. I did not see Your Honour standing in the background but I heard Your Honour was there. I would not expect Your Honour to participate in the demonstration because Your Honour is a natural member of this honourable House while he occupies the Chair and if Your Honour did not participate I can understand it. But, Sir, other members of the government side were asked to come out and speak to the students and they declined the offer.

The students were asking the Premier to come out and meet them out front, They were asking for the Minister of Finance, They were asking for the Minister of Education, but they went and hid away, Mr. Chairman. They were hiding. They would not come out and meet the students. It is beneath their dignity, Sir, to come out and meet these young Newfoundlanders who were down here fighting for what they think is right.

Three years ago, Sir, when the Minister of Finance wanted to drum up a little support for the Leadership of the Liberal Party and wanted to drum up a little support in two political campaigns in this

Province, Sir, he did not hesitate to go over to the university.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is drawn to the rule of relevancy again, Head 601 - Education.

MR. NEARY: I will bite my tongue, Mr. Chairman.

Well, Sir, yesterday, as I have indicated, the Leader of the Opposition was invited to speak to this group outside. According to



a report in the "Evening Telegram" today, Sir, here is what the Leader of the Opposition said. "Mr. Roberts spoke briefly outside of Confederation Building and told the students to keep up the fight. 'If you go home and forget it after exams,' he said, 'that will be the end. If you want this to go through you have to fight using all lawful means to do so' (and I underline that word "lawful", Sir.) 'All lawful means to do so.' The opposition spokesman said that when the estimates come up in the House, we will be in there fighting to get the money back to the students." That is precisely what we are doing, Sir. "Following an ovation for the Liberal Leader, the Council of Students Union, President, Wayne Hurley, presented a petition, containing some 1,500 names to Fred Rowe, Opposition Education Critic. Mr. Rowe was to present the petition in the House today." Which he has already done, Sir. "Not content to remain on the steps as the four man delegation went inside to meet with Finance Minister, John Crosbie and

MR. NEARY: Education Minister, Gerald Ottenheimer, the students began filing into the lobby while others made their way to the House of Assembly."

Now, Sir, on CBC today, on the 1:25 p.m. newscast on television, it was reported that the Leader of the Opposition spoke to the group and that the member of the House of Assembly for Bell Island, Steve Neary, addressed the group. This was in connection with criticism that was levelled at the Leader of the Opposition and myself for addressing the group.

Well, Sir, I would have liked to have had the privilege to address that group yesterday but I did not have the honour. I was not invited, Sir, if I had been invited maybe the member for Labrador South would have something to talk about. But I would like for the CBC to correct that story Sir, because I did not address the group of students out in front of this building yesterday.

My colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, and my colleague, the member for St. Barbe North, addressed the group. I did not speak, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Maybe there will be other opportunities to speak to the students before this controversy is all over.

So, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition said a few words and in my opinion, Sir, they were very sensible. There was a lot of sense in what he said.

Lo and behold! Mr. Chairman, today we hear announced on radio and television that the Leader of the Opposition was trying to incite a riot.

MR. MORGAN: So he was.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the honourable member for Bonavista South like to make that charge, Mr. Chairman, so I can deal with it in the House?

MR. ROBERTS: I heard the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South make a statement, Mr. Speaker, he did not have the floor but would he like to make the charge so I can deal with it, please?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion, yesterday as an observer on the main floor of this Confederation Building, that the students were fired up by some means after arrival at the Confederation Building.

My interpretation of how they became fired up and riled up, it was after the Leader of the Opposition addressed them. What he said to them I do not know. I did not hear him. But they did become alive, if you wish, more fired up, rushing into the building, throwing signs around, etc., etc., blocking the main elevator and up the stairs, these kind of things, but only after the Leader of the Opposition addressed the group.

In my personal opinion we were fortunate yesterday not to have had a riot on our hands. I sincerely hope that the remarks made to the students by the honourable Leader, that maybe he could pass along these remarks to the House and maybe we could determine if it did or not instigate the students to become riled up in the way they were yesterday.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member for Bonavista South has paid me the compliment of saying the students appreciated remarks I made. That is fine. He did not have the courage to say openly what he said covertly. We will let that stand.

As for the gentleman for Labrador South, I shall deal with him outside the chambers, in the appropriate way. I do not need to defend myself in here because I made no statements in the House. The statements I made outside stand.

The gentleman from Bonavista South said something sotto voce (v-o-c-e for the Hansard reporters) which he did not have the courage to repeat when I challenged him. We will

MR. ROBERTS: let him stand at that. Fine! Of course he stands on what he said, He made a statement of opinion that I had made a speech which fired up the students. So I did and I would do it again, gladly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, we come not to praise Caesar but to bury him. If we only knew which one over there was Brutus, Mr. Chairman, we should be doing very well.

MR. CROSBIE: Cassius you have to worry about.

MR. ROBERTS: Not me, not the lean and hungry look, Maybe the honourable member for St. John's West has to worry about it or the member for Harbour Main.

But the gentleman from Bonavista South did not have the courage to say, when I challenged him, what he said under his breath, so we will leave it at that for the time being.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this is another example of the low opinion the crowd over on the other side have of the students at the university. I give them more credit myself, Sir.

There was no chance of a riot here yesterday and Mr. Chairman, while we are on that subject, I was so irritated out in front of this building yesterday to see so many police out there, It is a wonder they did not have the helmets on, Sir, Some did have them on. It is a wonder they did not have the air raid shelters so that the people of St. John's can go underground when a group of poor little students come up to Confederation Building to fight for their rights.

You know, Mr. Chairman, there was a detective out there going around with a camera slung around his neck, unknown to the students, taking pictures of the students so that they could be kept on file down in the police station, Sir, listed amongst trouble makers.

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, The point of order is that we are not debating the demonstration yesterday by the students, we are debating the estimates of 601-01. I think we should stand by these and make the points relevant to the debate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this is the only way we can debate this matter. It is under the minister's salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member will permit, the point with reference to education is well taken and is debatable as to whether or not the government's position is right or wrong, However, the rules of relevance can only be stretched so far and points of debate between honourable members as to whether or not a riot was imminent or not imminent is irrelevant to this debate. As I arose I gave way to the honourable member for Bonavista South who wished to make the same point that he made.

The honourable member for Bell Island on at least two occasions this afternoon, has been drawn to the rule of relevancy with regard to 601-01. The honourable member is now drawn to that point again. The honourable member was spoken to at some length by the Chair this morning with regard to relevance and other attendant matters. The honourable member, if he is to address this committee is to address it in a relevant manner.

MR. WM. ROWE: May I ask Your Honour in what way my colleague is being irrelevant to this subhead?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member had listened, I felt that that was quite clear.

MR. WM. ROWE: It is not clear at all, Sir. I asked a question. I do not expect slurs on the question I asked. I am asking because I intend to speak in this debate as well. In what way is my colleague being irrelevant to the subhead under discussion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: While the Chair does not have to answer these questions, I presume it is nevertheless incumbent since the Chair is in effect being challenged to justify a ruling, that in my opinion, was lucidly enough stated. The matter of policemen inside or outside the building is a matter that is discussed under the justice element the Justice Estimates. It is quite irrelevant to a debate on Education.

The matters with which the honourable member for Bell Island is dealing are irrelevant, and if necessary the Chair's ruling can be appealed to the House.

I feel that the Chair can make itself no clearer than that except to say that the honourable member was being irrelevant and the honourable member for White Bay South, well the honourable member for White Bay South is given the benefit of the doubt in that the Chair had not made itself sufficiently clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: I wonder, at this point, if we are going to get to the relevancy of the debate, I think it is upon me at this time to clear up a few points that have been raised, three to be exact.

In the first place, the statement by the honourable member for Bell Island, that I had reported to CBC that he spoke to the students demonstrating yesterday, is correct. I realized, a few minutes after I said it, that what I had said was wrong. I meant to refer to the honourable gentleman from St. Barbe North, it came out. I apologize to the honourable member for Bell Island and I apologize to CBC.

MR. F. ROWE: Why did my remarks incite a riot?

MR. MARTIN: Let me get on to that, Sir. I did not state at any time that anybody was trying to incite a riot. What I said was that with the fervour, pitch at which these people were

MR. MARTIN: operating yesterday, with the emotional state at which they were, it is an emotional issue, it is an emotional issue for me as well as for the students, and I should think for most members of this honourable House, and that for not so much the things that were said yesterday by these honourable gentlemen to the demonstrators but the manner in which they were said, given the fact that it was an emotional state, I think if there had been, for any reason whatsoever, irrespective of whether or not the statements made were inciting or would lead to such an acceleration, whether or not, that it could have been the fact that if it had reached the state of a riot yesterday,

for any reason whatsoever that there could be a very good cause to believe that the statements made beforehand, not so much for what was said but the manner in which they were said, could have been said to lead to that state.

There is one more point that I would like to bring up at this point and that is that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition last night in a public broadcast referred to my frequent absences from debate in this House and that they were becoming noticeable. I have two things to say about that.

MR. ROBERTS: On a point of order! I do not want to cut off the honourable gentleman but he is somewhat irrelevant I submit to the Minister of Education's salary, Sir.

MR. MARTIN: Mind is a point of personal privilege, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whether or not it is a point of personal privilege will be ruled upon by the Chair. The honourable member for Labrador South has the floor.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I understood that points of -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition, the point of privilege takes precedence over all other points. The honourable the member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: I will restate, Sir, this is a point of personal privilege upon which I rise, concerning statements made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition last night on public television when he referred to my frequent absences from debate in this House. I would point out to him, Sir, and to all other honourable members here present and to the people in my district that if I have absented myself from this House it is for two very good reasons. In the first place I have become thoroughly disgusted at times with the tone and tenor of the debate. I do not think it has been a debate in most cases. Secondly, if the previous administration and that



honourable gentleman in particular had done his job while he was in office, then he would not have left things in such a state in my district that I would have to spend my time outside of the House trying to correct.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, may I ask what the point of privilege was? What I said about the honourable gentleman stands. What he says about me is not worthy of reply by me and as for his statements outside the chamber, I have already said that I shall deal with those in another way, in an appropriate manner. I notice he did not have the courage to repeat in the House what he is alleged to have said outside of the House. Again, it is a measure of the honourable gentleman for Labrador South.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I will be delighted too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the member for Labrador South was making a point that was very personal to him and undoubtedly was a matter of great urgency to him. However, the rules of privilege are clear. At this point I do not think it keeps within the precedents with regard to privilege. However, while the remarks may be ruled out of order they nevertheless quite often get into the record as a result of honourable members having raised them. They may nevertheless be out of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order there. It is my submission that the point raised by the honourable member for Labrador South is merely a breach of privilege. On page ninety-eight, section 108 of Beauchesne "Libels on members have also been constantly punished but to constitute a breach of privilege they must concern the character or conduct of members in that capacity. The libel must be based on matters arising, the actual transaction, the business of the House."

The honourable gentleman for Labrador South was libeled in his conduct as a member, by the Leader of the Opposition, on public television last night, the libel being that he was frequently absent from the House when important matters were before the House. That is

clearly a prima facie breach of privilege of the members of the House. The honourable gentleman in my submission is quite right in raising it and the honourable the Leader of the Opposition is quite wrong in these statements.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. First of all there is a question of timeliness. Secondly, Your Honour has told us time and time again; Your Honour has made a ruling and Your Honour will receive only a challenge, will not receive any further argument. The gentleman for St. John's West is obviously challenging Your Honour's ruling.

I feel therefore that on our side of the House we will appeal Your Honour's ruling and we will give the gentlemen on the other side a chance to vote on this, whether they will vote to sustain Your Honour's ruling with respect to the privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With regard to that point raised by both the honourable Leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Finance; the Chair, exercising its right or privilege to make no ruling with regard to certain matters that are raised, in effect made no ruling as far as the point of privilege that the member for Labrador South raised. If called upon to make a ruling, the Chair will undertake to make a formula ruling which will be delivered at a later date.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I understood Your Honour had made a ruling. Would Your Honour please make a ruling on the point. I realize that one cannot do it now, but in due course. Also may I speak to the point of order, Sir? Beauchesne is quite clear that timeliness is of the essence with points of privilege. The statements which I made on television were broadcasted I believe seven o'clock last evening. The House met at ten o'clock this morning, it is now three twenty-five o'clock this afternoon. I would like Your Honour to consider the rule on the status point as to whether or not the gentleman for Labrador South raised them at the earliest

possible opportunity. I submit that there are ample precedents to say that his action in not raising it between ten o'clock and one o'clock, between three o'clock and three twenty-five o'clock meant that he slept on his rights.

However if he should wish to sue me for libel, since I have made them outside of the House, my solicitors will of course receive service at his pleasure.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I wish to clarify a point for the benefit of the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I did not personally hear the broadcast last night, it was brought to my attention, and the reason why I did not bring it up until this point, it was until I had a chance to listen to tapes of that broadcast.

MR. ROBERTS: On a point of order, The honourable gentleman missed a good broadcast. Thousands of people heard it. If in fact I did libel him, I libelled him on the television, thousands of people heard it. Whether he heard, it has nothing to do with the timeliness issue. The rules say -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I have no idea what the honourable gentlemen opposite are cackling about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Leader of the Opposition raised a point of privilege himself last week. It is not until the tapes or Beauchesne were available that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition made argument to it.

MR. ROBERTS: If Your Honour would be good enough to check Hansard, Your Honour will find that I gave notice that the first possible opportunity on Friday, Budget Day. I stood on the orders, Your Honour I submit, Sir, is erroneous. Your Honour is going on recollection and memory has not served Your Honour well. In this case I raised it at the first possible opportunity. Your Honour may check the

Hansards if he wish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are honourable members now prepared to return to 601-01 from which we have digressed for approximately one-half hour? We have engaged in a debate which is quite irrelevant to this topic. The member for Bell Island had the floor at that point.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, if I may, just in dealing with this point.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: On a point of order or a point of privilege or a point of something, I would just like, Mr. Chairman, at this time to advise the Leader of the Opposition -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

MR. MURPHY: On a point of personal privilege, Sir. On a point of personal privilege.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

MR. MURPHY: I did not want to get into this argument. I would just like to advise the Leader of the Opposition or any other goon, when I entered this building not to invoke anybody over the Speaker - now let us hear it for the Minister of Welfare.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition may be making the same point of order as the Chair wishes to make. The reference to the honourable Leader of the Opposition - this remark is directed to the Minister of Social Assistance. The remark made by the honourable Minister of Social Assistance with regard to the Leader of the Opposition, describing him as a goon is quite -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the opinion of the Chair that is the same thing. It is quite unparliamentary and the honourable minister is asked to withdraw that remark.

MR. MURPHY: I will withdraw it, Sir, but I would just like to say this, that any member of this House that stands outside of this

building where another honourable member is entering and calls on a bunch of people to say, "Let us hear it. Let us hear it from the honourable Minister of Welfare whatever he said," or from Ank Murphy "actually it was." I do not need this kind of stuff and I think it is entirely unbecoming, unbecoming the conduct of any member of this honourable House. That is all I have to say on this, Sir.

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to say a word to that point of order, Mr. Chairman, I should be delighted to be cheer leader for the honourable member for St. John's Centre at anytime. I did say, "let us hear it from Ank Murphy."

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if I have the floor, I have the right to make my remarks in silence. The honourable the gentleman for St. John's Centre, I did say "let us hear it." The students heard it and I have no doubt the honourable gentleman in due course will hear it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman. the students at Memorial University, speaking on behalf of future students at the university, have requested the Progressive Conservative Government, commonly known as the "Tory Government" to reconsider and change its proposed policy towards government aid and support for university students. Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to say right here and

now that I unconditionally support that request. I am all for it. I hope there is no doubt in anybody's mind that I am behind this. The Minister of Social Services says it is a kiss of death, but that is his opinion.

The students go on to say, Sir, that it is their belief that the proposed policy is definitely contrary to the betterment of the students' welfare and ultimately the university's. I also believe that statement, Sir, to be correct. This is a rich man's government and they are trying to make the university a rich man's paradise. This new policy, Sir, of forcing students to borrow \$1,400 before they can receive government assistance, discriminates against the poorer students of this province, whereas, Mr. Chairman, it should be doing the opposite. It discriminates against the poorer students, Sir. The sons and daughters of the loggers and the miners and the fishermen and the office workers and the civil servants, a lot of them but not all of them, not the ones who are getting the big fat salaries but it discriminates against a lot of poor people in this province, Sir. It will mean that the enrollment at the university this coming September and succeeding years will probably drop off and I think this is a shame, Mr. Chairman. It is criminal. Already across Canada and down through the United States enrollment in universities is declining for what reason I do not know but it is declining.

AN HON. MEMBER: No jobs.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, how are students going to pay back this \$7,000 or \$8,000 or \$9,000 or \$10,000 they have to borrow? They come out of the university with their pieces of paper and no jobs. The increase, Sir, will mean that seventy-five per cent of the students attending Memorial right now, right at this present time and in the future, will greatly increase their graduation debts, so the students say. It has not been denied by the Minister of Education or the Minister of Finance. How will they pay it back

if they cannot find jobs, Sir? It will be a minimum of \$7,000 they will have to pay back and if this does not discourage students from attending university, Sir, as I say, especially with the job shortage that we have in this province, then I do not know what will.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate in my opinion that this is coming at a time when the government is talking about establishing regional colleges and community colleges. This backward policy that they are bringing in now will cause the enrollment at the university to drop and at the same time they are talking about building a regional college in Corner Brook and a community college in Stephenville. Where are they going to get the students, Sir? The students were severely critical -

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I am not quite sure on this point but this money the students have to borrow, is it guaranteed by the Government of Canada or does the province put up the full amount?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: It is a Federal Canada student loan and the money is guaranteed by the Government of Canada. The reason I am asking this question is I am not quite clear on it, Mr. Chairman. But in the event that students default on their loans, then the Government of Canada has to pick up the tab and not the province. So where the government is really trying to save the money here is in grants and not in loans. They are upping the loans to \$1,400 so they can save in assistance to students, That is where they hope to get the saving, and that will probably be poured into the linerboard mill out in Stephenville or paid to these high-paid flunkies we are hearing so much about these days.

Mr. Chairman, the students bitterly complained about not being consulted on this matter and the Minister of Finance gave us an excuse, "Well, we could not discuss this with the students because it would not be proper to let them know what

is in the budget." Well, Sir, the Minister of Finance did not have to let the students know what was in the estimates for this year. He could have polled the students. The Minister of Finance can poll the students any time. He can poll the students or anybody else in Newfoundland, on any issue that he likes and he could have polled the students. He could have sat down with the Student Council, had a little round-table discussion, brought this matter up, got their reaction to it and then go away somewhere to his office and make a rational decision. But the minister did not do this, Sir, and the students say they are very disappointed that the government did not do this.

The minister also said that he carried out studies. Well, we are waiting for the Minister of Education and the Minister of Finance to table these studies in this honourable House, Sir, I trust when the Minister of Education stands to speak in this debate that he will give us facts and figures, table the studies and let us have a look at them, let us see the information they had in front of them when they made this decision and let us see if they have taken a right decision or a wrong decision.

The students now ask, Sir, now that the damage is done they ask that the government initiate an independent study into the effects of any of these changes. Nothing wrong with that, Mr. Chairman. That is a reasonable request. Is that the request of a group of people who were trying to incite a riot? They want the government to initiate an independent study into the effects of any changes in their student-aid policy and that these be considered before any changes are made and that the report of the independent committee be made public. What is wrong with that, Mr. Chairman? Any member on the government side see anything wrong with it? It is a sane, sensible, commonsense, reasonable approach and the government would do well to grant that request. They also asked that the government immediately consult a joint



committee of student affairs to discuss the student-aid. Another reasonable request, Sir, and the most important one of all is that any and all changes in the student-aid programme be delayed at least until the fall semester.

My colleague pointed out this morning, Sir, that these students have made long-range plans and they are depending on this. They have drawn up a budget and they have to work within that budget. Does that not make a lot of sense, Sir? Take a little breathing time, take time to sit down and reconsider this matter calmly and collectively, to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion to this whole affair. Is this not a sensible thing to do, to ask that the implementation of this be delayed until at least the fall semester? It makes a lot of sense to me, Sir. I would ask the government to reconsider this.

Sir, there is not much else I can say on this except, as I stated in the beginning, and I am right behind the students on this, I think the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Education have made the booboo of the year. They should be men enough to admit that they have made a booboo and reconsider this whole matter, Sir, and not make a single change until they have had an opportunity to sit down with the students and discuss this matter, ask for an independent investigation into the whole affair and then bring a report back to this House of Assembly in the fall of the year.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now, Mr. Chairman, I intend to deal first with the statement of the hon. member for St. Barbe North, that as far as expenditure in education is concerned there is retrenchment on this government's part in its budget, and secondly with the issue which has taken up most of the time of the committee so far and that is the matter of the Canada student loan fund and the need for students to borrow up to \$1,400 before qualifying for provincial assistance, and then with the other matters which

April 6, 1973

Tape 1092

JM - 5

have been raised.

With respect to the opposition's charge that there is retrenchment as far as expenditure in education is concerned, certainly we cannot agree to that. They may disagree with various policies but the facts behind

belie retrenchment. The total vote in education last year was \$131.3 million. This year it is \$149.9 million. An increase of \$18.6 million.

Just to give a few instances of the increase, in teachers' salaries which last year was 55.7 million, this year it is 64 million. That makes up for 8.3 million of that increase.

Transportation for school children which last year was 6.3 million, this year it is 6.9 million, an increase of \$600,000. Perhaps I will add now, although I had intended to leave it until we got to that part of the estimates, that that \$600,000 increase in the vote for transportation of school children will allow this government to pay an additional ten dollars for each pupil being transported in school buses. In other words, starting the next academic year, through all the school boards for every pupil using school buses, there will be a ten dollar per capita increase in what they received last year.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, one cannot figure that out to the exact amount but we budgeted there for an increase of ten dollars per capita for every student being bused, starting the next school year.

Also, in the increases, the operational grants to school boards, last year 10.4 million, this year 11.5 million, an increase of \$1.1 million. That will allow this government to increase, to every student a per capita increase, for every student in the province of four dollars. For every student in elementary and secondary school, elementary school and high school, an increase of four dollars per capita. Now, the formula on how these are worked out and what the present amount is, certainly I will be glad to explain to the committee when we get into that section. I wish to point out, when one talks about retrenchment that certainly an increase in a departmental expenditure by 18.6 million dollars cannot be called a

retrenchment and I think in those areas where we can increase by ten dollars per capita for all pupils using school buses and four dollars in general for all pupils of all categories throughout the province that certainly this is not an example of retrenchment.

I might point out as well, if we are speaking about retrenchment; in the current account of the university, let us compare just three years, 1971-1972, 1972-1973 and 1973-1974: The account grant-in-aid for 1971-1972 (I am rounding all these out), \$16.2 million. That was for full-time student equivalents - there is a complicated formula which I can go into but it is probably not necessary now - for full-time student equivalent equaling 8,100 which came to a grant for full-time student equivalent of \$2,003. That is 1971-1972, a total of \$16.2 million for 8,100 full time students, a grant per unit of \$2,003.

In 1972-1973, that amount increased to \$18.6 million for 8,500 full-time student equivalent with the grant amounting to \$2,192 per full-time student equivalent.

Now, this year, the year of retrenchment, we have increased from \$18.6 last year to 21.2 million dollars this year. For how many students is that? For 9,200 students. If we are talking about retrenchment, does that mean that there is a decrease in the grant for full time student equivalent? That would be retrenchment. We have increased the amount from last year to this year, from \$18.6 million to \$21.2 million. The number of students based on the formula of full-time student equivalent has increased from 8,100 to 8,520. Now, we have to ask ourselves whether the grant per unit has increased or decreased. It has increased to 2,309. In other words, last year the grant per full-time student unit was \$2,192 and in this years budget it is \$2,309. I think Mr. Chairman, that these facts surely will certainly demonstrate that one cannot call this an education budget of retrenchment, a budget where there is retrenchment in education but show considerable increases.

Now, I would like to get specifically to the matter which has caused most of the debate in the House today. That of course deals with the policy of the government announced in the Budget Speech that students would be required to borrow up to \$1,400 before qualifying for Provincial assistance. I believe the honourable gentleman from St. Barbes North said that this would require students to borrow \$800 more. There is no student who in any year would have to borrow \$800 more. What it means is that before getting any Provincial assistance, a person has to borrow up to \$1,400. Now, it is fairly complicated. Let me give one example of how it works. Let us take an example.

Let us say a single student, and it is up to \$1,800. The total amount to which a student is entitled, of course, does not change, \$1,800 single, \$2,650 married. This does not change. What changes of course is the proportion between grants from the Provincial Government and the Canada Student Loan money. That is what changes. The total does not change. Let me take one example to show how it would work, let us say under the old system and how it would work under what we can call the new system.

Let us take a single student whose need was \$1,000. Under the old system he would borrow \$600. There would be \$400 left. \$200 of that four was by way of grant and \$200 was again by way of loan. So, in effect he was borrowing \$800. Now, I will repeat it. I do not claim to be any genius in mathematics. It took me some time to get these things clear myself. Let us say if last year a single student had \$1,000 of need. Before getting any provincial assistance, he had to borrow \$600. He got his \$600. There was \$400 left. I am beginning to feel like the other gentleman who sat over here a couple of years ago. There was \$400 left. That is split down the middle. \$200 in Provincial Government Grant and \$200 in Canada Student Loan. So, in effect last year this student had an indebtedness of \$800 to the Canada Student Loan, this

year because his need is \$1,000, he will borrow the full \$1,000. He will have borrowed \$200 more. Actually that exact instance that I took was the case of six hundred students last year. Last year there were in fact six hundred students, single students, with \$1,000 of need. They borrowed \$800, the \$600 and \$200, got a \$200 Provincial grant. This year, instead of borrowing \$800 through the Canada Student Loan, they will borrow \$1,000. You can see what the difference is there, of \$200, not of \$800 in any one year.

Now, one obviously could go through all of the categories that way, which would be quite time-consuming. The formula, the process is the same for each. Under the old system - we cannot understand the new one until we understand the old - these are what are being compared. You know the old one is supposed to be great and the new one diastorous. Under the old system a person borrowed up to \$600 before he qualified

for any Canada Student Loan Fund. The difference between that and what they were entitled to was split fifty-fifty, half a provincial grant - half a Canada Student Loan Fund.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Where would they borrow that six hundred dollars?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It would be Canada Student Loan Fund.

MR. F.B. ROWE: And what about the two hundred dollars?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It would also be Canada Student Loan Fund.

MR. F.B. ROWE: But it is just two hundred dollars more.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: This is not something taken out of the year. There were in fact six hundred students in this category last year. Their need was \$1,000. Before they could qualify for any provincial allowance, government assistance, provincial government assistance, they had to borrow six hundred dollars. They had their six hundred dollars and there was still a need of four hundred dollars to make up that \$1,000 which was their need. The formula was, that what was left half was provincial grant and that was two hundred dollars, half of four. The other half was put on as Canada Student Loan Fund so in effect those six hundred students last year, whose need was \$1,000, borrowed eight hundred dollars. They are indebted for eight hundred dollars to the Canada Student Loan Fund. Under the new system they would be indebted for a year, for \$1,000.

I am not sure if I am clear but I think I am. It is as clear as one can make it. I wanted to go through that in order to show honourable members what in effect the results will be. What I have here - there are approximately 5,515 students at the university last year who benefited from, took part in the Canada Student Loan Fund. What I have asked officials in the Department of Education to do is to break down that 5,515 in order to inform me, so that I may inform the House, so that I may inform honourable gentlemen here, what the difference in fact would be under the old system and the new system. Okay, if we take the number of students there last year, knowing the amount they had to borrow under the Canada Student Loan Fund, and ask ourselves, under the new programme announced in the

budget, what would they have to borrow per year more? That is what I am getting at. How much would they have to borrow per year more?

For 1,130 students, under the new system they will have to borrow one hundred dollars more per two semester year. So, for 1,130 students the difference would be one hundred dollars. No sense in saying no, it is in fact mathematically correct. One can disagree with the policy and say one should not do it, but one cannot disagree with questions of arithmetic. Basically it is arithmetic. They are not good, bad nor indifferent, they just are mathematical facts. One can say the programme is shocking but one cannot argue with addition and subtraction, at least I suppose one can, but one usually does not get too far.

However,

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not try to pull the wool over our eyes.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I would never try to do that. My dear man, my dear man, if somebody would send the honourable gentleman an adding machine.

AN HON. MEMBER: I just cannot see it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: For 1,130 students who last year, under the old system, under the same circumstances this year they would have to borrow from the Canada Student Loan Fund one hundred dollars more, for 1,700 students, they would have to borrow two hundred dollars more than they did last year, for 1,705 students, they would have to borrow three hundred dollars more, for seven hundred students they would have to borrow four hundred dollars more, for two hundred and eight students, there would in fact be no change.

This is taking last year's use of the Canada Student Loan Plan at the university and transposing the new system announced in the budget, Canada Student Loan Plan unto last year's statistics, facts, data, and those, honourable gentlemen, are the facts.

There is another matter I wish to relate to them.



AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right. I will make this other point first because it may be what the honourable gentleman is going to ask as it is related to it.

AN HON. MEMBER: May I have a copy?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, I only have one here in front of me but I will certainly be glad to give the honourable gentleman a copy.

There are just a couple of matters related to this I wish to comment on as well. I think a couple of members of the opposition stated that they thought the Minister of Finance and I, when met with the students for about half an hour or so, and that was our second meeting within a week actually, which we were very pleased to do and we are both pleased to meet with them at any time, but there was some criticism from the opposition that we should in fact have given out data and information and this and that. However, I am quite sure that we would have then been called discourteous to the House and bearing in mind that unless some honourable gentleman opposite were going to speak at even greater length than usual, within twenty-four hours and in fact it has worked to about twenty-four and a-half hours, within twenty-four hours, and it could well have been much sooner, this data would have in fact been made known, so I do not think that accusation is a valid one.

I think I should point out as well, because this does not seem to be clear to all, that for approximately four hundred and fifty students there will be no change in the plan until next September. In other words, students - that is probably why, when the honourable the member for St. Barbe North was finished this morning I had hoped that I would be able then to speak to get these facts on as quickly as possible, but it does not make much difference, it is only a few hours later - for approximately four hundred and fifty students who are doing two consecutive Septembers, from

January and May, the two consecutive Septembers, they will not be affected for the May semester, because in these cases students apply for the two semesters on the same form and I think the two semesters are usually approved together. It will, I want to be perfectly clear, it will take effect for a student who has been out during the January term and will be either commencing from scratch in May, if in fact there are any, or recommencing after being out a year, two years, one semester or two semesters.

For anyone entering or re-entering the university system it will become operative in May. For the approximately four hundred and fifty students who are doing the May semester as a continuation, consecutively after the January and who applied for student aid under the plan which was in effect, which was government policy when they applied for the student assistance, that will not take effect. It will take effect for them obviously, if they continue in September.

I have covered those two matters. There are a number of other items which were raised by members on the opposition which I think, for purpose of clarity, I will keep to comment upon until after any honourable members who wish get back into the question of student aid, Canada Student Loan Plan or this. In other words, there are matters on certification, pupil-teacher ratio, all of the other matters which were raised by honourable gentlemen opposite, the Alcoholic and Drug Foundation, regional colleges, school taxes and all of this. I have notes on all of that but I think for the purpose of clarity and there are eight or nine matters there, for the purpose of clarity I think it is better for me to keep that in abeyance, because other honourable gentlemen may wish to debate further on this particular matter. I think it would perhaps serve the purpose of clarity if we left these other matters in abeyance until the committee had if not exhausted its verbal prowess at least had given it good exercise.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I only wish to say a few words here because every now and then there is a determined attempt to inveigle me into this debate. The honourable Minister of Education has pointed out what we wished to point out to the students yesterday when the delegation came to meet us. At that time, Mr. Chairman, it should be noted that the students said they would not keep the information confidential. We told them that this information the Minister of Education has just given the House would have to be kept confidential until it was given to the members of the House of Assembly, since otherwise it would be a discourtesy to the members of this House to give it first to the newspapers and the media.

They said, Mr. Chairman, that they did not want to accept the information, that if they received the information then they would make it public and it was best for us to keep that information until the House met. The Minister of Education has explained just what the effect is of this change in policy on the student assistance programme at Memorial. It is not what the opposition has been attempting to lead people to believe, that suddenly next year, the 5,000 people who are receiving assistance at Memorial, are all going to have to borrow eighteen hundred dollars, whereas this year they only had to borrow six hundred. That is not true. There is not a word of truth in it, there is not a particle of truth in it. The actual facts are as the Minister of Education has given them, that assuming the same 5,515 students next year have the same need they had this year, the 5,515 who are receiving assistance now, 1,130 of them will only have to borrow one hundred dollars more next year than they did this year, 1,700 will only have to borrow two hundred dollars more, 1,705 will have to borrow three hundred dollars more and 700 will have to borrow four hundred dollars more.

The very maximum increase in borrowing for any one of

those 5,515 students is four hundred dollars and 280 of them have no change. Yet for the last couple of days in the province, we have been hearing the welkin ring with the opposition and others attempting to give the public the impression that this means that the students receiving assistance at memorial will all have to borrow eighteen hundred dollars instead of six hundred dollars next year. It is an attempt to deceive as to what has really happened here.

Now, Mr. -

MR. NEARY: \_\_\_\_\_ Is that a parliamentary word?

MR. CROSBIE: An attempt...

AN HON. MEMBER: Point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: I withdraw it, I do not care, call it a mistake, an attempt,

a mistaken impression that these gentlemen have propagated, these gentlemen and others some of whom should know better. That is what this change in policy is. That is the effect of it. The worst effect of it is that some students will have to borrow \$400 more next year than they did this year.

Now what is the Canada Student Loan Programme? The Canada Student Loan Programme is a federal programme administered by the Liberal Government at Ottawa. It is a loan programme. The Liberal Government at Ottawa is not giving university students grants. God knows they have the money, Mr. Chairman. They have the spondoolics. They have the greenbacks. They have it rolling in. They have more coming in than they can handle yet their programme is a loan programme. They could just as easily have a Canada Student Grants Programme if they agreed with the concept of grants to university students to put them through university. Yet that Liberal Government, and it has been Liberal for ten years, have a Canada Student Loans Programme. The assistance that we give the students, after they borrowed the maximum, is still a grants programme. But if the grant is the thing, if it is heartless and cruel, if this is a rich man's government because we have to make a change in this, then surely the government in Ottawa must be a rich man's government too. They are the ones. They have the money crawling out of their ears, they have the new income tax, they can borrow, they have the Bank of Canada, they can manufacture money yet they have a loans programme not a grants programme, and we do not hear honourable gentlemen opposite getting up in their righteous indignation and gritting their teeth and saying how Pierre Trudeau's government is a rich man's government - yet we have to sit here and listen to the guff. It is guff.

Now just look at the history of this whole programme. Let us look at the history of it. In 1964 the policy was that you could get a Canada Student Loan and that was all you could get. You could go to the Canada Student Loan and borrow. Before I come to that, by the way, Mr. Chairman, the Canada Student Loan Programme makes a loan

of up to \$1,800 a year for seven years. They will loan you up to \$9,800 as the present limit, \$1,400 a year for seven years. There is no interest charged on that loan until the student graduates or leaves university. No interest charge for six months after he graduates or leaves university. So it is interest-free as long as you are at university. The current interest rate, when you leave university, is seven and five-eighths per cent. That is the interest rate. So you do not have to make any payment, you do not have to start repaying until six months after you graduated or have left the university and did not graduate. That is the programme. No interest during those years.

Now in 1964 it was Canada Student Loan only. In 1965 the Smallwood Administration announced free tuition. There was going to be free tuition for every student who attended Memorial University. That was wonderful. In 1966, by golly, it went further, students salaries. every student that went to Memorial was going to get a salary. It started with \$100 monthly for students outside of St. John's, \$50 monthly for students in St. John's, starting with the fourth years and beyond, and it was going to go down every year until every student got a salary. This was indeed revolutionary. This, Sir, was revolutionary. The province could not afford it, as we will come to it in a minute, but it was instituted when there was an election.

In 1967 the salaries were extended down to the third year. So they were paid salaries if they were in third year, fourth year or beyond that at Memorial. That was in 1967. In 1968 what happened? In 1968 the Liberal Administration introduces a means test. You could only now get the free tuition and salary if you passed a means test, a needs test, that was in 1968. Where were the honourable gentlemen who were screeching and howling on the opposite side of the House then?

MR. NEARY: Where was the honourable minister?

MR. CROSBIE: I was in the same place I am in today.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. CROSBIE: Where were the honourable gentlemen? Did the honourable member for Bell Island protest against the change of policy? Did the honourable gentleman for White Bay South protest? Did the honourable the Leader of the Opposition protest? Did the honourable member for Fogo protest? No, they did not protest. Not a word, not a sound, not a squeak, not a murmur, not a whisper from those heroes who today think they are heroes of the students, not a sound.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: You know, Mr. Chairman, all day we have been hearing these little plaintive voices. Are we suppose to be allow to speak here in silence? Now I am speaking,so the honourable gentleman be silent. But if the honourable gentleman want to,interrupt I shall just out shout him. I have the microphone.

That is 1968,the needs test. I need a drink of water, if someone is within range of my voice. In 1968 there was a means test, so that glorious vision of the free tuition and the salaries had to bow to the means test. Honourable heroes opposite submitted meekly and the students did not hear about their concern for them, how they felt about these students. They did not hear that in 1968.

In 1969 what happened? In 1969 the Liberal Administration, those heroes of the students that we have heard from across the House for the last couple of days,said they brought in a new requirement:Students,you now have to borrow \$400 from the Canada Student Loan before you become eligible for any provincial aid." So that was another step back - see one step forward, two steps back. We never heard honourable gentlemen, the Leader of the Opposition, White Bay South, Fogo, Bell Island, they did not go to the students. They did not lead them in the streets. They did not welcome their petition. They did not meet them on the steps.

They did not meet them in the corridors. They did not see them in the hallways. They said not a word, not a squeak, not a sound did they say. Now it was \$400 before you were eligible for provincial aid. Gone were the salaries. Why were they gone? Because the government of the day knew the province could not afford it, it had other requirements for money, that this was a programme no other province had instituted, could institute, could afford. So they gave it up in 1968 and 1969.

In 1970, no change. Yes, one further change in 1970, the province said, 'All right, now you have to borrow \$400 from the Canada Student Loan before you get any provincial assistance and what is more now you will get half provincial assistance and half loan, after the \$400.' In 1970 that was another change.

Did we see honourable gentlemen opposite screeching on the house tops that they were going to fight this to the bitter end? That this meant the students were going to have to borrow more? No, they allowed them to borrow \$400 in 1967 and now they were going to let them borrow, in 1970, fifty/fifty, half provincial assistance and half loan. In 1971 it remained the same. In 1972 the government changed, the loan requirement was now moved to \$600. You had to borrow \$600 then you would get half provincial assistance and half loan, up to \$1,800 if you were single and \$2,650 if you were married.

So the honourable gentlemen opposite started to protest then. They have been quite from 1966 on but last year there was a change of government and we heard a few protests. They tried to make an issue of it but they were busy with the mothers last year, you know the mothers last year. This year is their year for students. I do not know what their year is going to be next year. Whom 's it going to be for next year?

Now this year, now this year it is changed so that you have to borrow \$1,800



or \$1,400 before you can get provincial assistance. Why? Is there a government in the world that wants to take anything away once it has been given? Not that I know of. This one certainly does not. Why? Mr. Chairman, because if this province does not make some attempt to be reasonable and to bring its finances under control, this province is indeed going to be in desperate straits and this is one policy where we had to bring ourselves in line with other provinces. Now what do they do in other provinces? What is the situation in Nova Scotia with a Liberal Government and all those Liberals that are supposed to be so full of heart? There is nobody but Liberals who thinks of the people at all. In Nova Scotia there is a Liberal Government and the first \$1,400 of need is a Canada student loan. Nova Scotia, that great Liberal province, led by Premier Regan, they have to borrow \$1,400 and the next \$600.00 is Nova Scotia Government bursary and the next \$400.00 is Nova Scotia guaranteed loan. It is not even all grant after the \$1,400 Canada student loan, that is Nova Scotia, Liberal government, Liberal province.

New Brunswick, what is the policy in New Brunswick's Progressive Conservative Government? The same as when the Liberal Government was there. The first \$1,400 of need, Canada student loan and that is the situation in New Brunswick. The first \$1,400 Canada student loan, balance up to \$700.00, maximum New Brunswick bursary, the rest of it is a bursary. What is the position in Prince Edward Island? Another Liberal government, led by Premier Campbell. What is the story there? Are they so heartless in that great Liberal Province of Prince Edward Island that they are crushing and abusing and maligning and stomping on the students and requiring them to borrow \$1,400 from Canada student loan? Yes, in Prince Edward Island the first \$1,400 of need is a Canada student loan and the balance, up to \$1,000 maximum, Prince Edward Island bursary.

What is the story in Alberta, that rich, wealthy Province of Alberta where they now have a Progressive Conservative Government and formerly Social Credit, oil and all the rest of it? They receive no tax equalization, one of the three provinces, Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia. The first \$1,400, Canada student loan, that is if you are a student in Alberta, the first \$1,400 Canada student loan and the balance, up to \$3,500, Alberta loan. It is not even a grant but a loan. If \$1,400 in Alberta is not sufficient and you need more, you need another \$600.00, they do not grant it to you but they lend it to you. That is Alberta.

Now the other provinces, just so that I will not be accused of not covering them all - that is four, the same as Newfoundland but two of them slightly worse. Ontario, the first \$800.00 Canada student loan and the balance of need, beyond \$800.00, Ontario grant. Ontario \$800.00 and Ontario certainly has more wealth and resources than we do. Manitoba, the first \$400.00 Canada student loan and the rest of it is Manitoba bursary and Canada student loan, the maximum of \$1,400, Manitoba bursary and \$1,400 Canada student loan. Saskatchewan, the first \$850.00 is Canada student loan and additional need, over \$850.00, is provincial loan and bursary, to a maximum of \$1,900. British Columbia, if the need is \$599.00 or less it is all a Canada student loan. If it is \$600.00 to \$899.00, the first \$200.00 is a British Columbia bursary and the rest a loan. If it is \$900.00 to \$1199, the first \$300.00 is a bursary and the rest of the \$1,200 is a loan - \$900.00. If the need is \$1,200 to \$1,800, the first \$400.00 is a British Columbia bursary and the remainder of the \$1,400 is a Canada student loan. So even in British Columbia there is very little difference from what we are now proposing in the budget.

That is this terrible thing that has now been inflicted on the university students of the province. We have said,

Mr. Chairman, and it is correct, there is not one student at university today who needs to leave it next year because of this change. If he is capable, if he wishes to get through the university, if that is his objective, if he is a worker, if he has ambition he does not need to leave the university because he has to borrow from \$100.00 to \$400.00 more next year, on which he pays no interest and which he does not have to pay back until he is finished with university. To go to university, Mr. Chairman, may be a right, it may be a right to do that but it also has its obligations and it also has its benefits. I do not have the statistics here but the average graduate of the university will earn over his lifetime several hundred thousand dollars more than a person who just graduates from high school. Now surely if you have to borrow, even if your need is a maximum and you have to borrow \$7,000 to \$9,000 to go to university for seven years, you will in later life well be able to repay it, as your income is going to be far higher than it was if you never went to university and apart from income altogether, there are reasons for going to university apart from income, self-satisfaction, self-development, development of the intellect, development of all these other things that do not mean anything in dollars and cents that are still worth making some sacrifice for if there has to be a sacrifice.

So that this move which the hon. the official opposition is trying to persuade the public is such a retrograde and terrible step and that is all it is and that is all, that it is going to cost people. There is no one, Mr. Chairman, with this move, who wishes to go to university and has the need who cannot go as the 5,515 that are there now. We hear this tripe on the air and in the papers and in the public that it is going to be an éliteist university because of this change. What junk! It will be no more éliteist than it was before this change, nothing to do with the élite. This is just propaganda, not facts,

not discussion of the issues - éliteist. Out of the, I do not know how many students are there this year, perhaps 8,000 or 8,500, out of that 5,515 receiving assistance, none of them are going to have to stop because of this change.

Now let us look at the numbers receiving different totals of assistance. Out of the 5,515 this year, 900 students needed \$800.00 and 600 students needed \$1,000 and 700 students needed \$1,200 and 700 students needed \$1,400, the maximum loan, and 900 students needed \$1,600 and 1,100 students showed they had need for \$1,800, the maximum. Now there were 1,100 who had the most need and they had to receive \$1,800 each. They had the greatest need. Well, Mr. Chairman, this year they had to borrow \$1,200 and they got a provincial grant of \$600.00 to make up the \$1,800 they needed. What is the change for those 1,100 with the greatest need in the year coming up? They will have to borrow \$200.00 more. The 1,100 who had the greatest need this year, \$1,800, got this year \$1,200 in loan and \$600.00 in grant and next year they will get \$1,400 in loan and \$400.00 in grant. They will have to borrow \$200.00 more.

This change affects least the students with the most need because the students with the most need were already borrowing just about the maximum because their need was the greatest. This change affects the most those with the least need and not with the most need. The 1,100 with the most need will have to borrow \$200.00 more next year than they did this year. \$1,200 loan, \$600.00 grant this year and next year \$1,400 loan, \$400.00 in grant.

Now the figures I have just given are single students, 4,900 of them. There are 615 married students receiving assistance this year. 150 of them had a need for \$800.00, sixty of them had a need for \$1,200, forty-five of them had a need for \$1,600, eighty of them had a need for \$2,000, thirty of them had a need for \$2,400,

thirty of them had a need for \$2,600 and 220 had a need for the maximum \$2,650. What change is there for the 615 married students? Well, 280 of the 615 married students were borrowing the maximum anyway. The ones that needed \$2,650 borrowed \$1,400 and they got \$1250 provincial grant and they will get the same next year, exactly the same.

So, 280 of the neediest students, married students, will be exactly the same next year as they were this year. The rest, their increase in loan will go from one hundred to two or three hundred dollars. So, Mr. Chairman, the neediest people at the university who are on the assistance plan, some 280 will not be affected at all, 1100 will be affected very little by this change, rather than this canard that some people are attempting to spread, that this affects most those who have the most need.

The honourable member for St. Barbes North, Mr. Chairman, has obviously read "George Orwell" because he is trying to speak in new things. In the book "1984" there was a language called "new thing" which was designed so when you said one thing it meant the opposite. If you are going to say that the weather is good out today, you would say that the weather is bad out today and the person hearing you knows that it was good out today. The honourable gentleman got up in the House and he said that there was less, you know that more was less. The fact that more money is being spent in education this year means that there is less being spent. You know that is "new thing" to try to persuade the people of the province that now we are spending \$164 million this year in education; that that \$164 million is less than \$144 million. I do not think that they will buy it. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, the people of this province will buy that argument.

The honourable Minister of Education just demonstrated the figures, more is less, 164 is less than 144. It is "new thing" and new maths, Is this the new maths? Is this the dangerous principle that they are teaching in the faculty of education? (as the honourable gentleman was on the faculty of education), This must be a result of the pedagogic training that he had at the faculty of education; less is more.

There is \$64,000,000 in for teachers salaries and last year was \$55,500,000. Well, obviously sixty-four is less than fifty five and a half. Well, the honourable gentleman tried to

persuade the House that there was less in the budget this year for education than there was last.

The honourable member for White Bay South was worried about the psychological impact this change is going to have on the students. Really! It will have quite a psychological impact on the students if they believe the guff that the honourable gentlemen opposite are trying to spread about this change. I do not think that we need to worry about the psyche of those students, Mr. Chairman, they are able to see through it.

Now, I just have a couple of other references before I sit down. A reference to myself by I think it was the honourable member for Bell Island or it might have been St. Barbes North: He said that I should feel chagrined, that I should feel ashamed and that I should feel like a rat, or words to this effect, because he said that in 1969 or 1970 I gathered the support of nearly all the students politically and invested in the Liberal leadership by gathering them in, and the Progressive Conservative Party got most of their support in 1971 and 1972 and that now they had been stabbed in the back. You know that they supported - let us take myself, I was referred to personally - they supported me, and now they have been stabbed in the back. Mr. Chairman, I never promised any university student or anyone else anything but honesty and a change of government and a change of policy which they knew was needed so badly for Newfoundland. They never said, "If we support you, will you give us better student assistance or free tuition or this, that or the other?". They were not interested. They were interested in the cause that a lot of people were interested in in those days and that was getting Newfoundland back from a state of abject fear and dictatorial policy and politics, getting it back so that we could be free to say and do what we like, which is the spirit in the province today. That is what they supported me and later the Progressive Conservative

Party for. They have not been stabbed in the back. They are now and the province is being faced honestly with our problems.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the honourable minister has strayed away from the subject. I would be happy to let him continue on that trend providing we can answer him when we are speaking in the debate, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I happen to be answering something that was brought up by a member opposite. If it were relevant for it to be brought up, then it is relevant for me to answer.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Your Honour has on any number of times in the committee ruled just to the contrary of the point made by the gentleman from St. John's West. We have time and time again, Sir, speaking to the point of order, allowed honourable gentlemen opposite and most recently the honourable gentleman from St. George's, presenting a petition, to go a little beyond the point and when we attempted to answer we were, to quote Your Honour, "unmercifully ruled out of order". I submit now that the honourable gentleman from St. John's West who may or may not be answering, whatever that may mean, is out of order and Your Honour should unmercifully rule him out of order as well.

MR. CROSBIE: Your Honour, I will pass by the subject because it is not of any great importance. It is typical of the kind of tactic and smear and sneer that gentlemen use opposite but it is not important enough now, if they are going to object to having it answered, I will pass on. He does not need to rule on it. Do not worry, this false calumny will go unanswered.

Now, where was I? Oh yes, discussion with the students: The honourable member for Bell Island thought that the Minister of Education and myself should have gone out on the steps yesterday with the students. For what? We were not anxious for the cheap publicity that the honourable gentleman was anxious for. We had told the students that we would meet a delegation of the students, when they came over on their demonstration. That



was arranged and we met with them, four students and their solicitor . We did not want to go running out on the steps of the building to get our pictures taken by the newspapers and television and radio. We did not have to. The newspapers, television and radio came to the Minister of Education's office and took our picture. You see, it saved us a lot of effort.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, he was right there, right by the desk, shaking hands with the student leader. They did not bite us. You know, we had a chance. We told them we did not agree, that we could not change this and did not agree with them. We were in no danger. We are in no danger anywhere in this province. I can walk anywhere. Even the honourable gentleman can walk anywhere and nobody would lay a hand on him. They would not take a chance.

Now, in ending, Mr. Chairman, I trust we will hear no more from the opposition and that they will simply stop this attempt to fool the public; rally behind us and say, "Carry on boys, you are doing what you can to clear up the shambles we left behind us".

Now, looking at their brief, there were three things requested in it. The government initiate an independent statement study into the effects of the many changes in the student-aid policy and that these be considered before any changes are made. Well, we made a study before the changes were made but, Mr. Chairman, we will certainly review this and see how this works in the next six months or a year, see if there are any real cases of hardship and review it if it appears necessary. There is no change in this policy now or this year. The Minister of Education has explained the situation of those who were accepted in January.

Secondly, they request that the government immediately consult a joint Committee of Student Affairs to discuss the student-aid policy. We discussed it with them last Friday. We discussed it with them yesterday. If they want to discuss it tomorrow, if they want to

discuss it next week or if they want to discuss it next month or the month after, certainly we will discuss the student-aid policy with them. We are always delighted to discuss anything with these students. We understand the position of the student council. They do not want to lose anything they have. That is quite understandable. We are sympathetic with them. We know they have to take the position they are taking. More power to them!

Third, they requested that any and all changes in the student-aid programme be delayed at least until the fall semester. That we have not been able to agree to, as the Minister of Education has explained. It will remain as it is for the fall semester for the students who were accepted in January on a two semester basis and I think that is only fair. So, Mr. Chairman, that is the facts on the student-aid changes that the Minister of Education and myself have been waiting since 10:30 last night for a chance to give. Now that we have had a chance to give them to the committee, I know that honourable gentleman opposite have been listening with great attention. They have had recalled to their memory what happened from 1966 to 1970 and

1971, and now in all decency I know that they, as loyal, true, patriotic Newfoundlanders, will say; "Carry on lads with the business of the country, carry on with the Education Estimates and congratulations on a job well done."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 601-01 carry?

MR. ROBERTS: Not quite yet, Mr. Chairman. I think there are still one or two points to be made, if I can pick up some of the mail that is here. These are all, Your Honour, from people who are dissatisfied with the Tory Government, several thousands.

Mr. Chairman, in 1966, in September, I was elected to this House for the first time. The honourable gentleman from St. John's West was elected to the House for the first time in the same election. Indeed, at that stage we were in the same party, but that is another story.

AN HON. MEMBER: Unfortunately.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes unfortunately. Unfortunately for the party.

MR. WINSOR: He has been in and out twice since then.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, he has been in and out twice since then, as my colleague from Fogo reminds me. Since then, Mr. Chairman, I have watched with fascination the honourable gentleman's performance as a member of the House, first as a minister of the crown, as he then was. I was but a humble backbencher, a parliamentary assistant to the Premier of the day, Mr. Smallwood, indeed occupying, not the same, it is not the same position as the honourable gentleman from Green Bay now occupies but shall we say, holding the same title.

Then I watched the honourable gentleman from St. John's West, first cross the floor, then back across the floor and then across the floor and into another party. Then I had the pleasure of watching him as I have this session and the two sessions we had last year, the one day session which will go into history, I guess as the "Barefoot Saunders Session" and the session of last year and now this session.

It has been interesting, entertaining, informative and

altogether worth-while. Anybody who is interested in politics and I most certainly am, could profitably watch the honourable gentleman from St. John's West and learn from him many lessons. One of them I submit, Mr. Speaker, one of the chief lessons one learns from the performances of the honourable gentleman from St. John's West is that when he has a good, strong case he makes it. He makes it quietly, effectively and forcibly. He is a good debater, Sir. When he does not have a good, strong case that is when he makes it noisily, he keeps raising his voice.

Mr. Chairman, I am told that we should have a little quorum call - unless some of the other honourable gentlemen would like to come back. Mr. Chairman, would Your Honour please ask the clerk to count the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a quorum. Would the clerk count the House again please? We have a quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, it is always nice to have a quorum. I realize my words are of little interest to honourable gentlemen opposite but if they do not want to pay me any courtesy, they could at least pay the rules of the House the courtesy to observe the quorum. Thank you!

It is good to see some smiling faces back. As I was saying, the honourable gentleman from St. John's West gives his best performances in the theatrical sense when his argument is the weakest. Judging by that standard, Sir, which is based, as I have said, on a number of year's observation of the honourable gentleman, we have seen today one of his most virtuoso performances. We had it all, we had the sarcasm, we had the references to the past (the honourable gentleman is preoccupied with the past) we had the sarcasm, we had the personal attacks, we had the abuses of personality, we had the refusal to discuss the issues.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The honourable gentleman has gone on for some time and his remarks are totally unrelated to 601-01. 1

feel compelled to call him to order to deal with the matter that should be under discussion.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour. As I was saying, the honourable gentleman puts forward no arguments, no arguments at all in his speech, I submit, that show why we should rush to grant his colleague, the Minister of Education, \$11,000 this year for his salary.

The honourable gentleman, in his speech, was dealing with the student-aid programme, with one particular aspect of it. In place of arguments in favour of this student-aid programme and in favour of the government's change, we have had personal abuse, tirades, the loud voice, the raised voice, the theatrical antics, all of that, we did not have arguments as to why the government's student-aid programme -

We had statistics brought up, trotted out on the floor of the House, mangled, trampled upon, twisted, distorted in every way, turned to try to prove the unprovable.

Let me touch first of all on one or two points the honourable gentleman made. He referred to the policy of paying student salaries, as they were called. These are allowances paid by the Government of the Province to students to attend university. There were no means tests, the fact of attendance at the university qualified one for the allowance, They were one hundred dollars a month for students from outside St. John's and fifty dollars a month for students inside St. John's.

Mr. Chairman, if three of the honourable gentlemen outside should step in - thank you, perhaps we could have a quorum called, Sir. The honourable gentleman from St. John's North is joining us, the honourable gentleman from Placentia West, There we are!

MR. DOODY: The honourable member for Labrador South.

MR. ROBERTS: No, because he is obviously on the Tory side. That is okay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: C'est un provocateur, is what he is.

The honourable member for St. Barbe North just left.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. One, two, three, four. Do not go.

I mean there will be no quorum if you go.

MR. DOODY: (First part inaudible) is drifting back.

MR. ROBERTS: In every sense of the word, the honourable gentleman is drifting. As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, we had a virtuoso performance. We heard from the honourable gentleman from St. John's West, a great denunciation of student salaries and all that. He neglected to point out one fact, Sir, the honourable gentleman was a member of the cabinet that brought in that programme, he voted for it in the House and he was a member of the cabinet that ended that programme. I was not a member of either cabinet, the honourable member for St. John's West was.

We heard nothing then publicly. I have no idea what passed privately, We heard nothing publicly then from him about any opposition to this programme. All I submit, Sir, is that to hear from him now is the rankest hypocrisy. It is utterly beneath contempt for the honourable gentleman to try this sort of argument, he is not fooling anybody except possibly himself. He may be fooling himself.

I have no idea of what ability the honourable gentleman from St. John's West has to delude himself. He had, I think, ability to delude the public but I think the people of this province, Sir, are now on to the honourable gentleman. I think they have learned their lesson from him.

He went on and he was quite eloquent about salaries. They were ended, they were ended by the Smallwood Administration. I was not in the administration which ended them, although I supported them here in the House. I still regret that they were ended but

there is a good argument - one can talk about universal social security programmes or one can talk about the programmes based on needs tests or means tests, the aid to students was a universal programme, rich and poor alike qualified. In that sense it was like the family allowance or like the old age pension. Perhaps we should have had it just on a means test basis as with social assistance or as with the old age security supplement, the guaranteed annual income supplement or with any other forms of social assistance. We did not, they were ended, they were ended by an administration of which the gentleman from St. John's West was a member.

I think that is a fact worthy of putting on the record. The honourable gentleman has a convenient memory. He dredges back into the past, dredges up what he thinks will serve his cause whatever that cause may be and he trots it out. He is not noted for being altogether fully candid.

Mr. Chairman, let me also refer to the honourable gentleman's remark that last year the opposition were preoccupied with the mothers' allowance as opposed to this issue of student-aid. Last year, student-aid was changed in the budget. As I recall it, students previously had to borrow four hundred dollars before they qualified for any grant component. Last year the administration changed it so that students had to borrow six hundred dollars before they qualified for any grant component. If Your Honour would check the record, I am sure Your Honour would find that we objected to that in this House. Last year the Education Estimates in committee took a number of days for two reasons; (1) because of the fact that we believed the then minister was incompetent to be minister. We do not believe that of the present minister, I think he is a perfectly competent Minister of Education. Indeed, if every member of the administration were as competent

at his job as the honourable gentleman is at being Education Minister, the administration would be incomparably better and the government would be incomparably better and the country would be in incomparably better hands. But I have no hesitation in paying that tribute to the honourable gentleman for St. Mary's, no hesitation whatsoever.

Last year also the committee was a long time on the estimates of the Minister of Education because of the mothers' allowance issue. There were some on that side who agreed with us. The honourable the gentleman for Bonavista South made public statements on that and agreed with us that the mothers' allowance should have not been cut out or if it had been cut out it should have been restored in some form or another.

The federal members of parliament -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. Until the federal government. I was going to deal with that point. I said restored in some form. I thank the honourable gentleman. I do not want to misquote him in any way.

The members of parliament at Ottawa, including Mr. Ambrose Peddle who met his just political reward at the hands of Mr. Rompkey and the voters of Grands Falls/White Bay/Labrador on October 30, they came out, considerably to the embarrassment of the provincial administration, their colleagues and their counterparts came out and made the same request as did the gentleman for Bonavista South.

Well what was the response from the administration? Well we heard the Premier make another one of his famous statements. I regret he is not with us this afternoon. I hope he is not ill again. I hope - indeed he is on his way to Harbour Grace because they are expecting him to speak at a banquet there tonight, to end their development conference. The Premier, I do not like referring to the man in his absence, Mr. Chairman, but it is hard to refer



to him not in his absence because his is away so often, the Premier made another of his famous statements. His famous statements, what are they? The government were reviewing the matter and he will be making or an appropriate minister would be making a further announcement in due course. But, of course, nothing happened. The mothers' allowance died. "It was as dead when the honourable.. the Premier made that statement as it was two weeks later. I do not know whether or not the administration reviewed that. I am not accusing them of bad faith. The people of Newfoundland will make that accusation but I do not.

The Premier made another of his statements - I can remember the honourable gentleman for St. John's East Extern who at that stage was Minister of Social Services and using government cars to flit about in, saying, Oh yes, it is under review. It was during the period of a by-election which brought the honourable gentleman for Labrador South into our happy home that that statement was made by members of the government.

Last year it is true we spent much more time on the mothers' allowance than we spent dealing with the student aid, because last year, Mr. Chairman, it was the mothers of Newfoundland who got the axe from the Minister of Finance. This year it is the students. He referred to next year and asked whom we would be against next year. We are not against anybody. We will be against the government if they give somebody the axe next year as they have. I do not know who is left. The smokers got it last year and that is probably a good thing; the Minister of Health would agree with me on that. It might be an idea if we could ban cigarettes but we cannot, it would be impractical, but cigarettes are bad for one's health. The honourable gentleman does not smoke, neither do I.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh the stresses and strains of office are beginning

to tell - if he is smoking a little now, Mr. Chairman, before we are done with him he will be a chair smokers, I assure him. I am judging only on his conduct as Minister of Health, his discharge of the duties of that high office.

We had the smokers last year, we had the mothers who got the axe last year, this year it is the students, next year I do not know who will get it.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it may well be. It may well be, Mr. Chairman. We have seen in this chamber a deliberate campaign by the government to stifle the opposition. We have seen it. We are still seeing it. We will go on seeing it. I do not mind that. I do not mind whether it is the Tory Party on that side or whether it is the wing of the Tory Party that sits to my right, politically as well as literally.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of personal privilege again. I have been called a lot of things in my life. One of the worst was to be called a Tory but I have been called worst than that, I have been called a Liberal, Sir, that is insulting.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, with respect to that point the honourable gentleman may have been called a Liberal but not by anybody who had any idea what a Liberal is.

Now as I was saying the honourable gentlemen, whether they are the Tory Party on that side or the Tory Party on this side of the House, and the honourable gentleman, there is nothing wrong with being a Tory, it is an honourable, historical doctrine. There may be something wrong with the way the honourable gentleman is a Tory but that is his problem not mine.

The reason we are protesting this proposed cut by the administration, Sir, is very simple. It is very simple

and it is a very simple issue to state, Mr. Chairman, but it is a

very great philosophical issue. Last year the administration changed the student-aid programme, for whatever reason they will say. They do say that they were forced into it by financial considerations. I have no doubt that is true. I have no doubt that the money they would have spent here, they spent somewhere else. But I submit, Mr. Chairman, that a government could always find the money to do what they want to do. They have found the money to hire 800 additional people in the public service. They have found the money to hire sixteen or eighteen or twenty executive assistants.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fifteen.

MR. ROBERTS: Fifteen, is it? They have found the money to hire defeated Tory candidates. They have found the money to pay a gentleman \$20,000 to be co-ordinator of the Silver Anniversary of Confederation. They have found \$800,000 to pay Mr. George McLean and his companies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! We are still on education and the honourable Leader of the Opposition is wandering off into other fields, so I would suggest that we stick to the 601-01 - Education.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest of respect, I am merely protesting the cuts in education and I am giving examples of where the money would come from. Your Honour I know is not trying to restrict debate in the committee in any way. Your Honour has a reputation for allowing the fullest possible debate relevant and within the rules. I am submitting what I am saying is fully relevant. The administration propose to save \$1.6 million, as I recall it, by this move. They have taken \$1.6 million. Oh! we are bringing in the heavy artillery now.

The administration proposed to save \$1.6 million by whacking it out of the financial hides of the students at the university. I am merely outlining some of the ways in which the administration have spent money which in my view might more easily and more profitably and better, in the policy sense, had gone to the students.

MR. NEARY: Cultural affairs, \$80,000.

MR. ROBERTS: Cultural affairs, \$80,000?

MR. NEARY: The Premier's office -

MR. ROBERTS: I must say they have all sorts of affairs but I did not know that they came that dear, Mr. Chairman.

So what we are saying, that last year the basic loan component increased from \$400 to \$600 and this year it increased from \$600 to \$1400 - \$1400 before one qualifies for any grant component whatsoever in student-aid. What we are seeing is a deliberate policy of denying the young people of this province access to the university. This administration, Sir, are deliberately trying, for whatever reason, maybe it is financial, maybe it is philosophical, it may be that they feel too much attention is being put on the university, maybe they feel that we do not need students, maybe they feel that Newfoundlanders should not be able to go to the university, we are seeing a deliberate policy compounded by the Premier, going out to Corner Brook and announcing that first year university courses will be held next fall in Corner Brook. Then the Vice-President (academic) of the University, Mr. Morgan, going out and saying; "not until we know for sure that the buildings will be there the year after." Then when we get the estimates the minister brings in, we discover the truth. It turns out that the Premier was at best confused, as well as confusing. But we are seeing a deliberate attempt, Sir, to make it harder for students, for young Newfoundlanders to get access to the university, to the higher education up there.

Now let me say quite categorically that philosophically there may be a very sound case for re-examining the various priorities within the field of post-secondary education in this province. Indeed, in my view, Sir, this is one of the chief areas to which the Minister of Education should be directing his attention. We should be looking down and seeing what post secondary education

facilities we have available in this province.

How many of our students in total go to them? What percentage? Is it too great? Is it great enough? Are the right students getting there? Then what type of training do they get? Should we have more post secondary non-university institutions? Should we have more university places? Should we have more technical institutes? These, Sir, are the great policy questions facing the Minister of Education today.

Money, of course, they need money. I do not know where they will get it. It will have to be gotten. It will be gotten. The Denominational Educational Committees have made it quite clear that they cannot carry on

MR. ROBERTS: As it now stands, either the people of Newfoundland will pay for the educational facilities that they need or they will not have them, that follows as night follows day.

The Minister of Finance and I are on common ground when we agree that we cannot have what we cannot pay for. There used to be a lot of talk about priorities and now we are seeing them because what the administration have chosen to do, Sir, consciously and deliberately, is to make it harder for students to go to university. We saw it last year from \$400 to \$600 and now \$600 to \$1400. What will it be next year? Heaven only knows, Mr. Chairman, heaven only knows. Maybe next year there will be no grant component at all. Maybe next year we will only have Canada Student Loans. Maybe next year there will be no Newfoundland Government Student-Aid Programme. I do not know. I doubt if the Minister of Finance knows.

He may leap to his feet and say, "I solemnly promise." The honourable gentleman has made so many solemn promises that have never been kept that it no longer means anything.

Mr. Chairman, that is the disturbing reason about this, the disturbing fact, the disturbing aspect of this policy, Newfoundland now has at university the smallest percentage of her eligible age group of any province in Canada. The figures cited by the university students, in a very well put together, very constructive brief, may not be acceptable to the government in its suggestions, in its requests, but it is a very well put together, a very constructive brief.

The Minister of Education is nodding agreement with me on that point, well he should. They say, and I quote now, Sir, "It should be added here that Newfoundland already has the lowest percentage of university population per Canada," I assume they

MR. ROBERTS: mean in Canada. "The Canadian census shows 1.5 attendance at Memorial, compared to 2.6 per cent for the Maritimes and 3.12 per cent for all of Canada. From our further research the only sections of the world with such a low percentage of attendance in post secondary institutions exist in third world and developing countries, i.e. Latin America, India and so forth."

Now that is the situation in Newfoundland, Sir, those figures apparently apply only to the university. I would submit that if the appropriate figures were produced to deal with the other post secondary institutions, the College of Fisheries, the College of Trades and Technology, the various nursing schools, we have one at St. Clare's, one at the General, one at the Grace General and one at Western Memorial, and the other post secondary educational institutions we have in this province, they would bear out the same point. By and large Newfoundland has about one half as many of her eligible students receiving post secondary education as do the other province of Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a prescription for the doom and death of this province. Whatever hope we have in Newfoundland, whatever hope we have of making this province the country we wish her to be, of developing it soundly and sanely, not of building a Ruhr Valley here, we will never do that, we never should, but developing a country that this can be, a country with decent work for all, a country with the advantages that we have in Newfoundland, of living close to the natural beauties, of living in a relatively unpolluted atmosphere, living in a relatively unpolluted countryside, whatever hope we have of achieving that Elysium, Mr. Chairman, will depend upon educating our people, more than any other single factor.

All of the authorities on economic development agree, all of them agree that education is the best single input, the best single place where dollars can be put into the system

MR. ROBERTS: to improve it, Of course we must do other things. Social services will not wait, industrial development must go ahead, all of them must go ahead but without education, Mr. Speaker, without education, to rephrase the old biblical saying, without education the people will perish.

The university is not the only educational institution we have. In the past great emphasis was put on it, not too much, but the time may be coming when relatively less should be put upon it. If the Minister of Education were to announce that the government are shifting the weight of the monies being spent within the post-secondary education field, and they were putting relatively more on nonuniversity education, I think I would be willing to welcome that, assuming he makes the case - there is a case to be made.

I would like nothing better than to hear from the minister a statement that he has instituted a thorough review of the whole post-secondary spectrum. I really believe it is one of the great problems facing us now in the educational field in Newfoundland. The other problems are matters of dollars, matters of quantums.

The former Minister of Education said, and I think he has got some considerable weight on his side here, that we should put, relatively speaking, more money into our elementary systems, into the lower grades of the school system, Again that may make some sense.

But what we are seeing here is not that sort of redistribution, what we are seeing here is a deliberate policy to restrict access to the university. How? By requiring students to borrow more money.

The honourable gentleman from St. John's West has pointed out that these loans are guaranteed by the Government of Canada, the Liberal Government of Canada, the same government that gave him \$24 million and saved him his bacon this year,



MR. ROBERTS: politically speaking.

Then he went on with another of his virulent outbursts against that government. Money was dripping out of their ears but they would not give it to poor little Johnny to enable him to do what he wanted. We did not hear that from him when he was campaigning for election. This is the tactic now of a scared and defeated administration. They realize they are incapable of dealing with the problems of this province and they are showing that.

By forcing students to borrow more money, Sir, we will deter students from going to university, not the richer ones, not the ones whose families are relatively well off, not the ones who come from families that are making it under the present system. It probably will not deter any member of the House who has children eligible to attend university, first of all members of the House are - well they are not well paid, but they are not on the dole, \$6666.67.

MR. MARTIN: A lot of money.

MR. ROBERTS: Even the honourable gentleman from Labrador North says that is a lot of money, and I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, his standards and mine do not coincide on that point.

But it is a lot of money compared to what many people in Newfoundland earn, compared to what my constituents earn, compared to what many people in the rural Newfoundland and even people in St. John's. There are many people in St. John's to whom \$6600 (\$120 a week, round numbers, \$3.00 an hour, double the minimum wage) to whom that is a lot of money.

Those people, Sir, the only hope they have of getting children to university is to get help, to get generous financial aid. I am all for wacking it off the wealthier people, of course but this, Mr. Chairman, will fall heaviest on the poorer people because they must borrow more. The wealthier people indeed do not qualify for any loans under the Student Aid Programme, because

MR. ROBERTS: there is a need step even to get the loan.

Now a family, to whom an income of \$4,000, \$5,000 or \$6,000 is what they reach in a year, will be forced, to get their son or daughter to university, to borrow more, perhaps \$1400, this year it was maybe \$600 or \$700, and then, as my friend from Fogo says, some families have two or three.

I can say, Mr. Chairman, and this is a fact, I can say that all the argument will not take away from this, the people will not do this, the ordinary people in Newfoundland who have the abhorant fear of debt, it is inbred in people who live by the truck system for too many years, they will think twice.

Oh the doctors and lawyers and businessmen do not. They are used to being in debt. They are accustomed to borrowing thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars in the normal run of their personal occupations. But a fisherman in Englee, Mr. Chairman, who makes \$2,100 a year, is not readily going to see his son or daughter borrow \$1400 just to go to university. A fisherman in Lance au Clair or in Red Bay or anywhere in Labrador South will not readily borrow \$1400.

He may do it. He may have enough faith in that child and enough determination to get that child through university, but it will make it harder, much harder. The honourable Minister of Finance knows that he tried to pour scorn on the students for saying, "Do not make Memorial an éliteist institution." That is what these rules will do, they will make it more éliteist, and that is what it was twenty years ago and even ten years ago. All Your Honour had to do was look at the proportions of the students who came from St. John's. Two-thirds of the students would come from St. John's, one-fifth of the population, supplying two-thirds of the students.

MR. ROBERTS: In other words, Mr. Chairman, your chance of going to university if you lived in St. John's were eight or ten or twelve times as great as if you grew up in the out-harbours. Well one thing the Liberal Government - There were two reasons for that, the first was the school systems in St. John's were better and maybe still are, They have been brought up substantially in the outports; maybe there is still a qualitative difference. That was worked on.

But also, the fact that people in St. John's had access to the university and so the Minister of Finance, one of the common people, one of the common

people as he is, one of the common men, is helping to make Memorial an éliteist institution. This government are, by restricting entry. No longer is merit to be as important, Mr. Chairman, it is now money. "How much money has your old man got? How much does he earn? That will tell whether or not you will get in or not? Is he the sort of man who would borrow \$1400? Would he mind you borrowing \$1400?" That is a lot of money. "I only earned \$2000 last year and you are borrowing \$1400 just to go off to the university."

No, Mr. Chairman, it is a bad move. It is a retrograde step.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, we had to borrow \$600 last year, Mr. Chairman, \$600.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, no, Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman is wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, oh, before they get any. I am sorry.

Now he has to borrow \$1400 before he gets anything.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, last year he borrowed \$600 before he got the grant component. This year he borrows \$1400 before he gets the grant component.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$400 more than last year.

MR. ROBERTS: \$800 more, Mr. Chairman. I cannot help it if the gentleman for Bonavista South cannot add or subtract.

MR. MORGAN: No he borrowed \$1000 last year.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Not more than \$400 in excess of last year.

MR. ROBERTS: What I am saying is that last year they borrowed \$600 before the grant component began to run. This year they must borrow \$1400 before the grant component begins to run. Am I correct?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, that is correct.

MR. ROBERTS: That is what I am saying.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: In the aggregate it would never be \$400 more in the finite.

MR. ROBERTS: In the aggregate, what was it Lord Brain said? In the long run we will all be dead." So much for in the aggregate. I am talking about the student who is sitting down in Englee or on the Northeast Coast, the metropolitan Northeast Coast, the seven families who are there, who are trying to decide to send a child to university and all they will know is, boy you have to borrow \$1400 this year and last year you could borrow \$600 and you would start getting a grant, dollar for dollar; a dollar grant, a dollar loan.

Mr. Chairman, it is a retrograde step. It will deter people. We will never know. You can never prove it. You can never disprove it. Who is to say what makes the distinction? Who is to say what factors enter into the judgment of an individual deciding? The fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that in Newfoundland today we are not giving our young people sufficient access to post secondary education including the university.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman for St. John's Centre did not have the opportunity to go to university. I only wish that he had. He might have made his contributions even more intelligent, even more helpful, even more worthwhile. And if there were an objective statement of a need to help people to get to university, the honourable gentleman for St. John's Centre is it, Mr. Chairman. My point is made.

MR. MURPHY: You will never make a silk purse out of -

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Chairman. and you will never made a real minister out of the gentleman for St. John's Centre.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman may have learned it in school, he has forgotten it since. He obviously does not realize that I have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Is he standing up or sitting down now?

MR. ROBERTS: Well I do not know if he is standing up or sitting down.

MR. ROWE, W.N. I can never tell.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Chairman, as I was saying before the gentleman for St. John's Centre so rudely and needlessly and improperly and impolitely interrupted me:

The point is that this move and the reason we opposed it is that it will help tend to make university education less accessible to our young people. That is what is wrong with it. It is a deliberate policy by the administration, by the government, by the Progressive Conservative Government - right or wrong, it is a deliberate policy by them to make it harder to get to university. Money counts now, not merit. Money always counted, now it counts even more and merit counts even less. "How much money has your father got?" That is the question now. "Can you afford to borrow this money?" It is a step back. We are against it. If being a Liberal means anything, Mr. Chairman, it means that we are against this sort of a motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: What difference if you are a Liberal -

MR. ROBERTS: It is one of the real differences between Liberals and Tories, Not that we do not make mistakes, of course, the Liberals do make mistakes in education; the Tories make them too. The difference is, Sir, we learn from ours, we try not to make them again. The honourable gentlemen are like the Bourbons, they have learned nothing and have forgotten nothing, Louis XVIII, when he came back, Your Honour, was doubtless aware of that. When Louis XVIII resumed the Throne of France, after Napoleon had been defeated at Waterloo, - speaking of educational matters, Your Honour, Napoleon reformed, to leave the educational philosophy entirely in France. The Minister of Education was at Cambridge, he would have been well advised to go across the Channel and to study the Lycée system of France, set up by Napoleon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition is permitted to carry on, and this matter is to debate education from Aristotle to Philip Warren. However we are discussing the Education Estimates - 601-01, and the honourable member is irrelevant.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I could go on discussing education from Aristotle's time to Dr. Philip Warren's time, it would be most helpful to the Minister of Education.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Comparing small things -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, comparing, as my honourable friend from White Bay said, comparing great things on the one hand with lesser things on the other.

Anyway I thank, Your Honour for Your Honour's wise and discreet and helpful ruling. As always, I am humbly anxious to accept it.

As I was saying, Sir, the problem with this policy that the minister has brought in is that it is an éliteist policy. Figures can be dragged out. The Minister of Finance can give us another of his virtuoso performances and we have learned that the scale of his performance is different, it escalates, he is much more theatrical when the merit is much less.

So, Mr. Chairman. we are against it. We were against it outside of the Chamber yesterday, we are against it inside of the Chamber today and when we return to the government of this province we shall be against it and we shall do something about it. I think that every honourable member, Mr. Chairman, should be heard on this point. I believe that it is an important issue. I really believe that there is a very great policy, a very great principle that is being dealt with here.

How many Newfoundlanders are going to go to university? How many Newfoundlanders are going to get post-secondary education and on what terms? Who are they? Are they the ones academically qualified? Or are other considerations to come into fact, to come into play? I am afraid, Sir, with these measures that if the Minister of Education carries them through that we are taking a step back, we are taking a

step back to the times when all that mattered was money, merit mattered relatively little.

There used to be a time, Mr. Chairman, when any Newfoundlander with enough money could get into university. That was probably true across Canada. These last few years, Sir, it has been that any Newfoundlander who could meet the academic standards set by the university was guaranteed admission. Well now, Sir, we are going back. No longer will you have to meet the academic standards will have to meet those. You will have to go one step further, Sir, you will have to meet the financial standards set by the Government of this Province. You will have to be able to borrow \$1400 each year. You will have to be willing to assume a debt of \$5600 for a four year course. You have to be willing to assume a debt of \$7000 for a five year course. If you are willing to make that, fine and dandy. But if you are not willing to make that assumption, if you are not willing to take on that burden of debt, then, Mr. Chairman, you are denied the right to go to university, as effectively as if honourable gentlemen opposite stood in the doorway, as George Wallace, when he was Governor of Alabama the first time, stood in the doorway and barred students from going in, just as effectively, Mr. Chairman.

We are against it. It is a retrograde step. It is not the sort of thing that I would expect from the Minister of Education. I am disappointed in him. I am surprised at him. I think the people of Newfoundland will be disappointed and surprised and will be hurt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable the member for Green Bay.

MR. A. B. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words concerning the estimates in this case and more particularly the topic which has taken up the time of the House for the past few hours.

I am one of those people, Mr. Chairman, who back in the early 1960's graduated from a high school in this province and went on to Memorial University. I proceeded, through the Canada Student Loan Programme, to receive an education there.



and two years ago finish paying off what I got from the Canada Student Loan Programme. I am aware only too well, from the many teachers and students that I do know and taught around this province, that once you give something to somebody, whether it be one of the more intelligent people of our province or somebody less intelligent, once you make the step, as was made a few years ago, of offering something to a certain segment of society, when you start to take back some of that, for good and sound reasons, one is going to find that there is going to be a segment of that group who are going to feel that their rights are being trodden on, that the government or whoever is taking it back is doing something terrible to that group. I can sympathize with the students, the more perhaps radical element of the student population of Memorial, in their protest yesterday, because I remember, Mr. Chairman, only too well in 1962 or 1963 I was a part of a demonstration that one time came to the Confederation Building, which at that time was fighting for higher teachers' salaries. We had a group in here to see the then Premier of the day. That was in 1964-1965, I think it was. There was a group organized on campus at the time and I was one of the organizers of it because I think it was at that time, with a degree in education, with a fourth grade certificate we would come out of university and clear something like \$249 or \$250, around that area, per month. As third and fourth year students about ready to go on the job market, we did not relish the fact that after spending four years in university we would come out and get \$250 a month or \$260 a month, whatever it was.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: \$4,000 per year.

MR. PECKFORD: \$4,000 a year, was it? This is how much we cleared, somewhere around \$260 a month. So, I can sympathize, no question, with the feeling of many of the students of Memorial at this time, because I have been myself a part of protest movements and so on at Memorial, when I was there.

However, I also remember, Mr. Chairman, and I remember it very,

very vividly, when the former Premier of this Province came over to the university. We all stacked ourselves into the Physical Education Building and listened, with his cabinet behind him, as he announced the salary and free tuition programme to the student population. At that time I was a member of the Student Council of Memorial. At the time, of course, there was exuberance unlimited at the announcement, but it was not too long after, in meetings that I held with students of three and four hundred and in council, that we began to analyse this thing and in some wierd, strange way, at least I felt and know there were quite a few other students at the time who felt that something had happened that was not entirely right, because we began to feel that some of the initiative which we had displayed in getting loans and so on and working in the summer time - a point which has not been mentioned, Mr. Chairman, by the way, so far. The opposition have been making the point that students have to borrow over a four or five year period, seven or eight thousand dollars. This total seven or eight thousand dollars will have to be paid back after four or five years. There are quite a few students in this province who in the summer time succeed in obtaining employment and can help themselves in the next year's academic year.

This has not been touched at all. This cloak figure of seven or eight thousand dollars has been picked out of the air. A student goes to university for two semesters or whatever. He gets no job in his first year at university. He gets no job in his second year at university. He gets no job in his third year, fourth year or fifth year. For the months that he is out of university, if he does not just go on through semester after semester for four or five years, he absolutely does nothing. He sits down. He waits until he wants to go back to university again and hence he does not try in any way to find any financial

resources to assist himself in that time. That is of course totally erroneous because there are quite a few students, many students, I was one of them, who obtained and who will obtain employment in the summertime and who will be able to assist themselves financially in their academic careers. So, it is not true to say - it might be true for a small segment of the student population. I do not have any figures on it but there are quite a few students, let us say, (I think that is a fair statement) who will be able to obtain summer employment.

Besides that, Mr. Chairman, there are at the university at the present time some students - it might be only 150 or 200 - who are in the engineering school or faculty, who are under the programme where you are in for one semester and out for the next, working. I know of a couple of students right now who are down in Labrador, who are working on this programme. Now, I concede right away, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the majority of students at Memorial that are on this programme or anything like that but some of the students are. Besides the fact that summer employment is a very important part of the financial resources which the students can accumulate to help put themselves through university, how many students actually go to university for four or five consecutive years? If they are like some of the students that I know, they will be going for a couple of years and perhaps come out and work for a year, which is not all together wrong.

If I am not mistaken, some surveys that have been done in the last year indicate, across North America, a strong swing by students and hence it could also be true here, where they are tending to go to university for a year or so or two semesters and come out and work. There has been a real trend I know in the American universities especially, in this way, where students now begin to feel, because of this middle class syndrome that has been growing up over the last ten years, where every parent's son or daughter must go-to-university type thing,

if they are to gain the status in society that their parents want them to, because their parents never had it. This thing is fading away. The young people today are beginning to see that university is not the end-all and be-all of existence, that there is something to be said for working with your hands, communes, etc. There is something to be said for hitchhiking. There is something to be said for Europe and whatever. Hence, it is not true. There are too many other factors involved, Mr. Chairman, to make a statement that the students at Memorial who get this money are going to be in debt after four or five years, a total of seven or eight thousand dollars. It just does not work because if you did a survey, I am sure that you would find so many of them are obtaining summer employment to assist themselves through, so many who go out for a year, so many whose families have the where-with-all to help put them through, plus other factors. So, it is not true to say.

However, my other point, before I got carried away, was simply that I do sympathize with those students who were down on the steps of the Confederation Building yesterday, because I am not that far removed from the situation at hand, knowing that full-well even in high school, a year and a-half ago, where students even in the highschool on different occasions, if they never thought that they would get their just due in the classroom, would picket or demonstrate effectively for something that they thought was wrong. So that, I can appreciate, once any human being, homo sapien, has obtained something, it is a natural trait of human nature when somebody else tries to take it away for the human being to react in that fashion. Hence, it is quite justified and quite normal and quite natural to do so.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that, as pointed out by the Minister of Finance, as pointed out by the Minister of Education, the net

effect of this is not so great that the students in Memorial cannot handle the extra financial obligation placed upon them. I think that is a fair and valid statement to make. I do not think that the net increase in this is sufficient to warrant the Leader of the Opposition or the honourable member for St. Barbes North who should know better, being an educator himself, that this is a retrograde step in the sense that we are now going to deprive certain people from lower-class incomes from going to Memorial. I do not believe it for one second that this will in actual fact happen. I think it is pushing the point too far for political purposes and personally I disagree with it violently.

Mr. Chairman, in the last four or five years that I have had anything to do with teenagers and people who are going to university, I found that if there were anybody who really, sincerely wanted to go to university from the high school, he succeeded in doing so. If they really had the talent, if they really had the initiative, if they really had the where-with-all and were determined, they would go to university and they would be a success at university. I do not think this step by this government at this time can be interpreted to mean that this is going to change at all, not one iota. Not one tittle.

There are other things, of course,

in the estimates for education which I am pleased with. Especially, now to reiterate the point made clearly and lucidly by the Minister of Education, that there are increases in dollars in this education estimates, that this government does not intend to disregard the teachers and the students of Memorial University or the students of any other educational institution. Now that they have received their support and have gone to power they are going to forget about them and stab them in the back; this is totally untrue.

The point that I would like to make, if I could get before quite a few students, is simply this; that if a university student or even a high school student would take the budget of this province from last year and the corresponding tables from this year and take a good hard look at it so that they knew the exact position that this province finds itself in today, I would say that very few would then protest the decisions of this government in the budget this year. Because you cannot, Mr. Chairman, you can try but you cannot isolate the education estimates, you cannot isolate the justice estimates, you cannot isolate any one departments estimates from the overall financial position of this province. When you start to do that, you are looking at it in a very narrow light and one which does not logically add up.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: No, no. Mr. Chairman, I am not saying what the honourable member for Labrador North - your knowledge of the budget from last year now, which is so clearly aligned in your mind, and the budget and the estimates which you have now read thoroughly and which now are also clearly aligned in your mind, are fully cognizant of just where this province stands financially. I am only saying that the same kind of procedure should be followed by the students so, as students, not only of their own student-aid programme but as students of this province and of this country they

have a full knowledge of all of the financial aspects of the budget of this province. They would be in a much better position to judge just exactly whether this policy on student-aid or the policy on the mothers' allowances or any other policy was then in the best interests of the province at this time. Otherwise, you are only taking the facts which are sympathetic to you and just ignoring the other ones which have some bearing upon that policy. So, I think that this too is a point that should be made at this time.

Mr. Chairman, just a few other brief comments. One on the school tax which was mentioned by the honourable member from St. Barbes North. I believe, as he does to some extent, that a good, hard look has to be taken not only at just the school taxes but at the larger question of financing of education in this province over the next ten years because we all know, anybody who has anything to do with education, that the capital financial requirements over the next five or ten years are going to be up into \$100,000,000 or more and we are going to have to find ways and means to provide this money. Hence, it was heartening for me to hear that the government is considering and will perhaps make some definitive policy upon this in next year's budget, concerning long term-financing for education and capital projects in this province.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: This year.

MR. PECKFORD: This year? Oh, I see. I thought it was starting next year.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Long-term.

MR. PECKFORD: Right.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Long-term financing for school boards and schools.

MR. PECKFORD: All the better. See how well we played that one—this year then on this long-term financing for education. I know that leading educators in this province will welcome this move because it is a move in the right direction. If we are going to continue to

do justice to the educational opportunities of this province, well then we have to provide greater financing to provide the physical facilities and not only the building itself but the kinds of things that most go in that building including teachers to allow for proper teaching and learning to occur.

On the school tax thing; the thing that always strikes me about school tax, that something must be done about, is that I think the rule of many of the school tax authorities is that if you make over fifteen hundred dollars a year or so you pay forty dollars a year. So that if you have a man down in, let us take Conche or Englee, down in the honourable Leader of the Opposition's district, seeing as it is so close to his heart because he is such a rural individual himself, he lived down there for so long, if we take some fisherman down in St. Julien's or down in Fischot Islands or Conche or somewhere down there on the French Shore, who makes fifteen hundred and fifty dollars and has eight or nine children and he pays forty dollars a year. At the same time the Leader of the Opposition who makes twenty or thirty thousand dollars a year, as a conservative estimate, with a small c, he too only pays forty dollars a year. That to me does not seem to be a fair way of taxing people of this province for educational purposes.

Perhaps something can be said for the honourable member from St. Barbes North's suggestion about putting a percentage or the income tax or something to be used or something along that line I think you mentioned. I think this should be looked into. I think it is an idea about financing education in general as opposed to school tax authorities or assessments. That should be looked into because in the long run we are going to have to decide on something like that, I think for sure. I think, Mr. Chairman, that is all I will say at the present time.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the member for Green Bay has used up his valuable time in wanting to contribute to the debate? I have heard on a number of occasions and I feel it is the



philosophy of this government that we shall not go on and do the things that we are doing because it is too good for the people of this province. We must now revert back to a system where we felt that we should have been a number of years ago. The debt of the province is extreme. It is well in excess of a billion dollars. Then again, the people that must suffer because of this are the people from the rural areas. The people in the rural areas, when they institute a policy of this nature, will not get the same benefits as the people from St. John's or from Corner Brook or at an éliteist university. It will no doubt become an éliteist university. I did not intend to get into this debate, Mr. Chairman, but I feel now that I have been prompted by the honourable member for Green Bay. He so readily said, "I was not satisfied while I was in university. I protested because of the low salaries that teachers were getting. I protested. We marched on Confederation Building but now I do not approve of those students." Maybe the students that came to this university, Mr. Chairman, were not the students from St. John's that are financing their own way. They are not the students from across the country whose fathers are merchants.

I had a student that came into me just two days ago that I took twenty bucks out of my pocket and gave it to him to carry him over the weekend. That student was from Spotted Islands, the son of a widow, a second year student in university who is now here with not enough money. I sent him along to the Minister of Education to get a loan of \$120 to finish up the term and he was completely and utterly refused by the minister. What are we doing, Mr. Chairman, what are we doing? Are we going to draw back? The honourable member for Green Bay is sitting on the eighth floor, the parliamentary assistant, making ten thousand a year in addition to the sessional pay of sixty-six hundred and something, which adds up to ten thousand dollars a year anyway, twenty thousand dollars. Now, we have turned up our noses. Although we are

from the outports, he is looking down at the students. Why should they do that? We should not give them fourteen hundred dollars for a student?

I have a particular case in my district, five communities. In most of those communities, at a high school level, the students are brought in to Northwest River to a dormitory. This expense starts for the parents when the students reach the level of grade VIII. Dormitory living is very expensive. On top of the sixty dollars a month bursary that they get for the children, they have to pay an additional thirty to forty dollars a month for other expenses. That student starts at an expense to the parents over and above the

government bursary of \$30.00 a month, at the grade level of grade VIII He goes on to grade XI (just add up that expense, my hon. colleague) and then from there gets an additional expense, if he is going to enter a profession, going on for five years, another \$7,000. Mr. Chairman, when can that particular student or that parent hope to get a return on that educational investment? These are the things that the hon. Minister of Finance, living completely and utterly in isolation in St. John's, surrounded by a circle of élitist friends, profession people, lawyers, doctors and what have you, who were never exposed to the conditions that exist in Spotted Islands or Black Tickle -

AN HON. MEMBER: I was.

MR. WOODWARD: You were. It is so easy to forget, looking from the eighth floor now. We should not do it for them? At that time you did not feel that way but now that feeling has disappeared. I am getting my \$20,000, Mr. Chairman, and that feeling has now disappeared. Now I am not going to support the students by say \$600.00, as last year, and then go on to the student loan programme. Now it is \$1,400. There will not be three students coming out of my district this year because their parents will not like to take on the obligation.

Well, let us start first. One year of university is going to cost you \$1,400. When a person first enters university, whether he passes or goes on to a profession, his motive is to get a degree and ultimately he is in turn looking at borrowing \$7,000, that is the ultimatum. So he goes to the parents, and the parents have a meager means of \$400.00 to \$500.00, and says; "I am going to borrow \$7,000 to complete a degree at university." Those people never ever saw \$7,000 and they cannot visualize getting involved in debt to the extent whereby they are going to have to spend that \$7,000. If there are two students we are looking at \$1,400 and if there are three students we are looking at \$2,100.

Mr. Chairman, this is ludicrous. This sort of a thing that the hon. Minister of Finance has picked to bring in to this province, a balanced budget, by getting an additional \$1.6 million savings this year on student loans. If the students and the hon. member for Green Bay - I can sit down with any student from the university today, take those estimates along with the salary estimates here and show the increases that have been given to executive assistants, special assistants, assistant deputy ministers, assistant-assistant deputy minister, chairman of royal commission, and \$500,000 -

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODWARD: The opposition do not want an increase. The hon. member for Green Bay was the first one who said in this House, "I cannot live on \$10,000, Mr. Chairman, I have to get an increase. I am living below my standards. My standards. Because I went to university, I was meant to make a vast amount of money." He has moved to the eighth floor and no doubt he is doing very well. But those are the things that -

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order, the hon. member for Labrador North has the floor. The hon. member for Green Bay is harassing him in this debate, and I assume he has the right to speak in silence.

MR. WOODWARD: If I were to take this budget, as I said previously, and show the increase, just the increase in the Premier's office over and above the increase in previous years when Premier Smallwood was in office, what was it increased by? \$500,000 or \$600,000, the restructuring of government, just to make it easier for the ministers by bringing a vast amount of people back into the civil service. Are the ministers of the crown prepared to work a little bit harder just to give the students the benefit? No, Mr. Chairman, this is not the concept of this thing at all. What the hon. Minister

of Finance is saying today, he is saying; "Look, this is the place to hit because we have a hot spot at the university. We are educating a number of people and we do not want those students to slip into an easy way of life. What we want them to do is work like their fathers did, to be productive, to chose something."

These are the questions and this is the method. It is not the mere fact that they are saying you have to borrow \$1,400 or instituting this particular policy. It is the fact that they are saying to the people and particularly to the people in rural Newfoundland, "Now you are getting it too easy. What you are going to have to do is, if your parents do not have the ability to borrow that money on your behalf, you must stay away from our university." That is true. I feel it, as very few people on that side of the House feel, when I get students coming out of my district - I will not say it in the House, Mr. Chairman. I doubt very much if the hon. Minister of Finance, in St. John's West, ever gets a visit from a student who says, "What am I going to do about education this year, Sir?" Or maybe the hon. member for Harbour Main. I am sure that the hon. member for Green Bay gets such a request.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODWARD: This maybe the case. I am not disputing that fact. But the method of the hon. member for Green Bay, Mr. Chairman, getting up and saying, "Look, they should not serve five years in succession in university." Maybe this dictorial method that we are going to use, put them in for one year and put them out for a year and let them earn some money and go back in again and consequently it will take them ten years or fourteen years to get a professional degree. Is that not what you have been implying? How many teachers have gone back to university since the university became whereby everyone could get the opportunity, how many have gone back and upgrated themselves people at forty and some people

fifty years of age?

MR. PECKFORD: How come so many got -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member for Green Bay observe the rules?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Does the hon. member want to allow the question or would the hon. member prefer to speak?

MR. WOODWARD: I would prefer to speak, if you would not mind, Mr. Chairman. I think it is the policy, and the thing that evolved from all of these methods and policy of the Tory administration will be to draw back, to take away the things from rural Newfoundland. I could not care less, Mr. Chairman, but there is a big hullabaloo about someone putting a building up on Signal Hill. I could not care less if they stripped down Cabot Tower on Signal Hill, for what it means to me but it does mean a lot when I see people in my district and from the Labrador Coast that are so sincere and so concerned about getting their children into this university that we have all helped to pay for and when I see measures brought in by the government of the day to disallow this sort of a thing. I mean this is where you turn around and you say, "Where are we going?" It is a matter of, "Well we hit the students this year and we took it away from the mothers last year." There was a big cry as a lot of people on the Labrador Coast and particularly in Labrador and I am sure in rural Newfoundland who were really looking forward to that extra money to put clothing on their children. It did not come.

This year, no doubt a number of parents with children in high school today have made arrangements to borrow the \$600.00 to get their children in the university this year. What a change. What a detrimental effect on the morals of the people of this province when you think in terms of all arrangements been made. "We had the means whereby we could borrow that \$600.00 but now how do

we go beyond that to \$1,400?" I think this is the real question and I, Mr. Chairman, I feel and I do not feel as the hon. member for Green Bay feels that now we are sitting up here I want \$20,000, he wants \$20,000 a year to live. We have a lot of graduates coming out of that university. I have truck drivers

on my payroll that make more money than the graduate teachers that are serving in rural Labrador, people with degrees . I am very sincere.

I would like to point out another point here of a warning that was given to the teachers in this particular budget. I asked last year if some incentive could be given to teachers to teach on the Labrador Coast rather than having to bring people in from Holland, bringing people in from the U.K., bringing people into Happy Valley to teach at a school, from the Philippines. I said that we have a number of students, we have a number of people out here that are graduating from the university. Why not give those people an extra incentive? It was never considered. Now, how do we hope to bring our people from those particular isolated communities in here to get an education at this elaborate university that we have and expect them to go back to teach, to take up that profession in their own communities if they have to borrow seven thousand dollars over a period of five years? No, Mr. Chairman. This word has spread all throughout this province.

The demonstration yesterday, I think - I am not a protestor by any means but I felt that when they counted the numbers of those students, the students that were protesting at the university were the students that knew that they could not go on. They were not the people whose fathers were financing them. They were the students that did not have the means to go on next year that made that protest. I do not think that the honourable Minister of Finance or the honourable member for Green Bay who was so hurriedly, I suppose, elevated to that great, honourable step on the eighth floor, getting a salary of twenty thousand dollars a year when we have superintendents who are travelling in the most isolated areas, with M.A. degrees, and what are they getting? Twelve to fifteen thousand dollars a year. So, what are we doing? We have executive assistants working here in this particular building who are getting up to twenty thousand.



When I was in office, I did not ask for an executive secretary.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, right. We did not want it. Neither do I want a raise in salary. I would rather think in terms of sitting down with the Minister of Finance and putting the strong arm on a lot of people that sit around in the civil service in this province and putting the strong arm on and say that we are going to take "x" number of dollars away to support this particular student-aid programme. If we are going to take something away, why do we not start at the top where we have the means whereby we can extract something from them, not start at the bottom where a poor university student has just got in by the hair of his head?

It is a sad day, Mr. Chairman. It is a sad day for this province. This move may not be sad but what other services will be taken away, what other means? Will we next take the buses away from central schools? Will we take the buses away? There were threats last year that we were going to close "x" number of roads in Southern Labrador because they were too expensive to keep the snow plows on to operate. Will we pull the buses off the Great Northern Peninsula, running from Cook's Harbour to St. Anthony? Is that a way of doing it? Well, I mean, we are going to do this. I have no doubt that this will be done, Mr. Chairman. So, where do we stop? I feel now is the time, as the honourable Leader of the Opposition said yesterday.

I think it is very distasteful to say that he was trying to incite a riot in front of Confederation Building. I think that demonstration yesterday was very, very orderly, maybe more orderly than the demonstration that will come about as the result if the teachers do not get their raise in this province, Mr. Chairman, maybe more orderly than that will be.

Those are the areas that hit the people in rural Newfoundland. Those are the things that I am very sincere about and when this

government bring a policy in. We have always looked on the Tory Government as the merchant's government. I see nothing wrong with a means-test at that university. I see nothing wrong with a selective body, responsible body going into that university and taking the student's application and sitting down and negotiating with the student but I see a lot wrong when the government bring in a blanket policy and says that it applies to everyone, Mr. Chairman. I think this is the wrong approach because of the fact that we have people that have various means and we have people here at the university now, as I cited before, that could have used more money this year and they are hanging on, as the student that I had visit me a couple of days ago.

So, I think that the honourable Minister of Finance did not have to look at a set figure of \$1.6 million saving.

What is he doing? Is he trying to balance the budget, Mr. Chairman? \$1.6 million saved this year. We will put it over in this particular corner, \$1.6 million there is no concern is not going to affect - how many students at the university?

MR. ROBERTS: There are over 6,600 full-time students.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The full-time student equivalent is around 9,200.

MR. WOODWARD: Sixty-six hundred. I do not believe for a minute that it is going to affect the sixty-six hundred or the sixty-seven hundred students at university. I do know for a fact that it is going to affect two thousand and possibly another enrollment of fifteen or seventeen hundred that will be looking to get in there this coming September.

So, I think that this administration, the honourable Minister of Education, the honourable Minister of Finance who, if he wants to put in a savings in this province, he does it regardless, I think that they should have looked at this in a different light and not to affect all the people. Maybe there are students in the university who do not need the fourteen hundred dollars but are just borrowing it.

I feel that it should be done with a selection committee set up

and having students on this particular committee and to screen those applications and say, "Look, if you have the means, you can borrow six hundred bucks from the Canada Student Aid Plan. We know that you have the means." Do it selectively. "We will lend you the remainder of your money."

So, Mr. Chairman, I think it could have been done in a far different way than saying, "Look, you must borrow fourteen hundred dollars from the Canada Student Loan Programme before we assist you whatsoever."

MR. GILLETT: Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps I should begin where my honourable colleague left off. I was very impressed with what he had to say. I agree wholeheartedly with his remarks concerning what he

referred to and termed as a blanket policy. I know that we all realize that in the outports of Newfoundland we have many people who are on welfare but who have children who have an aspiration and aspire to a higher education. In that aspiration they want to come to university. Now that person or the child of that family, if he leaves say Grade XI and wants to come on, the parent has nothing whatsoever for him. He may fortunately be able to earn enough money during the summer to buy clothes for himself but as I see it, he has to borrow \$1,600, not \$1,400 and he has to borrow, as the hon. Minister of Education has already said, \$400 more than before. It does come to \$1,600, if he has no means at all.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: He cannot borrow any more than \$1,400.

Nobody can borrow, under student loans, over \$1,400.

MR. GILLET: No, but he still requires the whole eighteen. The other four, fifty/fifty. That makes \$1,600 he borrows.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Under the new system he would borrow the \$1,400 and he would get \$600 then in grants. If a single student's fee were \$1,800, he would now borrow \$1,400 and get the remainder of \$400 in grant.

MR. GILLET: The fifty/fifty does not apply.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The fifty/fifty does not apply. The \$1,400 is the sum total which one can borrow.

MR. ROBERTS: When does the grant begin? At \$1,400.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right. If a person's fee is \$1,800 -

MR. ROBERTS: If \$1,400 is needed, he borrows \$1,400. If he needs \$1,000, he borrows \$1,000. If he needs \$1,600, he borrows \$1,400.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: And gets \$200.

MR. ROBERTS: Anyway he borrows \$1,400. That is our point. He gets the shaft.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I thought the honourable gentleman was saying that he might have to borrow more. He cannot borrow more.

MR. ROBERTS: If the honourable minister could have them borrow more they would.

MR. GILLETT: Earlier the honourable minister used as a basis the need of \$1,000. Taking that basis with the \$600, he required \$400 more, therefore, fifty/fifty of a loan and a grant. I thought it applied all the way up the line. I am glad to know that it does not.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: At first they would have borrowed \$800 and now they borrow \$1,000.

MR. GILLETT: However, Mr. Chairman, I do hope that the government will see its way to set up a select committee or do something to encourage and enable any student from any walk of life who wants to come to the university. Now that is one aspect of looking at. That is taking this student and taking him with absolutely nothing. On the other hand, I agree that anything that is worth having is worth working for. We should not take away the incentive from students. We do have cases - I am sure that the hon. Minister of Education realizes that. The member for Green Bay mentioned the cost of education by what he considered to be a more equitable means of levying a tax on income tax. I rather think that that should be on a sales tax.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. GILLETT: Well in what way would the income tax be more equitable?

MR. HICKMAN: It is based on income. The rich pay more.

MR. GILLETT: I am talking about contributing now. Every parent or person contributing to his or her son's or daughter's education where every parent has an obligation, naturally. Does he or does he not? However that is something that can be discussed later.

In speaking this morning, the hon. Minister of Education mentioned not only the academics but the utilization of our human resource. This is something which had been mentioned earlier in this session, and in developing this human resource in every possible way. This I agree with wholeheartedly. I also agree with something that was very uppermost in my thoughts but my hon. colleague from Bell Island took it away from me this morning and that is education in alcoholism and the use of drugs. This, Mr. Chairman, particularly the excessive use of alcohol, is becoming one of the biggest drawbacks this province has. If it should continue it will be without doubt one of the biggest if not the biggest, drawback that this province will ever have.

I think, therefore, that if this education is not given in the home then I think the government should see that it is given in schools. I think this is what my colleague had in mind this morning when he mentioned that somewhere in our school system this should be taught, and that is the results, the hard facts of the excessive use of alcohol and, of course, the use of drugs to any degree.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is all that I am going to say now. Perhaps as we come down through the estimates I shall have more to say. My colleague says to carry on until six o'clock.

MR. ROBERTS: That will bring us back at eight o'clock.

MR. GILLETT: Oh, I see.

MR. ROBERTS: Unless the honourable gentleman wants to spend his Friday evening here, I think we should have the committee rise and adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable gentleman is finished.

MR. GILLETT: I am, Mr. Chairman, I think for now.

On motion debate adjourned.

On motion that the 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 on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until tomorrow Monday at 3:00 P.M.