



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 2

2nd Session

Number 49

VERBATIM REPORT

Monday, April 9, 1973

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. J. CROSBIE, Minister of Finance: Before we get to presenting petitions, Mr. Speaker, the statement I make is with respect to the arbitration award and subsequent payment to instructors at the district vocational school.

In order to clarify this situation, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain that the - this is with respect to the payments to instructors at the College of Fisheries, College of Trades and Technology and the various district vocational schools as a result of an arbitration board ruling. There is a dispute over the interpretation of the collective agreement.

The arbitration board ruling favoured the instructors and directed the employer, that is the government, to make such salary adjustments as were necessary to ensure that each member of the bargaining unit received, during the fiscal year 1972-1973, the salary to which the collective agreement entitled him during that year.

With respect to instructors at the College of Fisheries, the adjustments were paid on March 20. With respect to instructors at the College of Trades and Technology the adjustments were paid on March 31, 1973.

However, because of certain administrative difficulties and because of the large number of instructors employed in the district vocational schools, the adjustment we hoped to make on March 31, 1973 for those instructors was delayed.

I have been in contact with my colleague, the Minister of Education, and we are now able to ensure the instructors at the district vocational schools and the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees that the necessary documentation has been prepared for the payment of the adjustments and the Department of Finance will be issuing the relevant cheques.

MR. CROSBIE: it should be before the end of this week. So these adjustments will be paid them by the end of this week and if for some reason this is not done by the end of this week, it will certainly be done before the end of next week.

This affected agreement with respect to the method of payment of vocational school instructors, whether they should be paid on the same basis as teachers in day schools or on a different basis, and the arbitration award was in their favour. So these payments should be out within the next week.

MR. E. MAYNARD, Minister of Forestry and Agriculture:

Mr. Speaker, I have two statements I would like to make. The first statement is in relation to the National Egg Marketing Scheme.

During the past few weeks a number of inquiries have been made to the House of Assembly regarding the status of the report of the Commission of Enquiry into the Provincial Egg Industry; and regarding this province's position relative to participation in the National Egg Marketing Scheme.

I want to briefly bring the House up-to-date on the situation at this time.

The Commission of Enquiry was appointed to study the provincial egg industry and make recommendations in respect to

- (1) the marketing of eggs in Newfoundland, including policies relating to quotas, distribution through grading stations and pricing;
- (2) the promotion and stabilization of the marketing of eggs in Newfoundland and in concert with other provinces, the marketing of eggs in Canada.

Meetings were held in Newfoundland and Labrador to obtain the opinions of all affected. All relevant information on production and marketing, including costs, from Newfoundland and elsewhere, was also compiled for comparison purposes. The Commission also examined marketing programmes elsewhere to develop the best possible programme for Newfoundland.

MR. MAYNARD: The Commission had strong reservations concerning the national marketing plan, but Newfoundland has no alternative but join or else compete openly with the other provinces who would be able to dump surplus eggs at reduced prices.

The Commission's two basic recommendations are for provision for consumer protection and a strong marketing effort to ensure the best possible distribution of eggs.

The government is also concerned that all producers receive fair and equal treatment. We hope to have adequate copies of the report to table before the House within two weeks. An explanatory note here: When the report was first received, as I explained to the House, it was received in a very rough draft form. We had hoped to have it much sooner in its final public consumption form but it has not been made available to us. The people

are still working on it. We hope to have it very shortly, at least they tell us we will.

In the meantime, new legislation has been prepared which will enable us to enter the scheme, provide for producer and consumer protection and facilitate the growth of an egg industry in the province.

The present legislation does not allow us to enter into an agreement of this type and would in fact transfer authority to the National Egg Marketing Agency regarding the setting of quotas and the pricing of eggs. The government feels that it has a responsibility to the producers, consumers and the province in general and has therefore delayed in signing the agreement.

A meeting is scheduled for 2:00 P.M., April 10, to discuss these problems with the producers and bring them up to date on the situation.

We are anxious to have the report tabled before the House prior to discussing the legislation. If the legislation receive approval of the House of Assembly, then the agreement will be signed to participate in the National Egg Marketing Scheme.

Copies of that are available for the press and the members of the opposition.

The second statement, Mr. Speaker, in regards to the Gros Morne National Park:

When this administration assumed office in January, 1972, one of the major projects we inherited was the proposed development of a large national park in the Bonne Bay Area of Western Newfoundland.

This government felt that the development of Gros Morne was very desirable from the standpoint of the economic benefits to the area. There was no doubt in our minds that a national park of the magnitude of the proposed Gros Morne would have a very large and in most ways a very beneficial impact on the whole West Coast of the Island.

At the same time, however, we looked on Gros Morne as presenting a considerable number of problems. The largest of these problems was the terms and conditions set out in the memorandum of agreement signed

by the then Provincial Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources and the Federal Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, the honourable Jean Chretien.

The most objectionable part of that agreement was the section which called for the relocation of five communities within the park area. We felt very strongly that no person should be forced to move unless that person had a personal desire to move. It was and is our belief that people should be treated with compassion and humanity. When any development takes place, whether a national park or otherwise, the social upheaval and interference with the traditional way of life should be kept at a very minimum. We are firm believers in the creed that if people want to change their way of life, government have an obligation to help in that change. On the other hand, if people are content and happy with their present life styles and in the communities where they and their forefathers have lived for hundreds of years, then government have a very serious obligation to protect these people from serious social and economic upheavals.

It was on this basis that, in early 1972, my colleague, the honourable William Doody, and I resumed negotiations with the federal government in relation to the development of Gros Morne. It should be made quite clear that although the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs were somewhat flexible in regards to some of the sections of memorandum of agreement, their response to our proposal that the five communities in question should be allowed to remain was an emphatic "No."

We therefore found ourselves in the almost impossible position of wanting to develop the national park and live up to an agreement made between two governments, and at the same time having to go a route that was diametrically opposed to our own stated policy, in order to get the development and abide by the agreement.

A great deal of thought was given to possible ways of overcoming this dilemma. We had almost resigned ourselves to accepting

and trying to live with a situation which we considered in certain aspects unacceptable in relation to our policies and objectives.

In early 1973, the honourable Jean Chretien made certain statements in the House of Commons, in answer to questions regarding Gros Morne, which led us to believe that there was some change of attitude on the part of federal people regarding the relocation of the communities of Sally's Cove, Green Point, Bakers Brook, Belldowns Point and Lobster Cove-Woody Cove. We immediately communicated with Mr. Chretien's office to arrange a meeting and try to clarify the position of the federal government.

A meeting was arranged with the federal minister for March 6. The honourable William Doody and I, accompanied by officials of my department, met, in Ottawa, with the honourable Mr. Chretien and officials of the National Park Service. Once again we stated our position regarding the relocation of these communities. Mr. Chretien agreed to make a reassessment of the problem and advise us within a few weeks.

I have now received the anxiously awaited response from the federal minister.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to report that the honourable Mr. Chretien has agreed that the people of the communities named may continue to occupy their properties without let or hindrance of any kind for as long as they choose to remain.

I would like to read the relevant sections or some of them from Mr. Chretien's letter.

It says, "(1) The present boundaries of the park will remain substantially as they are now drawn and the communities listed above will be within the park boundaries." These are the ones that I read a few minutes ago. "No resident of the communities which lie within the park boundaries will be under any compulsion to move. These residents may continue to occupy their properties without let or hinderance of any kind for as long as they choose to remain.

"When a resident wishes of his own free will to dispose of his property, Canada stands ready to share with the province the cost of providing fair and just options to the people concerned, at favourable terms. Two such options would be to provide, a house for a house and land for land exchange, in a provincial community offering a greater variety of services or, at the resident's choice, a fair price for his home if the individual considers this option to be more advantageous." The province undertakes to acquire all such properties offered.

"The federal government recognizes that they are residents of the communities and have supported their way of life by use of resources lying outside the communities but within the park and access to such resources such as fishing, pastureland fuel-wood etc. must be continued to be assured. I propose that a local committee or committees be established, with representation from the communities, the province and the federal parks administration, to work out the details of such arrangement in a way that will be fair to the communities and to afford the maximum possible protection of park values.

"Therefore the traditional inshore fisheries utilized by the residents of these communities and the enclaved communities outside of the park will continue undisturbed as in the past." There are ten points set out; these are four of them.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great breakthrough in respect to allowing people to pursue their chosen way of life as opposed to governments dictating the way they should live.

The communities will remain within the park boundaries and will not be enclaves such as Rocky Harbour - Norris Point. A relocation policy will be made available to them. We consider this to be very fair in view of the fact that a number of people indicated, during our recent surveys, a desire to relocate.

This is a very real victory for the people of these communities.

As far as this government are concerned, we can now proceed at full speed with the development of this large and very important project.

On behalf of the Government of Newfoundland and the people of the area, I want to extend our sincere appreciation to Mr. Chretien and his colleagues for this major change of policy. I am sure that the people of these communities will breathe a deep sigh of relief that this issue has finally been resolved.

A copy of Mr. Chretien's letter to me, dated April 5, is attached to this statement.

Thank you.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I wholeheartedly welcome the statement by the minister. I understand a similar statement is being made in Ottawa or will be made when the House of Commons opens there at 2:30 P.M. or whenever they do open, a simultaneous statement.

We welcome it. Sir, because for the people in the communities affected, the communities just immediately to the north of Norris Point, on the West Coast of the province, for them, Sir, it means the lifting of a cloud under which they have lived for the past two or three years.

I was most interested to hear the minister reaffirm that the present administration ran into exactly the stone wall which we ran into as an administration. I do regret that he did not say, I expected that he would give credit where credit is due to the man who brought about this change in the stone wall. He had help from the honourable gentleman, he had help the member for Humber-St. George-St. Barbe, Mr. Jack Marshall, but the man who most of all brought this about I am happy to say was the Newfoundland minister in Ottawa, Mr. Don Jamieson. He brought this change about. He was the man who persuaded the Government of Canada to change their mind when two premiers, two governments had failed completely.

I may also say, Mr. Speaker, I get a small amount of personal pleasure out of this after the vicious personal attack which was delivered by the Premier in behalf of the then ill minister, I get a certain satisfaction. I said at the time, I stood behind what I said.

I did stand behind what I said and in the event I have been proven right. One would naturally get a certain satisfaction from that. The minister will answer to his own conscience for this lying on his sick bed drafting vicious and low personal attacks. But by far the most important thing is for the people of this area who no longer are living with this threat now they know that they will be allowed to remain in their homes, little thanks to the present government, little thanks to the past administration, all thanks to Don Jamieson at Ottawa.

PETITIONS

MR. F. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition which I received from the parish priest at Fox Harbour but it is signed by the residents of Fox Harbour and Ship Harbour.

The petition is signed by over 500 individuals. The prayer of the petition is, Mr. Speaker, that steps be taken to upgrade and pave the road between Fox Harbour and Ship Harbour. The mileage in question is only five and a-half miles. The exact distance is seven miles but one and a-half miles were paved a year or so ago.

The Minister of Highways and his officials are quite familiar with the road in question because last year, after the House of Assembly closed, the minister, in company with the Deputy Minister and his area supervisor, visited the road.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very poor road. The children of the Community of Ship Harbour are compelled to use this road every day in travelling to school either at Fox Harbour or at Placentia. The prayer of the petition is that immediate steps be taken to upgrade and pave this road. In addition to the school bus using the highway also several of the residents of both of these communities work at Long Harbour and as a result they are compelled daily to drive over this road.

The parish priest states that this year the road has not been as bad as in previous years and it is in very, very good condition but only last year, Mr. Speaker, residents have had to stay either in

Fox Harbour or in Placentia overnight and sometimes as high as two days because this road was impassible.

I respectfully submit that it is one of the worst roads in the province. I would like to table this petition and refer it to the department to which it relates and I hope that the Minister of Highways will see fit to give it immediate attention this year.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by the honourable the member for Placentia East on behalf of his constituents in Fox Harbour and Ship Harbour.

Sir, I am familiar with that area and very familiar with that stretch of road and I agree with the honourable member that the road is in bad shape. It needs to be upgraded and paved. I cannot agree with him that it is the worst road in his district because the road down to Cape Shore I think is in much worse shape.

However, Sir, be that as it may, I hope that something is done with that road too this year. I hope that the government will see fit to undertake to make some improvements to that stretch of road this year because it is a terrible inconvenience to the people both in Ship Harbour and Fox Harbour.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further petitions?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER: (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to Question .

number 188, asked by the hon. member for St. Barbe North.

HON. L.D. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, there were a number of questions raised by the hon. member for Bell Island but I do not know if this is the proper time to answer them - with the leave of the House in any event. One question, "Had there been a discovery of a large deposit of copper in the Seal Lake Area of Labrador?" The department has no knowledge of any discovery of a large deposit or commercial deposit of copper in the Seal Lake Area. There are hundreds of occurrences of copper in the area, a promising concentration of berkelium minerals and further East many occurrences of uranium which have interesting possibilities. BRINEX and its joint partners have been carrying out an exploration programme and still are in the area, with a view to developing a mineral potential.

Another question, "What is the status of Hooker Chemical Corporation's activities in the St. George's Bay Area and of the salt potential there?" The company has reduced its concession area to fifty square miles of development license in a number of separate blocks. They had already discovered an apparently large deposit of salt in the Fischells Brook Area and through Diamond Crystal Limited, is currently drilling a hole near St. David's. No further information is available for publication on the current exploration project.

Another question, "What is the current rate of mineral exploration activity in the province?" A total of twelve exploration companies, as listed below, have exploration agreements with the Newfoundland government and are committed to spend approximately \$750,000 on exploration in 1973. These are Advocate Mines Limited, British Newfoundland Exploration Company, Newfoundland Zinc Mines Limited, American Smelting and Refining Company, Commodore Mining Company Limited, Noranda Exploration Company Limited, Allied Chemical Corporation, Radex Minerals

Limited, Hansa Explorations Limited, Iron Ore Company of Canada, Kemco Explorations Company Limited, Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited. Other companies active in the province in most cases as joint partners are Kerr Edison Gold Mines Limited, Cominco Limited, Serem Limited and Canadian Javelin Limited. In 1972 a total of thirty-eight miners' permits which entitled a company or individual to explore for minerals were sold. To date in 1973 twenty-five miners' permits have been sold.

The last question, "What is the current status of the Julien Lake mining lease in Labrador?" This lease was issued to NALCO on November 14, 1960, for a term of ninety-nine years. On November 15, 1960, NALCO assigned the rights to the iron ore in the area to Canadian Javelin Limited. Effective June 11, 1974, Canadian Javelin Limited is required to (and this is the wording of the agreement) proceed with mining operations with due diligence, whatever that means. The iron ore deposit covered by the lease is estimated to contain a reserve of 500 million tons, containing 34.2 per cent iron.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have copies of the answers that the hon. minister has given me? I see the minister has them.

MR. BARRY: Certainly I will get copies of them.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, in the absence of the Premier, even though his chair seems to be occupied perhaps the deputy Premier, I think it is either a false alarm or coming events casting shadows before them. But as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, a question, I guess for the acting Premier, the Minister of Justice, can the minister tell us anything about the strike at Labrador City where I gather there are twenty men on what apparently is an unlawful strike and who have succeeded at least at this time in closing the entire operation. They also say, Mr. Speaker, by way of asking the question, I

understand these twenty men feel they have been unjustly deprived of their jobs because of the QNS and L take over from IOC of the railway from Labrador City to the Ross Bay Junction. Could the minister tell us what this is all about, please?

HON. T.A. HICKMAN(MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations is back in his seat now and I would prefer that he would answer that question.

MR. ROBERTS: I will gladly redirect it to the late arriving minister. The minister should be aware that the House sits at 3:00 P.M. and it is now 3:30 P.M.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I did not ask anything of the minister responsible for garbage. Could the minister answer the question, please?

HON. T.P. HICKEY(MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): To a point of order, Mr. Speaker, are we going to tolerate this garbage? The greatest polluter of all times is over there.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister would permit the Leader of the Opposition is redirecting a question in a quite orderly fashion to the Minister of Industrial Relations. Some of his remarks may have been gratuitous and out of order, however they did not necessarily provoke the response that they did evoke.

HON. W.G. DAWE(MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS): Mr. Speaker, I was in the House. I was not sitting in my own seat but I was just back here. The situation in Labrador City is that apparently the whole operation is now tied up because of the people who went on strike, about twenty or so railway workers. I do not know exactly where we stand on this one because it seems that it might be a question of federal jurisdiction, because this is an interprovincial railway system.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister. I apologize as I did not see him sitting back there. I was so awestruck by the glamour of the gentleman from Bay de Verde, I guess. Could the minister indicate when we may have some action? Because really

these twenty men apparently have a just claim. But whether or not they have a just claim, the entire operation of twelve or fifteen hundred men is now shut down.

MR. DAWE: We are working on this now and as a matter of fact we hope to be in touch with the company officials later on, as soon as the question period is over.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have the company to date indicated anything to the minister? I gather they are responsible because, as the minister knows, the railway has been turned over by IOC to the Quebec North Shore and Labrador which after all is only a subsidiary of IOC; they own it, and the men are losing their jobs in the process.

MR. DAWE: No, the company have not contacted my office so far.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, has the minister contacted them?

MR. DAWE: We are working on that now.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Industrial Relations and Manpower. In view of the fact that some 130 workers, members of the International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 904, rejected the latest wage offer from the Avalon Consolidated School Board, has the minister taken any steps to set up conciliation boards to intervene into the matter so that the schools will not be closed as a result of the strike?

MR. DAWE: The conciliation services have not been set up yet but if they are required they certainly will be.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister indicate what he means by when they are required? I understand there is some danger that schools may have to be closed if those people go on strike.

MR. DAWE: The conciliation officers do not go into action unless they are requested by one party or the other.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the

Minister of Transportation and Communications whom we are happy to see back in his seat today. Would the minister tell the House if his department or if the government intend to extend the same privilege to the isolated residents of Bell Island as they have extended to Fogo Island, Change Island and other parts of Newfoundland that are isolated because of the ice blockade, by providing a subsidy for freight and essential goods and supplies to get back and forth?

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

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the honourable member for Bell Island, it is under advisement and we are watching the situation and at this time we do not have any intention of doing so.

MR. E.W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to, I do not know to which honourable minister but I suppose I will have to talk to the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Has the minister received notice that the school bus at Change Island had to be taken off the road this morning because of road conditions?

HON. H.A. COLLINS(MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING):

Mr. Speaker, that is the first I have heard of it. I should say that the honourable member for Fogo did give me notice of it as we walked into the House but that is the first I heard of it today and I will certainly take a look at it.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

601(01):

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Mr. Chairman, while the honourable the Minister of Finance has spoken on this whole business of students allowances and tuition and the way the minister put his words we should have just said, "Amen " and all gone home and the matter should have been finished. Sir, the Minister of Finance put on a very dramatic

display on Friday, a very colourful spectacle, full of fire, the sort of thing, Sir, that he usually does when he gets boxed into a corner and cannot defend the absence of the administration.

Sir, I submit that the statistics given to this honourable House by the honourable the Minister of Finance were completely lacking in logic as far as the actual overall facts were concerned with respect to the students allowances and their tuition. Sir, the honourable Minister of Finance is going to have to do a bit fancier footwork than he demonstrated in the House on Friday to get out from under the statistics that he stated. Sir, what the Minister of Finance and the honourable Minister of Education tried to do on Friday was to take a single example or a couple of single examples and try to use these two examples to disprove some of the statements made by the opposition. Now, Sir, I might point out that one example or one exception does not necessarily disprove the arguments that the honourable gentleman put forth nor do those single examples disprove the arguments that the honourable members of the opposition put forth.

Now, Sir, the Minister of Finance gave statistics with respect to 900 students whose need was established at \$800.00, 600 students whose needs were established at \$1,000, 700 students at \$1,200, 700 students at \$1,400, 900 students at \$1,600 and 1,100 students at \$1,800 need. Now, Sir, that was the example that the honourable Minister of Finance took to prove his case. He suggested that under these circumstances 1,100 students who needed \$1,800, they would get \$600.00 in Canada student loans, they would get a direct provincial grant of \$600.00 and they would have to get an additional Canada student loan of \$600.00, making up a total of \$1,800. That was the situation last year for that category of students. This year the Minister of Finance in his example stated that the students would have to borrow only

\$1,400 as compared with \$1,200 the year before and they would get a \$400.00 direct provincial grant. He said, therefore, that particular category of students have only to borrow \$200.00.

Sir, that example is perfectly correct. There is nothing wrong with the example except that the example gives the wrong impression as far as the overall affects of the new policy of this administration on student assistance is concerned and I will show that later in some statistics of my own.

Sir, the honourable Minister of Education suggested that 1,030 students would only have to pay \$100.00 more, 1,700 students would have to pay only \$200.00 more, 1,705 students would have to pay \$300.00 more, 700 students would have to pay \$400.00 more and 280 students are unaffected. When we add up these figures, Sir, they differ by some almost 1,500 students from the total list of students that the honourable Minister of Finance gave. But again, Sir, I cannot find anything wrong with these stated statistics. They are deadly accurate except once again, Sir, that that particular explanation of the situation gives the wrong impression as far as the overall effect on student assistance is concerned as a result of the change of policy of this administration.

Now, Sir, the use of the honourable minister's statistics was rather like the case where a principal bragged about the fact that his 100 students attained an average of seventy-five per cent in the final exams but when the truth was discovered, Sir, it was found that seventy-five students got one hundred per cent and twenty-five students got zero per cent. Sir, you can do anything with statistics, and probably the honourable members on the other side of the House may accuse me of

twisting the statistics around to suit my own ends. The fact of the matter is, Sir, I will give statistics on the over all situation and what it means to the students just a little later on, in a few minutes.

Sir, before I get into the statistics I would like to say that in spite of the Minister of Education's and the Minister of Finance's statements several things are still facts that have been brought forth by honourable members of the opposition. Sir, fact number one is this; the Minister of Finance did have a love affair with some six thousand students of Memorial University over the past two or three years. Sir, the honourable Minister of Finance as much as admitted that on Friday afternoon but the minister said that he did not promise them anything.

HON. J.C. CROSBIE: (MINISTER OF FINANCE): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. When I tried to address myself to this point last Friday afternoon, the Leader of the Opposition objected, said it was irrelevant to the debate and it was so ruled. I now point out that this is quite irrelevant to the discussion of these estimates.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, shall I go on? Well, Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member will permit, I will discuss it with the clerk. We will permit the honourable member to proceed with this argument and make a brief point on this matter. However, we will not entertain any long debate on it.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I will certainly make it brief and to the point. The fact of the matter is, Sir, that although the honourable Minister of Finance did not promise the students anything, he certainly did not level with them. The fact of the matter is that the Minister of Finance was against the student assistance programme as it existed and he neglected to tell the students that three years ago, two years ago or one year ago. I can understand not wanting to be embarrassed by having this fact revealed.

Fact number two, Sir; the students still have to borrow

fourteen hundred dollars in order to qualify for assistance whereas before it was six hundred dollars last year, and four hundred dollars the year before that.

Fact number three, Sir, is that - I am not confused, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member for Bonavista South can rant and roar and squeak all he wants to. The fact of the matter, Sir, is that I know exactly what I am talking about and I would appreciate it very much if the Chair would give me the right to be heard in silence.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Name the member.

MR. F. ROWE: Name the member. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Fact number three, Sir, is that there is eight hundred and thirty-six thousand dollars less in the vote for student aid this year as compared with last year. Eight hundred and thirty-six thousand dollars will not be going for student assistance this year and that is a very sizeable amount.

Sir, if we look at the next five years; let us assume we have a young student going in to the university from a middle income family, a low income family or no income family - there are a great many students in that category in this province. If he were to start programme this year, if that group of students start this programme this year, over the next five years these students will not get a total of \$4,180,000. That is \$4,180,000 in assistance will not go to the students who need it at Memorial University, and they would have gotten this had this administration not brought in a change of policy. That is \$4,180,000 that will not be going to the students that would have otherwise gone to them without this change in policy.

Sir, fact number four is that very few students who are not used to living in a credit society - and there are many of those in our smaller communities in this province - become horrified at the thought of going seven thousand dollars in debt for the purpose of an education. Sir, I submit that many of these types of students from our more rural areas, from our low income, no income

and middle income families will think twice and may not even go to university in the next year, two years, three years, four years or five years because of this thought of having to go up to seven thousand dollars in debt.

Sir, I might have left the impression on Friday that there will be a definite drop in enrollment at the university in the coming year. Sir, I actually doubt whether there will be an actual drop in enrollment because there are still lots of well-to-do parents who can afford to send the students to university. The problem is that those poor parents will not be sending their students to university because of the fact of having to go and borrow seven thousand dollars.

Fact number five, Sir - no falsehood about it, no falsehood about it whatsoever. Sir, we quite often get interruptions from the honourable member for St. John's Center. If he would only speak up once and make a rational point in debate instead of having his wisecracks made while another honourable member is speaking in this House.

MR. MURPHY: Because it is misleading.

MR. F. ROWE: It is not misleading. A ruling, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will please state his point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: The point of order, Sir, is that I have been accused of misleading this House. I believe that is unparliamentary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member has been accused of misleading the House, it of course is unparliamentary and warrants withdrawal. However, as the Chair did not hear it then -

MR. F. ROWE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I heard it and so did all other members in this House hear it.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely misleading. There is no reason why one student should be barred from attending Memorial University. That is all that I am saying. The very fact that he is saying that this one will not be going and someone else

will be, that is absolutely misleading. Whether he is no income, low income or middle income, he will still be able to borrow money the same as anybody else. That is the only point that I am making.

MR. F. ROWE: To start off with, Mr. Chairman, I did not say that students will be barred from the university. If the honourable member from St. John's Center had been listening carefully, he would have heard what I said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question as it appears to me is the question as to the fact of whether or not one honourable member said one thing and another honourable member replied in a certain manner. The statement "That it is misleading" cannot be expanded to mean that that person is being accused of misleading the House which is the statement that the honourable member made. The honourable member has the right to be heard in silence, which was the original point of order I believe. That will be enforced as the discretion of the Chair warrants. Sometimes honourable members encourage repartee between sides of the House. In this instance I doubt whether this is the case. However, the honourable member for St. Barbes North has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. F. ROWE: If the honourable member for St. John's Center would only get up and speak properly in debate.

Mr. Chairman, the other point that I wanted to make is that the students were given no warning whatsoever. The least that this present administration could have done was probably to establish some sort of a buffer zone so that the students could plan on a term to term basis, give them a term of warning so that they could make their plans. I have made that point once already.

Sir, the honourable the Minister of Finance referred in his speech to other provinces. He suggested that in Nova Scotia the amount is fourteen hundred dollars that has to be borrowed. In New Brunswick it is fourteen hundred dollars. In Prince Edward Island it is fourteen dollars. In Alberta it is fourteen hundred

dollars. In Ontario it is eight hundred dollars. In Manitoba it is four hundred dollars. In Saskatchewan it is eight hundred dollars and in British Columbia it is five hundred and ninety-nine dollars.

Sir, the point that has been made in the mini-brief from the university students says that it should be added here that Newfoundland already has the lowest percentage university population on a per capita basis. The Canadian census shows that there is one point five attendance at memorial compared to two point six per cent for the Maritimes and three point one per cent for all the rest of Canada. Sir, that is one of the very reasons why we need a special students' assistance programme in this province so that at least we can get to the national average of three point one per cent or at least to the Maritime average of two point six per cent. We are almost half the Maritime average. Sir, the honourable Minister's argument does not hold up at all in this case. By comparing the student assistance programme in this province with that of the other provinces of Canada, it does not hold water when we look at the needs as far as our own students are concerned.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: How about P.E.I.?

MR. F. ROWE: P.E.I., I said that. It is fourteen hundred dollars. So, what about P.E.I.?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Same as we are.

MR. F. ROWE: So, what! Two wrongs do not make a right.

Sir, another point is that - let us look at the need of a student going to university. I got these figures relatively quickly so we have to build on a plus or minus factor of probably ten per cent. Tuition at memorial is two hundred and fifty dollars per term. Sir, an awful lot of students are starting to go to university now for three terms of the year because of the fact that employment is very difficult to find. Consequently, a single student's tuition at the university now is seven hundred and fifty dollars per year if he attends for three terms, plus twenty-four dollars for the Council

of Students' Union fees. So, that is seven hundred and seventy-four dollars. The residence fees for that same period, three terms, is eleven hundred and sixty-seven dollars, and I understand that is likely to go up. With nothing in there for books, with nothing in there for travel, with nothing in there for clothing, with nothing in there for entertainment and all the sorts of things that young people normally want to do these days, that totals two thousand and seventeen dollars. Sir, I would suggest that a student going to university today needs close to four or five thousand dollars just to live like a human being.

So, by talking about a need of eighteen hundred dollars as is set by the Canada Student Loan Programme, this is absolutely ridiculous. Most students needs are far in excess of the maximum amount that can be gained through the Canada Student Loan.

Look, I am getting sick and tired of hearing that crowd over there now that they have the responsibility of government starting to blame everything on the federal government. Before they took over everything was the fault of the Provincial Government. We saw the honourable Minister of Finance, we saw another crew of ministers go up just after they were elected, with their movie cameras. We saw them going up there and meeting with federal ministers of finance, federal ministers of this, and saying what a great crowd this was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member -

MR. F. ROWE: I was provoked, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member may or may not have been provoked. He has the right to raise a point of order. However, provocation does not allow the honourable member to carry on with matters that are irrelevant to the debate.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give notice now that every time some yak over there opens his mouth when I am talking, that will serve as a point of order.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do you want to yield?

MR. F. ROWE: No, of course I do not want to yield. You will have lots

of opportunity to get up and speak. Is the honourable member for Bonavista South suggesting that these are not facts that I just gave there then, the amount of tuition, the amount of residence fees?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: What are not facts? Mr. Chairman, the truth hurts.

The fact of the matter that I was trying to make, Sir, is that it is not unlikely that four or five thousand dollars is a more realistic figure for the cost of spending one year in university. Probably some of the students in the galleries today would think that that is a minimum amount, some may think it is a bit much but as an average I would suggest that it cost in the vicinity of four or five thousand dollars for a student to go to university for one year. So, the real need, Sir, is in that order of magnitude particularly when we look at low, middle and no income families.

Sir, I would like to relate to some of the statistics that I dreamed up while I was painting the bathroom over the weekend. Sir, this is a direct rebuttal to the statistics as put forth by the honourable Minister of Finance and the honourable Minister of Education. I would suggest, Sir, that these statistics were quite misleading as far as the over all facts were concerned with respect to what this change of policy does to the students as far as assistance is concerned.

Now, Sir, I am going to use the same figures that the honourable Minister of Finance and the honourable Minister of Education used with respect to the amount needed by students and the numbers of students involved. Sir, the figures that the two ministers used is that they categorize students by the amount needed in the area of eight hundred dollars, one thousand dollars, twelve hundred dollars, fourteen hundred dollars, sixteen hundred dollars and eighteen hundred dollars. Sir, according to their figures there were nine hundred students who needed eight hundred, six hundred students who needed one thousand, seven hundred students who needed twelve hundred, seven hundred who needed fourteen hundred,

nine hundred who needed sixteen hundred and eleven hundred who needed eighteen hundred dollars.

Now, Sir, if we look at the amount of the grant and the amount of the Canada Student Loan that these students would get in 1971-1972, under the previous Liberal administration, we would see this; in the first category of students, those needing eight hundred dollars, these nine hundred students would have to borrow six hundred dollars and they would get a provincial grant of two hundred dollars. In the first year of the Progressive Conservative Administration they would have a grant of one hundred dollars and they would have to borrow seven hundred dollars. In the second year of the Progressive Conservative Administration they get absolutely nothing as a grant and they have to borrow eight hundred dollars.

Sir, the difference between last year and this year is that the grant is one hundred dollars less and the amount of the Canada Student Loan is one hundred dollars more for a total loss to the student between last year and this year of two hundred dollars. If we look at the difference, Sir, between -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, I will give you a copy.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: When the honourable member said a total loss of two hundred dollars, I did not -

MR. F. ROWE: Yes. Well, Mr. Chairman, if - I am trying to use an analogy here - if you take away what you would normally get as a grant, that is certainly a loss, and if you have to borrow the same amount, that is certainly a loss. So you add the two of them together and you have your loss. Oh, that is not very sick, Mr. Chairman. It is not sickening at all. I would like for the honourable member for Bonavista South to get up and try to explain that one away to the students. If the honourable member for Bonavista South had to borrow an additional hundred dollars and had a hundred dollars taken away from him, he would not call it a loss? He has to pay back the hundred dollars. That is a loss, if you have to pay it back, it is not being granted to you.

that is a loss if you have to pay it back, it is not being granted to you, so it is a loss.

AN HON. MEMBER: Want to yield?

MR. F.B. ROWE: No I do not want to yield, Mr. Chairman. Do not be so foolish.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. F.B. ROWE: If you would just clam up for a few minutes, I might be able to get on with some logic here.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is misleading.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Misrepresentation again, Mr. Chairman, misleading.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is misleading.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Well you are going to have to listen to a heck of a lot more of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Be factual.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The honourable member for St. Barbe North has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, if you look at the situation since this administration took over as compared to what was going on before, you will see that the students grant, the 900 hundred students, their grant is less by two hundred dollars and the amount that they had to borrow from the Canada Student Loan in excess of what they had to borrow under the previous Liberal Administration is two hundred dollars, which means a four hundred dollar loss to the students.

Mr. Chairman, if you look at the 600 students who need \$1,000, the difference between last year and this year is this: the grant is less by two hundred dollars and the amount that they have to borrow over and above, through the Canada Student Loan, is two hundred dollars for a total loss of four hundred dollars.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, when I get down to the sixth category, it may sink in. If you look at the situation again, the difference since the Progressive Conservatives took over, the amount that these

600 students have to borrow, over and above what they had to borrow under the Liberal Administration, is three hundred dollars and the amount of the grant is less by three hundred dollars, which means a loss of a total of six hundred dollars to the students.

Mr. Chairman, for the edification of the Minister of Education, what I am obviously doing here is suggesting that if you have to borrow more you are out by that amount because you have to pay it back some time along the line. If the direct provincial grant to the student is less by a certain number of units the loss is these number of units. Add them together, a positive and a negative number gives you a magnitude here of six hundred dollars.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there were 700 students who needed twelve hundred dollars. The difference between this year and last year is this; the grant to them is less by three hundred dollars, the amount of the Canada Student Loan that they have to borrow is more by three hundred dollars, the loss to the student is therefore six hundred dollars.

If you look, Mr. Chairman, at the difference since the Progressive Conservatives took over, the grant is less by four hundred dollars, the amount of the Canada Student Loan is more by four hundred dollars for a net loss to the individual student of eight hundred dollars. For the next category of students; since last year they have to borrow four hundred dollars more, the grant is less by four hundred dollars, they are out by eight hundred dollars. If you look at the difference since this administration took over, it is five hundred dollars more that has to be borrowed and five hundred less in the grant for a total loss of one thousand dollars to the student in any one year.

Now, Sir, the significant point that I want to make is not just the difference between this year and last year but the difference since this Progressive Conservative, "Tory" administration took over. The difference for seven hundred students who need fourteen hundred dollars is that they have to borrow five hundred dollars more and the

grant is down by five hundred dollars for a total loss to that student of one thousand dollars in any one year since this group took over. For 900 students, Sir, who need sixteen hundred dollars, since last year they have to borrow three hundred dollars more, their grant is less by three hundred dollars for a total loss of six hundred dollars. Since they took over they have to borrow four hundred dollars more, the grant is down by four hundred dollars for a total loss of eight hundred dollars and for 1,800 students; they have to borrow two hundred dollars more, the grant is less by two hundred dollars for a total loss of four hundred since last year. Since the Progressive Conservatives took over, three hundred dollars less in grants, three hundred dollars more to be borrowed for a net loss of six hundred dollars.

Now, Sir, in other words, what I am saying here is this, 900 students, since the Progressive Conservatives took over have to borrow two hundred dollars more, 600 have to borrow three hundred dollars more, 700 have to borrow four hundred dollars more 700 have to borrow five hundred dollars more, 900 have to borrow four hundred dollars more and 1,100 have to borrow three hundred dollars more. Now only that, but for the first 900 hundred students the grant is two hundred dollars less, for 600 students the grant is three hundred dollars less, for 700 students the grant is four hundred dollars less, for 700 students the grant is five hundred dollars less, for 900 students the grant is four hundred dollars less and for 1,100 students the grant is three hundred dollars less for a total loss to the students, 900 students, a total loss of four hundred dollars, for 600 students a total loss of six hundred dollars, for 700 students a total loss of eight hundred dollars, for 700 students a total loss of one thousand dollars, for 900 students a loss of eight hundred dollars, for 1,100 students a total loss of six hundred dollars.

I did not use any rhetoric, I did not use any colourful language, I did not use all kinds of similes, metaphors, fancy talk and footwork like the honourable Minister of Finance, I am simply using fact, figures and statistics to show the true story since this

administration took over, and that is the total loss to the students.

Now, Sir, I would like to give another table that is even more devastating as far as the effect of this new student assistance policy on the student is concerned. The following information is based on a five-year degree programme. What we have to remember now is that an increasing number of our students are coming into the university and they are staying there for the full-time in order to get their degrees. Let us face the facts, Sir, a university undergraduate degree now is not very much these days. As a matter of fact, there are lots of university undergraduates going around unemployed and there are too many of them making very low salaries.

The fact of the matter is, Sir, since the employment opportunities are relatively small, an increasing number of students are going around, going to university, staying in university for the full four or five years. I might point out that many degrees now, particularly in the field of education, are five-year degrees, conjoint degrees. Commerce degrees and what other degrees? (I cannot very well converse with the galleries) But there are a number of professional degrees that are five-year degree programmes instead of four-year degree programmes as you would have for Bachelor of History Degrees or something like that, or Bachelor of Arts, in History.

Sir, the figures I am about to give now are based on what a student loses over the five year period as a result of this retrogressive step by the Progressive Conservative Administration. Again, Sir, I am basing it on the 900, 600, 700, 700, 900 and 1,100 students as used as an example by the honourable Minister of Finance. The total amount of the students' need for that five years, for 900 hundred students is four thousand dollars, for 600 students it is five thousand dollars, for 700 students it is six thousand dollars, for 700 students it is seven thousand dollars, for 900 students it is eight thousand dollars and for 1,100 students it is nine thousand dollars.

Since the Progressive Conservatives took over and if their policy is maintained (even if it does not get worse and I would assume that next year we will hear that they will have to borrow the full eighteen hundred dollars) but if they continue with the very same policy as they stated there in the Budget Speech, the amount of provincial assistance to students would decrease by this amount. For 900 students the amount of the direct grant, assistance to the students would decrease by a full one thousand dollars, for 600 students the amount would decrease by fifteen hundred dollars, for seven hundred students the amount of assistance would decrease by two thousand dollars, for 700 students twenty-five hundred dollars, for 900 students two thousand dollars and for 1,100 students fifteen hundred dollars.

The amount that the students had to borrow over and above what they had to borrow last year is one thousand dollars for 900 students, fifteen hundred dollars for 600 students, two thousand dollars for 700 students, twenty-five hundred dollars for 700 students, two thousand dollars for 900 students and fifteen hundred dollars for 1,100 students.

In other words, what we are saying is this: that the total loss over the five years for students going to the university because of this new policy stated by the Progressive Conservatives works out as follows; for 900 students the total loss is two thousand dollars, for 600 students the total loss is three thousand dollars, for 700 students the total loss is four thousand dollars, for 700 students the total loss is five thousand dollars, for 900 students the total loss is four thousand dollars and for 1,100 students the total loss is three thousand dollars.

This is obvious to anybody who looks at it. This year the total amount of assistance that is not going to the university students that would normally be going to them is \$836,000. Over five years that works out to \$4,100,000. In other words, through the new

stated policy of the Progressive Conservative Administration, they are saying to the students of Memorial, needy students. Now, Sir, let me point out for one moment that there are hundreds of students at Memorial who I could not give a tinker's you know what for. They have plenty of money, some students at Memorial...

MR. PECKFORD: Some work and some are trying to work when they are not going to university. They do not go for the twelve months of the year, they work and accumulate a few dollars...

MR. F.B. ROWE: That is perfectly correct, that is correct, that is right. Are you telling the Memorial students how they should go to university, study for a year, work for a year, study for a year, work for a year? Did you ever hear of continuity, of continuing education?

MR. PECKFORD: Hold on now, you misinterpreted what I said, they do not go to university...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The honourable member for St. Barbe North has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The only time that an honourable member may address this House and be in order is if the honourable member has the floor, and when another honourable member has the floor, he may not address the House unless that honourable member yields the floor to him. In this case the hon. member for St. Barbe North has the floor. He had given no indication that he wished to yield it. The hon. member for St. Barbe North.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The point that I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that: (1). There has been a dramatic decrease in the amount of the direct provincial grant that goes to a student. This business of taking an insolated case and saying to the student that the worst a student has to do is to borrow \$400 is absolutely a ridiculous argument. The fact of the matter is that we see here that over a five-year programme the amount of the direct assistance to the student comes to \$1,000, \$1,500, \$2,000, \$2,500, \$2,000 and \$1,500 and the amount in addition that he has to borrow is \$1,000, \$1,500, \$2,000, \$2,500, \$2,000 and \$1,500 for a total loss to the students of \$2,000, \$3,000, \$4,000, \$5,000, \$4,000 and \$3,000 over a five year degree programme period. Sir, that is a significant amount. It is a very significant amount. You cannot disprove facts. The simple fact of the matter is that the student-aid programme is down by \$836,000 this year. The \$836,000 that the students would normally be getting they will not get. Over the next five years, \$4,100,000 that would normally go to the students of this province, the needy students of this province, is not going to them.

As I was saying before the member for Green Bay interrupted me, I am not the least bit concerned about a certain fraction of our university students. They can well afford to go to university. They can be sent off to private schools for that matter, but there is a large segment of our university students who come from mid, low and no income families, who have to travel down from St. Barbe North, and from Labrador South, who need this money. When you add to that the

actual need of students, we cannot categorize students based on a need of what the hon. Minister of Finance suggested. The hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Education were saying that we have six categories of students here, those who need \$800, \$1,000, \$1,200, \$1,400, \$1,600 and \$1,800. Sir, the need of students going to University, whether their parents are paying for it or not, is more like \$3,000, \$4,000 or \$5,000. I will give the committee figures to substantiate that. The tuition fees and the residence fees alone add up to over \$2,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: Everybody lives in residences?

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, not everybody lives in residences. Let us not be ridiculous. I might suggest that they do live under a roof and they do not get it for nothing. Some of the costs of boarding houses in this town and apartments may even be in excess of what they pay in residence fees. I know that for a fact. When you add all that together, plus the fact that most students that I have seen have clothes on, at least where I have met them, and they have to buy clothes. They have to buy food. They would like to go through the year with a little bit of entertainment. They have to travel back and forth from their homes. They want to go to the odd movie. They want to live like a decent human being in this province. The need is more like \$4,500. Sir, I submit that the statistics that the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Education gave the other day - the statistics, since they were isolated examples, were extremely misleading as far as the overall effect of this change of policy of this present administration has on the students of this province.

Sir, I would appeal to the Minister of Education and the Minister of Finance to reconsider bringing in this change of policy for next September, that they put it off for a term. If they are not going to change their ways, would the Minister of Education and the Minister of Finance consider putting it off at least until the second semester

next year so the students would have time to have some planning and so that they do not go waltzing in there in September and find out that they have a great huge new bill. Obviously, Sir, I would recommend that they reinstate the whole programme as it was. Heaven only knows that the previous administration tried obviously to do the impossible. They tried to provide free tuition. They tried to provide salaries to students. Sir, it was an honest effort on the part of the previous administration. They knew they were doing the right thing. I think everybody in the province realized that they were trying to do the right thing, the desirable thing, but this province honestly could not afford it. They had to introduce a means' test, however regrettable this is.

Actually I am just about finished and so I can yield the floor and allow the hon. Minister of Finance to speak. I am asking the administration questions. It is the opposition's turn to ask questions. The hon. Minister of Finance knows full well that under our democratic system (he has had lots of experience with it) that questions normally come from the opposition, not from the government. The honourable minister is responsible for policy. He is responsible for administration. Any questions in this honourable House should come from the opposition.

MR. CROSBIE: I will ask him my question anyway because the honourable gentleman - I wonder will the honourable gentleman be able to tell us why the Government of Canada have a Canada Student Loan Programme rather than a Canada Student Grant Programme? Obviously the Government of Canada have far more financial resources than any of the provinces yet it has a university student loan programme, not a grant programme. Does the honourable gentleman know why or is the honourable gentleman making any efforts? The Government at Ottawa are composed of the same party as the honourable gentleman belongs to. Can the honourable gentleman advise whether any action has been taken to have their policy changed?

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, whenever the honourable -

MR. CROSBIE: Could you explain that? Why do they have a loan programme?

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, whenever the hon. Minister of Finance gets boxed in, when he cannot handle the situation, he turns like a vicious animal on the federal government. We have seen this time and time again. He drags a red whale across the floor of the House of Assembly, Sir, every single time he gets boxed in, he gets trapped. The statistics have him proven wrong again. He turns on the federal government. In spite of that the hon. John Turner in Ottawa lashes out \$24 million to him there a few weeks ago, lashes out a few more million for the DREE Programme, for education in this province. Sir, the hon. Minister of Finance would do better to stop attacking the federal government because one of those days he is likely to do Newfoundland a horrible disservice. He will have Ottawa so turned off that they will probably turn off the financial taps to Newfoundland altogether.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I did not recognize that I just made a savage attack on the Government of Canada by asking this simple question in such a reasonable tone as I asked it. I did not think I was frothing at the mouth or delivering a vicious attack but obviously the honourable gentleman does not know the answer or does not want to answer or there is no answer. Now I will end my comments for the afternoon, Mr. Chairman, because our very capable Minister of Education will stun the House in a moment with a few other words on this, with a poem just composed over here: "We did not come to hear Fred's words in hopes to be more wise. But just in case we go to hell, it will be no surprise."

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, -

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to direct a word to the hon. member for Bonavista North. When he speaks in this Chamber, it should be from his own place.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of matters that I would like to refer to with reference to the statistics and the facts and then some other matters which were brought up in the debate on this heading.

I mentioned in the House before (I think it is clear but I will say it again just in case it is not. I do this. I repeat this although I do not suppose I would be the only gentleman in the House guilty of repetition if I were to repeat something that I said a couple of days ago. I hope not anyway. I would not want to be the only honourable gentleman guilty of repetition.) with reference to a terms' warning or students being able to plan ahead: It is clear, I would trust, that for those students starting the May semester, who are continuing on after the January semester and who applied for the student assistance some time ago (they usually apply two terms at a time) around 450 students, this change does not affect them. It will affect students starting off new in the May semester, who have been out a year or out a semester or out for some time or coming in for the first time but it does not affect approximately 450 who have applied and have been accepted on the previous system.

There is one other matter and it is a minor matter. It was inadvertent on the honourable gentleman's part when he gave the tuition figures as seventy hundred and fifty, three times the two hundred and fifty and residence for that period eleven hundred and sixty-three, adding up to nineteen hundred and ten or rounding it off to two thousand. I just want to point out to honourable gentlemen that the \$1,800, is based on a two semester year. It is really a third factor there of a third.

There is another matter too on which I would like to say a few words. It has been mentioned frequently during the debate that a number of people in this province, especially in rural areas, perhaps,

have (I guess it is part of the culture of the province and of the people and it is as a result of history) a fear or an apprehension of borrowing. I think that that is probably true. I think that it is perhaps much less true of the generation we are speaking of than it is for our generation or our fathers' generation. I think the people in the eighteen, nineteen, twenty, twenty-one, twenty-two year bracket, even in the rural areas or in any part of Newfoundland, I think we can perhaps tend to exaggerate that fear of borrowing because in practically every community in Newfoundland there is an openness to the general cultural patterns of North America, of the Mainland of North America and of Canada in general. I do not think that there is this great fear of borrowing on the part of people of that generation that some of us might think. If there is (I hope that I am not or I do not think I am going contrary to any accepted economic theory here) then I see nothing wrong with stating that to borrow to complete one's education is as fine a use of money and of borrowing and of one's credit as one can find. I do not think that anybody could say that a government would be irresponsible to make that statement and I will repeat it. All the enlightened educators and I believe economists would agree that for any young person to indebt himself, within fixed limits, obviously, or for any young person to put himself in debt under an enlightened loan programme, such as the Canada Student Loan Plan is, is a very good use of his credit rating and that there is no better use perhaps, certainly at that age, and that there is nothing wrong and much to be lauded in any young person's decision to indebt themselves for the purpose of getting an education. It is an investment in time and a worth-while thing to do.

I make a point of that because on a number of occasions this big fear of going into debt was mentioned. I do not think that that is the case of the generation we are speaking of. I think it is the case

MR. OTTENHEIMER: of their fathers and forefathers, I do not think it is of a generation we are speaking of but in case there is any lingering, apprehension in that respect, I would repeat again that it would be a very wise course for any young person to borrow through an enlightened programme such as the Canada Student Loan Plan, (I am not talking about you know finance houses) through the Canada Student Loan Plan in order to get an education, that is an enlightened and intelligent thing to do which is done throughout North America and that they should in fact do it.

A few other remarks on this - I want to point out as well, I think it is clear that the total amount to which a student will have access next year does not in fact change. What changes is the proportion of grant and loan. Of course, as the honourable gentleman said, one can do a lot of things with figures and statistics and he suggested that my colleague and I did some, not trickery but drew some conclusions that perhaps he did not agree with, I think the honourable gentleman would perhaps agree that maybe as well his use of statistics and figures obviously is open to different interpretations as well, that is fair enough. Everybody will endeavour to use given figures to bolster their own arguments. That is fair enough.

This is essentially the same list I gave the other day but the total will add up to 140 students more. It is complete; the other one was done quickly. What I disagree with, and it is a question of interpretation, I am not going to argue it because it is a question of interpretation, one can do what one wishes with these figures, but take the fact that in 1972-1973, 900 students had a need of \$800, borrowed \$700 and got \$100 in grant. Under the new system, they will borrow \$800. They have to borrow \$100 more or/and there is \$100 less in grant but personally I cannot

MR. OTTENHEIMER: go along with the mathematics that that makes a \$200 difference.

That is \$100 difference. He has to borrow \$100 more from the Canada Student Loan Plan.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has to pay it back.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes but it is the same \$100. It does not become an additional \$100.

Now that \$100 that he had to borrow more, that is \$100 he gets less from the grant, granted, but it is still only \$100. There is no way - I know the honourable gentleman when he was at the faculty of the university was not in the mathematics department.

MR. F. ROWE: That is right.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well I do not know what the honourable gentleman did with him I am sure but anyway, no doubt there would be some statistical theories, I am not an economist nor a statistician at all, and there would probably be things that one could do with that, but just looking at it as a nonmathematician and as the honourable gentleman from Twillingate, he is a businessman, I think he would agree that that \$100, that is an extra \$100 he has to borrow, You have to borrow it because you get \$100 less from the grant but it is still \$100. I do not think there is any way - well there would be ways - but I do not think that it is particularly informative nor enlightening to interpret that \$100 as if it were \$200.

That is all I have to say because obviously one can do all kinds of things with it. I just want to go down, just for the record, to have it straight without further comment on it, how the situation would change from last year to next year.

Last year 900 students borrowed \$700, under the new system they would have to borrow \$800. Now all these figures I gave per year, per two semester year. Last year 600 students borrowed \$800, this year they will borrow \$1,000. Last year 700 students,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: and these are all single students now, 700 students borrowed \$900, next year \$1,200 ; \$300 more.

Obviously in a four year course that would be four times that, in a five year course it would be five times it. Last year 700 students borrowed \$1,000, under the new system they will have to borrow \$1,400 for that year, an increase of \$400. Last year 500 single students borrowed \$1,200, under the new system they will have to borrow \$1,400, a \$200 increase. Last year 700 single students borrowed \$1,300 and under the new plan they will have to borrow \$1,400 so some will have to borrow \$100, \$200, \$300 or \$400 more. But there is no case in which any student will have to borrow more than \$400 more for one year in four years or five years he would borrow four or five times that.

Married students - last year 150 married students had to borrow \$700, under the new regulations they will have to borrow \$800. Last year 60 students had to borrow \$900, under the new regulations they will have to borrow \$1,200 - an increase of \$300. Last year 45 married students had to borrow, under the Canada Student Loan Plan, \$1,100 and this year they will have to borrow \$1,400 - an increase of \$300. Last year 80 married students had to borrow \$1,300, under the new regulations it will be \$1,400. Last year 280 students had to borrow \$1,400 and there will be no change, they will still have to borrow \$1,400. I just say that for the record.

MR. HICKMAN: When does this apply? Starting September, is it?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right.

MR. HICKMAN: It does not apply for the summer semester.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Not for those who were in in January.

Now I planned as well to make a few comments on some of the other matters that were brought up during discussion on this vote that we are on.

The honourable gentleman, member for St. Barbe North, mentioned the possibility of two departments of Education

MR. OTTENHEIMER: or two departments concerned with human resource development. He was obviously thinking of provinces such as Alberta, Ontario the west in general, I believe Quebec as well have this, the distinction often between post-secondary and other.

There is certainly much to be said for that. I would not doubt that in time it will come to Newfoundland, It may come soon. I do not think it would be wise now. For a number of reasons I think what we need to do now is to co-ordinate and integrate our services, our human resource development services, and I think that now that can best be done under one department.. As the committee is aware, we are planning to appoint two assistant deputy ministers and that division will be made within the department.

The honourable gentleman also referred to the church-state partnership and the fact that in the area of certification there is certainly a need for modernization, I agree there and all I can say is that this is a matter which I have been discussing with the authorities and the other partners and we are continuing to meet on that and I certainly hope that there will be agreement on a solution so that certain anachronism perhaps would no longer exist.

The honourable gentleman mentioned as well, and he was referring to the statement I made a few days ago on the pupil-teacher, well in the area of pupil-teacher ratio, the year's grace which will be offered to school boards. This obviously tied in with government's commitment for an improved pupil-teacher ratio next year, the year's grace which will be tied in. Regulations will be amended to give a year's grace. This is bearing in mind schools where there is a decrease associated with the decreased birth rate. I believe, if I understood the question right, it was as to how would this affect a hypothetical, I believe, situation where perhaps a school

MR. OTTENHEIMER: board had three or four, one or two room schools and these were closed out and a new school will be there in its place, The answer is, it would not really affect that because that new school would be staffed under the allocation for that one school rather than carrying over the allocation for the three or four it was there to replace.

The purpose of the year's grace is to provide for what could have happened if we had not provided that in a strict interpretation of the regulation where you get the slight natural decreases due not to a whole reorganization of the education system in an area but due to this birth rate decline.

With reference to comments on two areas here - the legislation on collective bargaining that has been drafted. I think the legal officers of the Crown are now going over it with a fine tooth comb and is being done in close consultation with the NTA.

MR. F. ROWE: Does the NTA have to ratify that before it is drafted?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The NTA negotiators, Before it, for example, comes to the legislature, the negotiators of the NTA would meet with the government, and they would look at it together again.

With respect to the bargaining in the area of collective agreement salaries, meetings are continuing.

The honourable gentleman did say some words as well on school tax authorities, I think there that there was a difference of opinion on both sides of the House, that is fair enough. If we all agreed with one another, either we would all be over there or all honourable gentleman would be over here.

I have, during the past three months, met on two occasions with the executive of Provincial Association of School Tax Authorities and the department does have their brief where they

recommend, among other things, certain changes in the legislation. We have quite an internal committee of the Secretary of Treasury Board, the Deputy Minister of Education, Mr. Newman Kelland, who is an assistant superintendent to the Avalon Integrated School Board, and one other person whose name slips me at the moment, but a fourth person, looking at those recommendations with a view to suggesting amendments to the legislation where necessary.

There are, as honourable members probably know, two areas where we expect to get official requests for school tax authorities - we have not got them yet. If we get them and if in fact they are accepted, that will mean that approximately eighty per cent, populationwise of the province will be within school tax areas.

We feel, at this point in time, it is important to have local involvement and we think as well that with regional authorities, with more assistance from government - I think we should make more assistance available to them in terms of expertise in accounting and financial expertise but that on a regional basis there is a greater knowledge and awareness and sympathy toward people's needs in various areas.

I think there were some other matters which perhaps in the headings as we go through would be more appropriate to get into, but there was one matter brought up by the member for Bell Island where strictly speaking there would be perhaps no heading, so I will mention that, and they were his remarks on drug and alcohol education.

Actually the vote for the Drug and Alcohol Foundation comes in the heading of the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation. There is a vote there. Inquiries that we get - obviously in the Department of Education we do get enquiries, are referred to health education, within the

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Department of Health, and also to the Alcohol and Drug Addiction Foundation.

I should point out that within the approved curriculum of the Department of Education, the health books for grade seven and eight contain special chapters with up-to-date information on alcohol, drug and tobacco addiction, their effects on people. The science books for grade VII to XI also deal with that and the biology text for grades X and XI also again have information on alcohol, tobacco and drug addiction.

I would think as well, I am quite sure that an important part of education with respect to addiction in this area of course would come under the religious education programmes of the various school boards.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education suggested that we might have been manipulating statistics around a bit and he accepted his responsibility for his part of it as well, but I would just like to make one point with respect to this column that I drew up about the total loss to the students in any one year of \$400, \$600, \$800, \$1,000, \$800 and \$600 according to the various categories and over the five year programme it amounts to a total loss \$2,000, \$3,000, \$4,000, \$5,000

Now let me just ask the honourable Minister of Education this question because I do not want this to become confused at all. The honourable the Minister of Education and all other honourable ministers are now making a salary of \$11,000 outside of their \$10,000 sessional fee, but a minister is making \$11,000. Correct. Now supposing we look at that as a grant and supposing we say, the government says this year, "Sorry, boys no ministerial pay this year." He loses his \$11,000 salary and he has therefore, to maintain his standard of living, to go to the bank and borrow \$11,000, Is that minister not \$22,000 worse off?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Oh, no, no. Not \$22,000. Well I owe money at the bank and I do not feel that is to my credit. That is the only point that I am making here. If you have to borrow money, you have to pay it back in some stage of the game. That is the only point that we made. The honourable minister will be \$22,000 worse off, next year he will have to get a double amount of salary to be even. If he got the same salary reinstated next year, he would still be \$11,000 worse off, even if he got the same one reinstated. You would have to make twice as much in order to get back on an even par.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F. B. That is perfectly obvious. If they cut out my sessional pay this year and I had to borrow that amount I am out by \$20,000. So it is as simple as that. Probably a better use of terminology that I could have used was that instead of a total loss to the student, I quite easily could have said the student is worse off by this amount of money. It is as simple as that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable the member for Labrador South wanted to ask a couple of questions but I am a little bit afraid that I may not get an opportunity to get back at this point that I

asked the minister about earlier, because there is no vote for it. It is listed though. Remember the last day I read out, to the embarrassment of honourable members on the other side, all those newspaper clippings relating to all the commitments that the honourable the Minister of Social Services made at the time when he was minister and the honourable the Premier made with respect to reinstating the mothers allowance. (1) The possibility of a reinstatement, a definite commitment. (2) They were going to set up another special programme to take the place of the mothers' subsidy with a parents' subsidy for needy mothers in this province. Another programme that was going to be announced just after the by-election in Labrador South. It was never announced. Then, Sir, we got another announcement that they were going to set up a special study to look at the needs of the needy mothers in this province with respect to getting their kids to school and then, Sir, later that was denounced or unannounced whatever you want to call it and we just got a cancellation of the mothers' allowance completely, with no study, with no special programme to replace it.

So I was wondering if the minister could indicate whether or not there is some policy of his department that they are considering that may be of use to the needy mothers of this province, Sir, because I have gone into homes up and down the coast of St. Barbe, Labrador South, all over this province, where those few dollars that would be meaningless for any honourable member in this House mean quite an amount to a mother with ten, fifteen, nine, eight, seven, six kids, when the father is unemployed or he is a poor fisherman in some little small place in our province. I would like for the honourable minister to give us some indication of that.

Sir, I might add before I sit down that I am quite disappointed that the honourable the Minister of Education did not convince the Premier and the honourable the Minister of Finance to take the bull by the horns, to call a spade a spade and say to all Newfoundland, we recognize our responsibility to establish a more efficient collection

system for the purposes of financing education in this province. Possibly, the most efficient system would be to accept the full responsibility for collecting revenue for purpose of education in this province.

Sir, I mentioned the other day where school tax authorities are the most inefficient, cumbersome, sloppy, stupid, inequitable, unfair system of collecting monies for education in this province. The school tax authorities now are considering the collecting of school tax from recipients of social assistance. They are considering payroll deduction of the poll tax from government employees. The school tax authorities are considering the institution of property taxation for school tax purposes in additional communities. They are considering the imposition of poll taxes on owners of business or other properties where no property assessments are available. They are considering the imposition of poll taxes on occupants of tax exempt property where grants in lieu of property taxes are paid. They are considering the collection of school taxes from recipients of manpower allowances, attending vocational or upgrading schools, and they are considering the inspection of employers' payroll records by school tax authorities.

Sir, school tax authorities are the most inefficient, unfair, inequitable, cumbersome, controversial, inefficient method of collecting revenue for financing education. I cannot demand but I suggest that the government of this day immediately should abolish completely and forever all school tax authorities in this province and collect the revenue themselves, whether it is through a school tax or the imposition of additional sales tax or on the provincial income tax, I do not know what the mechanism is, but I think we are going to have a situation where school tax authorities will proliferate, creep throughout the land and we will reach a point, in two or three years, of no return. It will practically be impossible, after all these administrations have been set up, to abolish them. Even if they are established and they cover every segment of this province, you still

have a fantastic duplication of administration and everything else and it is just - I cannot see how in a province where we are finding it so difficult to finance education how we can afford wasting money on administration of various numbers of school tax authorities.

One other point, Sir, I ask the minister if he would indicate whether or not this administration had any kind of a policy whatsoever respecting junior and/or community colleges. I will leave it at that because I will get into the meat of that one when we reach the vote.

MR. J. A. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I do not want the honourable member's statements to pass unchallenged. I think that it is the most pernicious nonsense that I have ever heard to say that because if your income goes down by \$11,000 and then you borrow \$11,000, that you are \$22,000 worse off. Against that statement has to be credited the \$11,000 that you borrow and presumably enjoy. So the net result is, if your income were to go down by \$11,000 or if your income were to go down by \$11,00. You are still \$11,000 or \$11.00 worse off but no more. If a person who is working should borrow \$100 and then has to repay it, at least he has the enjoyment of that \$100 for that period. I think it is very, very wrong, it is false, it is misleading and quite out of order to suggest that that money is doubled in any way, shape or form.

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the statistics that we have heard, the fact that the statistics play such an important part in this kind of a decision only proves to me that arguments of this nature are no more than academic exercises when it comes to getting right down to whether or not we are going to maintain this position or rescind it or what we are going to do about the matter at issue.

There are any number of arguments that can be proven or disproven with figures. I am not saying that one set is right or wrong or whatever. It really does not interest me at this point. The arguments put forth by the honourable member for St. Barbe North are well taken. There is no point in my going over those. I have discarded some five or six

pages of my notes here.

But I would like to interject another factor that we have seemed to have forgotten about here, in that we are dealing with people, individuals, and so very, very many variables that go along with this kind of thing. I would like to ask the honourable members just for a few moments to put aside the partisan political side of this debate and try to get back to where we started when the whole thing opened up, as to whether or not the university students should be allowed to have this kind of aid programme.

I sincerely believe that the decision of the government in this regard has been a wrong one. I would ask the honourable gentlemen on the other side, especially the honourable Minister of Education and the honourable the Minister of Finance, to try to take it back out of the realm of political partisanship and the controversy which has surrounded it and to listen to a few suggestions, and I hope that they will not be so arrogant as to dismiss the arguments from this side simply because they are from the opposition.

I would like to take a close look at several of the more subtle ramifications of this whole thing. I am asking, Sir, for the honourable Minister of Education and the honourable the Minister of Finance to reinstate this programme as it has stood in the past year. After having reinstated it, if they still believe, after hearing the arguments, that their decision was a right one and if they decide to abolish this aid programme, that they will do so over a long enough period of time, phase it out over a long enough period of time so that it will eliminate the sociological hardships that are being imposed now upon the students who are now in university and those who are about to graduate from high school and contemplating entering university.

As it stands right now, there are many young people in the universities, many more about to graduate from high school, already have their plans made for the next two or three years and have based those plans to a large degree upon how much money is coming and from what sources. Their financial programme I suggest, Sir, is of paramount importance in the reaching of a decision as to where they are going for the

next three or four years and whether in fact they are going to university at all.

Under this heading I would just like to address myself to this one issue because it is controversial and I think I will get around to it there will be ample opportunity for me to get around to the rest later on. I think none of us will disagree that there is a necessity to tighten our belts. That there is not enough money to go around for everything, there never is. I believe that if the university students were asked to tighten their belts and to take part in an austerity programme with the rest of us, they would have no objection to doing that. If this budget were truly an austerity budget, I do not think there would be too much to be said about keeping this student-aid programme on.

But, Sir, it is not an austerity budget. I do not think it is in any way an austerity budget. We have a growing staff of special assistances and executive assistances, cabinet ministers, maybe they are necessary to the good and efficient running of government here but if we really have to get down to saving money perhaps they are not all that necessary at this particular point in time. There are several other luxuries such as Mr. McLean, Mr. Nutbeam and all the rest of the programmes which in themselves may very well be all right. We are not arguing that point right now but they are there nevertheless. If this were an austerity budget, they are items that could be excluded without very much damage.

What we are asking the students and their parents to consider now is at what point between the \$4,000 mark and the \$7,000 mark does a university education become out of reach? That is really what we are trying to decide.

Now let us consider for just a moment the implications of this kind of debt. We are talking about a great many people who see the education of their children as the only way of breaking out of the poverty cycle that have kept us down in rural Newfoundland and Labrador

for centuries. To achieve this, I am sure that most of them will undergo a great deal of privation and hardship. But we have to consider too that a great many of our rural families right now today have an annual earned income of no more than \$1,000 to \$2,500 earned income, not counting the social assistance programme. You can talk all you like about people of this generation becoming more attuned to the kind of financing that we have available to us today and not being worried about borrowing money. But when you are forced to live under the restrictions of that kind of an income, it becomes than a sociological barrier in trying to reach a decision whether or not you are going to university or not or whether or not you are going to subsidize your children going to university when you are only earning \$2,500 a year, and you are looking at putting that student, your son or daughter, in debt to \$7,000, just to contemplate that amount short circuits the whole decision process.

Now, the rural areas have lower incomes. The students from rural areas have greater distances to travel. They are being brought into an area where automatically their spending is increased, the housing costs are increased. In short, the cost of living for people in rural areas coming into the university is such that it becomes quite a staggering thing to contemplate when you are looking at the whole cost of going to university, much more so than those that come from urban areas.

Now, most of those students who come from the rural areas will have to borrow the money necessary to get through because they come from lower income families. Okay! What do we have? A young man for instance coming from university must look at the prospect of when he gets out of university having right off the bat seven thousand dollars perhaps, just as an instance, if we want to get down to particulars, seven thousand dollars hanging over his head before he has a chance to earn one cent. This is a debt on which he must begin paying interest six months after he gets out of university. I may stand to be corrected on that but this is the way that I understand it myself. Okay! He may not have finished university in the first place. He may have just left without graduating. More than likely he will not have any employment to go into immediately. Nevertheless, that interest begins accumulating six months after he leaves. There is at this point in time no government programme to assist him in paying off that interest even supposing he does not have an income.

Now, let us hypothesize a little more: This young man man has had to go through that cost of getting himself through university, he is probably going to get out and at that age he may be getting married, he may not have a job, he may be setting up a household, he may even be marrying a girl who has gone through university and she herself will have a three or four thousand dollar debt. All of this he must assume. There is the cost of setting up his house. You know, these are the human

factors that we have to consider. We cannot just dismiss them because they are hypothetical. So, if we are to look at figures, then let us look at a few of the other figures that have not been trotted here in dealing with these human considerations.

There used to be a bursary fund, I understand. Two years ago that bursary fund was \$120,000. Incidentally, this whole amount was used up. Last year that amount was chopped to \$60,000 and last semester it was chopped again to \$22,000. Now, this bursary fund was set up to take care of the really hardship cases who had already used up the money available from other sources. This money was only given out after a very, very rigid screening by the university to make sure that the people who applied for it really did in fact need that money to get through. That whole \$120,000 was used up by those people with that demonstrated need. After the Canada Student Loan fund and other sources had been used, there were still applications in for that bursary fund, to a tune of \$190,000, of which there was no money to pay off. And you say that there is no need, there is no financial requirement for these students. That is only one part of it.

The Council of the Students Union at Memorial University used to have a scheme whereby they would co-sign for students looking for short term loans from the chartered bank. A young man or woman at university had used up all the money available to him or her and still needed more; this applied more in the case of those people who had summer jobs and could draw against that. They could go to the bank and get \$2,000 or \$3,000 to tide them over and the Council of the Students Union would co-sign for them. Last year the CSU had to abandon this practice. They had to abandon it for one very good reason, the demands being made were getting out of hand. They were being asked to co-sign for too many loans and they were getting themselves into a position where they may get in serious financial trouble themselves as a council. Last year the CSU co-signed for

somewhere between \$15,000 to \$18,000. I do not have the exact numbers but here again is a demonstration of a need above and beyond the money that is made available through the recognized loan funds.

Now, let us take a close look at the Canada Student Loan Fund. It is a federal programme set up to make money available to those who need it and can prove that they need it. So they use a means test. The means test is administered under a rigid formula that takes into account none of the many human values associated with the extraordinary requirements, the unanticipated requirements of going to university. For instance - another for instance. I am probably shot down for all of these. You take two families of identical income, ten thousand dollars for a round figure. If the student should apply and the means test is applied to that student or those students from those two households, both making ten thousand dollars, they look only at the income of those families in judging whether or not the student has a need for extra assistance. They do not take into consideration whether or not one family happens to have a mortgage and has to pay out \$250 or \$300 per month and maybe the other one does not have a mortgage and thereby has more of that income saved. None of these things are taken into account. Similarly none of the extraordinary expenses that may be incurred by students at university are taken into account, such as if there is an accident. A student falls down and breaks his leg and has to go into hospital, sure the MCP will take care of a certain part of it but there are other expenses always associated with this. If that should happen there is nowhere else to go. The formula used in the means test does not take these considerations into account. This all constitutes a further need.

If the honourable the Minister of Finance, Mr. Chairman, had given us the correct figures - we have no reason to suppose that he

has not given us the correct figures. He says that at least eleven hundred young people will be borrowing a maximum of \$1,800 by last year's figures. He stated that there were eleven hundred students who borrowed the maximum under which the system - I know we are not too clear on this - there were eleven hundred people according to the figures given us the other day who borrowed the maximum, eighteen hundred dollars allowable. "Who had the maximum need," I am sorry. I rephrase that. Who had the maximum need of eighteen hundred dollars.

Now, last year's figures stated that there were eleven hundred students who borrowed the maximum under which the system amounted to two thousand, two hundred and forty-two dollars in grants and loans. Does that check out with you? I think that will check out, Mr. Chairman, with the honourable minister's figures.

This year the ceiling has been placed at \$1,800. Statistics indicate that the costs of living are going up and statistics also indicate that the student population is rising at the university. This being the case, then these allowances are discontinued and we have to ask ourselves where the extra two or three hundred dollars is going to come from. I submit, Sir, that the \$863,000 that is involved in this particular case means very, very little relatively speaking to the over-all population of this province as compared to the extra two or three hundred dollars that is going to be placed as a burden upon the shoulders of the students coming in. Compare \$863,000 in the over-all provincial budget to two or three hundred dollars in a household budget where they are earning \$2,500 annually and you have got a considerable difference.

Therefore, Sir, I submit that to ask these students to make a decision as to whether or not to go to university under these conditions, the limiting of that loan programme to students is a psychological deterrent and is going to mean that many of our

children from rural and lower income areas are not going to go to university. That is an inescapable fact. Since education is a provincial responsibility, I look upon this decision to limit the amount of aid to students as a renegeing on the provinces responsibility toward education. It is not fair either, Mr. Chairman, to compare our province, the situation here with the situation in other Atlantic Provinces. In the first place if the honourable Minister of Finance's figures are to be taken into consideration here, they really mean very little if he wants to compare them to for instance New Brunswick. In New Brunswick a student can receive up to twenty-two hundred dollars per year based on need, of course. In addition, something which we do not have here in this province, a student from New Brunswick also gets that paid, no matter where he goes to university, anywhere else in Canada. There is no comparison.

What we are really talking about is a different set of cultural circumstances. We have a different tradition here in this province then they have in the other Atlantic Provinces. The other Atlantic Provinces have gone past the time when they need the kind of financial assistance that we are talking about here today. We are just that much further behind.

We hear people talk about the irrelevancy of the university and we do not really need that many students there anyway, that when they come out there are no jobs for them anyway, that we are educating them for nothing. Well, there are such far wider implications here. We have been traditionally tied down by our lack of communication. The whole problem, the whole outport syndrome is connected with the lack of communications. A great widening of communications has resulted from our children coming in to university, into St. John's and participating in this whole experience.

So university education, notwithstanding the very fact that this area has opened up to provide a wider base communication, is perhaps far more significant. We heard people refer, tongue in

cheek, to the coming revolution. I submit, Sir, that there is a revolution in progress even now, the revolution of consciousness, if you want, certainly not in the classic sense. It is nevertheless a changing of our consciousness of who we are, as a nation, as a people, of who we are culturally, that is changing the whole face of this province. That revolution was brought on by the wider access to education and all the implications are there. We know, Sir, who it is that we have to thank for that, the former Premier, the former leader of these honourable gentlemen here. Regardless of what we may think about that gentleman, regardless of where we stand politically, we have got to give Mr. Smallwood credit for instituting that education system which has brought about this revolution in concepts and consciousness. Joey Smallwood knew full well what he was doing. He said it at one point that he was instituting something that would eventually lead to his downfall, and it did. By making education available to everyone, he was ensuring that one of these days those people were going to put him out of office. It is ironic, I think, because the one gentleman who has stood to gain more from student aid - I wish he were in his seat at the moment - but I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the one person who has stood to gain more from student aid and higher education has been the honourable gentleman from St. John's West. I do not say that facetiously. We saw what happened a couple of years ago at the leadership convention and how the students rallied round him. There was a participation at that point that we could not have dreamed about four or five years previously.

I think it is wrong to tag

dollars and cents of education on to how many are going to graduate and how many are then going to go into the workforce, because it has far wider implications than that.

It is very, very desirable that everybody be given access to education and if we are only talking about \$163,000, what does that mean if we are going to change our whole way of thinking here? I submit, Sir, that it would be much to the benefit of the honourable gentlemen on the other side if they could encourage and foster that same kind of thinking.

I have not touched at all on the sorry state of our secondary education system, I have not touched at all on the whole philosophy of regional and community colleges nor the revenues and tax authorities and all of that. I think I will probably have an opportunity to do that but whatever, I most sincerely urge that these honourable gentlemen, in particular the honourable the Minister of Education and the honourable the Minister of Finance, to seriously reconsider, reconsider this decision to reduce the student aid programme. It has far more to do than with mere statistics or whether or not we are going to get "X" number of people out of university and into higher paying jobs.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to read into the record of this House a letter written by a former student of the university, of which I have received a copy. I notice the Minister of Education has the letter over there as well. the letter written by a former student to the honourable John C. Crosbie and to the honourable Gerald Ottenheimer: Sir, I think it states the case of the students extremely well and further than that, Sir, I think it states quite clearly the expectations that the young students of this province had with respect to this administration taking over the Government of this Province and what they had hoped to see from this administration.

It is a fairly lengthy letter and I will try to read it relatively quickly and I will not read all sections, only these that

I think are reasonably relevant. It is from a Mr. John C. Gould, a former student of the university. "Dear Sirs: I am writing in support of a petition presented on behalf of some 5,500 Newfoundland students who can attend Memorial University only by borrowing outrageously high sums of money. I strongly protest this action on the part of the government. It is completely and directly contrary to all statements made in the election campaigns of 1971 and 1972.

"This government was elected in many areas by the young voters or the young vote, the university vote, because we as intelligent Newfoundlanders saw a new era for Newfoundland."

On February 27, 1972; one month, Sir, that is before the March election, is that correct?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is correct.

MR. F.B. ROWE: "I attended a huge rally in the Thompson Centre of Memorial University and heard the then Minister of Education, the honourable John Carter say; 'There would be no decreases in the form of tuitions or grants. Federal student loans would be increased from \$500. to \$700. per semester.' I, like the other 1,000 or so students, cheered wildly that day the statement was made. Looking up at the platform, looking up at Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Marshall, Mr. R. Wells and Mr. Carter, I felt that there was a new feeling in the air, a new hope. A new wave of optimism was felt by every student.

"We all looked up at this group for new, a new direction, a new future, a new frontier in provincial politics and government policy. We left that meeting with a feeling of responsibility, that responsibility was to put an end to false promises, an end to cheap political tricks and a government that did not care about those whom it was elected to serve." That is what the students of this province were voting for, Sir.

MR. W.N. ROWE: What a letdown!

MR. F.B. ROWE: What a letdown! "And so we voted these men into

office, in good faith we supported them then and in good faith we support them now." Sir, this letter is coming from some supporters of this administration. 'We supported the honourable C.W. Doody, one of the top, new breed of men to run for office, when he said on September 29, 1971; 'The P.C. Party will do everything it possibly can to help our young people achieve their aims, regardless of their political beliefs.' On March 1, 1972, we heard with enthusiasm another new politician, the honourable Tom Doyle saying; 'The province seems to be losing sight of its young people, the best natural resource.' On October 25, 1972 we all listened as Dr. Tom Farrell reaffirmed the P.C.'s philosophy: 'A P.C. Government would establish a provincial youth advisory council to deal with such matters as educational development.' Another new face in Grand Falls, (presumably the ex-honourable Aubrey Senior) told us on October 13, 1971, that: 'We must offer the young people opportunities to keep them from migrating to other provinces.'"

Going on with the letter Sir, "How, Sir, do we propose to keep them here if you make it such an expensive venture to go to university, that many hundreds will turn it down? Turn down university, turn down a productive life, a fulfilling life in intellectual and financial terms, for welfare, unemployment on this small island, or else migrate to Ontario.

"Where is the faith in our people, the new interest in our young that was so evident in the campaigns of 1971 and 1972? In October 1971, the honourable the Premier spoke at Cox's Cove and told us: 'The government I would form will not tell the people what they are to have and then give it to them but would ask them what they want and then work with them to achieve it.'" Sir, the students are asking for the reinstatement of the original policy that was in action before this administration took over.

To go on with the letter, Sir, "Are we, the university students who supported this government, not worthy of that consideration,

a small consideration in financial terms? Only one-sixth of one percent of the total budget is what we are talking about. Only \$1.6 million out of six hundred odd million spent in the coming year and even then, we will not be totally happy, even then we will stand to be prejudiced against, even then we will have to scrimp and save and live on the smallest of budgets. Because the government cannot use the argument; this increase in the ceiling of loans will only mean that the student has to borrow more. If that was only the case it would not be so bad, we could live with that but the students cannot get any more, the students just cannot get any more loan.

"For example, we were told last year that 700 students needed \$1,200 loan. Using last year's calculation we get, a \$600. loan, a \$300 grant and a \$300 additional loan for a total of \$1,200. The total loan would be \$900. This year these same 700 students would need \$1,200 full loan, all loan, no grant, \$300 more each for 700 students. That is \$210,000 these 700 students alone would have to borrow more each year. So, that is \$210,000 per year more that these 700 students alone will have to borrow. Where are they going to get it? Each of these 700 students found it hard enough last year to borrow \$900 from the great, rich federal government. Do you think it will be any easier for them to borrow \$900 this year plus \$300, and that is only \$700?"

I think I will skip some of this now, Sir. The total additional loan that is required, by the way, is \$1,800,000. So the letter goes on; "So, if the university population stays the same, we have no new people enroll next year, we are going to have to squeeze an extra \$1.8 million out of the federal government. Any person who says this legislation to raise the ceiling will not prevent any Newfoundlander from going to university is either not telling the truth or is telling an untruth. It is as much a deterrent as raising the entrance requirements at the university. The academic entrance requirements are the same, the financial requirements are up by \$1.8

million per year."

Sir, I could go on with many other statistics here that give some indication of the cost to a student through insurance registration fees, for books, tuition fees, residence and this sort of thing. These statistics I have already given earlier this afternoon, so I will not bore the House with repeating them again. I felt it was my responsibility to read into the record of this honourable House the feelings of an ex-student of the university a person who does not stand to lose this coming year, the feelings of a person who had been deceived through two election campaigns, a person who thought he was going to see a new light through this administration. Instead, I maintain, as I said earlier in this House, the Minister of Finance in this administration has in fact stabbed the students of this university, this province, in the back.

I think that this letter indicated that this person and many other students supported the election of a new administration in this province and there was nothing in this letter to give me any indication that that same individual does not support this present administration. However, something comes across very strongly in this letter and that is that this person along with thousands of other students in this province feel that he has been letdown, he has been deceived by the change of policy of this administration. This is something that we have related to before in this House, Sir.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, before we pass off 601-01, I do not know that there is a great deal more really that can be said anew or additional. One can obviously repeat various arguments and points of view. Just a couple of matters: The honourable member for Labrador South referred to the importance to the province its social development of as wide as possible an access to education. Certainly that was the idea, it is not the exact words. There is no disagreement there. This government and I am sure all honourable members wish to have as wide an access as possible to forms of education.

Where the difference of opinion is, is that the government do not believe that this change, this requirement that students borrow up to \$1,400, will have any affect on the accessibility. In a case (and I said this before) where a student is most affected, will be in the additional \$400 a year. After four years it will be \$1,600 and if it is a five-year programme it will be \$2,000. There is no difference of opinion in the value of accessibility to education, the difference of opinion is in that area.

One other matter as well: The honourable gentleman was referring to possibilities of a person, you know, ill health or this and that - well obviously the Canada Student Loan Fund works under regulations, quite complicated ones. There is as well an appeal process and I understand that the most important function of that is for individual kinds of cases of unforeseen events which can happen to a student in the course of a year. There is an appeal board, there is a regular process of appeal and the purpose of that is, to a very large extent, for unforeseen events which do occur.

The other matter is, of course, mothers' allowances which the honourable gentleman from St. Barbe North brought up. All I can say on that is that it is not the government's intention to reinstate the mothers' allowance. The matter has been debated to a very great extent here. I think in the last session...

MR. HICKMAN: It is going to be debated again in a private members' resolution.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, it will be coming up in the private members' resolution which the honourable member for Bonavista North I believe has. I would think that, obviously, if we spend a day or two on it now, it is going to be somewhat repetitious if we do it then. I want to be perfectly candid. It is not now the government's intention to reinstate the mothers' allowance. It has been looked at and examined by the administration and we feel that this province does not have the fiscal capability of doing it and we do not intend to reinstate it.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the minister could indicate (or would he prefer to wait until we get to the specific votes in the estimates for his department?)

MR. F. ROWE: just how much Mr. George McLean's organization may be getting out of this particular department or probably the honourable member for St. John's North, seeing he seems to know more about it, can direct questions to the minister at that time.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There is a vote in the department whereby any people who would be doing work for the department in terms of preparing promotional material, basically in the area of manpower development facilities, where a certain amount has been voted on that. I will undertake to draw that to the committee's attention when we get there.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, if I may: The honourable member just read a letter which he said he was going to table, it has not been tabled yet. It is gone outside the chamber, I do not know if that is within the bounds of being legal or not. I am just wondering on this thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no provision in Standing Orders for tabling of matters while the House is in Committee of the Whole. The honourable member does not have to table it.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, did I understand from the minister that as the items come up, if there is anything for McLean's under these specific items, he will point them out to us?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, however I wish to put it into my own words - I said, it could be McLean or it could be McDuff or it could be McDougall, like anybody, but that there is money within the department for promotional material with respect to opportunities or courses at the College of Fisheries, College of Trades, various district vocational schools, adult education centres, etc. Who does it will depend on who is hired to do it. It could be McLean, it could be McDougall, it could be somebody else but I will undertake to point it out to the committee when we get to that vote, the amount and what it is for.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The reason I rephrased it is because the honourable gentleman's question presumed it was or had to be or inevitably would be McLean, That is why I rephrased it that way.

MR. WINSOR: Before we carry the vote, I am not going to go over and repeat all that has been said but I would like to ask the honourable minister one question. Did the honourable minister or the Minister of Finance consider the fact that many students who have to borrow this extra money will only go to university and get a degree, a straight B.A. degree? After leaving the univeristy here of course he has to pursue his studies in some other place. For instance if he is going to study law, he has to turn around then and borrow another amount of money to complete his study in law. Has the government considered that student?

Now there is no doubt in my mind that hundreds of students and parents combined will have to endure financial hardship in getting through the university next year. Unfortunately, the friends of the government, especially the friends of the honourable Minister of Finance, the students who went out almost to a man and fought and supported him in his campaign and the government as a whole, now they are slapped in the face by the same people whom they elected.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear. Hear.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, just a brief answer to the honourable gentleman: We considered obviously, students when coming out would have to go on for a further year or two, perhaps in the case of law three. Yes, obviously we did.

MR. CROSBIE: We have been all over this ground before. All that can be said is that the honourable member for Fogo is completely wrong in his last unnecessary statement. It is not so. It is not as he puts it. I will say this further - it is too bad that

MR. CROSBIE: nothing can be discussed in this House that really affects the province without this kind of jibe. Because this province is faced, not only this year but in the next several years and in the next several years after that, with very serious financial problems and considerations that may require a lot more consideration as to what we can afford in this province or what not.

You can see that quite easily when you look at the fact that despite the increase in tax equalization of \$24 million, we only show our projected current account surplus of \$6,700,000. We have collective bargaining and all the rest of it to do with everybody in the public service, teachers and all the rest of it.

No one likes to have to take back, Mr. Chairman, anything that has ever been granted, but there are tough decisions to be made and there will probably be more of them in the next few years.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is really a very poor answer. However, Sir, when the minister was replying to my honourable colleague, the member for St. Barbe North, earlier in the debate, the Minister of Finance asked my colleague why the federal government would not provide grants instead of the student loan plan. My colleague did not get a chance to answer the question, but the answer to that question, Mr. Chairman, is this, that education is a provincial matter. It comes under provincial jurisdiction, Sir.

I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he or the Minister of Education or the government, have gone to Ottawa to negotiate a plan whereby the Government of Canada would provide grants instead of a student loan plan? That is the question, Sir, because, Mr. Chairman I think honourable members of this House will admit that the Government of Canada

MR. NEARY: have acted in good faith inasmuch as educational matters that come under the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada and I am thinking about manpower training and retraining, whereby the Government of Canada is providing very generous assistance and very generous allowances to students who are attending vocational training schools and the College of Fisheries and the College of Trades and Technology over here, Sir.

So I think the Government of Canada are doing their share and the students that are attending the vocational schools and the College of Trades and the Fisheries College are probably, Mr. Chairman, in many respects better off than the students who are attending the university, because they are getting grants and they are getting generous allowances and they do not have to borrow whereas over at the university they have to borrow the money.

Now, Sir, the Minister of Finance may be absolutely correct when he says there will have to be a certain amount of retrenchment over the next few years, but Sir it all boils down, does it not, to a matter of priorities. If the government have to cut back and there has to be retrenchment, then, Mr. Chairman, why could it not be in the area of the Premier's Office, or the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs which is costing the government \$354,000? Or why could it not be as my friend from Labrador South pointed out, why could it not be the sixteen executive assistants, costing the province \$192,000?

Mr. Chairman, you could go through the estimates and you could find all kinds of examples of where the payroll is padded with people who are not there in the best interest of this province. Mr. Nutbeem was mentioned this afternoon - \$25,000 a year. Government employment officers - \$11,000 a year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The honourable member is directed to 601-01 and while he was relevant in the beginning, is now getting into matters which would be better discussed under other headings.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance mentioned retrenchment and I am trying to deal with that matter. I am trying to answer the Minister of Finance by pointing out to the minister that if retrenchment were necessary then there are all sorts of cuts that could have been made, Sir, that would not affect the students or the poor people of this province. I think the minister has made a very serious error in judgement, Sir, by increasing the loans that the students have to get under the Student Loan Plan.

I think it is a very serious error in judgement, Sir. I think that the government should reconsider this matter. I think if the minister went through his estimates he would find a number of instances, Sir, where \$1.6 million I think is what the minister needs, where he could find much more than \$1.6 million savings, countervailing savings, by eliminating a lot of things that are unnecessary and are not being done in the best interest of the people of this province.

MR. ROBERTS: 601-02-01 Mr. Chairman, we were being a little rapid there, I wish to know why it was \$5,000 last year. Has the minister been making any particularly lengthy trips? He shakes his head. But I mean \$5,000 even - the Minister of Finance with his world jaunts would only bring the total up to \$8,000 or \$10,000.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Actually, since I have been Minister of Education, and I have tabled the answer, I was out of Canada once, I believe that all the ministers' salary votes this year are \$3,000, but I stand to be corrected there, why the \$5,000 last year -

MR. ROBERTS: No, \$3,000 is noted - \$5,000 last year, I mean,

MR. ROBERTS: that is a lot of money.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Part of it could have been that the former Minister of Education did travel as head of a Canadian delegation to the Soviet Union and that may well account for some of it.

MR. ROBERTS: It is funny the minister should mention that because I wanted to explode a little myth, I wonder if the minister could indicate to the committee, Mr. Chairman, how much was spent on a trip, if any, to the Soviet Union last year by the former Minister of Education?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well perhaps the former minister would.

MR. CARTER: That trip was a two-sided trip, it involved my going to Russia but it also involved the reciprocal agreement with Russian Ministers of Education or their designates coming here. Of course it was under the aegis of the Council of Ministers of all of Canada. Each province in that particular organization, each province is expected to pay its share and there was no logical nor reasonable way that we could have avoided paying our fair share for that particular visit.

It is just one of the penalties, if you like, or one of the results of belonging to the Council of Ministers. Now you could argue that Newfoundland does not need to belong to that council but I would disagree with that wholeheartedly and say that we have to pay our fair share and if that is part of it, then that is the way it has to be.

In coming in one year, as it did, it tended to inflate that particular subhead. But I would argue that other years that subhead would be considerably reduced because that particular expense should not arise for a number of years.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the gentleman from St. John's North but now I am confused, Mr. Chairman, this subhead is listed as -

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable Leader of the Opposition would permit - the matter of discussing the 1972-1973 revised estimates are not subject to debate here, were subject to debate in the Interim Supply Bill when it went through the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, with respect, these figures have never been available before the printed estimates were tabled. The first any member of the committee had any opportunity to see them and I submit, Sir, there are innumerable precedents indeed there have been a precedent, I do not know about today but in the committee in the past two or three days, I submit it would be completely unheard of to say one could not refer to the previous year's revised estimates.

Indeed in actual fact, the minister should be producing the actual figures, Your Honour, because the year has now ended, even though the books will not close for twenty-one days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am informed by my assistant that that is the case. The honourable member may continue.

MR. ROBERTS: It just shows I have learned something over the years anyway, if not very much.

Now the former minister, the gentleman from St. John's North, told us that - I must say that I did not follow his statement at all. I tried to but I humbly say I was not able to.

As I understood it, he was saying that because we belong to a Council of Ministers of Education, which we do and properly so, I agree with the gentleman on the point, somehow the travelling expenses of the minister are high. Now there are a number of these councils of ministers, there is one that has been very active in the resources field. I think indeed the gentleman for St. Barbe South may have served as chairman of that at one. These things go around in a rotating fashion. Each province gets its turn.

MR. ROBERTS: Our turn comes and goes.

We are talking here about the minister's travelling and all I want to know is why the Minister of Education, and in this sense it does not matter who it was, there was a minister at any relevant time during the time, The fact that the individuals may have changed is just who is the in man or every cloud has a silver lining. I want to know why we spent \$5,000 last year to send the Minister of Education on his travels and he is only going to need \$3,000 this year, which I agree is the standard vote.

It would have been

Mr. Roberts.

proper to pay it for the council of ministers. Obviously it went for the minister's travel. It would have been improper to pay it for a gentleman from the Soviet Union to come. If the government are going to pay that, it should be shown elsewhere than under minister's travel. I notice the minister conferring with his deputy minister. Could the honourable minister give us the information? It is merely straightforward.

MR. CARTER: If I might clarify this because I was minister at the time when part of that expense was incurred: While we were in Russia, we had no expenses whatsoever. We were guests of the Soviet Government. While the Soviet Government representatives were here, they were guests of the Canadian Government, each province taking its turn. Part of that subhead is the legitimate expenses of our Soviet visitors while they were here in Newfoundland or as I understand it. Now if this is not the case, the present minister will have to explain it differently. This is as I understood it.

MR. ROBERTS: I would submit that it would be certainly wrong, not criminal but very wrong to pay, out of the minister's travel, expenses in hosting a delegation. It may be perfectly proper to pay the expenses of hosting a delegation. That is straightforward. There is nothing wrong with that. That is done all the time. It would be wrong in the extreme and the Auditor General I would suggest would be sending nasty notes to the deputy minister if ministers' travel money is - I will let the minister answer it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The expenditure here is for actual travelling of the minister. It does not include anything but that. I can undertake to get a breakdown of the actual travelling expenses of ministers of education during the former fiscal year. I can undertake to get that.

MR. ROBERTS: That is very kind, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if that head could just stand until we get the information. We may wish to make a comment or two on it. If the item is carried, then we cannot comment

upon it. The minister (I assume we are meeting this evening) could perhaps have the information after the dinner break.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I probably would not be able to because I should imagine that the staff have already left, being after 5:30 P.M. However I will certainly undertake to have it tomorrow. I am just saying that I probably would not be able to get it tonight.

MR. ROBERTS: Let it stand?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right. Let it stand and we will go on to the next heading.

Motion, 02-01 stand, carried.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, on 02-02, there is \$800 over last year. Is there any particular reason for that? On 601-02-02, there is an increase of \$800 - \$200 to \$1,000?

MR. ROBERTS: There seems to be some confusion because some honourable gentlemen think we are on 602-02-08 and the minister I think is under that impression and we are over here under the impression that we are on 601-02-02. Maybe the clerk could call the full subhead or a word to indicate what it is about so that we would be less confused.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the information of the committee, 601-02-01 was called and carried; 601-02-02 was called and carried; 601-02-03 had been called when the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked to revert back to 601-02-01 which was done. Then upon that item being let stand, the clerk read 601-02-03.

On motion 601-02-03, carried.

Motion, total subhead 601 stand, carried.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I was mishearing something in the House on some occasion but I was under the understanding that there was to be a deputy minister for vocational education. Is that correct? I did not see a salary vote in the salary estimates here

for the second deputy minister of vocational education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It was to the effect that there were going to be two assistant deputy ministers and one deputy minister. One assistant deputy minister commences in May and it is my opinion that we will probably wait a month or so until a new senior appointee had settled in before appointing the second senior -

MR. ROWE (F.B.): I am in error. I thought there were two deputy ministers.

On motion 602-01 carried.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, 602-02-08, this is a fairly large sum but, of course, computer services are used quite a bit by the Department of Education, in student-aid, educational planning, teachers' payroll, etc.

On motion 602-02-08 carried.

MR. ROBERTS: On the vote, Mr. Chairman, there are two questions. We are being asked in another department to vote \$3,000 for aircraft and I see they used \$8,000 last year. I do not know how much flying that is. It is forty hours at \$200 an hour and at eighty hours it is \$100 an hour. What are the appropriations-in-aid, miscellaneous? I mean what income does the department have that totals \$30,000 a year?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I will undertake to find that out because looking back over appropriations-in-aid, miscellaneous, \$30,000, there is no cost-shared programme that I can see.

MR. ROBERTS: There is a lot of miscellaneous. Well the minister will get the committee that information.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: What about the aircraft? It seems awfully high for last year.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I can undertake to get a log of the minister's use of the aircraft during the year. To the best of my knowledge, I have used

it once or twice during a fiscal year which is just about to end.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not particularly interested. If the minister wants to table it, fine. I have heard no reports that this particular gentleman is making, shall we say, free use of the aircraft. I am just interested as to why the department spent \$8,000 on aircraft. This is over and above the regular travelling. If an official is sent by the minister to Gander or to Ottawa, he buys his airplane ticket and goes ahead. Again it is like all these things in the estimates. There is a significant change from one year to another. There are questions. It seems high last year and it is going to be much less this year. Why? With regard to the minister, I could not really concern myself less. The more he gets around the country, the better it is.

On motion total subhead 602 carried.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, could the minister inform us under what departments they owe 09-01, 02, 03, 04, 05? What is the department?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Public Works.

On motion 604-01, 604-02, 604-03 carried.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, I believe that there was some kind of a block in a scholarship. There is a slight difference.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister has not been listening to his fearless leader the Premier because we are only providing forty-one electoral or forty-two electoral district scholarships. The Premier apparently is under the impression that redistribution is coming into effect this year. We will need more money in this item. The minister might check with the Premier who as usual does not know what he is talking about.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, that is down by \$14,000 I believe. Could

the honourable minister explain that, please?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Actually this is the same situation there. We budget for no ties and then occasionally there are a number of ties and there are a large number of scholarships involved there, 600 and then 100 post-secondary, the College of Fisheries. We do not estimate for ties but there could be ten, fifteen or a number of ties.

On motion 03-03 carried.

MR. ROBERTS: On 06, Mr. Chairman -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: These are eight scholarships at \$750 each, which are named after the former gentleman.

MR. ROBERTS: Well would the minister tell us how \$6,800 was spent last year?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It must have been another tie.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then, Mr. Chairman, the minister had better go back again because it is \$750 each and we have an \$800 difference. No wonder the minister's mathematics were so poor earlier.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There are eight at \$750 each and so the next one is \$6,800 so there was a tie, an additional \$750, with a \$50 -

MR. ROBERTS: No, the explanation is simple. The explanation is simple.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: What is that?

MR. ROBERTS: The revised estimates are rounded upwards to the nearest hundred dollars.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Very good.

AN HON. MEMBER: Some smart boy!

MR. CHAIRMAN: 604 -

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, there is no 04 and no 07 so that brings us down to M.U.N. Tuition and Allowances.

AN HON. MEMBER: Wait now, what happened to 07 New Bursaries?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I mean I will not talk about new bursaries because there is no vote and there is no vote for parents' subsidy.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): It is there though.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is what I am going to ask about. It is the same thing. If there is no vote they cannot call it so we cannot ask about it. The mothers' allowance that is the burial fee for it there. Mr. Chairman, would the minister tell us why the \$60,000 in bursaries has met the same fate as the mothers' allowance? I see it gone.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: As the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, it is not something we can debate on because obviously there is no vote there, but I will certainly answer the question. An examination of the use of the \$60,000 during the past year indicated that in the vast majority of cases, perhaps in all cases, perhaps, those people who benefited from that programme, which was called New Bursaries, could have in fact benefited under the regular student aid plan. These were usually situations where something would develop in the course of a year whereby a student's financial position was not as good as it had been a few months previously. It is the department's opinion that the area which was covered formerly under that programme, New Bursaries, can in fact be covered under the regular student-aid programme.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, I guess I am really looking for your guidance in this matter because in talking about the parents' subsidy there was some sort of a plan to be worked out between the Department of Education and the Department of Social Services, because on August 30, 1972, the Premier announced that Social Services and Rehabilitation Minister, Thomas Hickey, had a proposal for paying mothers' allowances only to needy families and this was being prepared by cabinet for study and Premier Moores suggested that this solution should be reached by that weekend. I was wondering to whom I may be able to address the question under the circumstances. What I am trying to find out is where

that great new proposal is. I would like to know what the status of it is at the present time. Can you address a question to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation? The hon. member for St. John's East (Extern) was the person who was concerned with this and involved with it. I wonder if he has an answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member will permit me, the vote 604-04, Parents' Subsidy, is not subject to debate. There is no vote there.

MR. ROBERTS: We are on 604-05, M.U.N. Tuition and Allowances, \$1.9 million and we are merely asking a question on a sum for allowances which has disappeared. That is all we are doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry. The item was called and it escaped my notice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Would the honourable member repeat the question?

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, the other day I went through a long list of public announcements that have been made by the Premier and by the former Minister of Education and by the former Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation with regard to what was going to be done with the mothers' allowance. I said that at one stage of the game that the government were considering reinstating the mothers' allowance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member will permit. Maybe the honourable member is responsible for my confusion. It seems to be rather stretching the point to be able to bring in anything concerning mothers' allowances under 604-05. This concerns Memorial University tuition and allowances.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, we will ask it on the total of the subhead,

when it is definitely in order. It is the same thing. Your Honour, the clerk must call the total and it is in order there. I wonder if the minister could deal with another question, please. I have a letter here from a young gentleman, a resident of Grand Falls, who is in the peculiar position of having on merit achieved not one but two separate Centenary Scholarships. He won one leaving Grade XI going into university and he achieved eighty-six per cent in his first year of university which is a commendable mark. Then he replied for a renewal of the \$600 Centenary Scholarship and he was informed by the scholarship committee that he was no longer eligible, since the scholarship regulations had been altered. Now the young gentleman was in the position that he was not attending university in Newfoundland. Apparently the change was made so that whereas formerly, a student winning a scholarship apparently could take it anywhere, a scholarship was tenable anywhere -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable minister just walked into it because the young gentleman was studying to be a priest.

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

The Committee resumed at 8:00 P.M.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, before we recessed for supper or dinner as one wishes I was raising a point with the Minister of Education to the effect that apparently within the last year or so there has been a change in the scholarship regulations. I do not want to put words in the minister's mouth but if I understood him correctly in the interchange that occurred just about the time Your Honour was leaving the chair, there has been a change to the effect that no longer do students who qualify for scholarships, no longer may they hold them outside of Newfoundland.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is generally correct.

MR. ROBERTS: That is generally correct. Well this is my point. I think that has always been so That is not a change. The exception always was that if a student were taking a course that was not offered within Newfoundland, then his scholarship was tenable outside of the province. If, for example, one won a scholarship and wanted to go and study the viola or the tuba or the clarinet, one presumably could go to the Boston Conservatory or the Conservatory in Toronto and one could hold one's scholarship. Well is that changed? Or is that still the policy that a scholarship is tenable only in Newfoundland unless the course one is taking is not available within the province?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is correct. May I make that straight?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, of course.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I think where some of the difficulty comes in is that there are two sets of scholarships called by the same name Centenary Scholarships, one available to Grade XI students and one available to the university students. With respect to the Grade XI students, the general regulation is that they must be held in the province. If however the person is pursuing a course not available here, he may go outside. But this is a one-year scholarship based on Grade XI performance. There is another series of scholarships called Centenary, ones given to university students and only to students at Memorial. The conditions there are that the recipient must either

continue at Memorial or (b) if he is taking something not available in the province he may go outside. But with that second Centenary scholarship, the only ones strictly eligible are those at Memorial. Now I think where the problem came up with this gentleman in question is that he got a Grade XI Centenary scholarship. If it is the same person that we looked up in our records, a person in Grand Falls who received two Centenary scholarships or received scholarships in a row. One was a Grade XI one and for that he went to the mainland. He was taking a course which was not available here. He was, it would appear, under the impression that this was a continuing programme and that he would be eligible for what are also called Centenary scholarships but which are given to students at Memorial only. On what appears to have been a sincere mistake on his part, he made commitments while under the impression that he was eligible for that scholarship, again because he had quite good marks, but in fact the Centenary scholarship at the university level is only awarded to students at Memorial even though under certain circumstances they may get permission to continue their studies outside of Memorial. Based on what appeared to be a sincere mistake and the fact that he had undertaken obligations, on that he was given the assistance the second year and explained and told quite clearly that he would not be able to reapply or would not be eligible again because (a strict interpretation of the regulations) he was not in fact eligible the second time. Because it was no longer a Grade XI scholarship, it was a university Centenary scholarship and he was not in fact then a student at Memorial. I am not sure if that clarifies it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I think it is some progress, Mr. Chairman, and I think we have the same person in mind. I do not want to use the gentleman's name in committee but, of course, I have given it to the Minister of Education outside. The young man got a scholarship in Grade XI. That is straightforward. That, as the minister tells us, can go anywhere. He went off to Carlton University in Ottawa.

He choose the Ottawa university rather than Memorial because he intends to enter the Oblate priesthood, I assume the priesthood is a member of the Oblate Order. This necessitated his living in an Oblate House, a vocational institution. I assume this is a requirement of the church or the diocese or the order, whoever are to ordain him.

He goes on, "in 1971 my Centenary scholarship was renewed after a very successful year at Ottawa, I then returned for the 1971-1972 academic year." This may be where the confusion comes in. Of course, the young gentleman was very upset and he sent copies of this letter accordingly - not copies but similar letters to the Minister of Education, who at that time was the member for St. John's North, before his unfortunate accident of disagreeing with the Premier - then the member for another district the member for Grand Falls District. This was on August 1.

So the confusion comes apparently as to whether or not the young gentleman - the minister says he was told quite clearly that sort of, we, the government have goofed. To compensate for our mistake we shall allow you to have this a second year. In other words, from your first year into your second year university, even though normally you would not be allowed to have it, but it will go no further because you are not at a Newfoundland university. The minister confirms that is essentially what the meaning is. Am I correct?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, that he is not entitled to it in a further year.

MR. ROBERTS: The only problem is that the young gentleman in quite a long and quite well written letter at no point gives any indication that he was aware that having the scholarship renewed for the 1971-1972 year in which he got and had it renewed, his second year, even though he was strictly speaking ineligible, as the minister has explained, at no point does he give any indication that he was aware of that. Indeed he goes further, he speaks of changes in the scholarship regulations. He speaks of - just let me read a paragraph, Mr. Chairman.

"I must further protest about the way in which the new

regulations were implemented. In May I wrote two letters of inquiry to the Scholarship Committee, (I assume that is a committee of officials within the Education Department), requesting confirmation of my eligibility for renewal of the Centenary scholarship." He was obviously aware that all was not well. But he wrote to them. "But however no reply was forthcoming. Then in mid-July, having learned that the scholarship winners had been announced, I attempted to phone the appropriate people in the Department of Education to learn why I had not been awarded a scholarship." Again apparently he was not aware, and he had an eighty-six per cent average in his first year studies which presumably, academically, put him in for it. "After five unsuccessful attempts, I finally spoke to the supervisor of scholarships and bursaries and learned of the new regulations. Not until July 25, fully two months after my initial inquiry, did I receive an official letter explaining the new regulations."

MR. OTTENHEIMER: But there are in fact no new regulations. The gentleman may have misunderstood it and thought that there were. but there are not.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, if there are no new regulations, there are no new regulations. The important point is that obviously this young man, I do not know if he is at school or not, I assume he is. I assume the Oblate Order or his own diocese in Grand Falls or his family or somebody has made arrangements for him to continue his studies. I hope so because we are all aware that the Roman Catholic Church is having difficulties, as are many churches, in recruiting people for the priesthood, and presumably anything could be done to encourage a candidate would be done by the church authorities.

But the point is that there was apparently this confusion and I wondered - all I can ask, Mr. Chairman, in view of the minister's explanation, is whether the minister could take steps to ensure that this sort of confusion does not happen again. The young gentleman had his plans made and apparently it was not until July 25 that he had an official letter, despite attempts on his part. He certainly

had not slept on his rights, in spite of attempts on his part to find out the situation.

I guess that is really the only point that I can make. If there are no new regulations then that is that. I started my inquiry, Mr. Chairman, by wondering if in fact there were any new regulations. It seems to be a case where the administration was not what it should have been. I realize the present minister cannot be held guilty for the sins of his predecessor, any of his predecessors. All I can ask, that the minister take a look maybe at this gentleman's case. He has obviously had a look at the file over the dinner hour. Maybe he might have a look at it and see if the young man has some merit in his case. Because if in fact he did not know the regulations and could not have been aware of the regulations, and this is a big "if" then I think he has a claim in equity if not in law. I guess that is really all I can say on it. I thank the minister for his explanation but I hope that he could assure the committee he will have another look at the young gentleman's case. If the minister has not got the letter if it is not in the files, I shall gladly supply him with a copy from my files.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, just one further comment on it. Actually I made the statement, there are no new regulations. That is not true. Regulations have been updated, but there are no changes of substance or significance and no changes which would have any effect in this particular area. I certainly agree that those recipients of scholarships or bursaries which are one-year, one shot deals, under specific conditions, when they are awarded there should go a covering letter making it very clear that these are one-year only. Also in a case like this, where the same name is used for two different scholarships, with different requirements, which leads to confusion, a letter, when they are awarded, should make very clear to them even if they do get permission to go outside of the province that this is not necessarily a recurring thing. We certainly will have another

look at it and perhaps suggest to the gentleman, as I do not think he will qualify under this programme - I mean there is no reason why he would not - it would appear there is no reason why he would not be able to qualify under the Canada Student Loan Programme.

MR. ROBERTS: It is an interesting point. I thank the minister, because there are now, I guess now for the first time in 130 years, no theological students in Newfoundland. I understand the candidates for the Anglican priesthood, there were three at Queen's, they have now been sent to England, if sent is the right word. They are now in England and following their studies. This means now that any Newfoundlander who wishes - the United Church never trained their people here, the Salvation Army do of course maintain the college for officers. Where is it? Next to the Citadel on Adams Avenue here in the city. The Roman Catholic people have never trained their people here, to my knowledge they have always gone to Ireland or to Ottawa. The Pentecostal people I think are all trained on the mainland. So what it means is, if a Newfoundlander is going through for the ministry, he in effect now has no opportunity to qualify for scholarships. That is what the minister is saying, is it? That is the effect of the regulation.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is the effect of the regulation, except for the first year he could possibly do this.

MR. ROBERTS: Leaving Grade XI, his matriculation: It is not my part to plead for the churches, Mr. Chairman, they are very effective as spokesmen. But perhaps the minister might want to have a look at that. I mean in medicine we do help people to go through it. I guess there is a public interest in medicine. We help them in dentistry. Fortunately we do not help them in law but there are lots of lawyers in Newfoundland, the minister will agree. We might have a look at this. I had not intended to stand here and make a plea for it. It seems to be a bit of an anomaly that we will help people to do all sorts of so-called traditional disciplines, traditional professions but if one has a religious vocation the Government of Newfoundland, after the first year say, "well, fine, no

help from us." It is a bit of a -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I would just like to point out that if a person in that position - of course, it could well be that a Grade XI student did not know, but if a person were in that position his best bet financially, from terms of government assistance, would be to go to Memorial for one year and then qualify for a centenary and go away after that first year. But I agree also it is an area that should be looked into. It is a fairly complicated area.

MR. ROBERTS: I will leave it by noting that first of all the average student does not shop around, although it may happen with the new schemes that the ministry are engaged in. It would be very interesting if the gentleman went to Memorial and took the student-aid. It would make interesting cause of action, the Minister of Education versus the Reverend so and so or versus Reverend Father so and so trying to collect some of these student-aid things.

By the way while we are on that, if we are on student-aid, Mr. Chairman, what has been the default record in Newfoundland on student-aid? The minister is not responsible for collecting these, they are federal. But what has been the record?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: To my knowledge, very few where there was any action taken. I understand that since 1964 and I believe the Canada Student Loan Plan was implemented in 1964, there have been between approximately forty-five

defaults or forty-five actions taken to recover. There may have been more defaults in which case Canada Student Loan Fund gave a longer term. There were approximately forty-five instances where they had taken an action to recover, that is since 1964. That is about four or five a year. It would average four or five a year which is pretty slight.

HON. E. ROBERTS: (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): So, our students have a rather good repayment record.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: So it would appear.

MR. NEARY: What kind of action would be taken? Would they put it in the hands of a credit agency or in court action? What sort of action would be taken? A collection agency?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Of course this would be action taken by the Canada Student Loan Fund not by Provincial Government at all. I presume it would be through their solicitor but it is something where the Department of Education or the Provincial Government is in no way involved. These small numbers of actions will be ones initiated by the Canada Student Loan people themselves.

MR. NEARY: Just a lawyer's letter or something like that.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I spent I suppose the best part of three and a-half hours to four hours in favour of the case for reinstating the tuition and allowance policy of the administration, the same policy that they had last year. It does not seem to me, Sir, that the government is about to change its mind over-night on this particular item but I would like to point out to the honourable Minister of Education that last year, on September 13, when the final announcement was made regarding the fact that there would be no mothers' allowance reinstated in this province, that the then Minister of Education who was pinch-hitting for the unavailable Premier at the time told a group of about a dozen women, demonstrating in front of the Confederation Building -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Were they not, by the way, inciting a riot at that time?

MR. F. ROWE: I do not know if they were inciting a riot at that time or not, but they did say that they were not going to reverse the decision with respect to reinstating the mothers' allowance. The minister of the day, the member for St. John's North, did say that the three point six million dollars saved by the Treasury by cancelling the mothers' allowance is to be used to improve the educational programme. Now, Sir, I think I asked the honourable Minister of Education in my preliminary remarks, when we were dealing with the salary vote, where that three point six million dollars is or where did it go in the estimates. We cannot debate that point now when we are considering a particular head but I would recommend, Sir, that probably the Minister of Education could take some of that money that was saved through the cancellation of the mothers' allowance and put it right back in the vote for tuitions and allowances for Memorial University students. It would only take \$163,000,000 to do this and that is a very small portion of the money saved on the mothers' allowance. So, Sir, we have bitten -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Eight hundred and sixty-three difference from last year. Eight hundred and sixty-three thousand. What did I say?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Million.

MR. F. ROWE: Oh, million. No. Eight hundred and sixty-three thousand, Sir. I think we have spent enough time trying to build a case for the reinstatement of the tuition and allowance policy that was adhered to last year. So, on that we rest our case and just hope that the minister in the final analysis will bow and put that eight hundred and sixty-three thousand dollars back into motion.

I am on my feet. Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon, I

had some difficulty with respect to whom I should address a question that I had regarding this whole business of the parents' subsidy, since there is no vote there for that this year. Sir, just to jog the honourable minister's memory and -

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member will permit: There is no vote for parents' subsidy in the estimates. The time for general debate on parents' subsidy is under 601-01 or in the budget debate. Since the total subhead 604 does not include any monies for parents' subsidy, it is out of order to discuss it at this time.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, with due respect, Sir. When we went to discuss this particular item this afternoon, since there was no vote for it, I thought we had a ruling from the Chair suggesting that we could discuss parents' subsidy under the total subhead here and I can remember the honourable Leader of the Opposition getting up and saying -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the honourable member may have felt that we had a ruling from the Chair to that effect but there was no such ruling. The honourable the Leader of the Opposition made the observation that it went without saying that debate would be able to go on on this matter but the Chair does not agree with that observation of the honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The matter was debated under 601-01.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I did not get an answer to questions that I put to the Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I do not mind giving the answer if that can be done without opening up the whole debate. If the Chair should permit it is up to the Chair.

MR. F. ROWE: May I ask a question of the Chair? Does that mean, Sir, that when the total vote for the whole Department of Education is dealt with that we cannot bring anything up at that time that could have been dealt with under another -

MR. CHAIRMAN: First of all, the matter is a hypothetical question which may not be posed and generally speaking may not be answered. The honourable member is directed to the rule, well preceded rule, that heads of expenditure within estimates are only debatable in themselves. If there is no expenditure there, if it is not debatable. However, wide ranging debate is allowed under the first general heading which in this case is 601-01. If the honourable member at that time do not get his answers and do not make an issue of it at that time, then the matter is not subject to further debate.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, it is an important matter, if Your Honour will allow. It has been my experience in the House of Assembly that we are permitted to, when we are dealing with any particular subhead, make remarks concerning last year's amounts and how they were spent. It has always been held to be in order. If you followed Your Honour's ruling to its logical extreme, all you would be able to talk about in the estimates is the amount which is voted for this year and you would not be able to talk about last year's at all, whether there was a wastage, or make any comparisons between them.

Now, because there is no amount to be voted under, say parents subsidy this year, therefore, there is nothing to be passed and it is passed over. When you come to the subhead where you can compare the subhead for this year to the subhead for last year - under last year's subhead there are sub-totals, Sir. There was an amount for that particular subhead. I mean, it seems to me to be logical and in keeping with parliamentary practice to permit a question at least to be asked on the sub-total of a certain subhead concerning something that was actually in the estimates last year. It would appear to me, Sir, quite seriously and not wanting to see an unwarranted precedent made in the Committee, that if Your Honour's ruling be upheld and adhered to rigorously, then

it would be a bad precedent for the House, Your Honour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member's remarks are by way of observation.

HON. T. A. HICKMAN: (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): When the estimates come before the committee, the committee is asked to vote or to grant supply unto Her majesty or to put it another way to grant government permission to spend the monies shown under the various heads of expenditure, in deciding or debating on a particular request or a particular sum of money, it is not unlikely that questions will be asked as to the comparison between what is being asked about this year with what had actually been spent last year. This is not the case here, Mr. Chairman. We have a situation where the government is not coming to the House to ask that any money be voted for. This is why I submit that Your Honour's ruling is correct and it is not a disastrous precedent but indeed one that follows precedent well established.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a motion, if I may. I move that the amount of subhead 604-05 be reduced by sixty dollars. That is a debatable motion, Sir. May I now speak in support of it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable Leader of the Opposition repeat that, please.

MR. ROBERTS: I move that the total of subhead 604 be reduced by the sum of sixty dollars. I cannot move that it be increased. I can move that it be decreased. That is in order, is it not, Sir? Of course that is a debatable motion. Okay. We are now going to talk about my reasons why it is being decreased. The reason that I think that it should be decreased, Sir, is that the administration has not provided any money in this for new bursaries. We have had no explanation at all from the minister.

By the way, to a point of order, I assume each of us on this side may now speak to the motion. It is a regular motion. In committee we may each speak to it a number of times. Last year the

government spent the sum of \$60,000 on new bursaries, a very wise expenditure in our opinion, Sir, a very wise expenditure and one that was necessary. My colleague, the member for St. Barbes North, when he speaks on this motion will explain why it was such a wise thing. He will also explain why we are so unhappy that the government this year proposed not to spend anything on new bursaries. That is why we are moving that this vote be reduced by the token amount of sixty dollars.

To me it is quite wrong, Mr. Chairman, for the government not to spend anything and the minister has offered not even the lame defense that he offers in some of his other moves as Minister of Education. This is a wrong decision by the government. We do not want to see the amount of student-aid reduced. That is why I only made it sixty dollars, just in case the government should vote for that motion. So, it is only a small amount off a total expenditure of \$1.9 millions which in turn is down \$863,000 from last year. If you take off the fact that last year included \$972,000 for mothers' allowances, you would see that the students of this province are being whacked something over \$1.6 millions cash this year. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a wrong decision. That is not the way that we should be going.

What it means, Sir, is that the Government of Newfoundland are withdrawing consciously and deliberately from the student aid field. Last year they spent \$2.7 millions on it. This year they are only spending \$1.9 millions on the MUN tuition.

On the subhead as a whole, last year they spent \$4.4 or five millions. This year they are proposing to spend only \$2.5 millions. That is a total decrease of about \$1.9 million dollars. We do not think that is right. In particular, we have talked at some length about the student allowances. I do not propose to go over that. We have talked about that. We think that is wrong and we will gladly go over it again if the government wish to go over it to think out

their feeble reasoning.

We have not been able to get any explanations at all as to why the new bursaries are being cut. Maybe there is a good reason for it. The minister so far, Mr. Chairman, has not given the committee a reason. If he does not, we have to assume that he has no reason and therefore, we choose to express our displeasure at this by moving the motion which I have just made.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, this matter has been viewed by officials in the Department of Education and it is our opinion that with the change, which was debated earlier today, in the Canada Student Loan Fund, whereby students must now borrow fourteen hundred dollars in order to qualify for provincial aid, that with that change the cases which were previously covered under the \$60,000 vote for new bursaries can now be met within the regular student-aid programme. In other words, that the need is no longer there, that through the student-aid programme the kinds of cases which were provided for under what was generally called new bursaries can now be looked after under the regular student-aid programme. It may be that there are some changes in some of the minor technical regulations which will be necessary. If that is the case, obviously those changes will be made.

The substance of it is that with the change in the student aid programme announced in the budget, the cases which were covered under the \$60,000 new bursary vote can now be covered under the regular student-aid programme.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the motion put forth by the honourable Leader of the Opposition with respect to the bursaries. Sir, the reason why I am against the original vote here is that we have not had a satisfactory explanation as to what the status is -

HON. J. C. CROSBIE: (MINISTER OF FINANCE): I submit to Your Honour that it is quite out of order for this debate to be made on the total

subhead 604. The individual items have all been voted under section 604. Salaries, expenses, travelling, office and the rest of it have all been voted on. It is not the first item of the minister's estimates, but page 201 of Beauchesne says, "The whole management of department may be discussed in a general way when the Committee of Supply is considering the first resolution of the estimates of that department which reads as follows: general administration but the discussion was not

MR. CROSBIE: to any particular item mentioned in the estimates, then it goes on to point out that you can only discuss when you get to the individual items, that particular item.

Halfway down the page, "Each grant is a separate motion which must be proposed and discussed as a distinct question and when it has been formally carried no reference can be made again thereon. Neither is it regular to discuss any resolution before it has been formally proposed from the Chair."

Now all of these items have been carried. We are just down to the total. The total is just that you add up each item that has been carried and then you have the total. The motion is quite out of order on the total of this subhead here. In fact the total of the subhead does not have to be carried.

MR. ROBERTS: May I speak to the point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: I submit the honourable gentleman from St. John's West is correct when he reads Beauchesne but completely incorrect in the conclusion which he draws. It is my submission, Sir, that the motion before the Chair is that subhead 604 be carried.

Let me deal with some points the minister made *seriatim* as best I can recall them. First of all he speaks of the fact that the individual items have been carried. They have, Sir, but it is the total which carries, and if that not be a valid argument, then may I ask why the totals have been called in this committee day after day, year after year, why the heads by departments are carried day after day, year after year, why the supply bills are carried, day after day, year after year?

In other words, Sir, it is not an arithmetical compilation. The motion before the Chair, I submit, Sir, in each case is that subhead 604 be carried and for the purposes of convenience and for the purposes of accounting here by the minister's officials, and by the Auditor General on the other hand, they are broken

MR. ROBERTS: into certain subheads.

Further, Mr. Chairman, the very reference which the honourable minister read from page 201 of Beauchesne makes the point that we cannot on the major item, the 01-01, the minister's salary vote, discuss items which are being referred to below.

Now we have amended that a little. Our practice is a little different. But the fact remains, Sir, that the motion before the Chair now is that the total of subhead 604 carries, I have made a motion to amend that, not to increase it, because that I cannot do, I am not a minister, indeed a minister cannot do that Sir, as Your Honour can tell us, without a letter from the Governor, increasing the total expenditures. But I do have it within my power, as a member of the committee, as a member of the House, to reduce the amount, I have therefore moved that the amount be reduced, My colleague apparently wishes to speak in support of that motion and in so doing he intends to refer to matters only within subhead 604. He would be quite out of order to talk about matters which should have been raised under subhead 602 or subhead 611 or subhead 612, that I submit, but he is only proposing to talk, as I heard him, about student-aid which is the precise item dealt with by subhead 604.

The whole formula of our estimates, Mr. Chairman, is subheads, not sub-sub-subhead but rather subheads. So therefore I submit the motion is in order and my colleague is quite in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Leader of the Opposition, as I understand it, his motion is on head 604, Does that concern 604-07?

MR. ROBERTS: No, 604 be reduced to \$2,535,940 and no cents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point being one that may be referred to continuously throughout the passing of the remainder of the estimates, It is certainly of sufficient substance to warrant

MR. CHAIRMAN: a short adjournment.

MR. ROBERTS: Let us go on with the debate for a while and the Chairman can consider his ruling. It is okay by us. We will do whatever the Chair wishes to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is a matter that will not be resolved by pleasant chit-chat across the floor, and the committee will rise for approximately five minutes while we consider the matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The committee rose ten minutes ago to consider a matter of some urgency and

Mr. Chairman.

definitely I would say a point which is rather difficult. The ruling somehow defies logic. However the tradition - the tradition is long standing - is when discussing estimates that subheads are called and members are called upon to carry or not carry the various subheads. In the case of subhead 604, all the various items have been carried and arithmetically they do amount to \$2,540,000. Honourable members have agreed that that is the amount that should be voted. However, whether previous Houses have been correct or not, honourable members have been called upon to approve the total, whether that be arithmetically correct or not. Since it is always in order or apparently it is always in order for an honourable member to move a reduction in the amount of money to be approved, this is what the hon. Leader of the Opposition has done. While it is not logical for the amount which is now asked to be approved, the precedents of the House are such that the motion has to be entertained.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Well, Sir, the reason I rise in support of the motion of the hon. Leader of the Opposition is because I am entirely dissatisfied as to the answer which in fact I did not get. I did not get an answer at all to the question put to the hon. Minister of Education regarding what the status of a new programme is to help the needy mothers of this province. You will remember, Sir, that on August 30 that the cabinet had hoped at that time to hammer out a new formula for the payment of mothers' allowances only to needy families in this province. This new programme was to be unveiled the coming Friday of that week of August 30.

Now, Sir, it was stated at that time -

MR. BARRY: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. There is something wrong here. If you have a so-called rule of relevancy in committee which is supposed to be fairly rigidly adhered to, can you permit an

avoidance of this rule of relevancy or an evasion or a getting around it by the moving of a motion and then the use of the supplying of reasons which logically have no connection with the motion that is moved?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: No, no, this is on another point. My point is that the motion is out of order, not for the reason given. The motion is out of order because to permit such a motion would be to throw away the rule of relevancy because whenever an honourable member wants to talk about anything in committee on any estimate, an honourable member need only rise, make a motion and then give as his reason for the motion the irrelevant point that he wished to make, which I submit is what the honourable member is doing right now.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): May I speak to the point of order Mr. Chairman? I give the honourable minister the benefit of the doubt. It is a different point, but it is one of relevancy. I would submit, Sir, that his argument bears no weight whatsoever. Subhead 604, what we are talking about, has a heading to it and it is clearly labelled. It sticks out like a sore thumb - student-aid. So if we are talking about the sub total of subhead 604, I would submit, Sir, that as long as the remarks are relevant to student-aid, then they are relevant on the sub total. In accordance with Your Honour's ruling earlier, if debate is permitted on an amendment to the sub total for student-aid and as long as the remarks bear reference to student-aid then it is relevant. Although the minister has raised an additional point of order, I would submit, Sir, that he is wrong because my honourable colleague's remarks are relevant to the subhead, the sub total of the subhead, student-aid.

MR. CROSBIE: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The point is that the hon. gentleman from St. Barbe North is trying to discuss

the parents' subsidy, not student-aid. There is no vote for parents' subsidy in the heading, Student-Aid. The motion that the vote be reduced by sixty dollars must be restricted to the reason that there is too great an expenditure somewhere here of sixty dollars. They want another sixty dollars taken off student aid or whatever the reason is. Certainly the honourable gentleman cannot be discussing parents' subsidy which is not in the vote at all.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if I may add a word to the point of order? I suggest, Sir, that the hon. member for Placentia West got off on a wrong logical base. There is no doubt that Your Honour has ruled and so there is no doubt that the motion is in order. Now the hon. gentleman from Placentia West is quite correct when he says that if the debate be irrelevant, but that is another chair and he has been most insidious. To quote the remarks of our Chairman: "in unmercifully drawing to order any honourable gentleman who strays somewhat from the path of relevancy."

MR. BARRY: Okay, you are right there. The reference to the parents' subsidy is the point that I am making.

MR. ROBERTS: It seems that I have satisfied the gentleman from Placentia West with respect to his point of order. Now let me try to deal, if I may, Mr. Chairman, with his sort of subsidiary point or his second line of defence, if that is the correct word. I have made a motion that the subhead be reduced. The subhead is 604. It is called student-aid. One could make an argument I suggest that student-aid includes aid to students, their mothers. After all these are minors. They cannot receive it in their own right. One has to be nineteen. I will make the argument, if one want. I submit that it is logically sound and legally sound. This sixty dollars may well come off salaries and the reason why we may want it to come off salaries is that the minister is not asking for any salary for anybody to

administer a mothers' allowance. Surely, Your Honour, it is quite relevant to the debate. I really think that the member for St. George's has made a very relevant comment, as is he wont, as he is wont. I feel exactly that way as well. We should have a word with his slave-driving House Leader, Mr. Chairman.

The point is that if my colleague be irrelevant, well Your Honour will rule him to order, of course. As long as he is relevant to subhead 604 and giving his reasons for supporting this motion, surely he has the right to do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A ruling has been made. It is not a ruling which the Chair is particularly proud of. It is a ruling that defies logic. However there are rules within rules as it were. I think it is something that should certainly be taken into consideration by any rules committee of this House. The motion raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition defies arithmetic. However there have been motions in this honourable House which defy many other things other than arithmetic. However the rule of relevancy is always an overriding rule of relevancy of debate. The honourable members will no doubt show their ability to keep to the subject. I feel quite sure that honourable members may find it quite interesting speaking to this subject and remaining relevant.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, just one more point to the point of order, which is just very brief. The point that I was making was that there have been many things relevant to the motion as to why the hon. Leader of the Opposition wanted the vote reduced. My point is that while the statements may be relevant to that motion, they have to be relevant to the heading, as I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, of student-aid or else the

rule of relevancy is no longer applied in the estimates. .

MR. ROBERTS: If I may be allowed a further comment on these points of order which, as Your Honour appreciates, are important. We are setting precedents. I am not sure that I would agree with the hon. gentleman from Placentia West. The motion is relevant. The motion is in order. It has been allowed. His Honour has risen the committee and has consulted his advisers and has made his ruling. I understand His Honour would like to appeal his ruling but he has not, so there we are. The debate must be relevant to the motion. The motion is that subhead 604 be reduced. The same rule of relevancy applies to any debate, any motion. That is all. If the hon. member for St. Barbe North should stray from the straight and narrow path then His Honour will unmercifully call him to order - mercilessly is a better word than unmercifully. In any event my colleague will be called to order. I do think we should get on with the debate. It was the hon. gentleman for St. John's West who started all this needless fuss with his pedantic impositions. But, Mr. Chairman, really we started with a simple question. The hon. gentleman for St. John's West is against us having questions. Now that we are in order, I think really my hon. friend from St. Barbe North should be allowed to carry on. We would have been at this an half hour ago. Are we going to have the House Leader whining on the radio again this Saturday too?

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, I think the easiest way to get around this whole thing is to allow me to get this off my chest. Then the hon. Minister of Education I am sure will be quite happy to answer my question. Then the whole thing will be settled instead of getting into this ridiculous wrangle that we are in at the present time.

Now, Sir, what I was about to say was that I was trying to find out the status of the new programme, the new proposal that the then Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation was going to announce at the end of the week on August 30. I brought this matter up before in my initial remarks. I am just asking the minister: Is there a new proposal or has there ever been a new proposal made to the cabinet with regard to helping the needy mothers of this province?

Sir, at about the time that that proposal itself was wiped off the face of the earth, the hon. the Premier stated that he was going to conduct a special study to see how they could take care of the needs of the needy mothers of this province as far as getting assistance to them for the aid of their children going to school. This is all I am asking, Sir. It is as simple as that. There is no great speech. I have already gone through in detail the various clippings of the hypocrisy of the administration in this regard. There is no need for me to do it again. I simply ask the hon. Minister of Education: Firstly, has a proposal ever been made to cabinet to help the needy mothers of this province? Secondly, is there any kind of a study being conducted to see what can be done to help the needy mothers of this province? It is as simple as that, Sir.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, the first answer is in slightly different terms than it was asked and that is about discussion in cabinet. Put it this way; the government, as obvious, decided last year that there would be no mothers' allowance. The government have looked at various possibilities as a substitute, if you wish, for the mothers' allowance. They have decided that whatever programmes should be presented for people in need should and would in future be part of the social welfare programme. The

parents' subsidy as it was before was, of course, paid to everybody of need or without need. That was stopped. The government obviously looked at various possibilities based on a means' test or a needs' test and government decided that a parents' subsidy related with and administered under the aegis of the Department of Education was not the most sensible way; that questions of people's economic need should be regarded altogether under a general area of social welfare. The Minister of Social Assistance, of course, is responsible for that programme. When the estimates for his department are debated, I am sure he will be able to inform the committee of their policies and

their programmes and recent discussion with Ottawa, where it appears quite imminent that there are going to be some changes there.

With respect to the Department of Education, there is no parent subsidy, for after having in government examined various alternatives and possibilities and other ways of doing it, through a needs test or a means test, we have decided that this should be regarded as a part of the overall question of social need and viewed in that light.

Motion, that the vote be reduced by the amount of sixty dollars, defeated.

On motion, total subhead 604, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 611-01 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Every summer there is a certain amount of temporary help here. Last year it would appear that a number of texts (I think for reasons outside this province's control, shipping from the publishers and publishers supplies) were late arrivals, so a larger number of summer help were taken on for a longer period toward the end. It is not anticipated that that will reoccur.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the total subhead 611 carry?

MR. W.N. ROWE: On the total, Sir, may I ask the minister a question? This is to jog my memory more than anything else. What is the situation now with regard to school supplies, school books and things? How much do the students have to pay for them in the schools?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: From Kindergarten to Grade IV inclusive there is no charge, they are supplied free. Text books above that, up to and including Grade XI there is a seventy-five percent subsidy. Actually they pay twenty-five percent of cost. I am wrong, kindergarten to Grade III are free and Grades IV to XI are subsidized seventy-five percent by public treasury.

MR. W.N. ROWE: That was the policy of the Smallwood Administration. Maybe the minister cannot answer this, Mr. Chairman, but is it the intention of the present administration to carry on with that policy,

to reduce it or to improve it from the students point of view, or does the minister know?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: At the present time there are certainly no plans to alter it. We do not intend to change the provision of free texts from Kindergarten up to Grade III, nor at the present time do we intend to increase the subsidy. We feel that there is certainly a much better chance of books being looked after and cared for if there were some investment in them. It is a pretty generous subsidy, yet people do have to pay enough to make some investment there.

I could say that no person is ever deprived of a textbook because of any financial difficulty that they or their parents might have. That has not nor will occur.

MR. MARTIN: Aside from schoolbooks, what other supplies are provided by the public treasury?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Teachers' guides and those kind of essential supplies are free, workbooks, certain kits, records, charts are frequently supplied free of charge. That is about it under this. This basically deals with textbooks, workbooks and related materials such as charts and that. It does not cover, say, library grants nor anything like that.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, I would say all of this is textbook material or what would accompany it.

On motion, total subhead 611, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 612-03-02 carry?

MR. F.B. ROWE: Just a few remarks on that, Sir. I think I might have mentioned earlier that this amount has been increased this year. This \$8,300,000 will just barely cover the increase in salaries through the yearly increments for the teachers and also, of course, if the teachers have improved their qualifications as a result of upgrading, this amount will just barely cover that. I understand that there is nothing here at all for any kind of an increase in teachers'

salary per se and that if there is to be an increase in teachers' salaries, we will probably have our mini-budget, as mentioned by the honourable the Minister of Finance, for that particular purpose.

There is not in this vote an increase for teachers' salaries nor a possibility of a reduction of the student-teacher ratio as a result of the figures that we see in this particular vote. I would like for the minister to indicate whether or not that is correct.

The other thing that I would like to mention is and I would like to get this perfectly clear; school boards can still conceivably have a reduction in the number of teachers teaching under a particular school board, if we have a number of small schools closing out with the students being bussed to larger schools. Is that correct? I will give an example of what I mean just so we will not have any confusion on this.

If we have a school board that has amongst its other larger schools five one-room schools, for example, with thirty-eight students in each one of these schools, which gives a total of 190 students and this means that that school board can have ten teachers for the purpose of teaching in those five one-room schools. Now, Sir, if these same students are bussed to a larger school within the same school system, I calculate that the number of teachers that would then be hired to replace the ten original teachers would be five or six teachers. In other words, there would be a reduction of four to five teachers teaching under that school board. This is what I am trying to get at, School boards are continually phasing out their smaller schools, so consequently we are going to have a situation where there will be an actual increase in some school systems in the student-teacher ratio as a result of this. That can still happen as far as I can calculate it.

One other thing that I might point out or is the minister of Education (an correct me if this is not the place to bring it up)

aware of the fact that there is some attempt to increase the boundaries of the Straits of Belle Isle Integrated School Board, to include St. Anthony, all the way down through Flower's Cove to Plum Point and also eastwards to Roddickton and the Englee Area? Is the minister aware of this fact and the fact that the school board has not been consulted with on this matter and they are extremely worried about it?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: On the last question first, Mr. Chairman, I understand that this matter which has been discussed by and perhaps with (by "with," I mean people in the area concerned) but it has been discussed by the Integrated Denominational Educational Committee. They have not yet, they may, they have not yet requested the government to take any action, change any regulations or to do anything with respect to changing the school boundary, and so far it has not been the concern of government. Naturally, before any change could be made it would have to be done with government's concurrence. So far government have not been approached by the Denominational Educational Committee in any way.

MR. F.B. ROWE: It came to my attention today that the school board had not been approached and they are a little bit concerned over the fact that these boundaries may be extended without them having been consulted. Could we have the assurance of the minister that these boundaries will not be extended without proper consultation with the school board involved?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, I will certainly do that. Before any changes are made, of course, the Denominational Educational Committee could make recommendations to us and we would wish to be sure that the Denominational Educational Committee had consulted the people involved. Whether, of course, there would be unanimity between the Denominational Educational Committee and the people involved would be another matter, but up to the present this matter has not officially come to the attention of government.

On the second matter raised by the honourable gentleman

with respect to the year's grace and the amendment to the regulations in that area; The amendment to these regulations and this additional year's grace is intended exclusively for the cases of a natural decrease and not in the case (Let us say a hypothetical case, I think the one the honourable gentleman mentioned) where four one-room schools would be closed down and people bussed to another central school. If that were the case, then there would be a loss of teachers. So the year of grace is not intended to cover that case.

If, for example, four one-room schools were closed and all of the students who were in the four one-room schools were at one school there would be a loss of teacher and the amendment to the regulation which was announced a week or two ago will not affect that nor was it intended to affect that.

The other matter; with respect to the vote for salaries of teachers, all I can say here and I am sure honourable gentlemen opposite will appreciate the governments' position, is that this amount was the estimate when the estimates were made up and is now the estimate but that obviously we do not and cannot and wish not to in any way prejudice what the outcome of the collective bargaining negotiations which are going on will be. They are in progress and continuing and I do not think that I should say anything else there.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, what I am just trying to find out, of course, is that obviously this \$8,300,000 is meant to include the amount of increase in the money voted to this division because of the yearly increments, Correct? Because of the yearly increments on the one hand and secondly, because of increased teachers' qualifications. What I am really asking; is there a certain amount of that \$8 million there set aside for a possible increase in the teachers' salaries? What I am saying; is; if there is in fact an increase in teachers' salaries this year, will the Minister of Finance have to bring in a mini-budget? Because the Minister of Finance did give some kind of a threat during his budget speech in that regard and the impression I

was left with was; "Okay public servants of Newfoundland, okay teachers, if you want a raise in salary this year I will have to bring in my mini-budget and I will have to increase the taxes." That is the distinct impression I got from the Minister of Finance. All I am asking here is, is there an amount of money in this vote, in that increase of \$8 million, is there an amount of money in there for a possible increase in teachers' salaries this year or is there no money set aside for that purpose?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, if my honourable colleague does not mind me speaking, it is of course impossible to correct the honourable gentleman's misinterpretation or misunderstanding or inability to grasp the English language. His failure to read the Budget Speech in the relevant area, if he could not hear it properly the day I delivered it, it is impossible for me to correct

all of these defects of the honourable gentleman, on the mini budget and all the rest of it. The honourable gentleman hopes and trusts and prays that he will not have to bring in a mini budget this year. But if the honourable gentleman keeps heckling upon this point, he will bring one in. We will call it the honourable gentleman for St. Barbe North's mini-budget.

AN HON. MEMBER: Another threat.

MR. CROSBIE: That is not a threat, that is a promise.

Now the position on this vote is very, very simple. There is an increase of \$8 million, in the revised estimate last year. It provides for the estimate of the normal increase in qualifications, teachers upgraded themselves. They get another certificate or they go up another grade. It provides for the normal increment. There is some allowance for an anticipated increase as a result of collective bargaining. Now what the amount is, of course, is not for us to say. We hope that the amount will turn out to be sufficient. Now it all depends on how the collective bargaining ends up and what happens there, which we cannot, of course, elaborate on. But there is some allowance in this vote, we know there is going to be some increase. We know that the teachers are not going to settle for nothing. There is an allowance for some further results of collective bargaining.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, we have made some progress. We now know the amount of \$64 million we are being asked to vote - I may add this is one of the single largest items in all the estimates, Mr. Chairman, this amount is roughly ten per cent of the total expenditure of this administration of the Government of this Province this year. So it is worth a little examination, Sir.

Now we know that last year \$55.7 million was spent to pay the salaries of our teachers. It is common ground between both sides of the House. How many teachers does that cover?

AN HON. MEMBER: Six thousand.

MR. ROBERTS: In the order of six thousand. Sixty-four hundred teachers. Now each one of those teachers, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, will get an increment. Or if one can come to the top of one's scale

MR. OTTENHEIMER: after eleven years.

MR. ROBERTS: After eleven years. But there will be very few of those 6400 teachers who do not get an increment.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Sixty per cent will get an increment.

MR. ROBERTS: Sixty per cent of them will get an increment. Let us call that 4,000, in round numbers. Now the increment is - what is the increment for teachers?

MR. ROWE, F. B.: Five per cent.

MR. ROBERTS: Five per cent.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: But it depends on -

MR. ROBERTS: Well what would it be in dollars? \$200 a teacher, \$300 a teacher?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Approximately \$200.

MR. ROBERTS: Two hundred dollars a teacher, 4000 teachers at \$200 each is \$800,000. We are being asked to vote an increase of \$8.3 million, so that leaves \$7.5 millions. It goes for two purposes. One is for teachers upgrading themselves, a Grade III teacher becoming a Grade IV teacher, a Grade IV becoming a Grade V, an on-going process. That comes to \$1 million or \$2 million. It is a lot of upgradings. A lot of teachers! I do not have the salary scale for teachers in front of me. I doubt if they are in the salary appendix because they are not strictly speaking an expenditure of the government. In theory there are very few teachers in this province hired by the government, Mr. Chairman, most of them are hired by boards. I suppose there may be 500 working in the College of Trades, and in the various trade schools. I mean they are the only teachers the honourable gentleman, my friend opposite, hires.

So what we are being asked to do now and I think the minister should give us a little information, either the Education Minister or his tender colleague in the Finance portfolio should give us a little information. I think I can understand some of the pressures of collective bargaining. The government are sitting down and they have half of their

chips on the table and they have another half under the table and another half in their pocket, that makes three halves. That is the way the government bargains collectively. They are not going to reveal their final offer. I do not even wish the minister to reveal any details of what has gone on because as I understand it both the NTA are acting for the teachers of this province on the one hand and on the other hand the Treasury Board or whoever is negotiating for the government. By the way, perhaps the minister could indicate who is negotiating for the government. They have agreed on sort of a mutual blackout. That makes some sense. That makes some good sense.

But I do think the minister should indicate to the committee how much money there is in here for possible salary increases. It is not giving anything away, Mr. Chairman. The teachers' negotiating team have doubtless whittled this one out by now. It is not difficult. We based \$800,000 on increments leaving a matter of \$7.5 million, I am sure the NTA know with fair precision exactly how many teachers will upgrade themselves this year and as a result we will be able to calculate how much of a lump sum amount is included in here. We are talking, Mr. Chairman, \$4 million, \$5 million or \$6 million because there is that much in here. It is a very large sum. That is a ten per cent raise for the teachers.

I would be very interested to know whether the government, I realize they cannot tell me now, that would be giving away the game, the ten per cent raise to the teachers is a very big raise. That then brings up the answer. Maybe we have an overestimate here. Estimates work two ways, Mr. Chairman. You can underestimate but you can also inflate your estimates and that then gives you a little cushion. You have it tucked away in the back of your mind. I have seen the game played. You know there is an extra \$500,000 or an extra million somewhere tucked away in case you need it for a rainy day. In a

vote as large as \$64 million. Mr. Chairman, it is not very difficult to tuck away \$1 million or \$2 million. Then maybe next year we will have the Minister of Finance claiming how good his budgeting performance is then. That is fine.

But what I want to know is how much of an item is in here for possible salary increases - not revealing any secret. I am not weakening the government's hand one whit because the NTA have figured out by now doubtlessly, exactly how much of this will go to meet the unavoidable bill, the bill of the teachers who are already at work and will upgrade themselves and gather their increments. That is not hard to figure out. That has been figured out by now.

So the only people who do not know really are the public of Newfoundland. The government know. The Minister of Education is fully aware whether there is \$1 million or \$5 million or \$7 million in one year allowed for salary increases. The Minister of Finance is aware. Any other honourable gentlemen opposite who has been doing his homework at Treasury Board and at cabinet, when they discuss the estimates, is equally aware.

I think the House has a right to know, Mr. Chairman. I think the people of Newfoundland have a right to know what the government are contemplating. I realize they may not settle for that. They may come in - I am not going to go on to the mini-budget. We will go on that again and again and again and again. If my friend from St. Barbe North has a misconception, I may add that most of the people of Newfoundland have exactly the same misconception.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Sparkes their chief negotiator I am told was on the radio or was on the television today. I mean the minister made a clear and definite threat, and all his words cannot take away from what is in the printed budget speech. By the minister, I mean the Finance Minister. He is the threatening one over there.

Mr. Chairman, to come back, I am not revealing the government's hand, I am not taking away one whit from the strength of their bargaining position. All I am asking is that the minister tell us

how many millions are included in this item of \$64 million? How many millions are included in it for a possible raise? They may or may not settle for that. They may say, look, if we say how many millions there are there the NTA know that we have cut that out and they will take that and come back for more." My answer to that - Mr. Chairman, I wish whoever in the gallery is tapping that pencil will stop. I thank whoever in the gallery who was tapping that pencil. It gives a nice counterpoint to my unrhythmic voice.

But, Mr. Chairman, they may come back and they may say the NTA, if they know there are \$5 millions there will take that as the base and start.

AN HON. MEMBER: The police.

MR. ROBERTS: The police, no. That there is roughly \$200,000 increase, or is it \$100,000 at least in the police salary book? But figures show that.

AN HON. MEMBER: One-third of what they want.

MR. ROBERTS: The NTA - the police, is it? Well we will watch this year. We will have some fun this year.

But to come back to the \$64 millions. The NTA know how much of that is in there. I suppose if I had all of the figures here I could do or get done the arithmetic, but I have not got them. The minister has them. All that I am asking now is either the Finance Minister or the Education Minister will tell us how many millions of that \$64 million is being reserved for a possible salary increase. I think it is a reasonable request. I hope that they will give us the answer.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the vote before the House is \$64 million in the estimates. "What will be required for teachers salaries this year?" It is the best estimate that we can give at this time. Whether it will be \$64 million or more than \$64 million we will not know until the collective bargaining with the teachers is concluded. Even then we will not know for sure, because you cannot always calculate how many teachers are going to go out and get a higher certificate or a

higher grade and therefore to go on to a higher salary. The amount originally asked for last year was \$52.5 million and it turned out to be \$2.5 million or \$3 million less than was required, because of this process of increasing the qualifications and all the rest of it.

Now we are in no position, Mr. Chairman, do not propose to give the honourable gentleman any breakdown as to what part of the estimate is for increases in teachers salaries and what part of it is to cover increments and the rest of it. All we can say is, it is the best possible estimate at this time. It depends on how collective bargaining negotiations conclude, Who knows where they will conclude? We are prepared to be reasonable and we will try to be reasonable.

However, the Leader of the Opposition's suggestion that this permits a ten per cent increase is very, very far off the mark. But other than that it is not - we cannot give this breakdown. It would be wrong to give this breakdown. It would interfere with collective bargaining. It would be very damaging to us to do it. All we can do is say that we hope that this estimate is an accurate one and it will not be any higher. I can assure the honourable gentleman that it is very, very unlikely that it will be too much.

Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but this is a very big item. teachers salaries. It is going to continue to be a very big item and if the estimates we have of what is likely to happen in the next three or four years, if conditions remain the same and in this vote are accurate then it is going to become an even greater and more gigantic item in the estimates. All we can say at this time is that collective bargaining is underway. We have allowed for the increases that the Department of Education feels will come about because of upgrading and the incentive and we have allowed something for a salary increase. What that amount is we cannot say now. It would be entirely wrong for us to say now and this is as accurate as we can be at this time of the year.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, this is a strange pass indeed.

MR. CROSBIE: Not strange at all.

MR. ROBERTS: Very strange, Mr. Chairman, the situation is now. It is strange simply because I am sure the NTA are fully aware -

MR. CROSBIE: They are not fully aware.

MR. ROBERTS: Probably to the nickel they have that \$64 million figure. They have the \$55.7 million figure of last year. They have access to all the information, quite properly, about teachers salaries. They can tell you, Mr. Chairman, how many Grade I teachers there are, how many Grade II (we have no probationers left) how many A's there are, how many B's. Grade VII I believe is the highest grade of the teachers. They can tell you where each teacher is on the point. That is the information they have assembled when they go in to bargain collectively. I am quite sure they are mathematical people. They have figured out to the dollar how much of this is in it. Now they do not know, I will grant the minister that, they do not know any more than the minister does now how many teachers will choose to go to Memorial this summer and complete the course that will push them over the limit into another degree or another grade.

But they have, as my friend from White Bay South said, they have a pretty shrewd idea just as the Minister of Education's officials have a pretty shrewd idea, and that is what they based their estimate on.

So the situation we are faced with is this, the committee is now being asked to vote a large sum of money, \$64 million, roughly ten per cent of the entire expenditure of the government. By the way I thank the honourable Minister of Finance for telling me that there is not a ten per cent allowance in here for salary increase, I take it though that he meant it is less than ten per cent. My figure was literally drawn from ignorance. I have no idea.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am assured. I am literally drawing from ignorance I have no idea. That is the point that I am making. The Minister of Education who has been noticeably silent on the matter comes before the committee and asks for \$64 million. Included in it is something, \$6,000, \$600,000, \$6 million, \$60 million, we do not know. We know it is somewhere between -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No. I was going to say we know it is somewhere between \$56.5 million and \$64 million. We know it is somewhere in there.

MR. CROSBIE: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: The NTA are fully aware. I have not spoken with them. It is not my place to consult with the NTA on matters like this. But I have no doubt that their president, Mr. Pike, and whoever is on their negotiating team, Mr. Bill Driscoll, or whoever is speaking for them in this matter, has calculated, with a pretty fair degree of precision, precisely how much the government have allowed in here, just as the police have calculated it and the hospital workers have calculated it and the NAPE have calculated it, going through the estimates. It is a perfectly normal process. I submit it is right. It is the heart of collectively bargaining.

So that is the situation. Here we have the ministry flatly refusing to tell the committee. They are asking for a blank cheque. We do not know.

To come back now, they will not tell us. I gather that the ministry position, the Minister of Finance speaks with a big stick, the iron hand in the iron glove. They will not tell us. Okay, I cannot make them. I cannot put them on the rack and even if I could I would not. We will have to go from the committee, I am not even going to vote against the item, I am not going to vote against teachers salaries. I am not going to even ask it to be reduced. But we are faced with a situation and the minister has refused to give any information. All they say, arrogantly, quite arrogantly; "take it or leave it."

whether you like it or not, there is an allowance in here to cover teacher's salaries, what we estimate. Two, four, six, eight, nine, I think we should have a quorum call, Mr. Chairman, please. There are only nine gentlemen on the other side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, it is nice to see the honourable gentlemen. It is good for their health because now they will not be smoking those cigarettes and drinking those cups of coffee.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman for St. John's Centre asked me to get to the business and that is what I am trying to do. I am talking about \$64 million and I am very glad to see he has been attentively glued to his seat throughout. I do not think he is aware of how much is in this because that would presuppose he was attentive at Cabinet meetings. That is another story.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the ministry will not tell us and if they will not, they will not and that is that. If the ministry will not tell us how much is in this item for salary, we must come to the conclusion, any reasonably minded person would, that there is a hidden amount here, and this is from facts. This is one of the ways the Minister of Education will not need much supplementary supply next year or the Minister of Finance, He has bundled away a couple of millions. Maybe the NTA will take it off him in negotiations but that remains to be seen. The fact remains that this ministry which talked so much about the right of the public, about the need to let the people of Newfoundland know when they come to a crunch, a very minor little crunch, a teensy-weensy little crunch, something that the other interested party, the NTA, have figured out long ago and I would be as surprised as a man could be, Mr. Chairman, if the NTA had not figured it out with their little pen and pencil, little pencil and paper. They would

not even need the new maths but the old maths that I was taught, would be quite adequate to enable them to figure out how many millions are in here for this.

So the ministry just refused, arrogantly. It is take it or leave it. If you do not like it you can go to blazes. If you do like it you are supposed to get in line and shout, "Amen! Hosanna!" What the people do about that now I have no idea. Here we are in the House of Assembly and we are being asked to vote millions more than will be needed for teachers, without a raise, yet we know there is going to be a raise. So maybe it is not millions more than is needed at all. Maybe it is millions less. We have no way to know, and that we must be content with. If the Minister of Finance says, "Oh, well there is an allowance in there and it would interfere with collective bargaining." It is not giving away our hand. It is not giving away the governments' hand. The NTA know how much is in there and the government will make the best deal they can, a deal they figure best in the interest of the people and then they will come into the House and if it is too little, if this \$64 million is too little, they will ratify it by supplementary supply and if it is too much, they will take the money and use it somewhere else as we saw in the quite shameful exhibition of supplementary supply this year.

So all we are saying, Mr. Chairman, at the risk of belabouring the point is a refusal by the government to give any information. The Minister of Education in silence. I hope he will get up and tell me whether there is \$1 million or \$2 million or \$3 million or \$4 million. He gives no sign of it. He does not look like he is quivering, poised with anticipation, and so we shall have to vote this item not knowing whether \$60 million is needed or whether \$61 million is needed or whether in fact \$65 million is needed. We are being asked to vote a number of million dollars in blank. Well, I object to it, Sir. I think it is wrong of the

ministry to ask this, unreasonable. It has nothing to do with collective bargaining at all. It is just their arrantly arrogant refusal to take the people of Newfoundland into their confidence. It is that simple.

Now I will ask the minister again. Will the minister tell the committee how much of an allowance is in here? I will settle for the nearest hundred thousand dollars.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that it can or should be answered. The Leader of the Opposition refers to arrogance of government and arrogance of the ministry and arrogance of this, that and the other thing but I certainly refuse to comment any more on that. I do think that it could jeopardize the collective bargaining process. One can hardly bargain between government and teachers or government and anybody else or through the press or through the legislature or in any other way. Honourable members obviously have their right to vote for what supply is asked for here or to vote against it, but I do not think that it would be in the best interest of the collective bargaining, which is going on in good faith between both parties, to comment further.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, could I add that this is the rankest hypocrisy that the Leader of the Opposition is getting on with. I do not know who he is attempting to fool. He is not going to fool anybody in this House and he is not going to fool anybody in the country with the kind of dribble and nonsense that he has gotten on with here for the past five or ten minutes. Every item in this book here is an estimate. Nobody can guarantee its accuracy or that it will be perfect. These are called estimates and they are estimates. Last year in teachers' salaries our estimate was \$52.5 million and it turned out to be \$2.5 million wrong, underestimated it was last year. The \$64 million that is

asked for this year for 6,450 teachers may turn out to be either too little or too much. If it turns out to be too much, I am going to be very, very thrilled and pleased. I doubt very much that it is going to turn out to be too much. There are two ways of approaching this either allow nothing for an increase at all, when you know there is going to be an increase, that the teacher's collective agreement is up, they are negotiating and there is going to be some kind of an increase, so allow nothing at all which makes the estimates inaccurate or allow something so that they will not be as inaccurate as they otherwise would have been.

We have chosen the course of allowing something in the hope that it will be enough, but it may not be enough. We hope that \$64 million is going to be the total. It is just an estimate only but I think it is safe to say that there are ninety-nine chances out of one hundred that it will be too little. So there is no fat in this amount. There is no deliberate putting in a couple of million dollars extra so you will have something in the budget to spend on something else. I only wish that were the case. There is no fat in this at all, it is all lean. I think it will all be spent before the year is out and it is the best estimate that we can give now of what teachers' salaries are going to cost this year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we did a splendid job and our supplementary supply bill was the lowest since 1949 in percentage, the lowest in amount for the last twelve years.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Yes the honourable gentleman brought it up and I am just -

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

MR. CROSBIE: The Leader of the Opposition just voiced on it himself.

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, I will not speak on it then, if he is going to -

MR. ROBERTS: May I raise the point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, the honourable Leader of the Opposition may and any member of course may at any time raise a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: It does take a while to get through to the gentleman from St. John's West when he is in full flight. I merely wanted to ask if we were to be allowed to debate. I would love nothing better than to debate supplementary supply again. I wonder are we to be allowed to debate it again. I would love it.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, then, Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CROSBIE: I conclude my remarks.

MR. ROBERTS: May I speak to the debate now? I gather the point of order has served its purpose, Your Honour. They seldom do but this one did. Well, I am not going to press on with the \$64 million question. I accept the minister's word that an estimate is an estimate. It is a \$64 million question. I thought that was rather good, my speech writer should think. If I were Agatha Christie, I would write a mystery called the \$64 million question and she also wrote a book called "The Crooked House" which might be appropriate too.

Mr. Chairman, I will accept the minister's word that an estimate is an estimate, and that is more charity than he gave us. When we were on the other side we ran into estimates and he wanted to know how much was going to be spent on medicare. Well, I told him, being Health Minister, I had no idea how much was going to be spent on medicare any more than the minister presumably has no idea how much is going to be spent under this item. He makes an estimate. But all we are asking - I am not asking him to lay down his life or even his political career on the accuracy of an estimate. I will accept his word as he has some extremely competent officials, well paid and competent, and very competent but

underpaid officials in the Department of Education and they have prepared their best estimate. That is fine, we will take it as that. All I want to know is what the estimate is made up of. I want to know and I am obviously not going to get the answer, whether the \$64 million question has in it one dollar or one hundred or one thousand or one million. That is all I wanted to know. I do not expect it to be accurate, any more accurate than any estimate is. One of the miracles of the Newfoundland Government without regard to political affiliation over the many years has been that the estimates have been as accurate as they are, as there are any number of items, Sir, I submit, that are really uncontrollable or cannot be estimated with any finality.

But if the minister will not tell us how much of an allowance, how does one know what the estimate is made up on? If he does not tell us that, the \$64 million question remains unanswered. On to the next plateau!

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, what are their salaries?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Approximately twenty-eight, and they are in the assistant deputy minister range and about \$14,000 would be the salary from the department. In some cases I think they are augmented by school boards, and that is between the superintendents and the school board.

On motion, 612(03)(01), carried.

612(03)(02):

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, this amount for operational grants, in the amount of \$11,500,000, which is an increase of \$1,041,000 over last year, I strongly suspect, Sir, it is far short of what is required by the various school boards in this province to carry on the operation of their schools. Sir, I was wondering if the minister could give some indication of the actual amount, the total amount that he figures in fact is needed by the various school boards for the purpose of operating their schools during

any one school year. I realize it must be in excess of this amount here and I am in full sympathy with the government if they cannot come up with an adequate amount. But I would like for him to give some indication of what the total amount would be, as requested by the various school boards of the denominational educational committees throughout the province.

Sir, I think everybody realizes that this has been one of the most severe winters that we have had in a number of years. Last year was bad enough but this year we have had a very severe winter and fuel bills must have gone up and on top of that the cost of oil has gone up and on top of that we have had major damage done to some sewer lines and water lines going to various schools, particularly in the more northern sections of our province. So there is a dramatic increase as a result of the severe winter alone.

Another point, Sir, is that this whole business of labour costs appears to be going up and a great number of school boards have expressed a certain amount of concern over the fact that labour costs are increasing in the schools with respect to the caretakers, the cleaners, the caretakers of arenas and what have you. As a matter of fact, I believe Mr. Byron March, Superintendent of the Avalon Consolidated School Board, in quite a press release there a few weeks ago said that there is no way that his school board could afford to operate the schools on the amount that they expect to get from the government this year, and this holds true for many other school boards as well.

Sir, as a matter of fact, just today in the "Daily News" we hear that school maintenance workers submit final demands today. "After rejecting the latest offer from the Avalon Consolidated School Board, Local 904 of the International Union of Operating Engineers, today will submit final demands to the board," says chief negotiator, John Wiseman. The union is bargaining agent for 150 tradesmen, caretakers and arena attendants

employed by the board and the latest offer by the employer was rejected in a vote by the union Saturday. Union members have threatened to take strike action which could put some 14,000 students out of school. Mr. Wiseman said that the union has reduced demands but it is not now willing to go any lower."

Sir, I submit that whatever the final settlement is on the negotiations with the employer under these circumstances that we are going to see a dramatic jump in the cost of labour as far as the employment of these various people are concerned, by the school boards, and therefore the operating grants will be that much more inadequate in the coming year.

So what I am trying to say, Sir, is can the minister give some indication of the degree of adequacy, if you will, of that \$11,500,000 for operational grants? Because I strongly suspect that it falls far short of the needed amount by the various school boards.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact I am quite sure that all of the school boards are certainly having financial worries and problems. Their financial situation is a fairly difficult one as indeed is the government's, as is the provinces'. It is something that we all have. They did request an increase and as was pointed out, there

MR. OTTENHEIMER: are financial problems of which we are aware and with which we sympathize. We have obviously made some provision here. What in fact this will allow will be an increase of \$4 per capita for each student. There will be some extra but it is government policy to increase by \$4 per pupil the operational grants which will be in effect and perhaps the committee might be interested in knowing how they are made up or what they are now.

For grades I to VI the basic is \$60, and \$62 per pupil grades VII to XI. Now on top of that every board gets \$5 per student for instructional materials. That brings it up to \$65 and \$67. Then there is an additional \$7 per pupil for reading materials for every student in opportunity classes and obviously that is not everybody, then a \$25 subsidy on the purchase of audio-visual materials.

What in fact we have done here is to increase by \$4 per pupil our operational grant to the school boards. This I think is certainly going to be a great help. Nobody suggests that school boards are not going to continue to have a difficult financial situation, as in fact the government does and a lot of others as well but I think it will certainly be a worthwhile help.

Perhaps I should point out as well that there was also a grant of \$1500 for each specialist teacher and we are anticipating that there would be additional specialist teachers in the schools next year and part of this is to look after that grant as well. This is made of \$1,500 for every specialist teacher. What is basically built in here is the \$4 per capita increase, \$4 for every pupil in the schools throughout the province.

MR. F. ROWE: I do not think the minister answered the question. I was reading there, but I am pretty sure he did not indicate to the committee what in fact was the amount that was needed by the various school boards in this province. What was the initial requestor

MR. F. ROWE: what was the amount that school boards have indicated that they need to operate schools? What I am just trying to find out, is this \$11 million twenty-five per cent, fifty per cent, seventy-five per cent, ninety per cent of the -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Not like they did, for example, in the brief for capital grants, where in a request based on an eight year period (I believe it was, eight or nine years) there was no specific amount mentioned nor indeed in the brief submitted to government there was no specific request. They, I suppose, know that we are aware of their financial problems and I suppose that they are aware as well that we will do what we can. So there has been no specific request for a specific sum.

MR. F. ROWE: So if there is no specific request, how then do you determine the amount to be paid out? Do you just look at the situation last year, on a per capita basis, and figure out whether you need to increase it by a certain amount this year - which in fact you said you have done - \$4 per capita and that is it? There is no real formula?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The formula of it is -

MR. F. ROWE: There is a formula but there is no formula with respect to the actual need.

I mean, does the government have any idea in the world what the need is of the various school boards with respect to operational grants? When you have school board superintendents coming out and saying that the amount they expect to get is going to be far short of what they need for the purpose of operating the schools, there must be some awareness on the part of the present administration as to what the need is. It seems most peculiar.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The school boards come to the Department of Education, We are aware of the indebtedness of the various school boards in the province and I think they are all in fact in debt. If we were to vote an amount which would allow them to liquidate their whole indebtedness -

MR. F. ROWE: But that is under the capital grant, is it not?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right, but they also have deficits in their operations as well. The school boards also have deficits in their operations.

We feel, from our knowledge of the situation, that this \$4 increase per capita will be a great help. Nobody would claim that is going to solve all of even the operating problems of the school boards, it will not. Public treasury does not allow that kind of action but it will certainly be a worthwhile, a significant increase and will be of significant assistance to the school boards.

MR. MURPHY: What is the difference in the formula from the previous administration? Is there a great change or -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There is an increase this year. There was an increase last year as well.

MR. ROBERTS: And there was an increase the year before, and the year before and the year before.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The formula actually is not a formula in a strict sense. It is an allocation of so much per capita with a slight difference between grades I and VI and grades VII and XI, a two dollar difference, and then come additional ones for opportunity classes and for specialist teachers. What this is is \$4 added on to everything else, \$4 across the board, per capita increase.

MR. WM. ROWE: 612-03-03 - Bilingual, I believe this is. Mr. Chairman, where is this being spent? I would imagine in our bilingual, for want of a better word, enclave on the West Coast, which has been a source of some concern to sociologists and historians and everyone else, is this where the majority of this money is being spent? Or is this for general expenditure in school? Is this part of that plan that I believe Mr. Pepin mentioned two or three years ago or what? How does this work?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: This is basically for French instruction throughout the province and based on the number of students taking French and the number of hours per week in which they are taking it.

Now it will be noted that there is a difference between last year's and this year's. All of this actually is recoverable from Ottawa and it could well be that that \$130,000 might well be \$180,000 because sometimes we get funds in after the year is over. That \$175,000, which is in the revised estimate, would include a certain amount probably spent the previous year but this is basically for the French instruction across the province.

With respect to the situation at Port au Port, officials of the department have been and will be in touch with parents and groups out there because, as honourable gentlemen might know, there are some who feel, having been bilingual at one time and indeed in certain areas, in certain families and certain communities are still Francophone and we are discussing and examining the possibility and the wishes of the people with respect to a fuller opportunity for a bilingual education there, whether they would wish their students or whether the students themselves would wish to take other courses such as history, geography and other things actually in French. There are some who feel quite strongly for it, there are others who feel against it and of course, as in most things, there are a fair number who have no opinion at all.

MR. WM. ROWE: On this point, it was Mr. Pelletier rather than Mr. Pepin who brought in the programme a couple of years ago, which might be of some assistance to the Port au Port Area. But \$130,000 - now this is one hundred per cent recoverable from Ottawa. I should have thought that the minister would have gone after as much money as possible. I see a reduction from last year. Is this because of some change in the formula that Ottawa uses or does it mean that the provincial government have not gone after the money as zealously as they might? (Question number one)

MR. WM. ROWE: Question number two : What type of French instruction? I mean, how does it differ? Is this just a contribution by Ottawa which can be used by school boards to go towards ordinary French curriculum, the course of French in high school or lower than high school in schools in Newfoundland or is this some kind of a separate programme? Mr. Chairman, what exactly is it?

The minister was less than explicit when he got up the last time.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, well actually the honourable gentleman referred to a deduction, The \$176,400, at least \$30,000 of that represents a payment from the previous year, from Ottawa, so in effect there is no reduction. This would increase or decrease depending upon the number of students in the province taking French and the number of hours during which they do it.

MR. WM. ROWE: It is a per capita hour sort of thing?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right. If people studied French twice as much or if we had twice as many students taking French it would basically be doubled, but it is based on that. It is not based on specific projects or programmes that one could start unless in the Port au Port Area it could well be possible, depending upon the result of discussions going on with people there. But this is basically a question of a number of students taking French and the number of hours per week in which they take it and that is what makes up the total of that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I understand that there are a number of students who go down to St. Pierre every year and actually live down in St. Pierre to learn how to speak French. Would that be included in this vote? If so how many students go down to St. Pierre each year to learn how to speak French?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I think the honourable gentleman is referring to pupils who go over and take courses run by the University of Toronto. Right? There has been some provincial assistance for

MR. OTTENHEIMER: these groups. "How many went last summer?" In the vicinity of a couple of hundred.

I understand last year there were about three or four groups organized by the schools. These things are organized by the schools and financed possibly through the schools themselves or by the students themselves and there was a small amount of assistance as well but it was not something totally subsidized by the government. But some funds were made available to them.

MR. NEARY: Will that programme be continued this coming summer?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes.

MR. F. ROWE: Was there not some criticism of that programme?

It seems to me that I heard a number of comments. It strikes me that I heard something, somewhere along the line, I just cannot pinpoint it, but it seems to me that I heard some criticism of that programme in St. Pierre, from the students, during the last year. Could the minister indicate the nature of the criticism?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I believe what the problem there was that Ottawa or a federal government agency was suggesting that Canadians in this bilingual programme should not be going to a foreign country and was suggesting that they should go to Quebec instead. Perhaps that was made by a beurocrat who did not see how close we were to St. Pierre and that the cost to them and everybody else would have been much larger. That was the problem and that was ironed out.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the minister's predecessor visited St. Pierre during his tenure of office. Was this to straighten out this problem and get diplomatic relations back on the rails again? Could the minister give us a report on his predecessor's visit to St. Pierre?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It would be rather difficult for me to do so. The honourable gentleman is not here himself.

MR. NEARY: Did he not tell his successor what it was all about?

MR. ROBERTS: Was there not a report or dossier in the Archives?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I think he went over to visit the schools and he would be in a much better position to give an account of his academic jaunt. The question, in case the honourable gentleman for St. John's North did not hear, was if the committee was interested in a report of your official visit to St. Pierre.

MR. CARTER: Yes I would be more than happy, Mr. Chairman, to report on our visit to St. Pierre. It is in line I imagine with this subhead, the \$130,000 for bilingual education.

This vote has been used extensively on a fifty-fifty basis for schools to send members of their school down to St. Pierre, the school children, for a weekend or for two or three days. While they are there, they live with a French family or live in one of the pensions that encourage French conversation and they see a real bit of French culture and they learn and practice the spoken French language and it more or less makes the language come alive for them.

This vote was given long before I was in the department but it was somewhat increased and we were working towards getting it even further increased.

Our visit to St. Pierre was an official one, partly to see how this programme was working and also to try to encourage and increase a regular exchange programme whereby we would have two Newfoundland students go down for the whole year and study in the schools down there and two St. Pierre students come to Newfoundland and study in our schools.

We were hoping to augment that programme. It seems to us to be a marvellous opportunity for Newfoundland students to become thoroughly and practically bilingual. While we were there we made an official visit to the Governor and to the technical schools and to the lay schools and to the church. It was a very profitable, enjoyable trip and very worthwhile and I would recommend it to any honourable gentleman opposite who should

get the opportunity to visit St. Pierre.

MR. NEARY: I wonder if the member for St. John's North, the former Minister of Education, would tell us how the students get down to St. Pierre? Are they flown down by government aircraft or do they go down by private airline?

MR. CARTER: There are a number of ways for the students to go down. As the honourable member probably knows, it is very difficult to travel to St. Pierre because the weather down there is most unpredictable. You can get fogged in. So, air travel is not too reliable. Even boat travel can be rough.

What some of these students have done and I must say that it is remarkable, their perseverance is remarkable, they have left on a bus and gone all night by bus and gone over, on a stormy passage over, and stayed a couple of days and come back and really had a rough time going and coming but had a thoroughly enjoyable time and a very profitable time while they were there.

It is possible for enough students to arrange a charter by air. This has been done in the past but the usual method is to take a bus and go down and get the ferry. It is a long, arduous trip but it is well worth-while.

MR. HICKMAN: I arise on a point of some privilege anyway. I suggest to this committee that there is nothing arduous in going from St. John's to St. Pierre in the interest of bilingualism, if your interest is restricted to that and that only. That is a condition precedent.

This great programme that the Secretary of State and the Provincial Minister of Education have come up with is no great startling discovery at all. There is nothing new about it. It is something that started before the turn of the century, between the residents of the Burin Peninsula and St. Pierre and Miquelon I cannot recall, in the years that I was going to school in Grand Bank from Kindergarten up through including Grade XI, when we did

not have at least three students from St. Pierre in our class, on a full time basis. There were also a number but not as many who went from the Fortune-Grand Bank Area to St. Pierre. The trip is delightful. I would condemn anyone who would go other than by highway (the Jay, whatever you want to call it - we are going to name it when the loop is finished) and stay for a day or so with us on the Burin Peninsula.

As a matter of interest, I understand that some local entrepreneurs in Fortune have ordered a (I think the boat is on route) large passenger boat to operate between Fortune and St. Pierre twice a day to accommodate thousands of students if they want to come down. The honourable member from St. John's North should never again travel by plane.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, this is 612-03-04.

Mr. Chairman, I think that I would like first to relate to the concern of a number of school boards with respect to the change that we have had in the school transportation policy over the last couple of years. Sir, the government's new payment formula to school boards for bus transportation is in fact a matter of very serious concern to many school boards in this province including the Roman Catholic Educational Committee which held an annual meeting in St. John's back there in last October.

Sir, I would just like to briefly refer to a news clipping of that particular meeting. "Representatives of several boards told the meeting that their boards would not have sufficient funds under the formula to operate school bus transportation required for 1972-1973. The previous policy was for the government to meet the commitments of tenders called by school boards for pupil transportation but this was changed so that boards received grants to students on a per capita basis and with consideration given to road and climatic conditions of particular areas."

Now, Sir, I have not spoken to one single school board member or chairman in the last year and a-half who has not indicated to me that they just cannot afford to operate the school buses in the proper manner. As a matter of fact, the school board here in St. John's, "Pressing financial problems will make the St. John's School Boards pass on costs of school bus transportation to parents of children who use the buses unless the government increases its grants to school boards or approves the imposition of a school tax."

Sir, I cannot help but relate. These are the types of things you pick up in the newspapers and refer to places like Gander, St. John's, Grand Falls, Corner Brook and Steyerville areas. Sir, I cannot help but point out the plight of school boards in areas such as those who are operating in Labrador South and in St. Barbes North and right up and down the Great Northern Peninsula, down the Burin Peninsula and in some of our more rural areas with respect of the spreading out of the density of the population.

Sir, every one of those school boards have indicated to me that they simply do not have enough money to operate school buses in a safe and efficient manner. Sir, I do not know what the answer is here but I think that the government, the present administration, should give very, very serious consideration to reverting back to the original policy with respect to funding school bus transportation. Surely, Sir, this administration can trust the school boards of this province to call tenders for the operation of school buses and then have the government underwrite the full cost of the bids or the approved bid. This is simply what we are asking for, Sir.

There was an asinine formula brought in by the previous Minister of Education that did not take anything into consideration with respect to road conditions, with respect to weather conditions nor with respect to density of population. Sir, to give you an example; in St. Barbes North, in practically the whole stretch of the Great

Northern Peninsula, we have a situation where we have approximately three hundred miles, we will say two hundred and seventy-five miles of dirt road. I would submit, Sir, that the weather conditions on that stretch of road are worse than in any other place in all of Newfoundland and Labrador, with the possible exception of the stretch of road on the Labrador side of the Straits. The worse conditions, Sir, the worse winter conditions. In this time of the year, at the present time there are great, huge water holes all over the place. The buses are being torn apart in their daily operation. The maintenance costs are extremely high. The safety factor is reduced to nil with respect to the operation of these school buses and, Sir, it is a deplorable condition. On top of that, Sir, you have a situation where you have seventeen or eighteen very small communities that are spread out and the population is scattered all over the place and these school children have to be picked up at different intervals.

Sir, the cost of operation of school bus transportation in a place such as St. Barbes North is fantastically higher than a place like the Gander area, the Grand Falls area, the Corner Brook area and the St. John's area. On top of that, Sir, we have a situation now where drivers themselves are asking for increases in pay, where each year the cost of gasoline goes up or oil goes up and every aspect of the operation of school buses with respect to maintenance goes up. So, Sir, I plead really with this administration to revert -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will permit a question.

MR. CARTER: Is the honourable gentleman aware that the cost per pupil in his area last year was one of the lowest costs in the whole island?

MR. F. ROWE: What has that got to do with the situation, Mr. Chairman? All that I know is that I have been informed and I have reason to believe the members of the school board in St. Barbes North - I have no reason

in the world to disbelieve them - that they do not have enough money to operate the school buses in that particular area during -

MR. ROBERTS: The reason the cost per student is low is that there are so few students and they get so little because of the insanely stupid formula that the previous Minister of Education -

MR. CARTER: If -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor. Let the honourable gentleman be quite. That is the reason that they get so little. I have the floor. The honourable gentleman yielded to me for a second and then he had the floor when I sort of finished. That is the reason that they get so little. There are relatively few students in that school board which I believe covers part of Labrador South as well, from Forteau up to I suppose Red Bay, as far as the road goes. It is an insanely stupid formula. It just penalizes the very area and the proof of this penalizing is the fact of the pupil expenditure alone.

I would like just to see every member in this House ride on those school buses some morning. Then we would find out.

MR. F. ROWE: The other point that I would like to make -

MR. CARTER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman -

MR. F. ROWE: What is the point of order, Mr. Chairman? I am speaking.

MR. CARTER: The point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that I was referring to the cost per pupil, say even three years ago, long before this alleged formula was brought in. It is a point of clarification if nothing else. Anyway I have made my point, Mr. Chairman.

MR. F. ROWE: That is all you were doing was making a point. There was no point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Is Your Honour going to enforce the rules in this committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member from St. John's North can speak in debate but I really do not see any point of order there.

MR. F. ROWE: I cannot even see a point let alone of order.

Well, Mr. Chairman, all that I am saying here is that I would like the present administration to sincerely and honestly reconsider this whole policy of school bus transportation in this province and go back to the situation where they can trust - this is basically what it boils down to - trust the various school boards to call tenders for the purpose of school bus transportation, have the bids submitted, have them reviewed and then award a contract. Surely to heavens, Sir, we can trust school board members, who are entrusted with the welfare of hundreds of thousands of students in this province, to do a reasonably good job of calling such tenders. This is what we are asking for because I have not spoken with one single school board member who has not said that the amount for school bus transportation is tragically low and that one of those days something is going to happen. What I fear most of all is that the safety factor in school bus transportation is going to be reduced to the point where we are going to have a major tragedy on our hands before the coming year is out.

Sir, not even talking about tragedies, the conditions on board some of these school buses are just unbelievable, the hardship the students have to go through. The school bus contractors, trying to make an honest dollar, have to cut back on something and the only people who are suffering are the students in this particular case. So, I would like the minister to:

1. Give some indication of what the actual need is.
2. Indicate whether his administration is considering reverting back to the other policy. There was another point that I was going to make that I have forgotten but I can raise it at a later point.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, first just a few remarks on the safety factor. As honourable gentlemen are aware, I presume are aware or

should be aware, every school bus in the province must have and does have eight safety checks a year, two every three months. Every three months every school bus in the province must be inspected by a certified mechanic and a police officer. Every three months there are two checks, one by a certified mechanic and one by a police officer. So, there are eight checks per twelve months, four of them by certified mechanics, four by a police officer. These forms are sent to and filed in and inspected by the Department of Education School Transportation Office.

With respect to the honourable gentleman's question, whether the administration is thinking of reverting to the former policy, the answer is no. In the vote here, Mr. Chairman, we have an increase of approximately \$600,000 over the revised estimate of last year, which will permit us to give an increase of approximately ten per cent. What is built in here is an increase of ten dollars per capita for every pupil using school bus transportation, a ten dollar per pupil increase. This is quite a significant increase, ten dollar per pupil. For every pupil using the school bus there is a ten dollar increase in the next year.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: How many students use the school buses?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Last year there were approximately 55,000. Next year there will be approximately 57,000 or 58,000. That would be an approximate figure.

Perhaps I will go over for the committee, if they wish, the formula, if you want to call it formula, of the present system. To this you add then dollars for the next year.

For paved roads, where pupils are

transported up to five miles, \$80. All these are paved roads. Paved roads where the distance is five to ten miles - \$90 per pupil. paved roads over ten miles - \$100 per pupil. Unpaved roads up to five miles, \$100 per pupil, unpaved roads from five to ten miles, \$110 per pupil and unpaved over ten miles - \$120. To this will now be added \$10 for every pupil using school buses. This we feel quite confident will be a significant improvement and will be of great assistance to the school boards.

MR. ROWE, F. B. I agree with the minister there is certainly an improvement in that respect. But I think probably the only factor that the minister has mentioned in this formula with respect to school bus transportation, the funding of it, is really the road condition. The road condition in this respect was paved or unpaved. I mean what I am trying to say, you have a certain formula here for paved roads and a certain formula for unpaved roads. Then you have another factor of distance having to be bussed, and these two factors. But there are other factors. I do not know the degree to which they are being taken into consideration. For instance, there is the actual condition of the road itself. I can think of areas of this province where we have some pretty excellent gravel roads or unpaved roads, whereas in a place like the Great Northern Peninsula at this time of the year you are spending half of your time going through the equivalent of lakes and bogs.

Another factor that the minister has not mentioned is the weather condition factor. A third factor that the minister has not mentioned, and I would like the administration to build these factors into the formula, is the actual distribution of the population. For instance, there are certain areas in this province where you can have a school bus going over ten miles, over twenty miles. It is all right, the only thing the bus has to do is whip down a highway, pick up people at certain terminal places, you have a highly concentrated population, but

there are other places I could point out in my own district where a bus may be going only ten miles but it has to go all over the place, down branch roads to pick up students, because you have an extremely dispersed and scattered population. Therein lies the weakness. I appreciate the minister suggesting that there is an increase of \$590,000 here and this boils down to an increase of \$10 per student. I appreciate that very much and I am sure the people of Newfoundland appreciate it. But are we sure that this increase is going to the right areas of the province with respect to school bus transportation?

I submit that if we do not take the weather conditions into consideration, if we do not take the actual conditions of the road into consideration, that is conditions outside of whether they are paved or unpaved, if we do not take the density of population into that, the wrong areas of the province may be benefiting. I can see a situation, Mr. Chairman, where some school boards may end up having a surplus, where some school boards in some areas of this province may end up with money left over, whereas other school boards who are operating in the more rural, remote aspects of our province may end up being far shorter than the money they require for school bus transportation. This is the point that I am trying to make, that there is an inequity built into this system where we do not have a formula with enough factors built into it.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Chairman, one thing that has always annoyed me about the school bus transportation system is the fact that the parents of children who are not using the system have no recourse to appeal. The government, not only this government, I suppose the previous administration is guilty of this too, but the government can slide out from underneath its responsibility by passing the buck to the school board. When a group of parents in any area of Newfoundland have a grievance or they think they have a grievance because their children are not picked up by the buses to be taken to school, the buses pass by children. They get rather annoyed and aggravated and

have come to me and come to the other members of the House very disgruntled, and they just run up against a stone wall, there is nothing they can do about it.

So I would like for the Minister of Education to let the committee have his comments on this matter.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, in the District of Fogo, especially on Change Islands, I do not think any amount of money that may be made available to bus operators can get a bus operating on Change Islands today. It is not the fault of the amount of money the bus operator gets for operating the bus. It is the condition of the road. This is where we have a lot of our trouble. Road conditions are such and especially this time of the year where people just are afraid to let their children travel by bus because the roads are not in a fit condition for a bus to travel over.

Now on two or three occasions this year, and the Minister of Transportation is fully aware of this, I must give credit where credit is due, he has arranged to have a man go to Change Islands to have a look at the road conditions there. I do not know what the report has been. I have not seen it, nor I have not heard. But nevertheless, I think he will be one of the first to admit that the road on Change Islands --

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WINSOR: I firmly believe that the first thing we must do in certain areas is to reconstruct and upgrade or otherwise there will be many students who will not be able, immaterial of the amount of money, whether it is an increase of \$10 per student or \$20 per student, if something is not done with the roads at Change Islands, for instance, and between Tilting and the new school on Fogo Island, between Island Harbour and Fogo, it will all be in vain.

The first thing that the honourable Minister of Education must do is to persuade his colleagues in cabinet, I do not think that he will have too much trouble in persuading the honourable Minister of

Transportation and Communications. He is fully aware of it and is anxious to do something about it. He too requires the money from cabinet and from the Minister of Finance to be able to do the job which is required so that those buses can operate and people will feel that there is a certain amount of safety when their children get on that bus to travel to and from school.

This is the plea I have to the honourable minister, to plead his cause with the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communication who in turn I am sure will plead with his colleagues in cabinet to get those roads improved.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, seeing that the honourable member for Port de Grave was mentioned by the honourable the member for Bell Island, about Juniper Stump and the bus service, I happen to be probably the only one here in the House of Assembly that has a contract for bus services.

I arrived at this in 1964, seeing that we had a school closed out. There was no one in the vicinity interested enough possibly to get a school bus, I proceeded to the mainland in 1964 and I bought a school bus. I took a contract. At that time the sixty-six pupil bus, for the small sum, it was enough to keep body and soul together, for the sum of \$6,000, with a thirty mile radius to carry school children.

I tell you the conditions that I had to operate under and while I am going along on this some will find out the reason why - for all the problems at Juniper Stump. To put a bulldozer before you or a wrecker attached to your bus, to tow the bus part of the ways to school with the children aboard of it. Had to do it for nothing, for the love that you had for the children who attended that school. Probably that is the reason why the honourable member is on this side of the House now, at the very present time, although he has been accused of a lot of bad things.

Right in Juniper Stump, after all the great years that we had with the Liberal Administration, we are left with seventy-two pupils,

that you cannot get down to Juniper Stump to pick up the children. You cannot get around the turns. After twenty-three years! Now who can I cast a reflection on? Not these people in this community - it is certainly not against the bus service, there is no road there down to get down. It was not my fault. It is someone's fault or it is someone's neglect. Be what it may, it is not my place to be here talking about, Sir, that is gone past. If we get back to what is in the past and we do not look forward to the future, we are still in the same position. It is the future that we have to look forward to. At the very present time this road is still there and these children are not coming out of it. I had signed a contract and I do not know what is what. I do not know if it is the school board that is making the money or who is getting the money. I am sure the school board is getting the money to pay the school buses.

I have a seventy-two pupil bus on the road and a sixty-six pupil bus, that I paid \$14,500 this spring for a new one, getting \$7,000 a year, some of these are carrying eighty-one to ninety-two pupils, enough. If a man never had something to stand against he would have to go and look for a welfare note to help him get over and get by the years. Or either that get someone in, pay him a salary that is against all the laws of the land or drive your bus for nothing. How can you get a confidential man or an honest man to do a just job if he is not paid. They say, pay him the minimum wage.

As far as the honourable the member for Port de Grave is concerned, he has sense enough to know that I am running a business over there since 1943 and I find out that if I do not pay a man I am not going to get a good job done. I had to pay \$2.25 or \$2.50 an hour to drive my bus and that is not two hours a day; that man has to be paid eight hours a day. The road is not there to get down into Juniper Stump. I have been criticized. I have been brought before the board. They have had their privilege to take the bus from me. As I have told the honourable members in this House already this year, to take over a bus service - there is no one going to take it

and run it for nothing. The honourable member is doing it. And until this road is done that bus is never going in Juniper Stump. My bus, if I am the owner with the responsibility for the bus. and I have the responsibility for the lives that are on her.

MR. G. WILSON: Then I am figuring that that road is going to be done to get these children out of it. As far as I am concerned they got every bit of the consideration to get to school as the one who is on the pavement to go there.

Somewhere along the lines we have been done wrong. I do not know what is the cause of it, it must have been former ministers in education. We have another situation with school busses in which you have to sign up to take children to a dance in the night. Where are they getting the money to pay double time and time and a-half to keep a bus operator on the road until two or three o'clock in the morning driving to dances?

My insurance is in the school term, not after four o'clock in the evening, and this is another thing that is not looked into. Mind you, I heard a lot in this House about education tonight, I have heard it day after day, day after day, and these are the things that are not brought forth. These people who are in the schools are getting paid a good salary. I wonder myself, have they the interest at heart to do the job for the pupils who are there, although they are getting paid for it? I am not a bit ashamed to stand on this floor this night and speak of that.

We have a person probably who is making \$1,000 or \$1,500 a year who has to pay his way and all the rest of it and \$2,000 and \$2,500, I know a lot of them in my community and a good many more who have to live on this money. They have to pay all just dues and demands. When they go out in the evening and get aboard the bus, they have the responsibility in the snow storm and what not. The teacher turns around and slips on his coat and goes on home.

The honourable member who has a bus or some other gentleman has a bus that comes in, they have to come into the House of Assembly and take probably abuse from someone, over a bus service that is doing the best it can.

MR. G. WILSON: Now I think myself right along the line, there is more common sense in the people who are in this honourable House than this alone. The very facts and the main things that are in this, for us to get by to do justice for our students and to do justice to our province we are not touching at all. We are letting it go by the wayside. Until you and I and the other person mind to sit down and get down to business and do something for our community or our districts, we will be in the same trouble that we are in here tonight, in here talking about things, and we are not getting anywhere.

I say whatever your political views are, whatever they are not, let us get together and try to do something for the benefit of all, not one or two or just one place. If I have pavement, I can run out and go along on it, let me be satisfied for the other fellow, who has none, to get some too. Now this is where we are. Let us get some common sense into it for you are only going to get as good service in anything as what is being paid for. You will get a few probably who have it in their heart to do a good job whether they are paid or not.

I am not a bit afraid to tell this honourable House that I am just that man. I have operated. In 1964 I went away to the Mainland and brought a sixty-six pupil bus. I considered this spring that that bus was no more good to transport pupils, but other fellows bought it and used it. I could not go on the road. I paid \$14,500 for a new one to replace it because I have an obligation and I was able to afford to put something there to take the people who were going to school, where the other fellow was not as well off. Therefore he should be getting paid where he would be able to do something.

But I am not blaming the Department of Education in that matter, in one sense. The school boards are getting the money. What else are they using it for? I have heard a principal in a certain

MR. G. WILSON: school in 1964, 1965, 1966, who was getting \$5,000 a year to bus people out of Port de Grave and he asked the principal of that school about a raise, He turned around and told him, "Do not mention it, you are getting enough."

Now was that the fault of the Minister of Education or was it the fault of the man who was paid to do his job? He never did the job, because his very first duty was that this man was disgruntled and was not interested and could not do a job, but came in to the Minister of Education to see if he could make arrangements to do better.

Now Mr. Chairman, this just leaves us where we are. Let us get down to business and try to do something and if someone steps over the line, we will bring him back and get him on the right foot and go along together, and let us do something for this province and the children and the people in it. I thank you.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, that was very well stated indeed and it just goes to reinforce the argument that we have been trying to present and that is that there is certainly a definite need to look at building additional factors into the school bus formula for funding school bus transportation in this province.

The honourable member for Port de Grave, Port de Grave has certainly no situation with respect to school bussing, has brought out the very factors that I have been trying to bring out, but he has brought it out much better because he has had first hand, a direct experience with it, and that is the need for bringing additional factors into any formula that is used for funding school bus transportation.

Now I would like for the honourable Minister of Education to give it some very definite consideration because, Sir, there are inequalities from one school board area to another in this province. I maintain that there are school boards in this province this year who will get more money than they need for

MR. F. ROWE: school bus transportation whereas there are other school boards who will not have near enough.

Now, Sir, the honourable member for Port de Grave did raise a very interesting question and I would like the minister to answer it if he could, What guarantee do the Department of Education have or what guarantee do the denominational education committees have, whoever the money goes to, what guarantee do the Education Department have that if a school board is given \$25,000 for purpose of school bus transportation, that all of that \$25,000 is spent in school bus transportation? Is there any kind of supervision or audit or this kind of thing done because it struck me that the honourable member for Port de Grave was suggesting (am I correct?) that some of the money designated for school bus transportation does not in fact go to school bus transportation. Sir, this is an extremely serious situation if we have this kind of thing going on.

So I would like for the minister to indicate to this committee, Mr. Chairman, what guarantee do we have that one hundred per cent of the money designated for school bus transportation does in fact go to school bus transportation under a particular school board?

MR. GILLET: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate what has been said, particularly by my honourable colleague from St. Barbe North. I believe that the department has to take a very serious look at the areas, the road conditions, the amount of equipment that is in that particular area, Department of Highways equipment and what not, and even with a sufficient amount of equipment, we do have times when perhaps even for a month the roads are bad.

In Twillingate proper, when I was home last weekend, honest to God you could scarcely get over the roads with a car much less a school bus. Now that condition has prevailed for two or three weeks because of the melting snow.

MR. GILLETT: I remember since this session when dealing with snow clearing, when the honourable Minister of Public Works mentioned that all sorts of prices had been paid by his department for snow clearing, as much as \$64 an hour because of the fact that there was but one piece of equipment available in that area.

I do not think it is too much to expect, and I think it can certainly be policed and supervised in all the areas of the province where perhaps we do not have sufficient departmental equipment to keep the roads in good condition and where the population is more sparsely located and it has already been said that school busses are called upon to go to various byroads and side roads and what not.

I think too that if the allocations for bus transportation are merely based upon per pupil then it is only natural, and I suppose that any school board when calling tenders are going to accept the tender, particularly if the bus operator is not aware of the actual allocation. So it is possible, quite possible that in areas some school boards might be able to save money. Now whether that money is earmarked and allocated for next year's possible expenditures I do not know but I would certainly try to support very strongly and I feel sure that the Minister of Education and his colleagues are well aware of this, the road conditions, and let us hope that before tenders are called for next year, that a more equitable solution can be arrived at and I think it will go for a better transportation system throughout the province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a brief point that I hope my honourable friend, the old timer from Port de Grave, did not take me wrong. What I said was not a condemnation of the member's bus service in the Port de Grave Area, it is merely

MR. NEARY: a condemnation of the system, and the member from Port de Grave has confirmed what my colleague, the member for St. Barbe North, and myself and other members on this side of the House have thought about the bus system. There is discrimination, Sir, whether it is deliberate or not, there is discrimination in the system and I think this is what the minister should look into.

I am amazed to discover, Sir, that school boards are being given grants for school bus transportation and it is not being used for that purpose. That is an amazing revelation, Sir, and I would like to hear what the minister has to say about this.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, before the minister rises to answer one or two questions that have been put to him, I am very much intrigued by the huge amount of money which is now being estimated for expenditure this year for bus transportation, nearly \$7 million, and one cannot help but translate that into capital terms. For example that would pay the interest on perhaps \$80 million, capital works, and if you could cut that in half, say over a twenty year period, that amount per year would pay the interest and the amortization of the capital over a twenty year period, say \$30 million or \$40 million.

One cannot help thinking again if really the government or the educators in the province are really on the right track with regard to the bus transportation policy in all its ramifications.

Now I am a firm believer that centralized education is an excellent thing, all things being equal, because it means that children are rubbing shoulders with other children. There is a cross fertilization of ideas, more teachers are in a particular larger school and there is gymnasias, auditorias, and language labs, science labs, and this sort of thing that can

MR. WM. ROWE: operate better in larger schools, especially at the high school level.

I am wondering with regard to say the elementary school level, if the government has been giving any thought to perhaps not going back so much as giving some thought to perhaps putting elementary schools of a smaller type, in conjunction of course with denominational authorities, in some of our medium size or smaller communities around.

Now I think that one of the main incentives or impetus towards centralization of education was the inability to get teachers to go to some of our smaller, medium size, remoter communities, but with the plethora of teachers coming out now of our university, and in a very few years with some of these teachers certainly having to look for jobs outside the major centres, perhaps it might not be a bad idea for the government, in conjunction with other authorities, to rethink this whole idea of transportation of children from smaller communities, especially the younger children I am thinking of, to centralized elementary schools and perhaps think about providing the basic elementary education in their own communities. Has the government been thinking along these lines? Can the minister give us any indications as to what the trends are in this regard now among the theorists and educators in the province as well as the officials of the department and the government itself?

I would like to hear, not so much philosophizing by the minister on it but I would like to hear general ideas how the minister is thinking with regard to some of the questions which I have just raised.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the matter just brought up by the honourable member for White Bay South, certainly we are not pushing any centralization at the elementary school level, I think most people will agree that schools can get so large and impersonal

that one will have lost quite a bit. The main part of the thrust of school centralization has been secondary schools and I would say the bulk of the bus transportation money would be secondary school and from grade VII on. There are obviously some central elementary schools as well where circumstances of geography do require it but there is no policy of pushing centralization on the elementary school level.

Now some of the other matters referred to and by a number of gentlemen - that was endeavouring to build more factors into the formula. The formula now of course is based on distance, whether a road is paved or unpaved. Now it would be just about impossible to build in a weather factor. The only additional thing I could think of would be if you took within the unpaved road and made for school bus transportation provisions like class A and class B, unpaved roads one category, being those which have less good surface and which have not been recently upgraded and which get muddy more quickly, that type of thing.

I know that some time ago the Department of Education officials discussed various possibilities for a formula, with the statisticians and some mathematicians of the university, I believe, and were not able to come up with at that time anything better. Now of course that does not mean that there is nothing better or that another try at it could not have beneficial results. As far as I can see, the only way you could make the formula a bit more flexible would be by breaking down the unpaved roads into a class A and a class B and giving somewhat more in say the class B gravel roads. That is something that I am certainly willing to undertake to have investigated and see if that can be done. Somehow criteria has to be worked out with the Highways Department as to what would be the distinguishing marks between A and B but I am certainly willing to undertake it and to see if something realistic can be worked out there.

The member for Bell Island referred to the concept of appeal. Now as honourable gentlemen know, school boards are required now to transport where a student lives a mile or more and inside a mile they are not required to do so. It is at the discretion of the school board. So any pupil who lives within a mile, then it is up to the school board whether they will -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes and the subsidy is only based on the number of kids who live a mile and more.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Just Labrador West I believe, and Buchans. In all other areas within a mile it is at the discretion of the school board. Now how one would? Since it is the decision of the school board, it is not the type of thing which necessarily the Department of Education could very well set up, an appeal board. It could be discussed with the school boards whether they would be willing to appoint an appeal committee. There are cases where people live just inside the mile limit and they do not get transportation. The trouble is of course that you have to make a limit somewhere. If it were half a mile or three quarters of a mile, there are still going to be some people just inside the limit.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, right. So I do not -

MR. ROBERTS: - sort of a quick mile.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I do not know how you could do it unless the school boards perhaps were willing to agree to set up a kind of an appeal committee, where anybody within their jurisdiction who felt they had a legitimate case could appeal to them. It is certainly something I will discuss with the school boards.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable minister will permit. It has been known you know that school boards have reversed their

decision. Not only in government does this happen but it happens with the school boards. So obviously there are occasions when they do have a case but it is pretty difficult to get through to the school boards.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There is no doubt. I think a lot of members, almost all of us who represent rural districts have come across this and not only rural districts. It is not restricted there. The answer may well be that school boards could be requested to set up a committee to hear these cases.

MR. MARTIN: I have refrained from getting into the debates just for the sake of saying me too, but I think this particular problem of the school buses is such a vexing problem and when the honourable member for St. Barbe North talks about the problems of the school buses and the school board in his district he is also talking about the same problem in my district, because it is run under the same school board. I would just like to add my voice to his and those who have spoken against this system. I think it is a most inequitable system. While there were abuses in the old system, perhaps the answer lies in better policing rather than changing the whole thing. I do believe that there has to be a better formula worked out to allow for a safer and more reliable mode of transportation, especially when we are talking about transportation for our children.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I think this is worth another word or two because the minister with all his honeyed phrases and his soft spoken ways, and the minister is very good at handling the committee. Other ministers should take note, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: His soft answers -

MR. ROBERTS: That is literally it, the soft answer -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, I am feeling mellow, Mr. Chairman. It is nearly eleven o'clock and I am feeling very mellow. Last year at this stage in the education estimates we were just warming up for

the discussion on the minister's salary and if it had not been for the fact that the government had an overwhelming majority, which was regimented into line ruthlessly by their fearsome and fearful whip. He seems to have gone home, one way or another. Here I am paying him - He has not been here all day. Here I am paying him a compliment. No wonder I got asked today to speak up on Isle aux Morte. The honourable gentleman is probably up there arranging invitations, and he would love to speak. But if it had not been for that fact, I mean the honourable the minister's predecessor might not have gotten his salary and thereby the country would have been saved a great deal of inconvenience.

Mr. Chairman, the school bus programme is one which will cause every Finance Minister grey hair and the Minister of Education still has some of his, it is a little thin on the top there but it will cause him to lose some of his hair. There is no solution to this problem. The step taken last year by the ministry, I now ask the minister to undertake to review it. I suppose we are stuck with this for another school year even though this is only the 9th or 10th day of April. The school year will not open until September so there is a load of time to change it. This step was an attempt to solve the problem and I do not fault his predecessor for attempting to solve a problem. I think that is to his credit but the fact remains the step which was taken, Mr. Chairman, did not solve the problem but it made it infinitely worse and it made it worse because it refused to take into account the realities of the situation.

I know what the previous minister did. He simply took the amount available for school buses, the amount that had been built up over the years, whatever it was, six million odd dollars, divided it by the number of students and that gave him an amount, it gave him the arithmetical result of a division. I think it was about \$100.00 per student, was it not? (from memory, about \$100.00)

Then the minister boldly announced it. I can recall him. He used to sit where the honourable the Minister of Tourism now sits. Let the Minister of Tourism take that for whatever it is worth. Then the heavens fell in on the minister and he backtracked, he recanted, he came out with a modified formula that was an improvement.

But, Mr. Chairman, it still did not meet the need because it refuses to take into account the realities. What are the realities, Mr. Chairman? The realities are simple. We have throughout this province central and regional schools and there is really no difference between them except over the years in the early 1950's, the mid 1950's, a terminology was adopted. If I remember it, a central school was up two grades, it began in grade VII and a regional school began in grade VIII or some such -

MR. PECKFORD: Grade VII to XI and grade IX to XI.

MR. ROBERTS: There we are. I thank the gentleman for Green Bay. Grade VII to XI was one, call it central, and the regional was grade IX to XI and we have the distinctions. It was not really a terribly important distinction. The point is we have regional schools. Since that period we have indeed centralized our elementary schools. In White Bay North and St. Anthony there is only one elementary school for the Pentecostal children and there is only one elementary school for the Integrated children and there is no Roman Catholic school. So we only have two elementary schools North of St. Anthony. That covers eight or nine communities spread out over thirty or forty miles of area.

I do not know the Port au Port Peninsula as well as I shall in the months ahead but - Well, I am going to go to the Progressive Conservative Association meeting out there and maybe the two of us will make it a crowd, Your Honour, you and I, and we can elect an executive. But the situation on the peninsula maybe roughly the same.

Now the children living in these communities are brought in to school by bus. How does one arrive at the cost of this? Well, the way it was always done in the past, Mr. Chairman, was simply an official in the Department of Education authorized the creation of a bus route. It does not matter which official it was but an official authorized it and said, "Very well, there are a number of children," and whatever the formulae were. There were some where we closed schools and there were others where we opened schools but there were rules. Then the school board had to go to tender, a public tender, and sometimes they got one bid and sometimes they got no bids and sometimes they got many bids but out of it eventually there came an acceptable bid. It was inevitably far higher than the estimates. It was inevitably far higher than the officials thought it should be. It was inevitably far higher than everybody thought it should be except the so-called free market system.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, the only answer to that system is another system of state socialism where the state runs all the buses. We could do that in Newfoundland. There is no reason why the Minister of Education, if he wanted to, could not have a great thundering fleet of buses. I do not recommend it to him. I strongly recommend against it but it could be done. It is possible. It is not beyond the wit of even this administration to devise a system to have a hundred or two hundred or three hundred buses tooting about. That could be done but unless we do that we have to go private enterprise and as the honourable member for Port de Grave quite rightly says, that will not be done as charity. It cannot be. If a man takes it on and makes no money, he will go out of business. Anyway the gentleman for Port de Grave and I agree on the point completely or we are as one on it.

So you have a cost and when you added up all those costs you get the total cost. Now that makes sense, that is

dealing with reality. Now what is the present situation? We have a completely artificial situation whereby the number of students is divided into the total expenditure. There is an adjustment made for paved and unpaved and then per distances but that is all.

MR. MARSHALL: Shall we raise the committee -

MR. ROBERTS: No, the Chairman will just leave the chair at 11:00 PM. That will be just fine, and we will come automatically at three tomorrow without any motion being put.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am not an expert but compared to the honourable gentleman, I am an expert. Does the Chair want to call it eleven o'clock? Your Honour is in charge.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, I want five or ten minutes more because I am slow thinking on this and I think it is a very well because of the incredible mess that this crowd have made of the school buses around this province, incredible mess. I would like the honourable Minister of Justice to come down and ride in the bus the kids have to ride in from Raleigh over to St. Anthony, and they get sick every morning. That is pleasant. This is because of the stupid, insane formula of pretending that a school bus in White Bay North or in St. Barbe North or Labrador South is the same as a school bus - the Minister of Education should hold his water, literally. But a school bus coming up the Southern Shore, there is no comparison between the two and this insanely stupid policy. Of course I would like a few minutes more. The minister is a reasonable gentleman and I may even be able to persuade him to take another look at it. That is what I am trying to do. I am not going to accuse him of having done anything wrong. The previous minister paid the penalty for his sins, incompetent as he was, and he was incompetent that Minister of Education. The present gentleman, whatever he is, is not incompetent.

Are we going to call it eleven o'clock, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member yield the floor?

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir, I shall not yield the floor. If the Chairman wishes to call it eleven that is fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it causes the possibility of a procedural wrangle tomorrow, with the inability to get into routine orders -

MR. ROBERTS: No, I have no intention. When Your Honour meet tomorrow, you call Orders of the Day or Petitions or whatever, but I do not intend to yield the floor, Your Honour. I mean I have the right to speak, surely.

It now being eleven o'clock I do leave the Chair until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 10, 1973 at 3:00 P.M.