



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 35

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

HON. W. W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): Mr. Speaker, before we commence proceedings I would like to inform the House that the Hon. the Premier will be in a position to make a statement this afternoon concerning the BRINCO matter. It is customary to make ministerial statements at this time. I presume that there will be no problem in making this announcement because of the fact the Opposition and other members of the House, everybody has been very concerned about the statement that will be forthcoming today. I presume there will be no problem in obtaining leave of the House at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed by leave of the House that the Hon. the Premier will have permission to make a statement at such time as is appropriate for him this afternoon?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed!

QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bonavista North.

MR. P. S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, on behalf of my colleague, the honourable the Member for Bell Island who has been kicked out of this House by the Minister of Finance, in view of the public statement made by -

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: In view of the public statements made by the Minister of Manpower that no major labour legislation will be introduced in this honourable House until the fall, can the minister guarantee members that there will be a fall session of the House to deal with the proposed legislation?

HON. J. G. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS):

Mr. Speaker, I have no qualms at all about answering the legitimate question. I think the member is quite aware that that question does not fall under my jurisdiction. I did not make the statement that there would be none. I said, I anticipated because of consultation being held

with various bodies that possibly we could not make it. The feeling being of all persons concerned that we would like to do it correctly and do it with consultation. Therefore, it will take a little longer and possibly it would not come in before the fall session. We are only talking about one there; we are talking about the new labour code. Other ones we hope, anticipate will probably be in during this sitting. I cannot tell you whether there will be a sitting of the House in the fall or not. I think the honourable member should direct that through the proper channels, the House Leader or the Premier.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, before we go into Committee of Supply, I wonder if the government House Leader - it is an unusual request - would agree to call Motion XI, which is the motion standing in the name of the gentleman for Twillingate, to give that bill first reading so it then could be printed and it would then stand as second reading and it could be dealt with in due course.

MR. MARSHALL: I would be delighted to, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me I have seen this bill before. We will be only two happy, not only will we call it but of course we will use our utmost of co-operation to see that it is printed as soon as possible for circulation to the House.

On motion of the honourable the Member for Twillingate, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Emergency Compensation Of Employees Act, 1971," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I had a question, I hope it is not too late. The Leader of the Opposition beat me to it with his point.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was a question.

MR. SPEAKER: We are on Orders of the Day although I recognized the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, who asked that this bill be introduced. Technically, I suppose the honourable Member for Hermitage is out of order for asking questions now but does the honourable member have leave to ask a question?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed!

MR. SIMMONS: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps as background I could read a copy of a telegram, if it be in order? The telegram is addressed to me and I understand the minister should have gotten the same telegram a day or so ago. It is from the Town of Harbour Breton, as follows:

"We have received information from reliable sources concerning disposition of sixty-five foot stern trawlers being built at Marvstown Shipyards. This council is very disappointed with the decision of your department and urges

for you to reconsider this very important matter. We also suggest that you consider the statement made by the Premier during the November by-election in the Hermitage District in which he said that one of those trawlers would be made available to B.C. Packers Limited, to offset slack periods in production experienced by B.C. Packers and affecting the total population of this community.

This council feel that you the minister should remind the Premier of his statement and you in turn should do your utmost to meet the commitment made to this community." That is the end of the telegram.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Fisheries is: Upon receiving the telegram has he pursued the matter and does he expect that some commitment can be made to make one of the sixty-five stern trawlers available to the B.C.Packers plant at Harbour Breton?

MR. COLLINS: I can appreciate the honourable member's desire to ask the question. I would take it under advisement and I will get a reply probably this afternoon or tomorrow morning.

MR. SIMMONS: Has the minister responded to the telegram?

MR. COLLINS: The response is in the process of going out.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Sir.

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of Interim Supply to Majesty. Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Shall Head XVII, Transportation and Communications carry?

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, we are going to go on with Transportation and Communications, I take it, in the absence of the minister. Who will be the acting minister today?

AN HON. MEMBER: He is here.

MR. SIMMONS: In full bloom!

MR. F.B. ROWE: Oh! I am sorry! I was going on what I heard from the minister yesterday, Sir, and I did not even glance in his direction.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I was pursuing this whole business of whether or not the minister would be willing to table a list stating the locations, the values and the type of capital works that his department will be planning for the coming year 1974-1975, and also a list of the activities that will be carried out or projects that will be carried out by the monies contained in the Interim Supply Bill.

Now, Sir, the minister first answered my question by saying that sometimes the minister himself does not know exactly what projects are going to be carried out during the year nor do some of his departmental officials. I found this and I stated it at the time, to be a self-condemnation of the minister, of his own efforts at planning and priority and the efforts of the government at planning and priority, if they do not know themselves what in fact their specific plans are for capital works, although they have the money voted for it, Sir.

Now, Sir, the minister did realize at this stage of the game that he was getting some part of his anatomy caught in the wringer and he decided to switch his strategy towards saying that it would be suicide for a minister of the Crown to state what the plans and what the projects are going to be for the coming year. "How do you explain it to the people?" The minister said; "if a certain project has to be modified or cancelled or postponed, how do you explain it to the people?"

Well, Sir, if the minister have plans, if he have priorities, and if he were to make public statements and lists of what is to be done and he has good reasons for modifications or cancelling or postponing of these plans, I do not think the minister need worry about defending himself nor his government nor his department. The whole point is, Sir, that if something were postponed, modified or cancelled, we would want to know the reason why. The only way, Sir, we would know if something is to be postponed, cancelled, modified or otherwise, is to know what is planned for the coming year.

There is another important principle at stake here. If the minister be not prepared to itemize and account for the expenditure of millions of dollars for capital works, for upgrading, improving and paving of highways in this province, how are we in the House of Assembly to debate the expenditure of these great amounts of money if we do not know where this money and how this money is going to be spent?

Sir, there are obviously certain areas of the province that should have priority over other areas of the province as far as road construction is concerned. I would submit, Sir, for example,

that the paving of a dirt cow-path on the Northern Peninsula should have priority over the recapping of paving say somewhere on the Avalon Peninsula, the complete recapping. The only way, Sir, that this can be debated in the House is if the minister provide us with an itemized list of where this work is to take place so that we on this side can debate it openly.

Now, Sir, the minister said he will not assure this House that he will be tabling such a list. Now, Sir, this is a retrogressive step on the part of the minister because after about thirty seconds research, Sir, I was able to find out that in the year 1972-1973 the honourable the Minister of Highways, who was at that time the member for Humber East, and I think the acting member at the particular time this list was tabled was the member for St. Barbe South, the minister tabled a list, Sir, of improvement and reconstruction for 1972-1973, Burin, Carbonear, Ferryland, Fogo, Fortune Bay, Green Bay, Harbour Grace, Harbour Main, broken down into paving, reconstruction, recapping, paving reconstruction, paving, recapping.

Sir, this is an itemized list. This is what we are asking for. Hermitage, Humber West, Lewisporte, Placentia East, Port au Port, Port de Grave, St. Barbe South, St. Mary's, St. John's North and St. John's South, Trinity South, Twillingate and White Bay North. Now, Sir, this is what we are asking for. The minister is saying that he will not table this type of a list this year during the consideration of the estimates.

Sir, there was another list tabled at that time, 1972-1973; roads programmes, new construction. Burgeo, La Poile, Burin, Fortune Bay, Green Bay, Hermitage, St. Mary's, Twillingate, White Bay North.

Sir, also there was tabled bridge construction; Bonavista North, Ferryland, Hermitage, St. George's, St. Mary's. Sir, this is the type of information that we are asking for during this coming year during the consideration of the estimates in order that we may debate them reasonably in this honourable House, and the minister says that he cannot assure this House that he will be providing the information, it would be

suicidal of the minister to do it, Sir.

Sir, the minister or the administration had no hesitation, no hesitation, Sir, in November, 1973, in listing off the future plans of the Progressive Conservative Government for the upgrading and paving of the remaining thirty miles of the Bay D'Espoir highway, the paving of roads for Hermitage, Seal Cove, Sandyville, Harbour Breton, to connect with the Bay D'Espoir highway, the construction of more access roads to develop the forestry potential, a large forestry road development in the Conne River - Milltown area, the construction of a causeway and bridge across the Conne River, improvements to all local roads and communities in the district, a continuing programme of assistance to local communities in their own road upgrading and paving programmes.

This, Sir, was in a nonpartisan document - not exactly the "Gazette", the "Progressive Conservative Times"-vote Albert Meade your Progressive Conservative candidate." This administration had no hesitation, whether they were considering the estimates or not, in listing off one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight plans, proposals, specific plans for upgrading, paving, bridge construction and everything. I might add, Sir, that of course a great amount of this, these future plans of the Progressive Conservative Government, was of course funded by the federal government in Ottawa.

Sir, it suffices to say that the minister - I would once again ask the minister if he would reassure this House, Sir, that he would be willing to table an itemized list of his department's plans for road reconstruction, upgrading, paving, bridge construction and this sort of thing before we consider the estimates for his department. If he does not do that, Sir, we cannot debate adequately and fairly the expenditure of millions of dollars. I think, Sir, if we break this principle, it is a serious principle that we are breaking.

So, Sir, the minister has no defence, no defence whatsoever for what he said yesterday, Sir. If he says he and his, the honourable minister and his department officials do not know themselves what is going to happen

in the coming year, this is a sad commentary, Sir, on the priorities and planning of this government. If he be worried about his suicide mission, Sir, his defence, how he would defend, how he would make the people believe

MR. F. B. ROWE: Sir, I would remind the minister that this is the government that promised in its election campaign that it would tell it the way it is. This is all that we are asking the government to do now, Sir, to tell it the way it is. On top of that, Sir, a precedent has been set, this itemized list has been given out before in the House of Assembly and even in the absence of estimates, we get a listing of programmes during an election campaign. Sir, I simply say that the minister is duty bound to present - he probably does not have the list now for interim supply but I certainly ask if he would present and table this list for consideration during the main estimates. I ask this sincerely, Sir.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a brief comment on what the honourable member has said. I want first of all to contradict what he said with regard to the projects that have gone on in the Hermitage District. People of the Hermitage District did not have to wait for the Progressive Conservative times to find out what was going on. This administration, through my office, announced repeatedly in the month of June, July, August, September, October and November -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, let me state one of the reasons why those pronouncements were made. In response on a number of occasions to the Leader of the Opposition, who made various releases, and we appreciate that that is his right and prerogative to do so, asking where were the plans, asking where were our promises and so on, I, on at least half a dozen occasions repeatedly stated that funds were available, when contractors were available to do the work, we would call tenders and not before. We, were close enough to the construction industry with regard to road building and paving to know that it was useless to call for tenders when in fact there were no contractors available to do the work. We did not want to take the chance on calling for tenders and have a contractor probably bid and feel that they had our backs against the wall so that they could come in with rather high bids.

I want to completely refute what the honourable member said with regard to that. That is a single issue. The statements were made first

of all with good intentions to make the people of that district aware of what was going to be done. All I said repeatedly was that I was unable to pinpoint the time but as soon as the contractors were available, we would certainly be calling tenders. The repeated statements following that was not politics but they were responses to queries and questions by way of public releases by the opposition. If the honourable member wish to call that politics, then he must blame his own party for it.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the tabling of an overall highway programme, I can only repeat what I said yesterday. I cannot in conscience give this House an undertaking that I will do so. I have not changed my mind in spite of what the honourable gentleman has pointed out. I can appreciate that he would like to know, as everyone would like to know, what the programme is for the whole province. He might feel, Mr. Chairman, that it is a reflection on me and my staff if we do not know what is going to be done during the year. I will make a public admission right now that I do not know exactly every project that is going to take place even after the estimates are tabled in this House. I suggest to him that if he do , we should have him in our department because we could sure use him. Nobody, Mr. Chairman, there is not a human being who can say factually what will take place by way of projects during the next construction season. There are too many unknown factors involved, too many problems involved and too many things which can change to a great extent the programme that we might envisage. A programme, Mr. Chairman, that we might hope to implement during the coming year is one thing but the programme that gets done is another and this is where the unknown factor applies.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable gentleman has thought of this. Even during the past year, Mr. Chairman, we had occasion to call for tenders for projects and we did not award a contract even after

we had received bids. Why? For the simple reason that my staff who are as expert as I think are available with regards to estimates and construction prices, road building, could very quickly see that the bids that came in were astronomical in cost, that the contractors who in fact bid knew that they had us where they wanted us so to speak. They knew that they would probably be one of two bids received and they also knew or had a pretty good idea that the other people bidding probably did not have the organization behind them to take on such a project. So in effect what we were faced with was a situation where we were going to pay through the teeth so to speak because of the shortage of contractors or from a more positive point of view because of the state of the road building that was going on at that particular time, the great amount of work that was being done by this administration.

Mr. Chairman, how do you get over that? Sir, if I were to announce today a road going to be rebuilt or paved in such a town or such a community and because of this kind of reasoning it did not come off, the honourable gentleman and his colleagues, (and I can understand why they would criticize us, I think I would if I were on the other side. I think I would seize the political opportunity to make political hay.) how could they justify it then and not award a contract just because the cost was too high.

The first thing the honourable member would be telling me as minister is that the economics should not play a part, really the social needs and the social requirements of that area were more important than the economics of it. Of course we agree that social needs are very, very important. We also agree, Mr. Chairman, that we must attempt to live within our budget.

I cannot see in any way where we could think of tabling a complete roads programme. The honourable member stated that in 1971-1972 or 1972-1973, I am not sure which one he said, there was a road programme tabled. This is true. Mr. Chairman, it was as a result of the chaos that we found ourselves in because of that, I think it is most unwise, it places my staff and my department in a very difficult situation

when we attempt to provide this kind of information.

This administration has tried. That is clear-cut proof that we have tried in fact to announce in advance a programme. But, Mr. Chairman, it is not realistic. For that reason I cannot give the House a commitment that I am going to do it, because I do not believe it is the right thing to do. I think it is not in the public interest that we do it. I do not think that it is in the public interest that we announce to the contractors of this province, for example, how many projects we are going to take on during the coming year. I think they could take us to the cleaners if they really knew what we were planning by way of a roads programme and for that reason I think that it is in the public interest that this information not be provided.

As I indicated to my honourable friend yesterday evening, I will be glad to make available to him whatever information I can, when it is proper to do so, when we are not going to get ourselves in any difficulty by doing so, as I will with every other honourable member and I will be most happy to do that. As far as I am concerned that is the most I can do.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to say that I find the minister's answer most unsatisfactory and in fact contradictory. The minister says, and he rationalizes the reason for the Hermitage list of road construction, the reason that this was made public, put in the "P.C. Times" - something that I did not realize because I

had no interest in Hermitage until such time as the election came when we were working down there, Sir.

The minister admits that this announcement was made in June, July and August and September. Sir, what was the reason that the honourable the minister mentioned that this list was given out in response to inquiries, in response to questions? Well, Sir, this is precisely what is going on in this honourable House at the present time. If the minister could provide a list to the Hermitage District of road construction, in response to questions and inquiries, why cannot the minister give this honourable House, elected members of this House, a list of road constructions based on his estimates as a result of inquiries from elected members of this House? The minister is most inconsistent and contradictory in his answer. What he can do for Hermitage, he can do in this honourable House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if you wish will I continue on or -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Mr. Chairman, I will be able to continue on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Thank you!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred, have made some progress and asked leave to sit again?

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of Supply reports that they have made some progress and asked leave to sit again. When shall this report be received?

On motion report received and adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Premier.

HON. F. D. MOORES (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House which I understand was granted at three o'clock, I would like to make a statement to the House.

First of all, Sir, before, actually making the statement I would like on behalf of the government and I am sure the House generally to welcome in the Speaker's gallery today, Sir Val Duncan, the Chairman of Rio Tinto and the Chairman of the Executive Committee of BRINCO; as well as Mr. William Mulholland, the President of BRINCO, and their

colleagues, as well as colleagues who have been with the government on the recent negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I made a statement in this House of major significance to the Province. Today I wish to make a further statement as a result of five days of discussions with the principals of BRINCO Limited.

Before making today's statement, which establishes Government's present intention, I think it would be advantageous to review the philosophy and intent of my statement of last Thursday.

At that time, I said "When my Government set forth to develop the Lower Churchill hydro potential, we were determined that this great tool for industrial development must be harnessed for the greatest possible benefit for this Province and for its people. This Administration intends to establish a comprehensively planned approach to the development of the Province and each of its major economic and social sectors; and to ensure that all resources of the Province are developed to the highest possible level of efficiency, consistent with the long-run interests of our people. One of these sectors as and must be energy.

"No nation or region can attain a high level of economic development without an intensive and intelligent use of its energy. A nation or region with its own sources of primary energy has a distinct advantage, especially in light of current world energy conditions. In order to move ahead on economic fronts, Newfoundland must have an increasing supply of energy."

Further it was stated, Mr. Speaker, "The Government was determined that for any subsequent developments on the Churchill River, the main beneficiaries must be the residents of this Province.

This policy was enhanced when the findings of the Teshmont - Zinder Study which was presented to Government in February, 1974, confirmed conclusively the technical and economic feasibility of developing the Gull Island site and of transmitting the energy to the Island part of the Province. Moreover, it is clear that this development is the most economic means of providing the electrical energy necessary to meet the future needs of the Province as it is less expensive per kilowatt hour than any other electrical energy source which will be made available or can be made available to us."

In my statement to the House last Thursday I pointed out that the Teshmont-Zinder Report confirms that there is no question that projected costs can be fully recovered from anticipated revenue that is based on competitive rates that will attract new industry.

Therefore, as a Government we are determined to see that this energy source is developed and that it is delivered to both the Island and Labrador regions of the Province, to encourage industrial development and to provide a secure and reliable supply of energy at a stable price for all consumers - domestic, commercial and individual.

My statement last week emphasized that my Government was not interested in nationalization for its own sake. As a matter of record my statement said and I quote, "I wish to make quite clear, unequivocally and without reservation, that this action should in no way be interpreted as being indicative of any nationalization policy on the part of this Government."

However, as I said on Thursday, "Government has determined as a matter of principle that the hydro electric generation facilities and related water rights in Labrador should be owned and controlled by the people of this Province."

At that time and only after ten days of negotiations with senior officials of BRINCO, the Government came to the conclusion that the best method of attaining its goal was by the acquisition of BRINCO shares. At that time I said, "It is with much reluctance that Government takes the step to vest the shares of BRINCO Limited through legislation."

Mr. Speaker, it should be re-emphasized that controlling our hydro developments and potential hydro developments is and was our principal objective. This has not changed. However, we have always been prepared to be reasonable - this I have contended over and over again. In brief we would much prefer a negotiated settlement rather than legislation.

Shortly after my statement last week contact was made between senior officials of BRINCO and the Government, which led to a further round of negotiations concerning the Upper Churchill project and the water rights in Labrador owned by BRINCO. The parties resumed negotiations again on Friday, March 22, and these meetings have continued until just a few moments ago.

I am now able to announce to this House that Agreement in Principle has been reached with BRINCO Limited with respect to:

- (1) The acquisition of the CFLCO shares owned by BRINCO Limited;
- (2) The acquisition of all Labrador water rights owned by BRINCO;
- (3) Provision by BRINCO of management personnel and operating personnel to complete the Upper Churchill Falls Project;
- (4) The availability of personnel to start the Gull Island Site Project this year.

When meetings resumed last Friday it was with the objective of finding an alternative to the nationalization of BRINCO Limited that would be acceptable to both parties. The four basic concerns of the Province have been:

- (1) Public control of the hydro resources of Labrador;
- (2) The price to be paid for these resources;
- (3) The fair and equitable treatment of shareholders; and
- (4) The assurance of personnel and management availability.

I have pleasure in tabling in this House a copy of the Agreement in Principle agreed upon today between the Province of Newfoundland and BRINCO Limited. This Agreement in Principle will be followed in due course by a Definitive

Definitive Agreement of Purchase and Sale which will be subject to the approval of the BRINCO shareholders.

The Agreement in Principle includes the following major points:

1. BRINCO will sell to the Province, or its nominee, (a) all the shares beneficially owned, directly or indirectly, by BRINCO or by any by any of its associates or affiliates in the capital of "CFLCO", being not less than 4,989,330 shares (56.96 per cent) of the issued capital of CFLCO, (b) all water rights in Labrador and all plans, studies, maps, and documentation relating thereto owned by BRINCO under the Principal Agreement dated May 21, 1963, as amended, made between BRINCO and the Province or otherwise acquired by BRINCO or by any of its associates or affiliates, (c) all the shares beneficially owned, directly or indirectly, by BRINCO or by any of its associates or affiliates in the capital of Gull Island Power Limited, (d) all plans, estimates, cost studies, engineering and other studies, documents and information relating to the Gull Island site and all other hydro sites in Labrador including the Upper Churchill site and all related programs, computer studies, load growth studies and other information, owned or in the possession of BRINCO or any of its associates or affiliates.

2. The purchase price for the above assets is to be \$160,000,000.

3. BRINCO will give its shareholders an opportunity to tender their BRINCO shares at \$7.07 per share.

4. BRINCO will exercise its best efforts to ensure that the personnel of BRINCO and CFLCO will continue their present functions in order to operate the hydro-electric facility at Churchill Falls until the end of 1974. BRINCO will work towards a position in which CFLCO will have an efficient, self-contained and separate operating and administrative staff by the end of 1974. BRINCO will be compensated on a cost basis to be mutually agreed upon for services rendered.

BRINCO will exercise its best efforts to ensure that the personnel of BRINCO and CFLCO will continue their present functions in order (a) to complete the construction of the Churchill Falls project, and (b) to carry on until the end of 1974 or until definitive agreements have been reached,

whichever is sooner, the program presently contemplated for the development of the Gull Island site. BRINCO will be compensated for services rendered on a cost basis plus a percentage thereof, both to be mutually agreed upon.

This Agreement in Principle enables both the Province and BRINCO to achieve their major objectives. The Province regains control over its hydro resources and is now able to proceed with immediate steps to construct the Gull Island site. This will also enable Government to proceed with its policy of seeking a broader industrial base for our economy.

In addition to having acquired control over the Upper Churchill Falls plant and the Gull Island site, what will probably be in the long run, Mr. Speaker, more important is the control of all the water rights in Labrador. This vast potential is not only undeveloped but for all practical purposes is unidentified. Just as an example, in the Teshmont-Zinder Report there were listed several potential sites that could be developed for hydro generation and integrated into a regional grid for distribution throughout the Province or for that matter Eastern Canada. A few of these sites specifically are: The Naskaupi River, with an estimated potential of 1150 megawatts; The Eagle River at 590 megawatts; The Canairaktok River at 490 megawatts; The Kenamu River at 188 megawatts; The Paradise at 175 megawatts; The Red Wine at 153 megawatts; The Goose River at 148 megawatts; The Fig River at 140 megawatts and there are many others, but just these few alone add up to 3,000 megawatts, or twice the capacity of the Gull Island site. Also, of course, there is the well-known Muskrat Falls and the possibility of expanding the potential of the Upper Churchill River facilities. In addition, there is the right of recall of 300 megawatts of energy from the Quebec Hydro contract. All in all, there is a colossal amount of power in Labrador, an amount of power that can be of tremendous value to our Province.

While the major objective will be to provide power for the people of this Province, either commercially,

domestically or individually, the efficient development of these resources will enable this Province to provide surplus power to other provinces for many years to come at a substantial return to this Province itself, either by means of existing transmission facilities or national or regional grid.

The Agreement in Principle which we have signed with BRINCO allows that company to retain its corporate viability and provides the means for expansion into other fields. The Company will retain all its non-hydro assets, including its investment in Brinex Limited Newfoundland, mineral assets in British Columbia, Coseca Resources in Alberta, Abitibi Asbestos in Quebec, Brinco Quebec Limited and its various development assets such as its pioneering work in the uranium enrichment field. They will also have a large amount of cash from the sales of the hydro assets which can be used to expand in other areas.

At this time I would like to pay, Sir, sincere tribute to the company and its people. The Chairman of Rio Tinto Zinc and the Chairman of BRINCO Executive Committee, Sir Val Duncan, is an industrialist of international repute. Not the least of his capabilities was demonstrated through the creation of the Churchill Falls project itself. The same can be equally said of the outstanding team that has been associated with his very fine company. BRINCO has had a commendable performance in our Province in the past and they have been very involved in our Province in the past and I fervently hope that their interest and effort will be such as to ensure their continued involvement in our province in the future.

It is only human, Sir, for the principals of BRINCO to have been disappointed to see the Upper Churchill Falls development, that magnificent achievement, being taken over by the Government. Being the type of men they are, they have accepted the Government's policy and realized the reason why it was necessary. Even after hard, lengthy negotiations, with much giving and taking on both sides, I feel there exists today between the senior personnel of BRINCO and our Government

a feeling of trust and confidence.

It is our mutual wish that the exceptional expertise of the company will work together with Government to develop other opportunities in the many areas other than hydro-electricity.

It is therefore with much pleasure that I am announcing to the House and to the people of Newfoundland that we have reached an amicable negotiated position with respect to the purchase of the hydro resources of this Province.

As I have stated earlier, this is a major step in the future development of this Province and its people and one which every Newfoundlander, Sir, should be proud of. The resources of Newfoundland are the property of our people, and it follows that control of these resources must rest with the Government. One of these resources, energy, is essential if we are to ensure a viable future for our people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to table the letter of Agreement signed by Mr. William Mulholland, President of BRINCO, and myself in behalf of the Government. This is a copy of the letter that has to be signed. Other copies will be distributed, Mr. Speaker, as well a copy of the statement I just made.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply To Consider Certain Resolutions For The Granting Of Interim Supply To Her Majesty, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

HEAD XVII - TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, after such a statement coming from the honourable the Premier, obviously one would want to turn one's mind to what was contained in that statement and it is a little difficult to get back to the points that I was making earlier. However, Sir, in my mind the expenditure of money by the provincial government, the Government of this Province, for the provision of public services, is every bit as important as the expenditure of money in terms of what the statements made by the Premier just contained. It is certainly just as important to the people of this province and I continue to pursue my questioning of the honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications, as a result of his most unsatisfactory and inconsistent and contradictory answer to the questions that I put to him.

Now, Sir, the point that I was making is that the minister rationalized the itemized list of road construction in Hermitage District prior to a by-election, rationalized it in terms of a response to enquiries from people, including the honourable Leader of the Opposition. Well, Sir, certainly the same logic prevails with respect to the tabling of a list of highways projects in the consideration of the minister's main estimates when they come down.

Sir, I once again ask the minister why is it that a list can be tabled a year ago and not tabled this year? Sir, one other thing really puzzles me and that is how can a minister present millions of dollars of estimates, broken down according to their various subheads, how can the minister present these estimates to this honourable House, come estimate time, without knowing what specific plans he has for capital construction, operating maintenance grants and this kind of thing? How can the minister do that, Sir? I just fail to understand the logic behind it.

We keep hearing announcements about the Buchans to Corner Brook Road. We hear announcements about other roads and, Sir, I maintain that in order to properly debate the estimates of the Department of

Transportation and Communications, this House requires a tabling of a list of proposed highways projects for the coming year and I, well there is not very much one can do, thirty-two to nine, but Sir, I think it is absolutely necessary and I demand it that the minister table this particular list.

Now, Sir, just one other point before I sit down and that is this: Sir, two years ago one of the largest petitions ever presented to this honourable House was presented jointly by the Leader of the Opposition and by myself, signed by 8,843 citizens, voters of the Great Northern Peninsula, calling for the immediate upgrading and paving of the Great Northern Peninsula in segments equally distributed along the Great Northern Peninsula so that all the people on the Great Northern Peninsula could benefit equally from jobs, construction work and also from the provision of these upgraded roads.

Now, Sir, I would like for the minister to comment on what his department is doing as a result of the presentation of one of the largest petitions ever presented to this House. Because, Sir, all that we have had on the Great Northern Peninsula is a continuation of an agreement worked out between the previous Liberal Administration and the Ottawa Federal Government, through a special areas agreement in the area of the Gros Morne National Park from Wiltondale to Deer Lake and around the Port Saunders, Port au Choix, Hawkes Bay Area, with I think another small provincial project between Cow Head and Rocky Harbour. All in one district, Sir, everything north of Port au Choix forgotten. Two districts north of Port au Choix forgotten.

Now, Sir, I mentioned that the people are becoming very frustrated and upset over this situation; 8,843 people signed that petition and they

understood when the present administration claimed power that they would listen to the people and they would try to act according to the needs of the people.

Well, Sir, this is a fair request, this great, huge petition. "Construction equally distributed over that three hundred and some odd miles of the Great Northern Peninsula, so that everybody can benefit equally over the years of construction instead of piling it into one little area." I would like the minister to comment on that.

What if anything (let us call a spade a spade) is his administration, his department going to do this year for St. Barbe North and for White Bay North? Not just as the result of pleadings on the part of the two members for those districts but as the result of the petition signed by 8,843 persons two years ago, what is the honourable minister's department going to do in these two districts in the way of road construction?

The road was a first-class gravel highway a few years ago, Sir, but it is down to rock-bottom at the present time. Without going into great detail, Sir, the people buying new cars, these cars last for a year. The cost of living is extremely high and the truckers have their trucks ruined within a year. Obviously, the cost of transportation for passengers and for fuel, fuel oil, for other goods and for food is greatly raised as a result of the very road conditions themselves, not to mention the fact the school buses travel over this road. It is the only road on the Great Northern Peninsula. There is no network of roads, it is the life line to the people on the Great Northern Peninsula, north of Port au Choix, and to the people in Labrador South, in the Strait section, from Blanc Sablon to Red Bay, when the ferry is operating.

I would like to hear from the minister. If he will not table a list of proposed projects for next year, what are his general plans, the honourable minister's general plans for the two hundred and some odd miles north of Port au Choix on the Great Northern Peninsula for the coming year?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I hope my honourable friend can agree with me that the matter of tabling a road's programme is an issue which to my mind there is not much point in debating further. I have done the best I can to convince my honourable friend. As to the reasons I stated yesterday, I was very, very sincere in those reasons. It is not a matter of attempting to fool him or to hide anything or anything of that nature. I am quite sincere when I say that I do not think it is in the best interest of my department, of the government or indeed the province to release the kind of information that the honourable member is requesting at this particular time.

He referred again to the Hermitage situation. I can only briefly comment and say that I guess it is just a matter of a difference of opinion between him and me. I reacted to a request from the Leader of the Opposition. I think I should have, I think it was proper for me to do so. This is why there were a number of statements made in response to the

releases, I could make those, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend questioned how I could make those kinds of statements as early as June or July and not table a programme now. I could make those statements because I knew, Mr. Chairman, and that I was assured by my staff that at some point in time between June and September or October - between June and September - I think in one particular instance as early as August that we will be able to call for a tender on those projects, we will be able to get the work done or at least make a reasonably good effort to do so.

Mr. Chairman, that has been proven out. It has been proven to be correct. We did just that, as quickly as we could, no matter what anybody thinks, what anybody wants to make out of it, connected with any election they can, they can if they wish. Now the important thing is that we know why we had to wait as long as we did before calling for tenders and awarding contracts. If honourable gentlemen cannot believe what I tell them, then the only thing I can say is; I am sorry to hear that.

With regards to the honourable member's statement as to, how can I come into this House and present my estimates or request the approval of the House for my estimates without producing a blueprint so to speak for the next year or a total detailed roads programme? My answer is very simple to that, Mr. Chairman. We have priority items, we have a number of priority items going from maybe one to six, one to three, one to ten in various districts of the province and various regions of the province. We are not stuck for projects. I come in here and request approval or the Minister of Finance, request approval of funds for my department and other departments.

Insofar as my department is concerned we are requesting a lump sum of money. I am sure it is broken down into detail. It matters not, Mr. Chairman, insofar as the debate in the House or approving of that money. So whether or not I am in a position to say that project 'A' or project 'B' is going to be carried out, if project 'A' which is the top priority is not carried out then project 'B' will. The money will be

spent, the important thing is that as long as the money is put to good use.

So that is the only and most logical conclusion that one could come to with regards to the query as made by the honourable member.

With regards to the matter raised by him, in connection with his own district and the general area of the Great Northern Peninsula, I can indeed sympathize with him in regards to the road conditions. I do not hesitate to say so. This administration certainly realizes in no small way the road conditions and the general situation with regards to roads in that area, and the need to improve the situation, Mr. Chairman, the great need to have those roads done.

Now I have to say to my honourable friend, he accuses me of being inconsistent. There again I have to say to him now that he too is being inconsistent because while admittedly there is a great case to be put forward for a great infusion of provincial funds into the Great Northern Peninsula, however, Mr. Chairman, how could I as minister justify or indeed this administration justify such a large infusion of provincial funds to do the road in the Great Northern Peninsula and bring it up to the kind of standards we want and leave the people of the Town of Burgeo go without even a road link or the people of any other community go without a road link?

Mr. Chairman, I am sure my honourable friend will be the first to agree that that priority would be of greater or would take greater place than the construction of a road, indeed very often, Mr. Chairman, I think than the paving of a road. As my honourable friend knows quite well, it is not very easy to convince the people of the province in various places that they cannot have a bit of pavement because there is not a road to a given town or community which in effect will probably

probably take two or three years to do anything. So we try to do the best we can to satisfy everyone, to spend the money where, in our view, it is required and which serve the greatest number of people and at the same time press on with the projects which, in our view, are probably not as great a priority as the ones that we do. I cannot tell the honourable member in any detailed way at this time what is to be done in his area. I make no apologies for that. I am very, very sincere in that. I just cannot tell him. I can say to him that this administration is very much aware of the conditions, is very much aware of the continuing escalating costs of maintenance of that highway. I assure him that we are just as adamant and just as determined to have that road done as he is or the Leader of the Opposition or those honourable gentlemen who represent the area.

Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that we do have a plan to continue to put as much money as we can of provincial funds into the Great Northern Peninsula Area in an effort to improve the road conditions, in an effort to bring them up to a reasonable standard. There are areas in that general area as well, Mr. Chairman, where there is not a road. A little while ago I talked with the Leader of the Opposition and a delegation with regard to one particular area. How could I justify a mass expenditure of funds just to upgrade a road, bring it up to a better standard and turn my back on the people who in fact had no road. Those are some of the problems that my department has to face and some of the problems that this government have to face.

Mr. Chairman, the only other thing I can say to my honourable friend is that just as soon as I can pin down what is going to be done in his district, I will be more than happy and I will not hesitate to tell him. I certainly will not. I would suggest that we continue on with any other questions that the honourable member may have. If he should have other questions on this particular heading, I shall do my best to answer them.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, there are just two more points. I would like to remind the minister that there is a very strong feeling in the district that they are being discriminated against. I can table a number

of letters if the Hon. House Leader would like for me to do that, to let him know that I am not just talking off the top of my head. Of course, the Hon. House Leader would know an awful lot about the Great Northern Peninsula. Mr. Chairman, there is a feeling that there is discrimination with respect to highway construction. All one has to do is to drive up the Great Northern Peninsula and see the amount of work going on north of Port au Choix and in the area of Port au Choix. This is largely as a result of a federal/provincial agreement. I just simply make this one last request of the minister in the consideration of his estimates this year and in view of the fact that there is a fair amount of work going on south of Port au Choix as a result of a federal/provincial agreement and the national park and what have you. Mr. Chairman, would the minister mind spending a little bit of money over the border, north of the border, north of Port au Choix, to try to do something with respect to road improvements? It is a simple request, Sir.

Sir, another thing is that when he is going to the Minister of Finance to get some money for road construction, when the Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications goes to the Minister of Finance, would he remind him of a promise that he made during the 1969 Leadership Campaign, 1968, 1969, right in the Northern Peninsula areas. I was at some of those very meetings when the Minister of Finance, who was seeking the Liberal Leadership at that time, said that if he ever became leader of the Liberal Party, the Great Northern Peninsula Highway paving would be of top priority for him as leader. Probably the Hon. Minister of Transportation could just remind the Hon. Minister of Finance of these public statements that he did make during 1968-1969.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one thing in response to my honourable friend and that is: Let me assure him (I do not think the statement can go without comment) there is no deliberate discrimination on the part of his area compared to any other area. Far be it for this government to be guilty of blatant discrimination. We had some samples of

that, Mr. Chairman, and we are not about to involve ourselves in it. Mr. Chairman, I have the honour of representing a district which can show some real evidence of the kind of neglect maybe that the honourable member is talking about, for more than twenty years, maybe not in highways, but certainly in other areas which are now receiving attention.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to my honourable friend, my colleague, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, I cannot help it, Mr. Chairman, if my honourable colleague is more forceful in behalf of his district than I can be on behalf of some others.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, on the one hand, the Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications says that there is no deliberate discrimination on his part or on the part of the government as far as work is concerned and then he turns around and talks about the forcefulness of the Hon. Member for St. Barbe South. Now, Sir, I do not care who is more forceful and who has more influence in this honourable House or in government or in cabinet or anywhere else but when 843 people put their signatures on a petition asking for fairness and equality for the construction of the Great Northern Peninsula Highway and the paving of it, equally distributed throughout the Great Northern Peninsula, it is not a matter of who is more forceful, the Member for St. Barbe South or the Member for St. Barbe North, it is a matter of whether this administration is listening to the people of this province. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the present administration is not listening to the people of the Great Northern Peninsula.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask another question: Exactly what influence did the Hon. Member for St. Barbe South have on the federal/provincial agreement, the special areas agreement that was signed between the previous Liberal Administration and the Federal Liberal Government in Ottawa? What influence did the Hon. Member for St. Barbe South have on that project?

Now the Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications is once again, Sir, inconsistent and contradictory. Sir, he says that there is no discrimination and in the same breath the Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications starts talking about the forcefulness or the influence or the impact of the

honourable the member for St. Barbe South. Sir, he is talking out of both sides of his face, avoiding the question again, Sir, a simple question. What attention has the honourable minister paid to this great petition, one of the largest petitions ever presented before this House? What attention has the government, has his department, has the minister paid to this petition? No answer, Sir, avoiding the strafe. Then he sneakily starts talking about the influence of the honourable the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Sir, I have a half a mind to go on the radio and television and repeat the statements of the honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications and let the people of the Great Northern Peninsula decide whether this represents discrimination or not. I would submit, Sir, that the honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications in the future attempt to answer the questions sincerely and honestly and not try to suggest that one member is more influential than another. If indeed, Sir, one member were not as influential as another or as forcible as another which is ridiculous anyway, if that were the case, Sir, it is the responsibility of this government in all fairness to make sure that the people who are being represented by such a weak, puny member get fair treatment.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. STAGG): Order, please! Order, please!

The honourable member with words "weak" and "puny" - he is referring to himself, I see.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I guess so.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I gladly withdraw that and state the exact opposite.

Mr. Chairman, I was simply saying that if the people of St. Barbe North are victimized by their poor, weak puny ineffective weakling, then surely it is the responsibility of this government as defender of all to ensure that poor old St. Barbe North is taken care of by this great administration, in spite of their unfortunate situation with respect to their member at the present time.

Of course, Sir, I am joking but I was dead serious when I was trying

to extract from the minister some indication of what the honourable minister is prepared to do for St. Barbe North in the year. We still do not have an answer and neither does the member for White Bay North. We have reached an impasse. We will give up in the House, Sir, during the interim supply, because we have reached an impasse. We will continue to battle during the main estimates and we will continue to battle by other media.

MR. HICKEY: MR. Chairman, I will be glad to move the passing of Head (XVII)

Before it passes, I just want to - my honourable friend apparently could not take a bit of humour. He took me more than serious when I made the remark with regards to my colleague. I was taking from his text not mine. He is the one who suggested discrimination, not I. I assured him there was no discrimination. If there were discrimination of intent, I merely stated in a humorous way, it must be the forcefulness of my colleague. The honourable member took me serious.

I will be more than happy to correct that. This is certainly not the way it was intended. The honourable member, I would not want him to go away with that impression. I am sorry that he chooses not to believe me, casts doubt on the statements that I made in regard to whether or not they are honest. I assure him they are. As regards to what the statements I have made today, as to whether or not they are honest, (He said he wanted honest statements from me.) I have given him honest statements, Mr. Chairman, all I am able to give him. That is all one can do. I would be happy to move that the vote pass.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, first of all I can only come to the support of my colleague from St. Barbe North when he stresses the need for highway improvements in that area. I know certainly at least as much about that great Northern Peninsula as the honourable the government House Leader does. That was my point for a couple of years, but it is beyond the overpass, for the information of the honourable House Leader.

I can only come to the support of my colleague though because he does make an excellent point and a point that needs to be taken up particularly

when it relates to the St. Barbe Highway. I do not care - not that I do not care but it is useless, Mr. Chairman, to care about how long the neglect has gone on either in St. John's East Extern or in St. Barbe North but if there be neglect at present that could be avoided, that is the real sin that we will have to answer for here, not what could have been.

He reminded the Minister of Transportation of the promises that had been made by the present Minister of Finance if he had become the Leader of the Liberal Party. Well, of course, therein, Mr. Chairman, lies the problem. He is not Leader of the Liberal Party. He did wind up leader of the other party. They will not give him the title but he is in effect the leader and therein lies the difference. Were he the Leader of the Liberal Party, I believe at this time these road improvements -

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. STAGG): Order, please!

The honourable member is drawn to the rule of relevancy.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to finish that statement and then if you could rule on irrelevancy.

I was going to say that if he were Leader of the Liberal Party, I believe those road improvements at St. Barbe North would be done or being done at this particular time.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is irrelevant.

MR. ROBERTS: How about calling a quorum.

MR. SIMMONS: I would say even, Mr. Chairman, with him as Leader of the Liberal Party, God forbid! the road improvements would be done.

Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of things I would like to say on the interim supply as it affects this department and then I have a couple of questions I would like to direct to the minister responsible.

I should like first to just make a comment or two on some of the exchanges, not the exchanges as such but the essence of the exchanges between him and the member for St. Barbe North in so far as they affect government planning and programmes. I quite agree with the minister that

it is not possible to say every inch of road, to identify every inch of road that is going to be paved or upgraded or built this year.

I can see the dilemma. It will depend on how much money is subsequently voted when the estimates come before us. It will depend on how cost escalation in the road construction business eats into the amount that the minister has available for these purposes. I can understand all that.

I cannot follow the argument, Mr. Chairman, that because of these reasons that no indications

can be given. I believe the least the minister can do is at least indicate what the areas of emphasis will be. Will the emphases this year be on local roads? Will they be on access roads? Will they be on major arteries to the province? Will the emphasis be on paving as opposed to upgrading or on upgrading as opposed to paving?

Surely at this point, the end of March, government has some idea, with the construction season so nearly upon us, government has some firm ideas as to what the areas of emphasis will be. I would ask the minister, when I am through my comments, if he would indicate to the committee what the areas of emphasis will be this year, and we will leave it to a subsequent time to raise the matter which my colleague has raised as to the actual projects to be undertaken.

He might also in indicating areas of emphasis, indicate areas of emphasis in terms of geography, in terms of the parts of the province to be given emphasis this year in terms of road construction and road upgrading.

I am rather concerned about the comment that the minister makes that it is not in the best interest of the province. Well that is always a decision for government to make as to what is not in the best interest but it is an umbrella that can be taken advantage of at times. If we are going to get to the point where the whole gambit of highways programmes is not in the best interest for us to know, I think we are easing slowly but surely into the realm of the, how shall I say, the benevolent autocracy, where people decide what is best for people. I would say it is the people of Newfoundland who should decide what is best for them.

I can appreciate the dilemma, the complications that might set in if, with improper timing, some details of the government's plans in terms of highway construction became prematurely known. We are not asking for that, Mr. Chairman. We are asking that we,

as elected legislators, be given as fair an indication as government can, as complete an indication. Without upsetting apple carts and without stacking the cards against the people of Newfoundland, give us as fair an indication as possible, as complete a one as to what is going to be done.

I hear him say again and again, "My staff told me." Now he uses it quite in context at times and quite properly when he is talking about details of the administration of his department and of course as a good minister he is learning to use his staff quite well, to look to them for the details of the ongoing administration of the department. But if he use that as he did once when he was addressing an answer to my honourable colleague from St. Barbe North, to explain what happened in Hermitage District last fall where, "My staff told me in June what was going to be done," I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if the staff of the Department of Highways have that kind of authority, we look for a new staff for the department.

MR. WM. ROWE: No, a new minister.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the difference between me and my colleague for White Bay South. I would not say that kind of a -

MR. THOMS: A blunt thing.

MR. SIMMONS: I would not say that kind of thing.

MR. THOMS: He would not be so blunt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The honourable member for White Bay South is speaking from outside the chamber, half outside, half inside the chamber. It must be just a slip of mind.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, what I was really saying was that I was rather excited last June and July and August and September when I heard the plans for various parts of the district that I was contemplating seeking the Liberal nomination to represent and when the announcements came out I was quite encouraged, encouraged for a couple of reasons: (1) that the impending by-election was giving to that district some benefits which it could never have gotten with a member, whether Liberal or P.C. and the record shows that of course,

that during the period of the P.C. incumbency there, these things were not done and were not announced. I was encouraged by that reason.

I was encouraged also because as I aspired to be the member, which subsequently I have become, that the more that was done the less would have to be done after. Now, Mr. Chairman, on that subject the minister has explained and I appreciate this information, has explained that the reason this got into the public record and whether it is the "P.C. Times" or the "Gazette" or The "Evening Telegram", I do not get too hung up on that. I read some significance into it but that is for another time.

The fact that it is in the public print is what is important. Things like the upgrading and paving of the remaining thirty miles of the Bay D'Espoir Highway, the paving of roads from Hermitage, Seal Cove, Sandyville and Harbour Breton to connect with the Bay D'Espoir Highway. The construction of more access roads to develop the forestry potential, a large forestry road development in the Conne River, Milltown Area, the construction of a new bridge in Conne River as well as the paving of local roads in the community, the construction of a causeway and bridge across Conne River, improvements to all local roads in the communities in the district, all local roads in the communities in the district, that is in Francois and MacCallum and Pass Island and Seal Cove and Sandyville and Furby's Cove and Hermitage and Gaultois and Harbour Breton and Conne River and Burnt Woods and Morrisville and Milltown, the Head of Bay D'Espoir, St. Joseph's, St. Veronica's, Swanger Cove, St. Alban's, every one of those communities, the improvement of all local roads in the communities in the district.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I am coming back to these. By the way, Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the Minister of Fisheries. I should tell you a little story, which is very much on the subject I assure you, of him getting aboard an aircraft during the - that would be politics, I will not say during what, but in early November, 1973, got aboard an aircraft. He was

going to my district, over the roads in my district, not my district at that time mind you, although I had some designs on it, but he ran into a friend of mine and he indeed, and he is the gentleman now who is mentioned. I missed two communities so I shall come back to these

in a minute. But I will tell you about another community in the district which needs some road improvements. The Minister of Transportation has already mentioned it and I will mention it because the Minister of Fisheries who showed particular concern for this. He did it in a rather offhand comment to my friend who was on the aircraft. Calling him by name he said, knowing of course that my friend was involved with me in the by-election, said, "Where are you going? Down to Burgeo?" The poor fellow of course thought that Burgeo was somehow in the District of Hermitage.

Well road improvements are needed theretoo but since he is the expert on what communities are in my district, let him notice that (1) the Minister of Transportation has already indicated he is concerned about the road situation in Burgeo; and (2) Let him note for the record that Burgeo is not in Hermitage District.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may continue this list of plans, labelled future plans of the Progressive Conservative Government. I have read most of them. I have mentioned improvements to all local roads in the communities in the district. "Finally a continuing programme of assistance to local communities in their own road-upgrading and paving programmes."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I took the time of the committee to read that because I believe when you put these, not promises, not possibilities, not conjecturings, nothing but plans, when you put these plans next to a statement which the Minister of Transportation made a few moments ago in response to some comments made by my colleague for St. Barbe North, you will realize why I as the Member for Hermitage District can take particular delight this afternoon, because the minister said and I may paraphrase him somewhat. I am not able to quote him word for word. The minister said, in essence of course, his department does not have detailed plans of everything but when it it nailed down to a plan, to a particular highway, to a particular pavement, to a particular project, a particular bridge or a causeway then at that time once it is decided not when it is still in the maybe stage or when it is still in

that area of doubt where it might be done or it might not be done, depending on the equipment available or the contractors available but when it is quite firm, then it becomes announced.

Mr. Chairman, I will give the opportunity to the Minister of Transportation to correct that paraphrase but that is the way I heard him. That only when there are firm plans does it get announced.

Now when I saw this first, Mr. Chairman, it was in a party publication, "The Progressive Conservative Times"; and you know, I not only as a candidate in the election but as a public person, a member of the public, I took it for what it was worth. I took it like a grain of salt, like you would anything you read in any party publication during an election time.

But today to come here and hear the Minister of Transportation confirm that these indeed are hard, fast, committed plans, I take great delight from that. The first item, the upgrading and paving of the remaining thirty miles of the Bay D'Espoir Highway: Well tenders were called this week for the upgrading of twenty miles of that remaining - well twenty-eight rather than thirty. So it does leave eight miles which have not been tendered for. I am going to ask the minister subsequently whether he will indicate to me or take it upon himself to find the answer as soon as he can, as to what the plans are for that eight miles which remain outside of the thirty, the twenty-eight which have been called under tender.

Now the plans mentioned here also call for the paving of that. Well, of course, you have to have it upgraded first but I take delight as the member for the district, from what has happened here this afternoon, because I know that paving is going to be done. I know its a harder - I hate to play my district against St. Barbe North but I know from what has gone on here this afternoon that it is a harder, firmer plan than exists for the St. Barbe North Highway. If I can read into what has happened here this afternoon, I know that the Bay D'Espoir Highway is a firm plan of this government to pave it and upgrade it.

One could go further, Mr. Chairman, and say that that obviously does not refer to five years from now or two years from now because

given the concerns that the minister so legitimately expressed - How could you know whether contractors would be available? How could you know about the cost involved and how could you budget for them? - given those concerns, quite legitimately, obviously these plans are not plans projected for the next five or six years. These must be fairly immediate plans. They have to be immediate plans for government to know they are going to be able to pave that, given the context to what the minister has said to us this afternoon.

So I take a particular delight, I take an awful lot of delight from the good news that the roads, not in Hermitage, these are done. Well they are half done. Another question I will have for the minister is what plans there are to put the second top, to put the top on the pavement in those communities. The first layer, the preliminary layer was laid in late November, in Harbour Breton, Seal Cove, Hermitage and Sandyville and the road between Hermitage and Sandyville, a mile and a-half or two miles, the first preliminary surface was laid and of course it is customary, it is advisable if you want these things to stand up, to lay top layer soon after. Well the weather caught up - now it is going to be spring again pretty soon, so I hope to have the indication that this top is going to be laid early in the spring. That is another one of my questions which I will come back to.

But this point here, the second point in this programme, does not talk about the roads in these communities but the roads from Hermitage, Seal Cove, Sandyville and Harbour Breton to connect with the Bay D'Espoir Highway. Now that is a lot of road, a lot of road, about seventy miles of it altogether. I am delighted that I have had this confirmed this afternoon. That is a hard, fast, firm plan which I shall pursue.

"The construction of more access roads to develop the forestry potential." Well I do not know exactly where that is going to be. I am presuming it is in Hermitage District because the authority being quoted here is, one Mr. Meade said, so and so, so and so and so and so; so I presume that it means in Hermitage District. Now I do not know where they are going to be constructed, I have not seen any master plan.

I am just going to make sure that there are more. I cannot hold the government to very much here. I know what there is there now in terms of access roads. After a given period of time I am just going to see to it that there is more than there is right now. It is a fairly general way to have to proceed but this was fairly general wording here, I think you will agree.

Mr. Chairman, a large forestry road development in the Conne River-Milltown Area: Well I know there is no such road there now so I will keep my eyes open and my ears open and see to it that it is begun, if I can at all, not only the promises here (that is wrong) the plan is here, Mr. Chairman. The plan is here so I shall look forward with anticipation.

The construction of a new bridge in Conne River: Anybody who has been to Conne River at all, Mr. Chairman, will know that here is a place where a new bridge is needed pretty badly. Indeed, it was only three or four weeks ago that one of the employees of the federal programme, the Local Employment Assistance Programme, one of the employees fell over that bridge because the rail gave away, and he has been since sporting a lame arm. That alone is evidence that perhaps the bridge needs some replacement. More evidence, of course, is that about two-thirds of the children who live in the community

cross that bridge to get to the school in the morning, at noon, afternoon and back in the evening, four times a day. I am pleased to see that that is part of the plan, the hard, fast, firm plan not the guesswork, not the possibility, if there is enough money. This is committed. This is committed, Mr. Chairman.

The construction of a causeway and bridge across Conne River: Mr. Chairman, this is the most interesting one of all. The Eastern Road Builders had a contract on the road that goes from the Morrisville Road down to the Conne Barasway. The impression was abroad, now I do not know who whispered it. Far be it from me to suggest that it was a deliberate whispering, but I only know that the people of Conne River had the distinct impression, which I could not dissuade them from nor did I want to dissuade them from this impression, except that I knew that it was not true. I have it on an authority which I will quote you in a minute, I knew it was not true but they were of the distinct impression that the causeway was committed, that the causeway was going ahead and that what Eastern Road Builders were doing there in late November was the obvious first steps to putting the causeway in.

I will tell you what Eastern Road Builders were doing. They were removing some surplus rock from a blasting area along the road which they were building, which was under contract. As part of their contract they were asked to deposit the surplus rock which they were blasting away, instead of just throwing it anywhere they were asked to deposit it down in the Barasway, right where the causeway is going to go. That is a bit of sensible planning. It is a bit of fill, that otherwise you will not need, when the time for the causeway comes. Of course you know the impression it was giving. It was giving the impression that it was gung ho! That everything was full-speed ahead for this causeway.

If you live on the other side and can look down into the Barasway, the gap is so wide and you see that the fill is pushed out, already, one-third of that way, your mathematics tells you that

by God! she is two-thirds the way across! I even had one fellow bet with me that she would be across before election day, at one point. He did not realize the intricacies involved in engineering and that kind of thing but he was so optimistic about it that it was a question of days and it was all going to be done.

Mr. Chairman, it is not done yet and I will tell you a couple of reasons why it is not done. Government, any government and certainly this government have limitations on their resources and if they can tap Ottawa for some funds for the Conne Causeway I would certainly recommend they do so. I say recommend, Mr. Chairman, because the impression is also abroad and for different reasons as you will see in a minute, that the government are going to take this one on all by themselves. They are not even going to bother to ask Ottawa to get involved in it. Where the government got that kind of money all of a sudden I do not know.

Here is a programme between Ottawa and the province whereby they can draw on a substantial amount of the money involved here to build a causeway. Do you believe, Mr. Chairman that while all this activity was going on last November with the blasted rock being dropped into the Barasway and while the impressions were clearly abroad and while we have in this publication here a hard, firm plan saying that there would be a causeway constructed across Conne River, do you believe that as of this day, or let me say as of yesterday, I have not checked today, as of yesterday, March 27, the Province of Newfoundland has not even applied to Ottawa for the funds to put this causeway across?

Mr. Chairman, I can read things into that but the kindest thing to read into it, the kindest thing is that the government intend to go it alone on this one. I am not particularly concerned on that except in one respect and that is, if government are going to spend provincial money here where they could get some federal money, it is going to mean less provincial money left for some other roads that I would like to tell the minister about. Of course I am

sure, Mr. Chairman, you get the real point.

To go on, it mentions improvements to all local roads. That is fairly self-explanatory and one I shall be pursuing in time. It is good to see it in the record as part of the hard, firm, fast plans of this government. "A continuing programme of assistance to local communities in their own road upgrading and paving programmes." I am going to draw on that particular plan, Mr. Chairman, very soon because the Town of Harbour Breton in particular is looking for the sum of \$84,000 to assist it with upgrading of some of the secondary roads in the community. Indeed, I would think they would have a pretty good chance to get that kind of money. I am told they would, they would have a pretty good chance to get it under the Winter Capital Works Programme, but there is a problem there, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the problem there, of course, is that that fund which was supposed to be good until 1975, or some period, has been more than used up already. As the Member for Green Bay points out, a large part of that has to do with the fact that his colleagues are finding that the demand is far exceeding the supply.

Mr. Chairman, first of all let me reiterate that there is nothing that delights me more than the news I have had today that these are firm plans of the government. I have had that news. It is the only thing that I can properly read into what the minister said in response to the comments put by my colleague for St. Barbe North.

Mr. Chairman, I share some of the misgivings of the Member for St. Barbe North concerning this whole matter. I would like to have some clarification whether now or during the estimates. The Minister of Transportation suggested or wondered whether it was his honesty or his sincerity. Well, let me say in sincerity that from what I know of him I would genuinely not question either his honesty or his sincerity. I do not think, as I saw the exchange

take place, I do not think that is the problem at all. I would not question his honesty, I would not question his sincerity as I just have no reason to do so. I would, Mr. Chairman, seriously question his logic. I would seriously question the thoroughness of his department's planning, because as I sat here and watched the exchange between him and the Member for St. Barbe North that is what most clearly came through to me.

It may be that the honourable minister and I just have different viewpoints but to me it is no logic at all to say we want "X" million, we want (I do not have the breakdown for a particular part of the, I did not take it down when he called it out) in toto \$11,100,000. Now, Mr. Chairman, he did not say in round figures \$10 million or \$20 million, he has it nailed right down to within \$100,000 -

\$11,100,000. Yet we are told that while the pencils were sharpened and while that is the actual amount, as near as it can be estimated, as near as it can be projected, while that is the actual amount that is expected to be needed during the next couple of months, while we are told that, we are also told that government do not have firm plans in terms of which road is going to be upgraded, which part of it, how many miles, etc. Mr. Chairman, I find that hard to believe not that I question the minister's honesty. No. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that he intended to say that and I would hope that if there are plans, detailed plans of what is going to be done with this money, what roads are going to be upgraded, if there are plans and he cannot tell us, let him at least tell us the reason why he cannot tell us.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the plans are pretty far advanced for the expenditure of that money. I would like to know, as a member of this House, where the money is going to be spent. The overall issue, of course, is the one that I learned so much about in listening to spokesmen for the government's side, a big word called "priority." The minister himself suggested that he had some painful decisions to make, whether the money should go to the Great Northern Peninsula or to Burgeo or to whatever other area of the province. That is fair ball. It is not only fair ball, Mr. Chairman, but that is the whole point of what we are asking on this side: What are the priorities? If the government know them - if the government insist on operating this way - it is a very good way to operate, I should certainly advise it if I were in government that we make hard decisions, as painful as they may be, and having made the decision to spend the money there; but that presumes a decision and that is our question. Where is the money going to be spent?

Mr. Chairman, again I am willing to buy that the minister cannot give us every last detail but I repeat the points that I made at the beginning of my comments that I would ask the minister if he would give at this time some indication of the areas of emphasis, upgrading verses paving, what parts of the province, whether the emphasis is going

to be on major arteries across the interior or on local roads or what the kind of balance is going to be? That is my first question to the honourable minister, if he could indicate that so far as he is able at this time.

Mr. Chairman, the second question, I mentioned just now, I will just repeat it and that is the status of the eight miles of the Bay D'Espoir Highway, the section between Mile 63 and Mile 71, the last remaining gap that is not referred to in the latest tender call, if the government intend to do something about that this year or whether that depends on the availability of money or what? That is two I would like to put to him and there are a couple of others after.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I did not interrupt my honourable friend while he was speaking but there were a couple of occasions when I felt that I should have but because of the fact that he is the newest member of the House, I felt he deserved the courtesy to continue.

It is my view, Mr. Chairman, that we are debating approximately two months of supply. However, the debate up to now, from the beginning actually, has centred around the estimates of my department as opposed to supplementary supply. I, therefore, feel that this kind of debate from here on in certainly is not in order. I will attempt to answer the honourable gentleman's questions.

First of all, let me say that the remarks with regard to my staff, I want to make clear that it is my opinion and the opinion of the government that we have in my department a competent group of people. I assure my honourable friend that if he got the impression that my staff were running the department, I assure him that that is not so. When I said that my staff informed me last June as to what could be done in the Hermitage District, that is exactly what I meant, what could be done. There had been certain statements made by my predecessor with regard to the people of the Hermitage District and we were determined to live up to these commitments and I inquired of my staff as to whether or not this work could be done during the present

construction season. I was informed that it would be late but in fact it would be. That brought a response from my friend the Member for White Bay South, not to get rid of the staff but to get rid of the minister. While he had said something else, as well, I can only react to that in a way that sometimes my most learned friends are indeed my most uneducated friends.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot, I repeat, I think I have said this about fifty times, I cannot give a detailed statement as to what my department is going to do during the coming year. It certainly would be improper as far as I am concerned to attempt and to make an overall statement. If I cannot give a detailed one, I do not see any point in giving a general statement. However, we are debating, Mr. Chairman, \$11,100,000 and that does not cover the programme for the coming year. I stated yesterday and I will state again right now that this money covers on-going projects carried over from last year's construction and certain projects that tenders are being called for and this is what this money is for. It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that debate beyond that or outside that scope certainly should not be permitted. It is my view that we seem to be getting into a debate of the estimates generally of my department and this is not what is before the House.

Mr. Chairman, I could give the honourable gentleman more information or some details with regard to some of the projects that this money will be used for, if that is what he wants. I am not sure of how much value that is. He can certainly take my word for it that the bulk of this money is to cover expenses incurred by contractors over the next two months on the on-going projects and the projects which are having tenders called for now, DREE projects and so on. With regard to the question, probably the most important one as far as he is concerned, about the additional eight miles or the remaining eight miles of the Bay d'Espoir Highway, I can only say to him that I am not in a position to give him any

firm answers to what is to be done. I can assure him that we are certainly aware of the desperate state of that road at certain times during the year and we will make every effort to do our best, as we have in the past, to maintain it and to keep it up to as high a standard as we can. I cannot say to him that any further work will be done. I am not in the position to do so. If and when I do get a firm commitment one way or the other as regards to the availability of funds, then I will be glad to inform him.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, first of all thanks to the minister. As he says, I am the newest fellow here and it is quite understandable if I show my eagerness by wanting to debate some things that are perhaps more properly debated later. If so, I will live and learn. I will try my best anyway.

I think though if I might have digressed into what could more properly be covered later in estimates, I think while that is probably true, I would also say that the schedule, the list that the member for St. Barbe and I have been calling for, if that list of expenditures is included in the \$11.1 million, I think that is a legitimate question. If the minister is unable to give it now, well, of course, then we will get it subsequently though I personally fail to see how the figure of \$11.1 million could be arrived at if somebody did not sit down with a pencil and add it up. I would like to know what parts were involved to get the total.

Mr. Chairman, certainly one of the dangers in this House when someone says what I said or what another member said, the paraphrase often suffer something in the translation. At no time did I suggest or imply that the minister's staff is not competent. Indeed my contacts with his staff is that they are quite competent. Indeed my whole suggestion was that they might be too competent. That was the point of my question.

Of course, just for the record, let me say that I am getting lots of co-operation from the members of his staff as I would expect to, but just for the record I wanted to say that I am getting it.

Two or three other quick points, Mr. Chairman. I neglected to phrase this one as a question before I sat down. I shall do so now. I referred to the pavement in Hermitage, Seal Cove, Sandyville and Harbour Breton and I wanted to know - perhaps the minister could take the question and get the answer if he should not have it right now. I wanted to know whether in the monies here there are plans to put the pavement top on the first surface in those four communities.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, with regards to that matter I can tell the honourable member that despite what might have been said during the time of the paving, we are experimenting in terms of paving roads, town roads or short stretches of roads in areas such as this. We have been watching the areas that were paved, very closely. We are certainly interested in determining just how it holds up and so on. I can tell him that there are not any plans formulated at this time to put an additional coat on those roads. It will depend on how they stand up and so on and because here again we are talking about the expenditure of funds and we are trying to do as much as we can throughout the province, therefore, we make an effort every now and then to test out this kind of approach and that kind of approach. This is the real situation with regards to the paving in Hermitage District.

While I am on my feet I might correct something the honourable member said. He probably said it in the form of a question with regards to the Conne River bridge and the causeway. He is of the opinion that no representation has been made to Ottawa with regards to cost sharing and I can assure him that - he is probably thinking in terms of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, if that be so then I can certainly say that there has been representation to the Government of Canada that might not have gotten to the office of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion as yet. Certainly the whole matter of a causeway and bridge across the Conne River has been discussed at the federal level, correspondence certainly to support this for quite a number of months.

I want to correct my honourable friend or certainly give him the

information and assure him that it is not the intent of the province to proceed on this project on a purely provincial basis but contrary to that on a federal-provincial basis.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister for the information. One question now that is not at all related to the points that I have been pursuing but certainly related to the interim supply matter: The road through New Melbourne, not the road through New Melbourne, Trinity Bay but the other road that is going through New Melbourne, Trinity Bay - I understand it is a highways project. There has been some controversy about it particularly in the community itself. I have received a couple of representations on the subject. Could the minister indicate just what the purpose of this road is? I understand it is a new gravel road

the effect of which will be to by-pass the community; the road will then be on the back of the community.

Mr. Dignity has returned to the House, Mr. Chairman, for the record. The road in New Melbourne, the new road I am talking about, would have the effect of by-passing the old road. Now I have heard something as to what the purpose of the road is, my question - as soon as I can get some water, Mr. Chairman, I will continue.

AN HON. MEMBER Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: No, I am not at all concerned about the whisperings. I am concerned about the loud, dignified mumblings, Mr. Chairman. That is unparliamentary, I found out yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, the road through New Melbourne, the new road that is being constructed behind the community, could the minister indicate what the purpose of the new road is?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I became aware of this situation just a couple of days ago, at least insofar as it being some sort of controversy. I want to personally visit the area and see the existing road for myself before arriving at a final decision. I can tell the honourable member that I have made the decision that nothing further will happen on that road until we reassess the situation.

The whole story seems to have developed because of two or three people at least, that is all I know of at the moment, who were opposing the building of that road. The purpose for building the road is to raise the standards of the road in that area, by-passing the community. It is the opinion of the engineering staff in my department that that section of road can be built cheaper than upgrade and make what we consider a safer road or a reasonably safer road than the existing one. For that reason property was acquired, certainly before my going into this department. This has been a project that has been on the go for some time.

The property was acquired to construct this road. My staff at that time, I am told, determined the situation with regards to the people of

New Melbourne and they found there certainly was not any opposition to it but in fact the people were to a great degree in favour of it. Now I have an indication that indeed that is not the case. I do not know if there has been a change of mind on the part of the people or if it is just a couple of individuals who are opposing the building of the road or just what the situation is.

However, no further action is to be taken on that project until I visit the area and until I determine at least just what the feelings of the people are.

MR. WM. ROWE: Next question, Sir, hopefully getting brief answers in reply: Is there any indication at all, Mr. Chairman, or can the minister give any indication to the House as to when the new DREE Special Highways Agreement might be signed between the government here and the government in Ottawa, number one.

Number two, these films that we see on television, so called safety films, are they paid for out of the minister's departmental votes, or some other department? If so, if they are paid out of his votes, what amounts of money have been paid for public relations work of any kind, this type or any other kind, to any companies and particularly George McLean, say last year, and what amounts are included in this \$11.1 million?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, the first question, the DREE agreement, as I understand it, is not signed obviously. Our proposals have been presented to the federal government. I cannot state in any definite way when the agreement will be signed. I am advised that it should be very, very soon. Certainly we hope it is very, very soon.

With regards to the advertising, the television advertising, Mr. Chairman, this matter was raised yesterday. I gave an answer then, I can only give the same answer today. One, no money in the amount that we are debating here today is included or no money of the total that we are debating here today will be used or is planned

to be used for advertising as such.

The only thing I can say is that there will be more detailed information available to the honourable member when the regular estimates of the department are being debated.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, at that time I will be asking the minister or somebody will be asking the minister how much was spent last year on public relations, advertising, monies to certain firms which were probably mentioned anyway and how much is intended to be spent on the main estimates.

One other point I would like to make before sitting down, Sir, then I am finished, When I have asked questions of the minister's department, and this is not only the minister's department, other departments as well, Municipal Affairs for example and other sort of line departments of that type, public service departments, you ask a question of an official or sometimes even the minister, we say, "Do you have any money to do such and such?" or "When will money become available to do such and such a project?" or "What projects will be

done in the District of White Bay South? Very often we will get an answer from officials and sometimes from the minister that we do not know until the budget is brought down. The usual old dodge. We used to sometimes resort to it too, if my memory serves me correctly. "Wait until the budget comes down then we will know." Then when the budget comes down and the main estimates come into the House, the minister gets up and says, "Well it is not in the public interest to divulge on what projects this money is going to be spent." That type of thing, Mr. Chairman, is probably typical of people who find themselves in highly responsible office or trying to have as pleasant a life as possible. They realize they can bring the roof down around their heads.

I would say to the minister that when the main estimates come through the House, come into the House, that all of us here on this side will be making certain queries as to what projects are going to be done in districts. We will be asking what money is going to be spent on what. I do not think it is fair now to press the minister since the minister has already given an answer that he does not know or does not have the information in front of him. When the main estimates come into the House, we will be asking him where money is going to be spent? What districts money is going to be spent in? What kind of projects are going to be commenced or resumed in the coming financial year?

I say to the minister, I, for one, as a member of this House, will not be satisfied with the answer that well, we cannot tell the public this because there is many a slip twixt cup and lip, that kind of an evasive answer. I say that we are entitled to that kind of information and we shall be pressing for it.

Once more I would say that the minister's estimates are likely to be treated or likely to go through the House a little more speedily if we get - obviously, this is not a threat or blackmail or anything else - if we get the information we request, then estimates are going to go through the House more quickly without any sort of bitterness or racket

or anything else. If we do not get the information, the reasonable information we request, (Mr. Chairman, I am not asking for superhuman efforts on the part of the minister but reasonable information) well then I think we are in for a rough time when the estimates come into the House in two or three weeks. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, before we do, I have one brief representation and one equally brief question I would like to make. The representation is in connection with the Northern Peninsula Highway and I do not intend to spark a lengthy debate on this because I think my position has been adequately canvased to say the least by my colleagues for St. Barbe North and Hermitage.

I would like merely to place on the record of the committee the strong feeling and I have checked with all of the councils now in White Bay North and I understand it is a similar feeling in St. Barbe North, I have checked as well with, you know, leading citizens in the area, the strong feeling that the next priority on the Northern Peninsula road would be to start at St. Anthony and to rebuild and reconstruct and then to pave out towards, first of all, the junction running up to St. Lunaire and then on out towards the airstrip and the junction running up to Cook's Harbour.

The minister has been good enough to see a couple of delegations from my constituency and I have been with them. I think he is aware of the feeling. I merely like to say it publicly that I think it is the strong feeling of the people of all political persuasions in White Bay North that that is the road which most needs to be done. It serves them for school purposes, it serves them for hospital purposes, it serves them for economic purposes and also all the other reasons that people travel, that road is the road which they must travel.

That is the representation and I simply make it. I have made it before, I shall make it again. I look forward to having the minister join with me at the opening of the road. Whether he is the minister or not, he would be welcome to be there. I would like nothing better than to have him there as the minister, which means it must

be done in the next year or so.

The question I have, Sir, is with reference to a special fee which I understand is payable by people in Labrador, especially reduced fee for vehicle licences. It costs, it varies, it costs on the island \$20.00 and up, as I recall it, to licence a car or a truck. It varies, some of the big trucks are much more expensive. I understand it is \$5.00 on the Labrador, is that -

AN HON. MEMBER: Five dollars, six dollars and seven dollars.

MR. ROBERTS: Five dollars, six dollars and seven dollars again depending on the size of the vehicle. That applies to all of Labrador including the south coast, The Labrador South Area from L'Anse-au-Clair To Red Bay, that, in theory at least it is hooked into the provincial road network. That is correct is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that is fine.

The question I have for the minister is that I have had a representation from people in Burgeo. The letter is on the letterhead of the Town of Burgeo. It is signed by a gentleman, Mr. Leonard Matthews. Although Mr. Matthews is not a member of the council of Burgeo, I presume he is speaking in effect for the council. As I say the letter which I received a day or so ago is written on the Town of Burgeo letterhead.

The point of the letter, Sir, is that on February 4, Mr. Matthews conveyed to the minister, by registered mail, a petition. The petition was apparently signed by a number of vehicle owners in Burgeo. It does not say how many, but they have had no answer. I will just read the letter. I think it states that - the point of the petition is that Burgeo be granted the same five dollars, presumably six and seven dollars fee that applies to Labrador. I must say I think they have a good case. Burgeo, Harbour Deep - there are really very few other places left on this island which have no access by road outside of their community. There are apparently about twelve miles of roads available to the people in Burgeo.

MR. ROWE, W.N. There is a truck in Gaultois.

MR. ROBERTS: There is a truck in Gaultois that can go - well there are two trucks in Gaultois, are there not? Then there is the one that the gentleman for Trinity South had down there on rental but that is another story.

Let us broaden it. Any place that has no real access to the provincial road network, the point of the Burgeo one is that they be given the same consideration as has been given in Labrador. I think that is a very reasonable request and one which I would commend to the minister. Because if the purpose of the licence fee is merely to enable one to participate in a meaningful way in the development of the road network, if you are sitting in Burgeo, Mr. Chairman, and you pay your \$20.00 or \$25.00 fee whatever it is, and you can drive your car only from Burgeo up on the sands, on the road running out towards wherever it is going to run to, whenever it gets there, I think you would have a reasonable cause to make this request.

The people have made it. The letter which came to me, Sir, said, "However to this date no replies have been received from the honourable minister regarding this matter." The letter which included the petition

was posted by registered mail on February 4, 1974. "Our feelings are that the honourable minister has had sufficient time to acknowledge our letter and if the matter were being looked into by him, he should have had the courtesy to advise us of same.

"We do hereby request that you, as Leader of the Opposition, bring this matter to the minister's attention and that favourable results will be obtained."

I do honour that request, Sir, and I now bring it to the minister's attention and I do hope that favourable results will come out of it.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, before we carry, may I just say that I am very much aware of the petition. I am rather surprised to find that the gentleman states that he has not had an acknowledgement. To my knowledge, there has been a reply to that request. It was certainly not one of giving any decision but an acknowledgement that the petition was in fact received and that it would be given consideration and in due course he would hear from us again. I can further state that this is a matter which is not decided on in just five or ten minutes or what have you. Mr. Chairman, it involves a number of things and it also calls into question other areas of the province. There is consideration being given to the request. There is no final decision made as yet and the only thing I can offer is that as quickly as possible we will get the decision to the people of Burgeo. Indeed I will be very happy to check and find out just why the honourable gentleman, as he indicated, said that no reply was received.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, just for the information of the minister, the letter to me which got here the 28 March, which is today, was dated March 15. It is conceivable that between the time this letter was posted and the time it got to me, Mr. Matthews had received an answer. The minister should check into it because as of March 15 the gentleman had not received a reply and quite properly felt aggrieved.

On motion Item XVII - Transportation and Communications, carried.

HEAD VI - EDUCATION - \$33 million.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, it obviously comes as no surprise to honourable gentleman that there is a very large vote in Interim Supply, in the Department of Education. As honourable members will recall, last year's vote was approximately \$150 million and obviously the proportionate amount in interim is proportionate to the overall expenditures of departments, I just point that out because there is nothing unusual about it.

Mr. Chairman, what I intend to do is to go through, giving the amounts under the major headings. It is all very straightforward and it is for the regular services and expenditures of the Department of Education for approximately the first two months of the fiscal year which is still a part, of course, of the present academic year.

Out of the total of \$33 million, there is an amount of \$12.9 million in teachers' salaries, that is the payment to regular teachers in the schools throughout the province and would include as well institutional schools and various hospitals, the Vera Perlin School and all of the elementary and secondary schools throughout the province. There is an amount of \$1.6 million (these are rounded off to the nearest decimal) which is salaries in the public service of the Department of Education, the civil service salaries and the salaries of instructors in the district vocational schools throughout the province. There is an amount of \$750,000, under the heading of provision and distribution of school supplies, and ninety or ninety odd per cent of that would in fact be textbooks, many of which we have already ordered. I suppose invoices will be coming fairly soon for textbooks for the next academic year.

Mr. Chairman, there is an amount of \$2 million, operational grants, These are the grants paid to school boards throughout the province. There is an amount of \$1.6 million for the transportation of school children. There is an amount of \$1 million, grant-in-aid, to the College of Trades and Technology. There is an amount of \$300,000, the training and manpower programmes. These are the students in the various vocational schools, (all of this is current) Memorial University, grant-in-aid, \$3.8 million; College of Fisheries, grant-in-aid, \$600,000 and then there is a total of \$3.8 million which would include all of the other expenditures, all of the other subheads in the department, the operating expenses, i.e., the School for the Deaf, the Audio Visual Scholarship and Bursary Programme, various grants, the work of curriculum, the travelling of various consultants within the department and indeed all of the services, apart from those which I have already indicated with specific expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, the other two items, making up the total of \$33 million, would be under capital expenditure: The erection and equipment of schools, \$2.5 million. That as I recall it, is the same amount that was voted in Interim Supply last year and I think it is a fairly constant amount that is put in there. Under other capital, apart from the day school system, if you wish, there is \$2.1 million, and that would include vocational schools on capital expenditure and would also include equipment, such things as rentals by the Department of Education where we rent quite a number of classrooms or buildings across the province for adult classes

and related services and also for rental purchase which we pay on, I believe fourteen vocational schools. Those in the general headings are the way the expenditure is broken down.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I did not quite catch the minister's first statement in connection with the amount in Interim Supply of \$33 million for a two-month period and how this relates proportionately to the amount that will come forth in the main estimates.

I note that last year the main estimates provided, approximately now, \$150 million for education. If this \$33 million in Interim Supply represents an amount in proportion to what would be demonstrated in the main estimates we will have something like \$198 million provided in the main estimates for this year. At the outset, Sir, I would like to get some indication from the minister as to whether this \$33 million represents to any degree what the figure will be in terms of the main estimates for education. Just using some figures here I would expect that we could expect an amount of almost \$200 million for education, more specifically, \$198 million in the main estimates for education. Could the minister indicate whether this is a reasonable assumption or not?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I do not think to multiply it by six one could - if I did not correct the honourable gentleman it would be wrong. This is not meant with mathematical precision that you would - this amount is to enable the Department of Education to meet its expenditures and its commitments in general for a two month period. It could be for, you know, that it would be sufficient for two months, perhaps a number of weeks or a two and a-half months type of thing. There are some areas as well where a larger amount, let us say two-twelfths or one-sixth would have been allocated because it could well be that at that particular time of year a fair amount of expenditure under a certain subhead would be made.

It could well be, for example, that early in the year perhaps fifty or sixty per cent (I am just using a figure there) for

costs for text books might be paid because naturally, during the last months of a fiscal year there is very little expenditure in that area because they are all ordered and placed. They are placed early in the academic year and they are ordered, mostly ordered some months ago and invoices and bills could well come in. I think the usual procedure is that the majority of the expenditures there would probably be April or May, under normal circumstances.

It would not be mathematically accurate to multiply by six and say with precision that that is going to be the total estimate. That would not be the case in this department and I do not think that that would be the case in any department. It is a basic indication but mathematically I would not say that to multiply these by six you would have the total amounts for the various departments when the estimates are tabled.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that that is true because even if we made the assumption that we would get \$198 million for education this year, that would represent \$48 million over and above the amount that was expended last year unless the revised figures are substantially different. I would suggest to the committee, Mr. Chairman, that more than a \$48 million increase is necessary for expenditures in education this year in view of the difficulties that the school boards of this province find themselves in with respect to their debt on the capital accounts side and with respect to their debt on the operating side.

At this particular point in time, Mr. Chairman, I intend to reserve most of my main points for consideration during the main estimates of the Department of Education. However, there are a number of points that I would like to bring up. Number (1) I think I shall ask them one at a time in order to give the minister an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to answer specifically each one of the questions rather than going on to any great length.

One point I would like to bring up, Mr. Chairman, is this:

The third term at the university will soon be starting and I know that there are a great number of students who are interested in knowing exactly what the Student Aid Programme will be at the university as quickly as possible so that they can make plans to attend the third term. Of course there are a great number of persons who want to make their plans immediately for attending the university during the term starting in September.

The main question I want to ask the minister is this: What efforts have his department made over the past few months to formulate a Student-Aid Policy, not just for the university students themselves but to formulate a Student-Aid Policy, obviously in consultation with the federal authorities, so that students attending the vocational schools, the College of Trades and Technology, Adult Education Centers, the College of Fisheries and

any of the regional colleges that may or may not start within the near future and/or community colleges and/or extensions of the universities and whatever these institutions represent, what attempts, what efforts have the minister and his department officials made to formulate a student aid policy that would be fair and equitable to students attending all of these post-secondary institutions?

The one I left out was the university. I left that out deliberately for the simple reason that I have been accused in the past of being the member for Memorial University and "Mr. University" and this sort of a thing. Our main interest, Mr. Chairman, on this side of the House, is that students who leave the high schools in our province will go to the post-secondary educational institution of their choice, of their desire, to study at that particular place, not go to a particular institution simply because the student-aid policy is more beneficial to them.

I have spoken to thousands of students, Mr. Chairman - well, hundreds of students, Mr. Chairman - who have indicated to me that they were going to the College of Trades and Technology and/or the vocational schools for one simple reason, the period of time of study is not as great, the job opportunities are probably greater when they graduate from those. The most important reason is that the student-aid policy of that College of Trades and Technology or the vocational schools is far superior to that which exists at the university, and they really wanted to go to the university.

I would remind the minister that we have half the per capita attendance at our universities compared to other provinces of Canada. Now, you can find differences from province to province but of the national per capita average we have exactly one half. Sir, if there were ever a province that should have an open door policy as far as university education is concerned, I would suggest that it is this province, but not at the expense of students who wish to go to the College of Trades and Technology, Vocational schools, Fisheries College and what have you.

So, the major question is this, Mr. Chairman; what steps have the

government taken to ensure that there is an equitable formula established in student-aid for all students who wish to go to any type of post-secondary educational institution in this province? Has the minister been working on this? In particular is there any money in the interim supply bill here set aside for student-aid at the university for the upcoming third term? Has there been any change in the student-aid policy for university students for the third term?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now, Mr. Chairman, I will answer the last part of the question first while it is fresh in my mind. There is in the estimates, in the interim supply rather, in the interim supply an amount for student-aid for university students and also of course in the other post-secondary areas for provincial students. It is based essentially on all - I will put it this way and it answers the question the same way:

About two weeks ago the government received the brief or recommendations of President Morgan's Task Force established on student-aid. Some time before that, a few weeks before that, we received a brief from the C.S.U., the Council of Students' Union. We are studying both. The one of the university of course includes as membership, the C.S.U., the faculty of the university and people from provincial government. That is under active study. There are three or four sort of alternatives proposed in it. No final decision has been made with respect to any changes in the policy for student-aid. The matter is under study and certainly a decision will be made when the provincial budget is brought down.

With respect to the general area in which the honourable gentleman was speaking, that was, in a sense - I think I would be putting it correctly if I said what he was suggesting or hoping for was a parity or equality so that students in university and other institutions would have the same form of student-aid. Of course there is one area - I am sure he realizes this - where of course it is totally out of our control. That is the actual manpower students, because in these institutions in a sense there are two categories of students, basically there are. There are others too. There are people going there for probably adult classes.

Basically on what we are discussing now, there are two categories of students. One, manpower and the other provincial students. Now, the manpower students of course receive regular payments from the Federal Government Department of Manpower and whatever it is called -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, not our department, the federal department.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Immigration.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right, Manpower and - the gentleman is an egotist - Manpower and Immigration. These are very attractive payments, of course, from the federal government's point of view, from the Federal Department of Manpower's point of view. They regard this as a, you know, labour, totally labour-market related. These are people being prepared to enter or to re-enter the labour market. On the whole, I think the allowances they receive are quite competitive with the labour market. Of course, that is done totally without any consultation with us and is quite a different category.

There would be no way that we or I suppose any province would be able to match for provincial students in these institutions or for university students those kinds of payments. Of course, the vast majority of manpower students are married and have a number of dependents and the payments they get depend upon how many dependents they have. So, I do not think one will get parity with the manpower students and I do not imagine the honourable gentleman was probably referring to that but was thinking in terms of the provincial students.

Well, to the manpower students, you know there are numbers there who would or

they cannot be there for a period of over a year as I understand the manpower regulation. In many cases they are receiving perhaps five thousand plus per year or four thousand plus per year, depending upon the number of dependents they have. I certainly do not foresee that in the immediate future we shall be able to make that kind of out-and-out salaries, if you wish, available to university students or to other students in post-secondary areas.

In the area of provincial students in these institutions, and they are those who in most cases do not qualify for manpower for a number of technical reasons of manpower's own creation, manpower's own regulations, then there is a system, there is a schedule of payment to them which is, I understand, found by most of the students to be not quite adequate. One of the problems of course is, and nobody disputes the ideal of parity, one of the problems of course is that at the university the vast majority are going for full programmes, four year programmes, some for five year programmes, whereas in the other institutions the vast majority will be going for one year and there are some for two year and a very small percentage on the three year programmes. Certainly, the vast majority are on one year programmes.

This is a problem which is focused on and referred to actually in both submissions, that from the C.S.U. and that from the presidential, I think it is called the Memorial University Presidential Task Force Report on Student Aid or some such title. This is, especially with respect to provincial students and their position, these are the university students, this is an area that is focused upon and the fact that provincial students, regarded by many as a more (small 1) liberal allowance, are having difficulties. Of course, as I said, the problem is that most of them are there for one year, some for longer. All I can say, since we are still studying the two reports and the various alternatives proposed in them, is that we are aware of the problem and certainly government shall have a firm decision

when the budget is brought down with respect to the Student-Aid Programme for next year. Right now we are still in the process of examining it and as I say, we got that report about two weeks ago and as the honourable gentleman knows it is a very complex area and we are still examining it and studying it in order to come up with what we consider to be the best and fairest programme for all concerned within, obviously everything is within the financial capacity of the province.

I hope that answers the honourable gentleman's question.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Yes, Mr. Chairman, you know the main point that I was trying to make is this, is that really in a way of a positive suggestion from this side of the House that the minister give some very serious consideration with respect to formulating the Student-Aid Programme for all post-secondary institutions that have some degree of parity about it.

Now I would like to point out to the minister that I am not a complete fool and I do not suggest for one minute that parity or equality or fairness as far as the Student-Aid Programme is concerned; when you compare one institution to another, it does not necessarily require that equal amounts of money, dollar bills for allowances be paid out to students.

For example, if you had a good residential system for students at a university or at the College of Trades and Technology and these students were put up in these residences, free of cost, obviously whatever institution this would pertain to you would not have, you know this amount of money, the equivalent amount of money would not be passed over to students in the form of green cash or cool cash. There are all sorts of formulas that can be used.

What I am trying to say is that, well what we recommend on this side to the Hon. Minister of Education is that every effort be made by his department to formulate some sort of a programme. Another example, Sir, is if you have a programme in a university whereby students go out and work for one out of every three terms, say an internship programme where students are being employed and making money during their study period over three or four years, this would contribute towards parity or equality as far as the Student-Aid Programme is concerned.

However, if these same students at the end of two terms find that they are broke, number one, and secondly, cannot get a job in the labour market or anywhere else, they are in pretty hard straits. So equality of educational opportunity from one secondary institution to another can come about through other mechanisms other than passing

out salaries to students or allowances to students or loans to students.

I will just ask the minister if he would, you know, very obviously he has the expertise in his department and presumably they thought about these things ever before I brought them up - what we want to see on this side, Mr. Chairman, is action along these lines.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a second point that I would like to bring out: Do the various nursing schools come under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Education? The reason I raise the question is because looking at this chart in here on the task force that was set up by the university, I think all members can probably see without looking at the scale here that these lines up here represent the number of applications of people trying to get into nursing school and these lines down here represent the number of students who are accepted.

Anyway if the honourable House Leader knows anything about scales and charts, when you have lines up here and lines down there, there is a great difference between the number of people who are applying to get into nursing school and who are accepted in nursing school.

What I am saying is this, that the physical facilities made available for students hoping to pursue the nursing profession are sadly lacking. If this does not come under the minister's jurisdiction, I would end that particular question right here.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It does that. I suppose one can say that it makes sense, financial sense. The School of Nursing, for example, at the university, sends money to the university that is voted through this department but that is all. The other schools of nursing

the ones at the hospitals of course would come under the hospital and their liaison would be with the Department of Health.

MR. F. ROWE: Okay, Mr. Chairman, that answers that question.

I would like for the minister, again we are dealing with Interim Supply and I will not be getting into any great detail at this point, but I was kind of distressed over the minister's statements over the past few months with respect to the fact that his administration and his department are not going to go after any great deal of DREE money for the purpose of providing elementary, primary and secondary schools in our province. When you look at the amount that the government has made available, I believe \$120 million over the next twenty years for school construction, whereas the DEC has asked for \$132 million, over seven years, and then when you add on to that the amount that has been provided through DREE you get a tremendous gap between the amount of money that this present administration is willing to provide for school construction and that which is needed. The school boards are desperately in debt to the extent that the amount of money that they receive from the government can just barely service their debt.

Now I would like for the minister to indicate once and for all as to whether or not it is the plans of his department or government to try to as great a degree as possible to wipe out these capital debts so that the money that is provided to the school boards can be used for the purpose for which it was originally intended and that is for school construction. Number one - have the government ever considered a wipe-out of the school debts as far as capital debts are concerned, the capital side of the ledger? I think this would in itself, Sir, be a great step forward. Last year I recommended seriously, although the honourable the Minister of Finance did not take it quite so seriously, I recommended that this extra money that came to the province as a result of the modification of equalization grants, and for which the Minister of Finance in Ottawa indicated that this was to be used for educational purposes,

we recommended that this money be used to wipe out or liquidate the debts of the school boards or partially liquidate so that they can use the capital grants through the school boards for school construction. Has the minister given any consideration to that possibility, number one, Number two, since the minister is not planning to go after DREE money, which I think is a desperate mistake, I think it would be much better if this government, provincial government, negotiated with Ottawa to change the specifications and plans of the DREE schools.

If they are too expensive to operate, it would be much better if they negotiated with Ottawa to change the specifications of the DREE schools so that this government can afford to operate, or the school boards can afford to operate them and then continue to go after DREE money because we are just, you know, turning our backs on available money, I would assume.

One other little point, Mr. Chairman. When you look at the DREE schools in this province and when you look at schools in some other parts of Canada, these DREE schools are certainly not superior to new schools that you would find in other parts of Canada, whether they were built by DREE, through DREE or by the provincial government itself. Now, are we going to be second class citizens when it comes to the provision of educational facilities for our youngsters in this province? Do we not deserve schools that are of an equivalent standard to schools to be found in British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario and other provinces?

Now, maybe there is some substance to the fact that we cannot afford to maintain such schools. If that be so, the next logical step is to renegotiate the specifications of the DREE schools so that we can continue to go after DREE money.

So, the first point, Mr. Chairman - has the minister given any consideration to liquidating the debts of the school boards so that they can use capital grants for purposes of construction? And has the minister attempted to negotiate with Ottawa for a changing of the specifications for these schools so that we can continue to go after DREE money? Thirdly, what has the government done to meet the requests of the D.E.C.'s for something like approximately \$19 million per year for seven years instead of \$12 million for a ten year period? That is a generalization brought out as a result of some mathematics here but it is based on the request of the D.E.C.'s for \$132 million for a seven year period, compared to the offer by the Department of Education of \$120 million for a ten year period.

What I am asking for, Mr. Chairman, is did the minister get these three main points? If so, I will not repeat.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, with respect to liquidating the capital debt of the school boards: Of course, this is a matter in which there are a number of meetings with the D.E.C's and government, the Department of Finance and Education. Up to the present time it is certainly not government's intention - capacity I would say - it is not within government's capacity to liquidate those debts because obviously in order to do so we would have to incur, you know, additional debt ourselves.

It is something which we are, you know, continually aware of and on which there are continuing discussions. There was a meeting a few weeks ago of the D.E.C's and the representative of the Federation of School Boards, Deputy Minister of Education and the financial adviser to the government, the Deputy Minister of Finance, whose services are available to the D.E.C's if and as they wish to use his professional services in terms of arranging their own financing.

With respect to DREE - now, the agreement which was tabled in the legislature roughly two months ago does not, of course, contain any reference to school construction

construction. It is open for review each year of its term; it is open for review at each year but as it is now, it makes no reference to schools. What it does refer to is the human resource development and the likelihood of DREE participation in the area of vocational and technical and fisheries education. In this area, plans are being prepared for submission to DREE and discussion with DREE in terms of a subsidiary agreement. I mean we have to work within the terms of what the agreement is now, not what it might be or should be, however way one wants to phrase it, in a year's time, if and as it is amended.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree that if after an amendment after one year, I suppose it is nine or ten months now because it has been a few months since it has been signed, if there is such an amendment with specific reference to schools, then I agree that there must be a more realistic look at the specifications but even more so in the procedure or the channels or the bureaucracy or the steps, the whole amalgam of these things so that it can be expedited, because there have been numerous committees and revisions and the procedural aspects of it. That is secondary. If upon an amendment there is reference there, then I think specifications and procedures should be streamlined.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Minister of Education, (I assume that he has read this task force report in detail) the Llewellyn Parsons' Report, not a task force report, Dr. Llewellyn Parsons, who was commissioned by the university to look into the drop in enrollment situation, did a very good job because he did not focus just on the university itself. Dr. Parsons did have a look at the situation in the vocational schools, the College of Trades and Technology, nursing schools and the Fisheries College. Mr. Chairman, some very significant things came out, Mr. Chairman. I am not saying that there is a greater need for more vocational school construction. One glaring thing that came out was that the vocational schools in this province at the present time are capable of accommodating

the number of applications that they are presently receiving, which is very significant, when the minister suggests that they are going to go after DREE money for that kind of an institution.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: (Inaudible.)

MR. F. B. ROWE: The Minister of Education did mention on a number of occasions, Mr. Chairman, vocational schools. Now if he did not mean that, well that is a different thing entirely.

Now getting to the College of Fisheries; One of the problems that the Fisheries College has is in attracting students themselves. They have no space problem. They do not need additional facilities relative to the number of students who are making application to the College of Fisheries. Now I am not suggesting for one minute, Mr. Chairman, that there is not a need for

greater space facilities and expansion of the Fisheries College. I, for one, think that the college officially should be expanded and extended particularly into the communities of our province because we have this vast resource out there. There is a great potential for a very high earning power by people who graduate from the College of Fisheries.

But at this point in time, it seems that the Fisheries College is having difficulty in getting students to apply and come into the College of Fisheries for studies. However, the situation is far different in our primary, elementary and secondary schools when we move, Sir, into the area of operating grants.

I know and I will not mention the names of the schools, Sir, for very obvious reasons. I know of cases where young children in some of the best primary and elementary schools in this province have gone home and have had to change their clothing because they did you know what on their way home from school. The questions were asked and I asked the parents the questions. Why did this happen to this kid? The reason given was that the child refused to go into a very modern washroom in the school because it was in such an utter state and the fact that there were no toilet paper and no paper towelling and this type of a thing.

I probably should not have brought it out, Mr. Chairman, and I will not name the school but I have been talking to a number of parents who have rung me and other people have probably heard the same thing. I am afraid, Sir, that this is symbolic of the fact that the school boards just do not have enough money for operating purposes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F. B. What is that, Mr. Chairman?

AN HON. MEMBER: Name them.

MR. ROWE, F. B. I am not going to name this school. I will talk privately with the Hon. Minister of Education about this. I am not going to name the parents involved. I am not going to -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. P. THOMS: human rights over there, that is why.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that this is indicative of the fact that the schools of this province do not have enough money for operating purposes. I am sure if I had to use the example that the schools do not have enough paper to operate their spirit duplicators or gestetners it would probably not have the same impact as the example that I just used. The same thing still holds true, Sir.

I am very concerned as are the boards of this province that the minister is not indicating that more money will be made available for both operating and construction purposes in the coming year. I have gotten a little bit more into it than I had intended to during Interim Supply but I can assure the minister that I will be doing my homework and I will be asking some very pertinent questions during the consideration of the main education estimates. Every bit of it, Sir, will be based on not political motivations but based on what I have read in the newspapers, what representations have been made to me by authorities, from school boards, from the various post-secondary institutions and from the schools themselves.

I will be quite prepared to table the kind of information that I just gave with respect to some children, in very modern schools in our province, refusing to go into washrooms and suffering the consequences on the way home because these washrooms are not properly stocked. The honourable Mr. Decorum for Bonavista South may find that humorous but I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if he suffer these same consequences on the way home from the Confederation Building tonight he might not find it quite so humorous.

On motion Head 6, Education, carried.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we had intended to sit this evening but again a storm has intervened, so I move that the House at its rising do now adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at eleven o'clock in the morning and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday at eleven of the clock.