

Indexed by S. J. Mac Gillivray

*Amendment - to Add in Reply - J. Morgan
F.B. Romi
A.R. O'Brien
J.J. Doyle*



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 23

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I would like to welcome to the galleries today the Mayor, Mr. Wadland, and councillors from Southern Harbour. I would also like to welcome to the Speaker's Gallery the American Consul and his good wife, Mr. and Mrs. Dobbs. I trust that your visit here is most interesting.

HON. W.W.MARSHALL (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that tomorrow the burial of Bishop O'Neill will take place and because of the fact that most members of this House will wish to pay their respects and attend the funeral, I move that the House when it adjourns this afternoon at six o'clock stand adjourned until Thursday at three o'clock in the afternoon to enable - and I might say by way of explanation again this is to enable members of the House to attend the funeral of Bishop O'Neill because a large number of them will wish to.

MR SPEAKER: Is it the wish of this House that the House adjourn until 3:00 P.M. on Thursday? Those in favour "Aye" contrary "Nay"; carried:

PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs:

HON. W.G.DAWE (Minister of Provincial Affairs): I wish to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Topsail Pond Road, in Topsail, in the District of Harbour Main. This area, Sir, has a population of 130 persons and this during the summer months doubles when the summer cottages are used. Apart from that, Sir, many thousands of people from St. John's frequent the area because it is a well known recreation area. Topsail Pond is well noted for its swimming, boating and fishing etc. and the residents of Topsail Pond Road and several adjoining roads such as Neil's Pond Road and Angel's Road, Three Island Pond Road and so on, have to endure the Tremendous dust problem which is caused because of the many thousands of people who frequent this area each summer.

The residents are calling for upgrading and paving of this road. I would like, Sir, to table this petition and have it presented to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Labrador North:

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, We on this side of the House wish to lend our support to the petition that was presented by the Senior Member for Harbour Main. We also would like to see that the dust problem be overcome this summer by having the road upgraded and paved in the Topsail Pond Road Area.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition, on behalf of thirty-two fishermen, boat owners of Beachy Cove, Bay Roberts, (I know this comes under the federal department) in support of a wharf that has been there in a dilapidated condition, they have no place to tie up their boats.

I think myself, while looking around here yesterday, there were a lot of the M.P's. here from the House of Parliament but there was no sign of the member for Trinity - Conception - Bonavista, therefore in his lack of wisdom to try to have something done in the District of Port de Grave and Beachy Cove, Bay Roberts.

I support this petition on behalf of these people also a letter accompanying the petition from the Council of Bay Roberts wishing that this could be undertaken. I know that it is a federal responsibility and therefore I wish that any encouragement that can be given this by our own provincial government that this be done; I wish them to do so, and I wish to place it on the table for the department to which it relates.

HON. E.M.ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word in support of that petition, Sir, presented so ably by the Gentleman from Port de Grave. I am not so sure it is in order to present a petition in this House having to deal with federal matters but since it has been received surely we can

support it. I do hope this work will be done, Sir. I notice the honourable gentleman made a remark about the Member for Trinity-Bonavista-Conception. The gentleman of course yesterday was in Ottawa attending the duties of the House of Commons which, after all, is where a member of parliament is elected.

He is making representations there and I have no doubt, Sir, that if Your Honour directs the Clerk to send this petition to the member or to the appropriate minister in Ottawa that it will receive consideration. Of course the Liberals at Ottawa have recently decided to spend many millions of dollars a year on building wharf facilities all over Newfoundland, wharves and small harbour facilities, which is many millions more that the honourable gentleman has ever succeeded in getting for any of his constituents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: It has just been brought to my attention that we have in the galleries today fifty-five students from the John Burke High School in Grand Bank with their teachers, Mr. Maxwell Snooks and Mr. Carl Rose. Indeed I would like to welcome these people to the galleries today.

MOTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Justice:

HON. T.A. HICKMAN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "A bill, an Act To Repeal The Debentures Of The Province Act." *Bill - 26*

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for Bell Island:

MR. S.A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Would the minister inform the House if he met today with a delegation representing the Mayor and Councillors of the Town of Southern Harbour?

HON. H.R.V. EARLE (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I met with the delegation.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate to the House what action the government is going to take on the numerous trips these gentlemen have made to the government in the past few months to correct the contaminated water situation in the Town of Southern Harbour and install water and sewerage in the area?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the honourable member. The problem which the gentlemen presented to me

does not go back a matter of a few months. They have been in continuous negotiation with government for five years, three years of the former Liberal Administration and two years of this administration. The problem is a serious one. We are well aware of the great need in Southern Harbour of an adequate water and sewer system. My department for months has been working up the necessary details for presentation to DREE and the request, I imagine, will be going forward with many other similar requests from different parts of the province. We hope that it will receive favourable consideration by the federal authorities.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I am pleased to note Your Honour that the mayor and councilors are in the public galleries of this honourable House today. Is the minister aware that if something is not done before March 31 of this year that the council has threatened to resign?

MR. EARLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware and I would regretfully have to accept it should the council decide to resign.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable Minister of Fisheries. Can the minister tell the House what arrangements are made between his department and the shipyard at Shoal Bay on Fogo Island for his department operating that shipyard now?

HON. H. COLLINS (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Mr. Speaker, there has been some difficulty with regard to the operation of the ship building yard at Fogo which I suspect the honourable member is aware of. We do have some people, one man from the Fisheries Loan Board in Fogo, trying to get the thing straightened out to get the boats finished which are now in various stages of completion.

CAPT. WINSOR: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention to keep that shipyard in operation or is it just a tentative arrangement

until something else better can be worked out?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a temporary arrangement. What will happen to the shipyard I really cannot say but the co-operative people they are meeting with Mr. Cashin who is the manager of Newfoundland co-operative services. He is in constant touch with us. Hopefully something can be ironed out to keep that going.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the government House Leader could inform us when the Premier and the other ministers will be back in their seats. Sir, we have a number of urgent questions to put to ministers. They were not in attendance at the House in the last week or so, Sir. Could the House Leader indicate when the ministers will be here? They should be here during the question and answer period, Sir. Mr. Speaker, does the House Leader intend to answer the question or is he tongue-tied like the Minister of Tourism? Could the minister indicate when the Premier and the ministers will be here so we can put questions to the ministers?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Arrogance, Mr. Speaker, you talk about arrogance!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Address in Reply, I think the honourable member for Bonavista South adjourned the debate last day.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in resuming the debate, I think yesterday afternoon after speaking for approximately one hour, I think there are approximately thirty minutes left in my

portion of this debate. I talked about the three main parts of the amendment: (1) This government are doing nothing about the rising cost of living; (2) This government are doing nothing about the unemployment situation in our province; and (3) This government are not providing adequate services to the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, in talking about the rising cost of living, today in listening to the news from the nation's capital, it was very amusing to me to listen to the news outlining that today legislation was brought to the House of Commons by the Minister of Consumer Affairs, Hon. Herb Gray, to regulate and control mutual funds. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the demands are being made on the Liberal Government at Ottawa from the opposition and from the people across the nation (in reply mainly to the meetings held by the Prices Review Board across the Nation of Canada) instead of bringing in legislation to control food prices in this country, to put a freeze on wages and prices of foods across the country, the minister devotes his time to controlling mutual funds. We have a Prices Review Board; headed by Mrs. Plumptre, who is not proving anything. For example, after a very thorough study of the situation across the nation, a report was made saying that food prices were extraordinarily high and they were going to continue to rise.

Mr. Speaker, there was no need for a Prices Review Board to determine that. We can all see what is happening. A few days ago the Prices Review Board gave the indication that there would be a further increase in the price of milk and in the price of bread. They went on to tell the House of Commons and tell the federal government that they felt that the price of bread should not be increased more than two cents per loaf of bread. Yet the same day the Bakery Council of Canada turns around and says: "Oh, no! Two cents of an increase is not enough. We want at least four cents. We intend to increase it by four cents."

Mr. Speaker, that is a very vivid indication of what the Prices Review Board can do with regard to price controls. They have no power; they have no teeth and no legislation to control the prices. Yet we see the honourable minister responsible for Consumer Affairs in Ottawa talking about controlling mutual funds. I know and I admit that we should not be laying all the blame with the federal government. The price controls across the Nation of Canada can be only levied by the federal level of government.

Now I, as a member of this Assembly, and I think each honourable member of this Assembly should follow my example. I have written the Minister of Consumer Affairs in Ottawa, the Hon. Herb Gray, and I have asked him to do one of two things; either to bring in legislation in the House of Commons to implement price controls as per the Leader of the Opposition's recommendation or to immediately investigate these food manufacturing companies in Canada who are using the inflation psychology across the country, using that as an excuse to increase and hike up the food prices. In other words, I am asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs to investigate what I feel, as a politician, is profiteering on the part of food manufacturing companies. I think it is his obligation, as the minister responsible for Consumer Affairs, to do one of these two things. If we cannot here in this Assembly find ourselves unanimously agreeing on that, I think we are not doing justice to our province. The authority and the responsibility lies with the federal government. We should urge and use whatever pressure we can, as a Legislature, we should urge the federal minister to take the appropriate steps to try to control inflation; to try to control the rising cost of food prices. It is fine for the federal

minister in the Federal Government to say we are going to increase production. Maybe by the end of 1974 production may be increased. In the meantime, the prices are going to climb. The Prices Review Board is saying this. Surely they travelled the country extensively enough to know that the -

MR. M. MARTIN: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. MORGAN: Sure.

MR. MARTIN: It is intriguing the proposal put forward and I wonder if the honourable member would say whether or not he advocates going the full way and implementing as well as price controls, profit controls and rate controls along with the whole bundle?

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the federal government could not bring in legislation to control the price of foods without controlling wages as well. When I am saying controlling them; not controlling them in a permanent way but controlling them for at least a ninety day period and to see what happens from there. The federal government seems to be very hesitant about doing that but until it is tried, until it is tried at least the consequences is relatively unknown, but the legislation could not be very well implemented in Ottawa without controlling both wages and food prices.

I would like to see a resolution passed by this Assembly in that regard. Unfortunately we have many private member resolutions on the Order Paper now, and for me to bring in this resolution it may not even get debated in this Assembly this session. But I feel if the opposition members who are concerned, according to their vote of nonconfidence in this government, if they are really concerned about the rising costs of food prices and the rising cost of living, that they should do what I have done, write to the federal minister and ask him to give strong consideration, we cannot demand him to do it, to give strong consideration to the proposal put forward by the honourable Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons. There seems to be some question mark with regards to the N.D.P. support on that kind of a piece of legislation but I am sure that all parties in the House of

Commons are concerned about the rising prices and they would support whatever legislation is required to control the rising costs of living.

The speakers in this debate so far, Mr. Speaker, have been attacking this government for taking little action or inadequate action. I feel that out of all the speakers who spoke from the opposition side, maybe only one stood and spoke with sincerity about the services rendered to his people and although I am a member of this government I think I have to agree with him because I am not that familiar with Labrador but I have travelled Labrador, in fact about five years ago I travelled extensively in Labrador. I feel when the honourable member for Labrador North stood in this debate and condemned this government and maybe both governments and all levels of government, all politicians, to an extent during the past number of years, for neglecting Labrador, I think he was doing it sincerely. I think most members on this side of the House of Assembly got that impression as well. He spoke sincerely for the people and sincerely for the concern he has for the lack of services that has been existent for the past fifteen, twenty years. I agree to a point in many cases these facilities are still needed all along the Coast of Labrador and throughout Labrador.

The other speakers, Mr. Speaker, the other speakers in this debate have stood mainly to condemn the Progressive Conservative Government, have used this amendment which is called a nonconfidence motion, has used this debate to stand in the House of Assembly and condemn government, to criticize the individual departments and indeed to make personal attacks on the ministers and others concerned.

On opening day I stood in this Assembly and I moved

that a committee be established to draft the Address in Reply.

In my speech that day I said that I felt that there should be legislation or regulations or some kind of rules brought into effect in this province to prevent politicians from standing in this debate and in this Assembly and making unsubstantiated charges, in making personal attacks, slanderous, derogatory statements about other members in this Assembly.

I said that then, Mr. Speaker, and today I have no hesitation in saying this may be my last speech in this Assembly for quite some time. There comes a time when a member stands in this Assembly and has to make a decision. I came from Bonavista South, the people sent me here to speak for them, in all debates, in all legislation. I feel that if I do not sit in this Assembly in the future under the present circumstances, I will not be doing an injustice to the people of Bonavista South. I will still work for them. I will still carry on to the best of my ability for the people who sent me to this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I refuse, I simply refuse to sit in this Assembly or stand in this Assembly and listen to the kind of personal attacks, the kind of charges that have been made in this Assembly, unsubstantiated charges which are trying to and attempting to destroy the integrity of the Assembly, to destroy the sovereignty of the Assembly, to indeed destroy the whole aspect of government.

What goes out in the electronic media to the people of this province is an image of this Assembly which is really unbelievable. I am not going to sit here in this Assembly and be linked with these kind of charges which are condemning individuals, condemning individuals who are doing a sincere job for this province. Unless - Mr. Speaker, I refuse to sit here in the future unless this kind of thing comes to an end. Either a person stands in this Assembly in this debate or in any other debate, either he stands here and if he makes a charge he substantiates that charge with the facts. Mr. Speaker, if a charge be made and that member, whether he be on this side of the House of Assembly or on the opposition side, if that member, Mr. Speaker, cannot substantiate

his charges with the facts, even if he should do that, either he brings in the facts or this Assembly takes the appropriate action. I am sure there are many members of this House of Assembly will agree with me that they will not sit here either in the future.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the present decorum of the House continues, unless the kind of charges that we have heard in the past two weeks and in the past two days - here is one member, Mr. Speaker, who is not going to sit in this Assembly until that kind of attitude changes.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing this debate I sincerely hope that all members of this Assembly will in the future stand and speak accordingly in all debates but debate the issues of the province, debate the things that people of this province want us to debate but not stand here and condemn each other, condemn the character of other members, with slanderous, vicious attacks.

So I sincerely hope that either this House of Assembly changes its attitude or if the attitude of some members do not change, Mr. Speaker, we should and we must by a majority vote of

this Assembly take the appropriate action to deal with these members who will not follow the proper procedures and the proper rules that should be followed in this Assembly. If these members do not follow the rules and do not follow along in the proper decorum of the House of Assembly, we must and we should and if we do not, here is one member who is not even going to sit in this Assembly let alone speak here in the future. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. †

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

† MR. FRED ROWE (St. Barbe North): Mr. Speaker, I rise, Sir, to support the amendment moved by my colleague for Fogo district and seconded by my colleague from White Bay South. Sir, I will just relate briefly to this particular amendment. "This House regrets the failure of the present administration to introduce adequate programmes to lessen the severe impact on our people of the rapidly rising cost of living and regrets the failure of the administration to introduce adequate programmes to reduce the extremely high number of our people who are unemployed." Thirdly, Sir, "it regrets the failure of the administration to introduce adequate programmes to bring public services up to an acceptable level throughout all parts of this Province."

Now, Sir, in my remarks in support of this particular amendment, I will be relating mostly to the third section of this particular amendment; to introduce adequate programmes to bring public services up to an acceptable level throughout all parts of our Province. That is the part of the amendment that I will relate to, Sir, and I will be relating specifically to the field of education with respect to this particular amendment. As you remember, Sir, in my speech in the Address in Reply to the Throne Speech, I referred extensively to the utter and complete failure of this administration to develop rural parts of Newfoundland and I referred extensively at that time to my own district of St. Barbe North. Now I wish to turn my attention to the sorry state of practically all sectors of education in this Province with respect to the failure of

the government to implement policy to bring the educational services of our Province up to an adequate standard or an adequate level. I will be referring to the vocational schools, the situation with respect to the College of Trades and Technology, the Fisheries College, Memorial University, the capital grants to the schools and the operating grants to the schools, in other words, the financing of the primary, elementary and secondary schools in our Province.

Sir, this Government has totally mismanaged just about every aspect of education in this Province and for this reason, Sir, and many others we lack confidence in this administration. The Moores administration, Sir, has failed utterly to grapple with the many problems of education in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not just the Liberal Opposition in this honourable House that has lost confidence in this P.C. administration. I would submit, Sir, that the whole of the educational community has lost confidence in the administration because they have not, Sir, exerted the leadership and direction in the field of education that is required to bring education ahead at the same rate of progress as was witnessed in the twenty-three years previous to their takeover.

Now, Sir, the educational communities to which I refer, which I suggest have lost confidence themselves in this administration would be such institutions or communities as the Newfoundland Teachers' Association

the administration, staff and students of the vocational schools, the College of Trades and Technology, the Fisheries College, Memorial University and the numerous school boards throughout our province and the parents.

Sir, judging by the jaundicedlike looks of some of the honourable members on the other side of the House, I would suggest that there are even those on the government side who have lost confidence in their own administration. Sir, I would suggest that this is the very reason for the vicious attacks on the Liberal Opposition at the present time and the vicious assaults on the Federal Government in Ottawa in order to camouflage their own lack of confidence in their own administration.

Sir, we have not yet heard a great outcry from the N.T.A, from Memorial University from the students, from the vocational schools, from the College of Trades and Technology, for one obvious reason, Sir; Budget day has not yet arrived. The estimates I assume are still being drafted. Sir, you would not expect these various sectors of the educational community to come forth with great public outcries at this present time and possibly give the impression of biting the hand that feeds them.

Sir, if there is not a great breakthrough in expenditures in the various sectors of education this year, I predict that there will be a complete catastrophe in many areas of education. There will be some very legitimate and some very concerned and sincere outcries from the educational communities, the students and the parents.

Now, Sir, first I would like to refer to the Student-Aid Programme at the university. The points or the areas to which I will refer are not being listed in their priority. Sir, with respect to the Student-Aid Programme at the university, I want to talk about a student's opportunity to study at the university, to attend the university. Sir, since the Progressive Conservatives took over, we

expressed the fear that students enrolled at university or student enrollment at the university would be restricted because of inadequate provincial grants to the university during the last two estimates. Sir, this is just not our opinion, it was also the opinion expressed by the university administration on a great number of occasions.

Sir, we predicted that student enrollment at the university would have to be restricted because of inadequate grants to the university - nothing to do with Student-Aid Programmes. Now, Sir, the administration of the university did not have to restrict student enrollment at the university. We were to a certain extent incorrect when we said that student enrollment would have to be restricted because of inadequate capital grants and lack of space at the university. Sir, the student enrollment was not restricted for that reason. Sir, the student enrollment at the university was restricted because of this government's backward, discriminatory, retrogressive and élitist student-aid policy. That is what restricted student enrollment at Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Now, Sir, this may be a blessing in disguise for the administration of the university. They did not have to go through the agony of turning down students because of inadequate accommodations and inadequate space. Sir, the university administration did not have to raise entrance requirements in order to keep students out of the university and they did not have to crowd students into overcrowded classrooms and laboratories at the university, Sir, because of this retrogressive, backward, student-aid programme. Sir, it is a blessing in disguise for the administration at least.

Sir, it was a nightmare for the students in this province. There was a sense of helplessness, of despair, of hopelessness for thousands of parents, Sir,

of middle income, low income and no income, over the years (and because of the rantings and roarings of the Progressive Conservatives, prior to the election campaign and during the election campaign) they had at last sensed and seen the possibility of having their sons and daughters attend the university. Sir, they felt that my son or my daughter had at last the opportunity that they themselves did not have. Sir, they would have been proud to have seen their sons and daughters graduate from the university, getting experience which was well nigh impossible for them ten years ago. They would have been proud to see their sons and daughters make a contribution to our province and for that matter, Sir, to our nation.

But, Sir, what is the situation now? Hundreds of young, intelligent Newfoundlanders in the bays, on the islands, on the coast, Sir, in small, little settlements, even in larger cities, go, Sir, to institutions not of their choice, they go to institutions where they can get the most assistance if indeed they even go to institutions of higher education or post-secondary education. Sir, they seek employment and some of them find employment. Some of them have to accept the kind of employment that they do not want to have because they have no choice. Sir, this student-aid policy that the present administration have brought in has squelched the freedom of choice of young people in Newfoundland who wish to attend the university or any other post-secondary institution.

Now, Sir, what was the situation when the Progressive Conservative Administration took over? When the Progressive Conservative Administration, the Moores' Administration took over, students had to borrow \$200 from the Canada Student Loan before qualifying for provincial allowances. Sir, that was termed an absolute disaster by honourable members sitting on the other side, by parents and by students. Sir, it was the very reason why almost one hundred per cent

of the students at the university campaigned against the Liberals in the October and in the March election and voted for the Progressive Conservatives and campaigned for the Progressive Conservatives. That is one of the reasons, Sir, because of the fact that the previous administration forced the students at the university to borrow \$200 from the Canada Student Loan in order to qualify for provincial allowances. Sir, did the Progressive Conservatives and the Hon. Minister of Finance ever exploit that situation and use the students? Sir, these honourable members raised false hopes and the expectations of these students. In short, Sir, the Minister of Finance and some of his colleagues carried out the con-job of the century.

Sir, the Minister of Finance can well remember the good old days of 1969, during the Leadership Convention and the 1971 and 1972 election. The honourable minister, Sir, was - I suppose you could consider him at that time to have been, "J.C. Superstar," with 6,000 student disciples, Sir, during the 1969 Leadership Convention and during the two provincial elections that followed, Sir, he was "J. C. Superstar" to the students before gaining power and "Judas Iscariot" to the students when he settled into the powers of office in the administration of this province.

Sir, the same thing can be said of many other honourable members sitting on the other side. On February, 22, 1972, at the Student Thompson Centre, the Hon. Minister of Education at that time, who has since become the education critic sitting on the government side, the Hon. Member for St. John's North, said this, Sir: "There would be no decreases in the form of tuitions or grants. Federal student loans would be increased from \$500 to \$700 per semester." "There would be no decreases in the form of tuitions or grants," Sir. That is what the then Hon. Minister of Education said during that election campaign. Sir, the Hon. Junior Member for Harbour Main, who is not in his seat at the present time, on

September 29, 1971 said that the P.C. Party will do everything it possibly can to help our young people to achieve their aims regardless of their political beliefs.

March 1, 1972, Sir, the Hon. the Minister of Tourism said that the province seems to be losing sight of its young people, the best natural resource we have.

The Hon. the President of the Council, Sir, who I am sorry to hear is sick in hospital on the Mainland but. Sir, he did on October 25, 1971 stated that the P.C. Government would establish a provincial youth advisory council to deal with such matters as educational development.

Another great new face, Sir, the once Minister of Community and Social Development, now the Member for Grand Falls said; "We must offer the young people opportunities to keep them from migrating to other provinces."

Sir, the Premier, 1971, at Coxes Cove, said; "The government I would form will not tell the people what they are to have and then give it to them but would ask them what they want and then work with them to achieve it."

Now, Sir, this is the kind of rantings and roarings and promises and misleading statements, a con job on the young people of this province, because we know exactly what has happened since.

Sir, the Hon. the Minister of Finance said; "We must continue to make every effort to provide the money needed to expand the facilities of Memorial University so that all eligible Newfoundland students who wish to enter the university can be accommodated. It must continue to be our aim to build a great university in Newfoundland."

Anothe quote from the Hon. the Minister of Finance, Sir, before he gained power: "Allowances for students at Memorial University have been changed beyond recognition and a means test instituted." This was when the means test was instituted, Sir, and they had to borrow \$200 in order to qualify for student allowances. "This complete programme shall be reviewed in the light of the present financial position of the government and consideration given to changes, to benefit those

students in our province who live in Labrador and other distant parts of the province, to enable them to meet the additional costs incurred by them if they wish to enter university. The programme must be reviewed to better ensure equality of opportunities for high school graduates across Newfoundland and Labrador. The present situation is entirely unsatisfactory."

Sir, quotations from "The Red Book": "Building For The New Newfoundland" - "Priority Progress" "John Crosbie" - "The New Generation of Leaders": That is the kind of a campaign, Sir, that was being carried out for three years in getting the students of this province, tying them in not only to vote against the Liberals but conned in to campaign and vote for the P.C.'s and you can see, Sir, the gratitude that this administration and in particular the Minister of Finance has now shown the students at Memorial University.

Now, Sir, in view of these enlightening statements of their philosophy, what did the government do once they gained power? Well, Sir, the very first year in office the Minister of Finance announced that the students have to borrow \$600 from the Canada Student Loan before qualifying for provincial allowances to attend university. The second year, Sir, they were told that they had to borrow \$1,400 from the Canada Student Loan before qualifying for provincial allowance.

Sir, if we look at the estimates for 1972-1973 we see that - Student Allowances, Sir, for Memorial - the previous year 1971-1972 it was \$3.7 million approximately the very next year, Sir, when the P.C.'s took over the same amount \$3.7 million, a slight increase but Sir, not enough to take into consideration the increase in student enrollment. Sir, so it goes:

The following year, with respect to student allowances, there was an actual decrease in the amount of money that was made available to the students for student-aid. I cannot find the exact figures here, Sir, but it was in the millions or so of dollars. Yes, Sir, here it is, down to \$1,900,000, a drastic decrease in the amount of money made available for the students.

MR. WM. ROWE: \$2 million drop.

MR. F. ROWE: A \$2 million drop. Now, Sir, I explained in the House of Assembly last year what this meant to the students in one year. For 900 students, Sir, who had a need of \$800; since the P.C.'s took over it meant that they lost \$400. For 600 students who needed \$1,000, whose need was \$1,000, they were out by \$600 since this present administration took over. For 700 students who needed \$1,200; they were out by \$800. For 700 students who needed \$1,400; they were out by \$1,000 since the P.C.'s took over. For 900 students who needed \$1,600; they were out by \$800. For 1,100 students who needed \$1,800; they were out by \$600.

Sir, for these same categories of students, the total loss for these categories of students - 900, 600, 700, 700, 900, and 1100 categories of students based on different needs, the total loss to them, Sir, because of the change in the Student-Aid Programme over a five year period, which is usually a degree period, particularly if you are working on a conjoint degree, the total loss to the students, Sir, was \$2,000, \$3,000, \$4,000, \$5,000, \$4,000 and \$3,000 respectively. Now, Sir, you ask me why there is a drop in enrollment at the university.

Sir, all of this litigates against equality of educational opportunity at the university level. Sir, we on this side of the House predicted that there would be a decrease in student enrollment at the university. Not only was there a decrease in the rate of increase which is natural for a province with only half the per capita average attendance at university compared to the rest of Canada, not only was there a decrease in the rate of increase but there was an

actual concrete decrease in student enrollment. Sir, we predicted that young Newfoundlanders with the mental capacity but not the financial resources would not seek entrance to the university. We predicted, Sir, that the university will become a university for the élite. We predicted, Sir, that the student-aid policy was discriminatory in favour of those who were rich or had money and those who were close to the university and it would discriminate against those sons and daughters of middle, low and no income families and those students who were distant from the university.

Sir, we pleaded with the government to change its policy and Sir, we were met with catcalls, scorn and insults from the opposite side of the House. Sir, I was told, I can remember very clearly, by the Minister of Finance, "The honourable member for St. Barbe North was whining about the mothers last year and now he is whining about the students this year, what will he be whining about next year?" So I was called Mr. Memorial by honourable members on the other side and the honourable member for Green Bay, who specializes in poster snatching, Sir, informed me that I was the member for university, giving the false impression that I was trying to represent the interests of the university at the expense of the interests of the College of Trades and Technology, vocational schools, high schools and what have you; A low-down, dirty tactic, Sir!

Well, Sir, we predicted the change in the student-aid programme would cause a decrease in enrollment at the university. We were laughed at.

Sir, what was the government's defence? What kind of a profound defence did we get from the government? Well, Sir, the honourable Minister of Education defended the government's policy on the student aid and he actually said, Sir, in June 1973, that it is not the cause for the decrease in enrollment at the university. The honourable Minister of Education said that the decrease

merely reflects a national trend and that while Memorial has not yet reached the population of other Maritime universities, it shares this slowdown in enrollment with them.

Sir, what kind of a weak analysis of this serious situation is that? The honourable Minister of Finance, Sir, in April, 1973, said that no student would be prevented from attending Memorial University because of changes in this government's financial assistance policy. Sir, that statement, although probably not deliberately false or not a deliberate lie, turns out, on the basis of evidence that we have received over the past few months, to in fact be a falsehood. It is the major cause of the reduced enrollment at the University.

Now, Sir, I ask you after being laughed at and insulted and scorned and after listening to the weak defence of the honourable Minister of Finance and next to no defence on the part of the honourable Minister of Education from whom I had hoped to see better things come after the disposal of the original Minister of Education, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, were we correct or were we not? We said amongst other things that the Student Aid Programme would be the major reason for the reduction in enrollment at the University. Well, Sir, what we have said has been borne out by proper research and collection of data, analysis of that data in the Parsons Report. Dr. Llewellyn Parsons, Sir, a Professor of Education at Memorial University, was commissioned or asked by the University to do a study on the causes of reduced enrollment at the University.

Sir, the data and the conclusions and the recommendations are based on a survey of 8,000 high school students in this Province and there was a ninety-five per cent return on the questionnaire. Now, Sir, the interpretation based on the data goes something like this: Present cost of attending Memorial University- per cent of respondents who gave this as a reason, 88.5 per cent, 88.5 per cent of these eight thousand students, Sir, said that the reason why they would probably not attend university is because of the present cost of attending university. Reasons, Sir, what were the reasons given? Government decision to have students assume greater responsibilities for the cost of university education. The university education is long and costly

in terms of rewards received and in comparison with rewards received from attending technical and vocational institutions.

Students believe that they will have to go heavily in debt to complete degree programmes. Students believe they require Canada Student Loan of \$700.00 per semester or that is \$1,400 per year before - provision of financial aid could be too high. Students are not certain what financial aid will be available because every year, Sir, in the budget, there is a different slap in the face for students. Parents discourage students from incurring large debts through attending university. Students, from the lower income groups especially, are discouraged from attending university because of the cost involved. Sir, there are other reasons. Students want immediate financial rewards and this type of thing.

Sir, this is based on a scientific study, the very thing that members on this side of the House were saying last year. Sir, what were the conclusions of this report and Sir, I only wish that the Premier of this Province and the honourable the Minister of Finance and the honourable the Minister of Education were here to hear the conclusions drawn by the Parsons Report

because, Sir, on a number of occasions I asked the minister if certain things were true and the minister replied by saying that he had not yet had an opportunity to read the report.

What were the conclusions drawn by this study group?

"Many students find it increasingly difficult to attend university because of financial considerations. There is a perceived inequality of educational opportunity at post-secondary educational levels in that students of vocational and technical schools receive greater financial aid than do students attending university. Many students are reluctant to assume a large debt in order to finance their education.

"Many Newfoundland families are unable to help students finance their university education. Students, especially those from the middle and lower income groups and those more distant from St. John's, find the cost of attending university to be increasingly prohibitive."

Sir, we predicted this. We said this. This report was almost unnecessary. The only thing this report does is confirm scientifically what the opposition have been predicting for the past two years.

What are the recommendations? "Students should not be deterred from entering university for financial reasons. Financial aid provided for university students should be at least comparable to aid given students attending other post-secondary institutions. It is recommended that the present plan for financial aid of university students be reviewed and improved." There is nothing in the Throne Speech, Sir, about that. "There is a need to promote all types of post-secondary education in Newfoundland. It is recommended that the university, the College of Trades and Technology, the College of Fisheries, the Vocational Schools and other post-secondary institutions work more closely together regarding this policy of financial aid and other common interests.

"As the number of students in this province enroll in all post-secondary educational institutions as the percentage of the

total population is barely half the national average, it is recommended that educators in this province devise strategies to enable our students to attend various types of post-secondary educational institutions.

"As the university education participation rate in this province is far below the Canadian average, it is recommended that the province devise strategies to enable more of our people to attend university."

Sir, this report confirmed every single thing that we have predicted. The government, the honourable Minister of Education has a civil service force in his department. They should know what the problem is with respect to enrollment at university. They have been warned often enough, at least the minister has been, Sir. Yet, in this Throne Speech we do not see one single indication that this administration is willing to rectify this particular problem. We had to wait for this Parson's Report to come out and confirm what we had already been saying. Sir, do you wonder why we lack confidence in this P.C. Administration?

Before the Member for Green Bay or some other honourable member jumps up on the other side of the House and uses the tactic that they did in the first session, I would like to make this quite clear. This should be obvious from a Private Member's Resolution that I have on the Order Paper: We on this side of the House are no more interested in university students than we are interested in other students in other post-secondary educational institutions in this province. What we want is a standardized student-aid policy, equality of educational opportunity at the secondary educational level so that some students up in Flower's Cove or in Ramea or in Gambo or up in Nain, if he wants to attend or she wants to attend a nursing school, a vocational school, the College of Trades and Technology or the university, they will all be given an equal opportunity as far as finances are concerned.

Because, Sir, what we have in this province are students being forced to go to institutions, not because they want to go there, not because they are interested in diesel mechanics but

They are going to certain institutions because the money is there in student allowances, assistance and tuition and what have you. They refrain from going to university even though they want to go to university, because the money is not there. So, what we are saying and I repeat it and I want to re-emphasize it, that we stand for equality of educational opportunity at the post secondary level of education for all institutions so that the student goes to this institution of his choice and his thoughts are not modified, his decisions are not made upon the basis of how much money he can get in student assistance or student allowances.

Now, Sir, with respect to junior colleges, regional colleges, branches of the university or community colleges; Sir, this is a classic example of the results of planning and priorities or so called planning and priorities on the part of this administration. This government, Sir, takes great pride in its task force committees, in its planning, in its reports. Yet, Sir, in May, 1973, we had the honourable Premier make an announcement in Corner Brook that a regional college for Corner Brook would be ready for the first year programme in September of 1973. Sir, that has not come to pass. Sir, the Premier succumbed to political pressure on that occasion. He said only what the people of Corner Brook wanted to hear. The university was caught by surprise. The president of the university made a press release to the effect that there was no way, Mr. Premier, that we are going to be offering courses in a regional college in September, 1973.

The Minister of Education, Sir, ten minutes after I heard the release, in the common room - I put it to the Minister of Education, what is this about the regional college in Corner Brook? The Minister of Education, Sir, did not know that the honourable the Premier had announced a regional college for Corner Brook on that particular occasion. Sir, there was no articulation of over-all policy on regional or

community colleges. There was no philosophy. There was no definition. Time and time again we asked the Minister of Education, "What do you mean by a community college? What do you mean by a regional college? What do you mean by a junior college? Are we to have regional colleges, junior colleges or community colleges or a combination of both?" No answer, Sir. No master plans for the other parts of the province with respect to the regional college. No answers from the minister.

Why no answers from the minister, Sir? The reason the minister gave was that we are awaiting the Report of the Task Force Committee or Subcommittee on Education and Human Resources. That is why the minister could not define a community college or a regional college or whether he is going to put a regional college in Central Newfoundland or Southern Newfoundland or Northern Newfoundland or Labrador. He could not answer that question, Sir, because he is awaiting the Task Force Report from the Subcommittee on Education and Human Resources. He could not answer these simple questions, Sir, but the honourable the Premier could go out in Corner Brook and state to the people out there, "We will have a regional college in Corner Brook." If I remember correctly, Sir - excuse my language - he said, "Because I damn well said it should go there." That was the reason why the regional college was announced for Corner Brook.

Sir, what kind of sense does this make at all? Planning and priorities, Task Force Report - I cannot make any sense out of it, Mr. Speaker. Nobody can. The only thing that we do know, Sir, is that the Premier and the Minister of Education talk out of more sides of their faces or have more faces than the colors of Joseph's coat, because I cannot pick any sense out of it whatsoever.

Now, Sir, in our view, we think the government has made a very serious mistake. It might have been politically pleasing to the people of Corner Brook. If I lose votes or if we lose votes in Corner Brook because of what we have said in the past or for what I

am about to say now, I could not give a tinker's you know what because I believe in what I am saying and it is the policy of this side of the House.

Before any announcements of regional colleges are made - do not slap up to me about the promises of the previous administrator. They have defended themselves, and they are where they are today. We are a new Liberal Party, Sir. We agree with most of the things that the previous administration did. Most of the things, Sir, I supported them and I will continue to support them because they did more good than harm in this province. Sir, I state here that to announce a regional college for any part of this province without articulating a philosophy with respect to what a regional college is or community college is or junior college is, is an utter mistake and this province cannot afford it. The next thing there will be institutions jumping up all over the province. They will be nothing but white elephants.

What this province needs, Sir, and what it can afford is true community colleges, a true community college system. Such institutions would provide functions something similar to these: A two year programme of university studies for those who wish to transfer to Memorial University of Newfoundland or to any other post secondary educational institution. A programme of vocational and sub-professional education, and this is most important. A programme of continuing education for adults, that is such things as leadership training, cultural education, short courses related to social, economic and community needs as well as recreational programmes based on community needs and interests. Sir, these are the types of institutions that our communities need outside of the larger cities in this province.

Now, Sir, a summary as far as junior colleges and this sort of thing are concerned: About the only thing I can say is that it is a complete shmozzel. This government has the gall, when they do not answer questions put to them in this House during estimate time and

the question period, to say that they are awaiting a Task Force Committee Report, yet they can lash out a regional college when the Premier succumbs to political pressure.

Now, Sir, the College of Trades and Technology, there is where we have an extremely critical situation. Now, I am going to get into detail with respect to the College of Trades and Technology and the vocational schools to a greater extent during

consideration of the estimates because what I have to say it will take me past my time.

Sir, the Minister of Education I submit does not know what he is talking about. When questioned with respect to DREE money, the Minister of Education said, "No, we will not be going after DREE money for schools in this province, we will be going in other areas, the vocational area, the Fisheries College Area and the College of Trades and Technology Area."

Well, Sir, I can tell you now that relatively speaking compared to the high schools and the elementary primary schools there is no crisis with respect to buildings or structures in the vocational schools of our province. That statement, Sir, is borne out by statistics in the Parsons Report, if I can find them, Sir.

Vocational Schools, Sir, twenty-two vocational schools. The number of students expecting to attend are 1,658. The estimated number of students in the entrance requirements or admission requirements will be 1,078. The number of students which can be accommodated by these institutions are - the same number, approximately, 1,078.

So there is no real crisis at the vocational school level but Sir, there is a crisis at the College of Trades and Technology. At the College of Trades and Technology 1,523 wish to attend, approximately 990 of these students will be admitted. The number of students actually accommodated by the College of Trades and Technology, Sir, 400. That means that 590 students in this province will be deprived of an opportunity to study at the College of Trades and Technology this very year, not because they do not have the academic background, Sir, but because the space is not available. Now, Sir, this is space in terms of accommodations for residence and accommodation for classrooms.

Sir, something must be done about this immediately and not a mention of it, Sir, in the Throne Speech, not a mention, just teacher allocation and extended school days. Sir, I will be relating back to the College of Trades and Technology and the Vocational Schools, as I said, in the consideration of the estimates.

Sir, there is a crisis at the College of Trades and Technology and something should be done about it immediately.

Sir, if we look at the estimates for the past two years we will see that there was no increase in the capital grant to the College of Trades and Technology at all when there was a great need for it. There was no need for an increase in the capital cost for vocational schools because there were four or five schools being completed as a result of a previous commitment by the Liberal Administration.

Now, Sir, I would just like to point out another thing. We have one of the finest fisheries colleges in the world. Do you know what our problem is in this province? We cannot get the students to go there. We cannot, Sir, get the students to go there. We have a vast fishing resource off our coast. Honourable members on the other side scream and yell about the Law of the Sea Conference, about the need of protecting our off-shore resources, minerals, oil and the fisheries. Sir, what is the good of protecting the fisheries resources if we do not have the men, the fishermen to go out and exploit these resources?

I ask you, Sir, what is this administration doing to attract students to the Fisheries College of this province?

AN HON. MEMBER: Trying to do the boats for them a few years ago.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Very brilliant. If the honourable member would forget about the past and think about the present and the future he might be a little bit better off, so would the people of Newfoundland be much better off, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, instead of McLean's films on trying to sell the great forestry policy, the so-called great forestry policy, instead of films on how to drive on the highways, instead of films and advertisements trying to sell the social services programme, I would submit that a few hundred dollars or thousand dollars go toward attracting students to the Fisheries College of this province.

Now, Sir, I would like to turn my attention to capital costs of the primary and elementary schools of our province. Sir, the school boards in this province face utter and complete bankruptcy. Sir, it has been stated by some education officials that a moratorium

may have to be placed on school construction in this province. A moratorium, Sir, a halt to school construction in this province.

Sir, if I can refer to the estimates for 1972-1973 - 6-12-08, we see that for the year 1971-1972, \$8 million in capital grants to the schools. The first year this P.C. Administration took over \$8 million in capital grants to the schools. The second year, Sir, this administration was in office we see the same figures, Sir, \$8 million for capital construction in the schools. Now, Sir, are we building schools in this province or are we not? Presumably we should be but for the past three years there has been the same provincial grant for capital construction, eight measly million dollars. If honourable members over on the other side can Thank God for the P.C.s, I would say in this instance, Sir, Thank God for DREE and for the federal government who pumped in last year \$11,079,000 for school construction and the year before \$8,658,000.

Sir, if it were not for the federal government DREE money there would be students walking the streets or cramming the classrooms at this point.

Now, Sir, what is the situation? Fact No. 1 - The school boards of this province have an approximate debt of \$46 million now, Sir, this is close on

six years on future provincial income based on \$8 million per year. Even if the government continue with its \$8 million per year, they could not even wipe out the capital debt of the school boards in six years.

Now, Sir, add to this the debt charges or interest on the debt and we will come to an approximate figure of \$68 million or \$70 million for the next few years. Sir, the amount of money coming for capital grants from the provincial government can just barely allow the school boards to service and pay their debts. There is just no money left over. There is no money left over for purposes of school construction except in the cases of DREE schools. Sir, all the money goes for the repayment of the principal and the payment of the interest on these debts. Sir, the school boards cannot afford to service any more debts. I would submit, Sir, that any school board going to a chartered bank at this particular point, juncture of time, would just get the bank manager's door in the face. The banks will not allow the school boards to borrow any more money.

Sir, last year the Denominational Educational Committees asked for \$132 million for the years 1973-1980. Now, Sir, this averages out to \$16.5 million per year for the next eight years. This is what the Denominational Educational Committees asked for, Sir. They asked for \$16.5 million per year for the next eight years. It is a total of \$132 million.

Now, Sir, add to this the debt figures. You can follow the logic, Sir. Add to this request, this need of \$132 million, the debt figures of approximately \$70 million, including the principal and the interest and we get, Sir, \$200 million (let us round it off) required by the school boards for the next seven or eight years. That is \$200 million, Sir, in order to pay their principal, pay their interest and construct schools. Sir, this averages out to \$29 million per year for the next seven years. That is \$29 million per year for seven years. Now, Sir, the present situation provides the Denominational Educational Committees with \$8 million per year for eight years. This is \$64 million.

Sir, this is a far cry from the \$202 million needed. The Denominational Educational Committees under the present formula over the next seven or eight years are out by \$138 million. Now, Sir, if I were a businessman, I would be kind of concerned about this. I would come to an unalterable conclusion that I am headed for bankruptcy. That is precisely what the school boards are, Sir, headed for complete and utter bankruptcy.

Now, Sir, the latest announcement by the Minister of Education, which had gotten great headlines, Sir, was: The Minister of Education announced \$120 million for the next ten years for the Denominational Educational Committees. Sir, that is only \$70 million or \$80 million for the next seven or eight years. Sir, I have shown above that the Denominational Educational Committees require \$202 million for the next seven or eight years in order to pay their principal, pay their interest and construct new schools - \$202 million and not \$70 million or \$80 million.

Now, Sir, what are the recommendations of the Denominational Educational Committees? The Denominational Educational Committees have asked for \$16.5 million to be made available for the building of new schools. Sir, they have asked that money be made available for twenty years. This total then would be \$328 million. Now, Sir, of this \$328 million (Now this is the recommendation of the Denominational Educational Committees. They have asked for \$16.5 million per year for the next few years. They have asked to be able to enter into financial arrangements for twenty years. At this minimum amount, Sir, and I would suspect that they would need more later on, it would total \$328 million.) approximately \$68 million of this must be used to repay the existing commitments or existing loans. Therefore, Sir, this leaves \$260 million all of which could be applied to new school construction over the next twenty years. There is no other alternative, Sir.

Sir, what is wrong with borrowing more money for educational purposes or going after DREE as hard and fast as you can, Sir, to get money for educational purposes? Sir, this administration give the impression

that it was only the previous administration that borrowed money.

Well, Sir, you remember that the previous administration left a \$100 million debt -

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, \$1 billion.

MR. F. B. ROWE: It was \$1 billion, is that right? That is \$1,000 million, a \$1 billion debt, Sir.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. B. ROWE: Yes, Sir, we admit it. There would be no roads in the member's district, no schools in the member's district, if that money were not borrowed. We did not have the industrial or the resource base, Sir, to provide the social services for our province without borrowing money. If we have to borrow money to provide hospitals, schools, roads and what have you, that the young youth of our province

would benefit from and would help pay for in years to come, so be it! I am not ashamed of \$1 billion debt, Sir, as long as our people are living half as well as some of our other Canadian citizens.

Now, Mr. Speaker, \$1 billion over twenty-three years, this averages out to approximately \$43 million per year. Well, Mr. Speaker, it might do the members' hearts good to know that this administration, since it has been in power, has managed to borrow approximately \$325 million, so that is \$162 million per year. If the previous administration had borrowed at that rate, Sir, the provincial debt when they took over would have been \$3,726 million, almost four times the debt that the other administration managed to build up. So, Sir, what I am saying is why not borrow more money for educational purposes? It is a good investment, Sir.

Now I got two suggestions and I wish the honourable member for Bonavista South were present, because honourable members on the other side, Sir, are using the strategy that if you say something long enough and loud enough, the people of Newfoundland will start believing it. Every morning I hear honourable members on the other side on radio talking about the negative criticism of the Liberal Opposition. We hear the same thing in this honourable House. They are asking for positive suggestions, forgetting, Sir, that we were booted out, they were elected in. They were asked to govern the province, Sir. Honourable members on this side were not asked to administer the province, I submit, Sir, that the nine of us could do as good a job.

But, Sir, it is not our job to formulate policy, it is to give constructive criticism and constructive proposals from time to time and on occasion after occasion, honourable members on this side have made positive suggestions. I have made them myself, I am about to make a couple more now. But let us hear an end, Sir, to this ridiculous tactic, the strategy that the honourable members on the other side are using, of trying to convince the people of Newfoundland that we are a negative bunch and they are the holier than thous.

Now, Mr. Speaker, suggestion number one - the Minister of Education and the Minister of Finance should go like dogs after DREE money for educational purposes in this province. It is a weak and a feeble excuse for the Minister of Education to suggest that DREE schools are too expensive for this province.

Sir, are we second class citizens in Canada? Can we not have DREE schools, schools that are comparable to schools in Ontario, British Columbia, Alberta? Can we not have at least that much? What is wrong with flushing the air out of a school? It is expensive, Sir, but a little bit of clean air, is that too much for our Newfoundland students? Go after DREE money, Sir, and build more DREE schools. I got evidence, Mr. Speaker, to suggest and this would be brought out during the estimates, and this is why I am trying to get the honourable Minister of Education to table his evidence, his data, when he says that DREE schools are more expensive to build and more expensive to maintain. I want to see that data, Sir, because I have data that suggests that there are schools in this province that were built not by DREE but by the authorities that were just as expensive to build and maintain as DREE schools.

Sir, if the minister actually believes that we should not have schools in Newfoundland comparable to schools in other parts of Canada, if he believes that DREE schools are too expensive to maintain and to build and maintain, why can the minister not renegotiate with DREE? If they do not like the big fan system in a DREE school, renegotiate, whip it out. But, Sir, the minister and this government have to go after DREE to get this money because there is a crisis in school construction in this province and the school boards are headed for bankruptcy. That is suggestion number one, Sir.

Suggestion number two: Sir, there should be a twenty year financing programme for school construction in this province. Sir, we suggest that a crown corporation be set up, you can call it the Newfoundland Educational Finance Corporation, Sir, a crown corporation be set up, call it the Newfoundland Educational Finance Corporation.

Sir, this corporation be set up to go to work and borrow money from the financial markets with government guarantees, with government guarantees. There is a crown corporation, Sir, set up, I do not know who would make it up, this particular corporation, it could be the DEC's or some members of the federation of school boards but a crown corporation.

This corporation would then use this money to build schools. It could either build schools itself and then turn them over to the denominational authorities to operate or could give the money to the denominational school boards who in turn would build the schools just as they do now, Sir.

The Education Finance Corporation, that crown corporation, would have laid out a ten to twenty year construction programme and Sir, it could be worked out in conjunction with the authorities and subject to all the checks and balances which must be built into such an undertaking at the present time.

Once this programme is worked out then it could be carried into action. It would be financed by borrowing, Sir. How would these borrowings be repaid? Simply by an annual allotment by the government, the same as we have now.

Sir, we have such systems but we have financed such systems as water and sewer systems and other municipal services over the past twenty-five or thirty years in exactly the same manner and it makes good sense. It would give us the schools we need at the least possible cost and even more importantly it would enable the school authorities to plan on a forward and reasonably long term basis.

Now, on the contrary, Sir, they have to plan on a short-term basis all schools and it makes good sense to put school financing on a twenty year basis. After all, Sir, most honourable members in this House have twenty, thirty or forty year mortgages to pay off their homes. Why can we not have twenty or thirty year or twenty year financing for the purpose of building schools.

Now, Sir, this is a great step forward, I would suggest, if such a crown corporation were set up. It is a positive suggestion that we on this side make to the Minister of Education. It sounds reasonable to me, Sir, rational, particularly when we look at the miserable mess the school board find themselves in now. It is a positive suggestion, Sir, it has got logic to it. Sir, was this suggestion made by the Minister of Finance? No, Sir. The Minister of Education? No. The Premier of the Province, Sir? No, Sir, it was not made by him. Was it made by any member on the opposite side? No, Sir. Was it made by the previous Liberal administration? No, Sir, no. Sir, this recommendation was made publicly by what the honourable the Minister of Mines and Energy calls "that nasty creep". It was made, Sir, by Mister Negativism himself. It was made by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition in a public speech. I cannot remember where exactly it was made. It was made, I believe in Corner Brook, Sir.

So, it is our policy on this side of the House that such a crown corporation be set up in order to enable twenty year financing for the purposes of school construction. If that is not done, Sir, school boards will collapse financially and we will be doing without schools comparable to other schools in the rest of Canada.

Now, Sir, I have all ready said that I am getting sick and tired of the attacks by members on the other side of the House. I have got a few notes jotted down here about their tactics but Sir, to be quite frank with you, I would just as soon skip over them because the tactics used by some honourable members on the other side of the House are really not worthy of comment, their attack on the present Liberal Opposition and the present Liberal Administration in Ottawa, not worthy of comment, Sir.

Now, Sir, I would like to turn my attention to operating grants of the schools. Sir, besides the teachers' salaries and the superintendents' salaries, the operating grants mostly go to school bus transportation, fuel and oil, lighting and maintenance and teaching materials and so on. Now, Sir, there has been a tremendous escalation in these costs over the past two years. I am not blaming that on the present administration, Sir, but there has been a worldwide escalation in these kinds of costs but unfortunately, Sir, the operating grants to the school boards have not increased proportionally to the escalating costs in the schools. Consequently, we find that the school boards announced a few days ago they find themselves with a \$3.5 million debt on the current or operating aspect of their budget.

Sir, in the estimates of 1972-73, 6-12-02, Sir, the operating grant to the school boards went from \$10.5 million to \$11.7 million. Now, Sir, just listen to this. In 1971-72, \$10.5 million almost. The first year the P.C.s took over \$11.7 million, a bit of an increase, Sir, but not adequate to take care of the escalating costs. In 1973-74 Sir, 6-12-02, we see that the operating grant was \$11.5 million. It decreased by \$200,000 and it, well let us say it was the same. It was the same for 1973-74 as it was for 1972-73 where there was a tremendous escalation in the cost of school bus operation, fuel oil, maintenance and what have you because of labour costs.

Well, Sir, there is a most peculiar thing here. When we look at the revised estimates for 1972-73, we see that instead of the \$11,700,000 that was estimated for 1972-73, there was only \$10.4 million spent. Sir, quite frankly, I cannot understand why that should be when the revised estimates dropped by over \$1 million but, Sir, the point should be clear. There has been tremendous escalations in operating costs for the school boards and we have not had a comparative increase in operating grants to the school boards. Consequently, the school boards get it again to the tune of \$3.5 million in debt.

Now, Sir, we predicted two years ago that the school boards would go under on the current or operating side of the ledger. Again, Sir, disregard on the part of the various Ministers of Education and the present administration: Now, Sir, what are they going to do about it? They should have known that the situation was happening. They have their army of civil servants down there. The Minister of Education should have known the nature of the requests made by the school boards and he should have known they were coming.

Mr. Speaker, the school boards are now placed in this kind of a situation. Before I get on with this, Mr. Speaker, could you give me some indication of approximately how much time I do have left.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has fifteen minutes left.

MR. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the warnings that we have given this administration and as a result of the requests of the various school boards, this administration should have known that the school boards would be \$3.5 million in debt at this stage. They should have known that these kinds of requests would be coming. The government supply emergency grants to school boards in

extreme current financial difficulties asked just a few weeks ago, Sir, by the Federation of School Boards. They asked that greatly increased grants be allocated for the school year 1974 - 1975, with the review of their adequacy in December 1974. They also asked that special funds be provided for the operational and maintenance of resource centers and all-purpose rooms etc. They asked for additional funds to provide for more staff in school board offices and that a capital loan board be established to provide long-term loans for school construction. Sir, they went on with many other requests. This is the Federation of School Boards. Not a word in the Throne Speech with respect to what this administration were going to do with respect to the operating aspects of the school boards.

How are we going to pay for all of this? Well I have made two suggestions, Sir. (1) Go after DREE money and (2) Set up a crown corporation that could operate on the basis of twenty year financing. Still, Sir, where does the money come from? It comes from the pockets of the people.

One thing that we are deadly opposed to and I will say it again, is a proliferation of school tax authorities in this province. We are deadly opposed to it, Sir. They should be abolished immediately. We have been calling for this for two years and to be quite frank, the only groups that I have heard who supported the School Tax Authorities were the people on School Tax Authorities and the School Tax Authorities themselves.

Let me make one other point perfectly clear: I say God Bless the members on the School Tax Authorities and I thank them for their interest and all Newfoundland should thank them for their interest in education in this province. They are trying to do something that should be the responsibility of government and that is raise money for educational purposes in this province.

The school boards are forced into setting up School Tax Authorities for the simple reason that they do not have money to

build schools and they do not have money to operate schools. They are in debt on both accounts.

I suggest that this administration through the Newfoundland and Labrador Educational Finance Corporation, a crown corporation, this administration accept the full responsibility for capital construction and operating of the schools in this province, one hundred per cent of the responsibility for capital construction and for operating to a certain standard.

Now, Sir, the argument will be that there should be some local input. There can still be local input at the community or school district level. We can have improvements in library facilities, gymnasium facilities, lab facilities, in music rooms, in what have you, in certain aspects of the curriculum. You can still get money from the local level but it should not be mandatory. It should be on a voluntary basis and organized by those people who are interested in raising money just as money is raised by bingo for certain purposes. Not mandatory, Sir, but voluntary.

I think that the government should wipe out straight-away these School Tax Authorities, accept the responsibility for capital construction of the schools and for operating grants for the schools and they should set up this crown corporation and get on with the job of providing decent schools for our young Newfoundlanders.

This whole business of School Tax Authorities throughout the nation, throughout the rest of Canada, they are moving away not only from local School Tax Authorities but they are moving away from municipal responsibility for educational costs. I can remember when I first taught at Prince of Wales Collegiate, I went up to Wolfville one summer on a marking board and I can remember what I witnessed as a result of municipal responsibility for education. Beautiful big schools with all kinds of facilities with teachers with great salaries in places such as Halifax but out in the valley, Sir, schools not quite as good and teachers

being paid less.

Provinces of Canada are moving away from not only local school tax authorities but municipal responsibility for educational costs. They are moving toward provincial responsibility and, Sir, I would submit that within the next few years we will see a greater responsibility on the part of the federal government for educational costs in the nation. The money still comes from the same place, the people's pockets. School tax authorities and local school tax authorities, with poll taxes, property taxes and competition with municipal governments and court cases and magistrates running all over the place, doing such things as giving consideration to collecting school taxes from recipients of social assistance, inspection of employer's payrolls, records by school tax authorities, collection by school tax authorities from recipients of manpower allowances for those attending vocational or upgrading schools, this kind of stuff, Sir, the most cumbersome inefficient, awkward, costly, duplicating way to collect revenue for educational purposes. I say, Sir, do away with them and let this government go on and do the job for which they were elected. Accept the responsibility for educational costs in this province and allow some local input on a voluntary non-mandatory basis at the local level but accept the full responsibility for operational and capital costs.

Now, Sir, there are many other things that I can say with respect to education. In view of the crisis at the College of Trades and Technology, in view of the inequality of educational opportunities at the post-secondary level for those particularly wanting to attend university, in view of the near bankruptcy of the school boards, a \$46 million or \$48 million debt on the capital side and \$3.5 million on the operating side, in view of the continuation of the School Tax Authorities, which is nothing but

duplication and an awkward and - what is the word I am looking for - inefficient method and controversial method of raising money, in view, Sir, of the fact that there are hundreds of girls trying to get into nursing schools who cannot get into nursing schools, in view of the utter and complete failure of this administration in the field of education when compared to what they promised during the election campaign, I have no other choice, Sir, but to strongly support the amendment moved by my colleague from the Fogo district.

I submit that if there are other honourable members interested in education in this province and the welfare of the youth, that as far as adequate programmes to bring up public services in education are concerned, some other honourable members on the other side of the House have no other choice, Sir, but to support the same amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that any of us were surprised that the honourable gentleman would be supporting the amendment made by his colleague. Honourable gentlemen will perhaps forgive me, I have a certain hoarseness. However, it is not too serious. Certainly the honourable gentleman painted a very dark picture of crises and bankruptcy, impending doom, collapsing. Mr. Speaker, one would think that we were in a terrible state, one would not think that Newfoundland like other provinces was having problems in financing education. One would not think that in terms of capital costs and current costs there were serious problems that school boards were having and that all institutions were having, one would think that we were in a state of total chaos and crisis. Mr. Speaker, this situation does not reflect the facts. It is in my opinion a playing to the galleries. I suppose that is fair enough too. People may have to play to the galleries.

The suggestion is that the government should take over all of the financial aspects of education, capital, current, whatever it is. On a number of these matters of course I can only say so much because the

budget which will be brought in next month and will in fact give the House and the people information with respect to what the capital expenditures will be next year and what the grants for operating expenses will be next year. I certainly cannot now forecast that or state that or indicate it in any way. One would think that the honourable gentleman had the budget and he knew what the capital expenditures were going to be next year and was already criticizing them.

Well, I suppose in a sense he can because whatever they are or will be they will never be enough. One would also think that he knew what the vote was going to be for operating expenses for schools, that he knew it and came to the conclusion after a serious study that it was not enough. He does not know, Mr. Speaker, what it is going to be. I have no doubt, whatever it is, that he will say that it is not enough. Of that I am sure, absolutely, totally sure. I am sure that the honourable gentleman and his colleagues will say when they know what they are talking about, when they know what the vote will be next year for operating costs, when they know how much public money will be available next year for capital construction of schools, when they know - they do not know it now - even when they know it and they speak they will even then condemn it.

There is not too much difference, I suppose, in condemning something, even when you do not know what it is, if you are going to condemn it no matter what amount it is. Is it not somewhat indicative, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition could not wait until they would know in a months time, sometime next month or this month rather or in March probably, certainly within the next month? They will know within a month how much money will be voted for capital construction of schools. They will know how much money will be voted for the operating expenses of schools. Is it not better, number one, to speak about something when you know about it? Maybe it is not. Maybe it does not make any difference. Maybe

if you are going to be "agin it" anyway, then it is just as well to be "agin it" when you do not know it as "agin it" when you do know it. I do not know, Mr. Speaker. I think it depends on where you put your emphasis. Are you putting your emphasis on knowing what the situation is, maybe even having an open mind? You might not criticize it but even if you do, you can do it with knowledge.

That, I would suggest, is where you put the emphasis, on knowing the situation. If you put your emphasis just on condemning it, then I would think that the honourable gentleman did the obvious and inevitable thing, he criticized it without knowing it because he was going to criticize it when he knew it anyway.

Let us take a look at the suggestions: How are we going to solve the problem that Newfoundland of all the world, only we are facing one would almost think? No problem with financing education in Ontario. None in Alberta. None in British Columbia. None throughout Canada, throughout North America or wherever else you want to go. One would think that this was a problem unique, brought in by the Tories two years, brought in like a disease, that only here in Newfoundland we have it and we only could stamp it out. How are we going to stamp it out? Why not borrow more money?

My God! Mr. Speaker, if it were all as simple as that, if we could solve the problems of education by borrowing more money, solve the problems in health services by borrowing more money. The Minister of Municipal Affairs could have municipal services in every community in Newfoundland, water, sewerage, everything that was needed. The Minister of Highways could have paved highways throughout every part of Newfoundland. There would not be one reason why one road

throughout Labrador, throughout the island part of the province, anywhere, why one road, primary, secondary, call it what you will why one road should not be paved. If the honourable gentleman has the solution, by heavens it is so drastic and it is so imaginative and it is so compelling that we have to ask ourselves, by God do we have the answer now? Borrow more money, Mr. Speaker, and I am not, the Minister of Finance and he has much more knowledge in this area than I have, but I think it is evident to every member of this House, including honourable gentlemen opposite, evident to everyone, that a government has to borrow, has to borrow for certain purposes, has to borrow for its sinking funds, has to borrow to turn over debt. That is obvious, it is a fact, a financial fact of life of governments, of a Tory Government, of a Liberal Government, of a Government in Newfoundland, of a Government in Ontario, that there is a point beyond which a government cannot borrow.

Let us say that you stop at a certain amount and you say to solve these problems in education or whatever it is we borrow an extra \$10 million, Mr. Speaker a government goes on the market for that extra \$10 million in bonds and they are not bought and nobody picks them up, then what happens? The credit of the province is destroyed. The ratings of bonds houses which determines your ability to place bonds and the rate at which you can borrow money that way is totally effected.

If a government put bonds on the market, this government, the previous Smallwood Administration, any government put bonds on the market to raise money and they do not have a buyer, then the credit of the province is destroyed. Mr. Speaker, just the borrowing of more money, it is not as simple as that.

If one could list up all of the needs of education and other essential areas, and say x amount in millions of dollars and that is to say \$30 million more or whatever amount it is more than can be placed on the bond market and these go and there are no buyers, then the financial creditability, stability of the province is destroyed. This no

government can do, no government can do. It would be the most irresponsible act, the most devastating act that any government can do. So the answer, borrow more money, does not hold out the easy solution. As a matter of fact I do not think there are easy solutions.

I think perhaps for too long we have been fed on the pabulum, the pabulum of easy solutions and everything is free because if it comes from government it is free. If it comes from government it is not free. There are very few free things in this world. It still comes from people's taxes but somehow or other this attitude of looking for the easy way to solve difficult problems and thinking that the government will supply all the money, Mr. Speaker, the government only has the money it collects in taxes or it gets in payments from Ottawa, equalization payments, that it gets in revenue and what it borrows, and it can get no more. The amount it gets in revenue is set. The amount it gets in S.S.A., various forms of revenue, the amount it gets back from taxes collected, that it gets back from Ottawa, the amount that it gets in equalization grants, the amount that it gets in these various forms and it is a certain finite amount and when that amount is in, it is in the treasury, it is there. There is nothing you can do to stretch it. You cannot make it any more. The amount you get from Ottawa under equalization, once you have gotten it, you have gotten it, there is no way of making it any more. The amount that you can safely borrow, the amount that you can borrow is also a certain amount and when it is reached you cannot at that period, at that time, increase it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that far from being a magic cure to our problems, it is refusal to recognize the obvious and that is that there are limitations on every government's ability to borrow including the government of this province.

Now we had another suggestion; set up a crown corporation.

The Crown Corporation would borrow the money from the financial markets with government guarantees, obviously, it would have to be with government guarantees.

Mr. Speaker, this crown corporation is competing in the same money markets that the government itself is whether ten or fifteen, whatever the amount is that is going to be raised, if it is to be raised directly by the government or raised by a crown corporation which is a instrument of the government created by statute and guaranteed by the government. There is no difference. The money comes from the same places. It is coming to the same province. Certainly, there is a legal technical difference but it is no more than a legal technicality. It is still guaranteed by the Province. This corporation which is a creature of the government is competing in the same markets as the government, only has access to the same markets as the government. The \$20 million - you call them Peter and Paul, you call the crown corporation Peter and the government Paul- a \$20 million that Peter, the crown corporation, borrows is \$20 million that Paul, government, does not borrow or vice versa.

So, the crown corporation is no cure-all of our financial problems with relation to education or anything else that at a very superficial glance it might appear to be.

Mr. Speaker, borrowing, increased borrowing, just reliance totally on borrowing, whether it be by government or crown corporation which is an instrument of government does not have unlimited sources of money because of the fact there is only so much one can borrow and to attempt to place bonds on the market which would not be picked up would be to destroy the credit rating of the Province.

The honourable member suggested as well that we should abolish school tax authorities and I presume he meant well. He went on to say that the government should take over all the financing for capital and current expenses, for capital and operating, the government should take it all over. If in a local area people wanted to collect money for some local

need, like improvements to a gymnasium, etc., nothing would stop them doing it but essentially that the government should take over all of the financing for capital and current - we already, obviously, have all the financing for teachers' salaries.

Mr. Speaker, one looks at this as well. (1) Public funds now pay all teachers' salaries. We pay at least ninety odd per cent of capital construction of capital costs and we pay close to one hundred per cent current of operating costs. So, let us see what the involvement of government is now. All of teachers' salaries and not like in other provinces where in many cases a specific amount is voted to a board for teachers' salaries and then either it is supplemented locally or however way it is done, all of teachers salaries are covered. At least ninety per cent of capital construction costs covered from government and close to one hundred per cent of current costs, operating costs, in the high nineties, certainly, in the high nineties. The government should take it all over? That would mean abolishing school tax authorities. It would also mean, presumably, abolishing school assessments, if government were taking it all over.

Mr. Speaker, this Province was led down that particular garden path a few years ago. We were all, people, schools, school boards, everybody led down the garden path, everything free, government take it all over, a few years ago, and no longer would there be school fees. This was the philosophy of the previous administration, it was starting out. They changed it themselves, they had to. No longer would there be school fees, everything would come out of general revenue of the Province. I think it was at that time that the S.S.A. went up two points.

Mr. Speaker, it did not work. It did not work. Shortly after that administration had to permit, enable assessments and school taxes. Mr. Speaker, I do not think at the present time there is any substitute for a certain amount. It can only be so much, obviously, but for a certain amount of local involvement, not only in decision making, but a certain amount in terms of financial responsibility as well, that at the

school board level there should be a certain amount of involvement. If one were to abolish taxes for educational purposes because the state would take it all over, then why not abolish municipal taxes? The state would take that all over and you would have everything run from the Confederation Building, a great and glorious picture of a centralized, state approach because the piper who does not play at least a little tune does not have very much say. If we were to totally abolish local financial involvement, the school board level, no, there could be voluntary

contributions, voluntary contributions. If we were to abolish required local participation in financing for educational purposes, then, to be consistent, we should abolish taxes in municipalities as well. We should go the whole hog and say, I would think, that the logical conclusion would be that everything will be run from the central office. Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much that that would be any improvement. I think that for quite some time it will be necessary in this province to have a certain amount of local, regional and financial responsibility in educational matters. I repeat that in teachers' salaries all is now covered through public funds, in capital, at least ninety per cent, and operating in the high ninety's, close to one hundred per cent.

Mr. Speaker, we also have the suggestion of further DREE involvement in education. Certainly that is quite a different kind of suggestion than the other ones. As the honourable gentleman knows or at least should know, as I mentioned to the House, the general agreement, signed some time ago, is open for review and amendment every year during its ten year period of life. That agreement does not, the general agreement does not mention education. It mentions human resource development and the whole tenor of the agreement and the whole tenor of that agreement relates it to development opportunities. For the first year of that agreement, we are concentrating upon a subsidiary or subsidiaries and agreement or agreements in the area of vocational, technical, fisheries education. The second year of that agreement, we are going to have another look in the area of primary, secondary education. DREE participation is not precluded. I point out that in the agreement, as it now is, it is not mentioned. Human resource development is mentioned and the whole tenor of the agreement with its basis or bias if you wish (not bias in the pejorative term) toward development opportunities, is much more oriented to vocational, technical training in the broadest fields.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, that agreement is open for review and review is meaningless unless there is the possibility of

amendment every year of its ten year period and that is an area which certainly another look can be given to at that time.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one other area in which I wish to speak briefly and that is with respect to the teacher allocation programme. I noticed in this evening's "Evening Telegram" that the Hon. Member for Hermitage is quoted in the "Evening Telegram". Now I did not hear the words. He is quoted in the "Evening Telegram" as having said that I misled the House with respect to my explanation thereof. Mr. Speaker, we have had enough points of privilege here. I have no intention of mentioning it as a point of privilege because really if honourable gentleman want to accuse somebody of misleading the House then I suppose they are going to accuse somebody. I do say that the honourable gentleman is quoted as having said that in the Legislature. I think I was outside during those few minutes. If he were misquoted, he certainly is not the first gentleman who has been misquoted. As I say, I do not know, I am just making a brief reference to what the newspaper quotes him as having said.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the new teacher allocation programme, there are a few things that I would like to review and emphasize there. First of all I would like to review and point out to the honourable House the effect in terms of additional teachers and to indicate as well the additional cost over the next three academic years; and secondly, I would like to indicate the philosophy behind the teacher allocation programme. I do not intend going through the technical aspect of it nor the various components. When I made the statement, I think a copy was put on every member's desk and that is there. I would like to point out what it means in terms of the number of teachers for the next three years and also in terms of cost. Let us bear cost in mind too. I want to say something about the philosophy behind it, with relation to the suggestion that has been made that this new policy should not be applied to high schools but only to primary and elementary and that high schools should stay under the old system. I would like to comment briefly on that as well.

Mr. Speaker, during the next school year, 1974-1975, the new teacher allocation programme will bring an additional 300 teachers to the schools of the province, at a cost during that academic year of \$2.4 million. During the second year of implementation, the academic year 1975-1976, there will be an additional 200 at a cost for that 200 (All of these costs are based on the present teachers' salaries over the whole period. If it goes over a three year period, there is no projection of increases for that. It is dealing with the salary scales as they are now.) of \$1.6 million. This will mean, Mr. Speaker, that during the second year of implementation the new programme will have brought 500 extra teachers to the province at a cost of \$4 million.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Pardon?

the legality -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Oh, I thought you said the legality. I am sorry. No, no, I would not do that but there is nothing wrong with looking at them. After all, if the honourable gentleman were over on this side and he looked up he would see that there are three young ladies there much more attractive than the five honourable gentlemen opposite.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, but one cannot look in all directions at the same time. As a matter of fact, in this House you would hardly be able to leave your back to some honourable members.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, I certainly have no fear. The Honourable the Member for Placentia East yesterday gave one of the most firey speeches, a very brief one but a very firey one but obviously I cannot see the people above me in the gallery but I am sure there are some very attractive young ladies up there as well. I can only see the ones in front of me, Sir.

However, we have now finished with year two. During the third year of implementation, a five year, 1976-1977, there will be an additional 364 teachers at a cost for that 364 of \$2.9 million. Therefore, by September 1976, two and a-half years from now - by September 1976 the new teacher allocation programme will have brought an additional 864 approximately 860 teachers available - in two and a-half years by September 1976, an additional 864 teachers will be available at an overall cost of an additional \$6.9 million. I will repeat that these dollar figures are conservative, they do not endeavour as they should not endeavour to take into account any increases in teachers salaries etc.

AN HON. MEMBER: May I ask the honourable minister a question?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: A question, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Speak up I cannot hear.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Teachers supply? I wonder, Sir, if he would look at the possibility that the teacher supply may not be there to provide these 800 extra teachers that he is talking about. I ask this question in view of the fact that there has been a reduction in student enrollment in the faculty of education over the last couple of years, because I think we may have a situation here were a formula for an additional 800 teachers but the supply may not be there.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I will comment briefly on that, Mr. Speaker. Certainly I think one of the benefits of the announcement of this programme, of the teacher allocation programme - some months ago or I do not know how it started - maybe a year ago all of a sudden people seemed to think without anybody checking facts but you heard it here and you heard it there, we are going to have many more teachers than needed. It seemed to have been stated without anybody checking the facts. There is in the foreseeable future no over-supply of teachers.

I think it is important of course that the people preparing for a career in teaching - one of the things obviously to look at look is that there are a number of areas where there are real shortages and real needs. Certainly that I think will be one of the things that people preparing for careers in teaching will bear in mind and no doubt the faculty at Memorial and guidance counsellors there would help draw to their attention. I think certainly one of the benefits of this is the fact that in two and a-half years we are going to need an extra 860 teachers will show that there is no over-supply in the immediate or the near future - the future that one can see within the next five or six years - I suppose as far as one can see those things.

I think the department recognizes that and the university recognizes that. I think, however, the mith sort of developed, I think it is now recognized and has been perhaps for the past couple of months that it was really based on inaccurate knowledge - as far as I know nobody ever checked to see what authenticity it had in the first place.

So in the third year, in two and a-half years, in September we will have an additional 860 teachers at a cost for them \$6.9 million. The total cost therefore of implementing this programme within the three years without bearing in mind any possible increase in teachers salaries will be over \$14 million.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: We are talking about money. His honourable colleague was pointing out the millions and millions that were necessary for capital costs and for the current expenses and that all we had to do was borrow or to set up a crown corporation. Certainly I would be remiss in my duty if I did not indicate to the House what the cost of - what in the government's opinion is a very beneficial programme will be. By three years time without bearing in mind any increases to teachers salaries it will be at least \$14 million.

Now I would like to indicate as well what philosophy this teacher allocation programme is based on.

MR. SIMMONS: Would the honourable minister permit a question?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: All right.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate whether his projections for a number of additional teachers over the next three years are based on present enrollments - I presume present enrollments or do they take into account the declining enrollments which we can expect in the next three years?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, these figures are based upon our projection of what the enrollment figures will be by that period. This would still show that next year there is going to be a decrease in entrance and the year after as well. There will in all probability be a decrease in entrance. In other words, for the last few years we have had a smaller number of people entering the school system. We had less last year than the year before, we have less this year than last year. We will have less next September than this year and in all probability we will have less the September after 1976 than in September 1975, this is due to the declining birth rate. But these figures are based upon the data

that we have with respect to actual enrollments next year, the year after and the year after. Really you are talking about

an increasing and I think - I am very glad the honourable gentleman asked me that question because it points up something that obviously I should have mentioned and which is probably not generally known. We are increasing the number of teachers, we are improving the ratio - one can say it should be better or it should be this or it should be that but we are increasing the number of teachers. In two and one-half years, eight hundred and sixty and more, next year three hundred more. We are improving the ratio that way but we are doing this with the population trend of smaller enrollments because of a decline some years ago in the birth rate. This too is a very important factor in just what that allocation programme will do. Certainly for the next two, probably three years, we will see a further decline according to the data that we have available.

The old policy, the one that this one will replace, was based essentially on allocations to individual schools. Essentially it was based on allocations to individual schools. I am not going into all the ramifications obviously, but that was the essential overall philosophy, the major component, allocations to individual schools, whereas the new programme is based upon the allocation of salary units to a school district. A school district can have various numbers of schools. The basic, if you wish, philosophic, an over-used term, but policy difference between this programme and the one it is going to replace is that the old policy was based on allocations to schools, school by school by school throughout the province. This one is based on allocation of teachers or teachers' salary units to each school district of which there are thirty-one, I believe.

Under the new programme the internal allocation, if you wish, for the schools within the board's jurisdiction becomes the responsibility of that school board. We feel that the school board at the regional level should have a more realistic awareness of the needs and priorities within its area. This is in line with the educational principles of allowing boards to identify their own

priorities and of giving them a needed flexibility in the deployment of teachers. Certainly we believe that this is significantly preferable to the rigid mathematical formula whereby it is applied to every school across the province on an individual school by school basis.

It has been suggested that the old formula school by school continue to be applied for high schools and that the new one be for other schools. While there are obviously differences between primary, elementary, junior high, senior high schools, we do not view them as four isolated educational services but rather as parts of an overall educational service and they are all related and inter-dependent. To apply one formula for high schools and another policy for primary and elementary schools would, I believe, be to contradict the basic philosophy of a new teacher allocation programme. That is, that in addition to making additional teachers available to the schools in the province the allocation and deployment should be done on the board level to give the boards the flexibility they require in terms of their own priorities and their own assessment of needs.

To continue the old formula for high schools and the new formula for other schools would, I think, perpetuate the inequities of the old formula.

I want to point out too and I made this point in answer to the honourable Member for St. Barbe North's question a few days ago, there is nothing in the new teacher allocation policy to require that there be fewer teachers in high schools. It is obvious, of course, that if in a or some or whatever schools there is a drastic drop in enrollment then obviously, there is going to be on the school board level, one would think, on the educator level as well, a thinking out of what actual allocation should be made. If there is a drastic drop in enrollment because of a reorganization in the school district, or for whatever reasons, if there is a drastic drop in enrollment in a particular school, then it is only obvious

that this would require the board, educators and everybody interested in education to re-think the allocation for that particular school.

There is nothing in this formula, in the allocation policy as such to require a teacher in high school be reassigned to primary or elementary schools. All we have done or what we have done essentially is as I stated. In addition to bringing in new numbers we have gone on the philosophy which to the best of my knowledge, to the best of my knowledge most enlightened educators approve and that is to give the allocation on a district basis, not on a school by school basis.

Indeed, even those who have suggested that we keep the old formula for high schools do not suggest that we keep it for primary and elementary schools. I think to have two formulas, that way would be a total contradiction of the kind of philosophy that we are allocating.

As honourable members know as well, we have taken the recommendations in their entirety of the committee on teacher allocation. In their entirety! We have implemented them over three academic years instead of over two. That is the only difference. I can well see that people wish to say that it should be done in two rather than three or that it should be done in one. That is fair enough! One would like to do it in two, I suppose one would like to do it in one but I do not think one could do it in one. That is the only change we have made and this in no way violates the allocation principles recommended by that committee. What it does is postpone the full implementation of the programme from September 1975 to September 1976 because it was recommended over a two year and we are doing it over a three year period.

The reasons we decided to implement in three, over three rather than over two, they should be obvious. The honourable Gentleman from St. Barbe North has indicated the increasing needs in other areas of education. Operating grants,

capital grants, vocational technical, you name it, there is not an area in education where there are not needs for more money. We recognize the reason for increased expenditures in other areas of education, and essentially is why we have decided to implement it over a three academic year rather than over a two academic year period.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes the remarks that I wish to make with respect to what I was speaking about first, the allocation of capital funds for next year and the operating funds for next year. I can say no more about that and as I say, within a month the budget will be brought down and then honourable gentlemen will know what it is we will be spending and they can criticize it and say it is not enough but they will do it knowing what it is. There is not much sense in doing it not knowing what it is.

What I should point out as well is of course that the last three months of the school year, April, May, June, indeed July and August as well although they are not operating months for schools but there are still certain expenses involved, come under the new fiscal year. In other words, what school boards have in operating grants for April, May and June does not depend on last year's budget, it depends on the budget that will be brought in within a month. I do not really think that much can be said on capital or current account for next year until those estimates are available.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Placentia East.

MR. F. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak in this particular debate, I was going to wait for the address in reply but one almost feels compelled in self defence and almost to retain one's sanity to speak.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that really this session to date has been practically a complete waste of time.

AN HON. MEMBER: How do you know?

MR. AYLWARD: How do I know? Well I look at the Order Paper. It would easily indicate, Mr. Speaker, what we have been doing. The Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, there are twenty-two items on it, so far we have I think

considered four bills on second reading and referred them to a committee and the others - three is it? Three bills.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. AYLWARD: Lose what? Well, Mr. Speaker, if the people of Newfoundland decide that that is what they want, they want us here for all the month of February, we are over a month here now, and we have not passed one piece of legislation. We have not created one job. We have not brought down the cost of living one cent. We have not improved the public services of the province an iota.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come on over.

MR. AYLWARD: Come on over? Mr. Speaker, what we are invited to do is to continue what has happened for the past twenty-two years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh yes, but you were a big Liberal.

MR. AYLWARD: God help me! God forgive me! God forgive me! God forgive me!

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the opposition talk about more employment, the cost of living, what this honourable crowd over here have done or have not done and the speaker that we just finished listening to, before the Minister of Education, the honourable member for St. Barbe North, his answer was, for education just borrow the money, borrow the money.

Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate part of this is that the vast

majority of the people of Newfoundland have been led to believe and still believe the only reason why they do not have their public services is because the government just will not borrow the money. If, Mr. Speaker, if this honourable House were asked to fulfill the promises that were made in October, 1971, just in my district alone, it would cost this province I would say in excess of \$50 million alone.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we heard, on opening, the honourable member for Bell Island ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs what has happened, did he receive a delegation from Southern Harbour concerning the water and sewerage. Mr. Speaker, the problem that this government is inheriting in Southern Harbour I am sure is like the problem in a large number of rural districts in Newfoundland but particularly, Mr. Speaker, are they to blame for the terrible condition that prevails in Southern Harbour.

What happened in Southern Harbour, Mr. Speaker? The previous government in its resettlement programme brought in a large number of fishermen from the islands of Placentia Bay, just dropped them there without any water and sewerage. They designed roads and when the homes were brought in and placed in certain positions in the community where they were to face a proposed road, no road was even ever built. So, you have people living in that community today not even on a road, Mr. Speaker.

You had in that election this delegation. Only this morning we met with the Minister of Health as we did on previous occasions. Is there, Mr. Speaker, I ask any honourable member of this House and indeed anyone in Newfoundland, is there a more dedicated and a more honest Minister of the Crown, not alone in Newfoundland but anywhere in Canada, than the honourable Minister of Health? I say the same for the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Trained seals.

MR. AYLWARD: Trained seals, how are you? Mr. Speaker, if the delegation

from Southern Harbour had received from their predecessors the same answers that they received from this gentleman, from these honourable gentlemen, at least they would know where they stand. Their big criticism today and on previous occasions has been that they have been promised for five or six years - they quote a meeting with the former Premier and with the then Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, John Nolan. When they came out of the office they really felt certain that they had the water and sewerage. They have been going back and forth, back and forth and the honourable member for Bell Island asked the minister; "does he have knowledge that the council is going to resign?" Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether they are going to get the water and sewerage but I know this, since I have been elected I have done everything in my power to see to it that they can and will get the water and sewerage.

I have never promised it to them, Mr. Speaker, because I do not operate that way. If I know that we have a commitment - we have met on numerous occasions with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and with the Minister of Health. Why should I

tell the people, Mr. Speaker, why should I tell them if the government has not yet decided where water and sewerage is going.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. AYLWARD: Oh, Mr. Speaker, they have been told and this is why in that particular community as indeed in hundreds of other communities throughout Newfoundland and that is why it is getting harder and harder and harder for people to represent districts because these elected members of council feel and properly so, if they were promised by a government, not particularly by the leader of a government, that they were going to have their water and sewerage, they should have had it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Are they going to get it now?

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, are they going to get it now? The answer to that is: Right now the Minister of Municipal Affairs tells the council, as he has told them previously, that he has made a submission for assistance through DREE. I do not know and I am not going to say they are but I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that I will do everything in my power as their elected representative to support their efforts.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: We do that too.

MR. AYLWARD: What did you do? What did you do? What did your administration do for twenty years for Southern Harbour?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: We did as good as the member is doing now.

(Inaudible)

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, they have done absolutely nothing only fool the people there. They brought out a recreation centre in October, 1972, which cost, I think, in excess of \$100,000.00 and laid in on the ground, laid it on the ground and that is where it was, Mr. Speaker, until we could extract the fishing funds to try to get it assembled. It is the same situation throughout the district. Take the people of the Cape Shore. They were promised, Mr. Speaker, a paved road from Point Verde to North Harbour, promised a paved highway, a fish plant, a new hospital in Placentia. What did they get? What did they get in the twenty years? What did they get?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. AYLWARD: I know, but what I am saying now, Mr. Speaker, is for twenty years the people on the Cape Shore as well as the people in Southern Harbour and in all these communities were promised, promised, promised and now, of course, their needs and their aspirations are coming to a boiling point.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is when you were a Liberal and you supported (inaudible)

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. AYLWARD: What happened, Mr. Speaker, was as far as the - The Liberals and the honourable member who spoke previously on the other side of the House said that there was a new Liberal Party. Mr. Speaker, the individuals over here who left, they did not in fact leave the Liberal Party, the Liberal Party left them. These men stood up for what they felt and thought was the right move for Newfoundland. They did not fool around.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What a dedicated crowd.

MR. AYLWARD: What a dedicated crowd, exactly, Mr. Speaker, and when they condemn and malign the Minister of Finance, I think they should be on their knees, they should thank God that the Minister of Finance was successful in his efforts to bring an end to that regime. What happened, Mr. Speaker, they should not point with pride, they should not point with pride, Mr. Speaker, to their accomplishments in the past twenty years and to the fact that certain people on this side of the House were Liberals.

Of course, I can look around me, Mr. Speaker, and they talk about the leadership convention in 1968. I think every man who supported John Crosbie or who supported the honourable member for Burin, they had a lot of guts at

that time, Mr. Speaker, How many of the elected members of the House came out to support them? How many? What happened? What happened to the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing? What happened to him Mr. Speaker? What happened to him when he came out?

AN HON. MEMBER: He resigned.

MR. AYLWARD: What happened? What happened when he was promised to return to the cabinet? Then all these honourable gentlemen opposite were the same men who told him, "Oh no, we have no objection to your coming back in the cabinet." Did you not hear the man stand on the floor -

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. AYLWARD: I think the people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, will believe the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply when he says that each one of these honourable gentlemen when he contacted them and asked them -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of privilege? Sir, the honourable gentleman is - would he please take his seat while I am - thank you. The honourable gentleman is making insinuations which can only be aimed at the gentleman from White Bay South, myself, the gentleman from Bell Island, the gentleman from Fogo is not present. We have had this out in the House before. If he should want to debate the conduct of the present member for Fortune Bay, I should be quite prepared to do it. Until then, Sir, let him -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Placentia East, Sir, has no right to make insinuations about people in this House unless he is prepared -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: There is Charlie Brett who says he does not care if Bill Saunders were paid off or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the honourable gentleman from Placentia East is, I would submit, wandering somewhat far from the point of the motion under debate but the point of privilege Sir, is that the gentleman from Placentia East is -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: It is a point of personal privilege. The gentleman from St. John's North who is neither on personal nor privilege Mr. Speaker, the point of personal privilege is quite simply -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I proceed without this going on, Sir? The point of personal privilege, Sir, is that the gentleman from Placentia East, although he has not had the guts to name anybody, is stating facts which can only apply to four men who are presently in this House, I have just named the four men. These facts are not correct and it is a valid point of privilege to stand and to say so and the honourable gentleman if he has any manliness or courage will either make the statement definitively and make a charge or he will withdraw them.

My further point is, Sir that the conduct or the lack of conduct of the present member for Fortune Bay has little to do with this debate. If it be in order to debate it, I should like the opportunity to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The point made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition I feel is not a point of privilege but a difference of opinion between alleged statements between two honourable members. With regard to the relevancy of the debate by the honourable member for Placentia East, I feel that perhaps he was not relevant too much to the amendment and I suggest that he perhaps be a little more relevant to the amendment in question.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs would be glad to answer any questions that the Leader of the

Opposition would direct to him, who has personal knowledge of them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: We settled that at the time.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition I am sure wants his question answered, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, who has personal knowledge -

MR. ROBERTS: Could I ask a question?

MR. AYLWARD: Yes, sure.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, then would the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs please repeat, and I authorize him

fully to do so, what passed between us on the occasion when he came to see me in my room as Minister of Health? It was early in November of 1969. I authorized him to reveal what passed between us but I say of course that he must reveal exactly and truthfully what happened or I shall of course contradict him by stating the truth.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. An honourable member may ask a question of another honourable member if that honourable member yield for that. I am not quite sure that an honourable member should yield the floor for a question to be asked of another honourable member.

If the honourable Member for Placentia East wishes to continue:

MR. AYLWARD: If the honourable minister wish to answer the question, I shall be glad to yield the floor to him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, what I was announcing was this, when they talk about promises, as I said, Mr. Speaker, in my district alone it would cost over, in excess of \$50 million to fulfill the promises that were made there in the fall of 1971. The answer was simply, as in education, borrow the money. How simple it would be, Mr. Speaker, how simple it would be if we were to follow the position postulated by the honourable member for St. Barbe North.

Now, if the people of Newfoundland or indeed the honourable gentlemen opposite, if they were really honest and they asked themselves who in Newfoundland would they prefer to see sit as Chairman of the Treasury Board, who is best equipped and best qualified and has proven himself beyond any doubt to be the best member of this honourable House to fulfill the position he has in the present ministry, who else, partner or no partner, Mr. Speaker? Fair is fair, Mr. Speaker. When the honourable Minister of Finance took over the position that he now holds in this cabinet, what kind of a financial position was the province in? What was happening to Stephenville? What exactly was

happening? We had \$100 million of our money into that but at least, Mr. Speaker, the operation is now functioning and a crown corporation owns it.

Mr. Speaker, the mess that the Minister of Finance -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. For the last fifteen minutes or so we have been seeing continuous interruptions from the opposition side of the House of Assembly. The rules of the House are that a person can stand in his place in this Assembly and speak and be heard in silence. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that that rule be observed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am sure honourable members are very much aware of the rule. It has certainly been repeated here enough. When an honourable member is speaking he has the right to be heard in silence and I request the honourable members to adhere to that rule.

MR. AYLWARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are very, very fortunate to have in Newfoundland a man of the ability, a man with the passion for work. Mr. Speaker, if that man had to have run against any one of these individuals for Leader of the Liberal Party, they would never be where they are today.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. AYLWARD: Why did you not run against him when he ran?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He did not know how to beat him, that is why.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I understand that one of the rules of this House states very clearly, Sir, that if you speak in this honourable House, you have to do it from your own seat. The Member for Green Bay, Sir, has repeatedly interrupted the Member for Placentia East, not from his own seat, Sir, but from another seat in this honourable House. I ask that Your Honour take whatever action is necessary to discipline the member.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

That is correct. When an honourable member is speaking or if he is making any comments, even if he is not in order, he should be doing so from his own place. I would trust that the Hon. Member for Green Bay will abide by that.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, when one sees the challenges that confronted this administration when they took over and in particular the challenges that confronted the man who held the position of Minister of Finance, when one sees these and asks themselves honestly, what in the name of Heavens could be done and sees what was done, just that linerboard mill alone, if the Minister of Finance had done nothing else but salvage that as apparently he has (I am not saying the mill will make money, Mr. Speaker.) but to salvage the investment that Newfoundland had in that mill, I think he should and would undoubtedly go down in history as having made a great contribution in itself.

MR. NEARY: Who is trucking the wood?

MR. AYLWARD: Who is trucking the wood out there? Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of questions you will be asked. Who is trucking the wood out there?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, it is like when the Minister of Finance, as he did in his last budget, laid down the terms and conditions under which the the Lower Churchill would be developed, and what was the re-action opposite? The Hon. Member for Labrador North who nods his head said, "It is criminal. It is criminal." Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, "it is criminal." What is criminal? What is criminal? Is it criminal, Mr. Speaker, for this province not to allow BRINCO -

MR. WOODWARD: Go away!

MR. AYLWARD: Go away, put your hands - go away. Mr. Speaker, if I could rephrase that. Is it criminal to say to Brinco: "No, you must pay sales tax now; you must pay sales tax on what is used; you must build a transmission line down to the area which the honourable gentleman represents?"

AN HON. MEBER: (Inaudible).

MR. AYLWARD: I am aware. I am aware. I have the budget here. I knew the point that he is speaking about, Mr. Speaker. We are told what a great imperial concept. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that Newfoundland could afford another imperial concept of that nature. When this province, with all its needs, including what the delegation from Southern Harbour are looking for, water and sewerage and everything else, when we are told what this province is losing because of the rates for which Quebec is buying that power, \$165 million a year, then the honourable member says, that is criminal not to allow them another \$165 a year.

MR. WOODWARD: (Inaudible).

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Placentia East has adjourned the debate. I think the motion for adjournment was earlier put today and we meet on tomorrow Thursday at 3:00 P.M. I do ^{now} not leave the Chair until 3:00 P.M. tomorrow Thursday, March 7, 1974.