



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

---

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 17

---

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 1975**

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

The House met at 11:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a matter of personal privilege.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, the matter of personal privilege, I understand, is to be raised for consideration immediately. Last night the Chairman of Committees was in the Chair. The Speaker was not in the Chair. The proceedings of the Committee were somewhat hectic at the time. I needed a transcript of the tapes in order to get accurately what was said during certain exchanges at this time and consequently this is the most immediate time that I can raise this particular point of privilege.

Sir, the circumstances leading up to certain charges by certain members opposite resulted from my reference to a demonstration that was held in the lobby of the Confederation Building where I pointed out the dissatisfaction of the students at the College of Trades and Technology and their disappointment over the building of a residence for the College of Trades and Technology.

Now, Sir, the next thing that happened following this was that I was being interrogated and questioned by members opposite as to whether or not I condoned or approved of such actions which subsequently turned out to be actions prior to a reception held at the College of Trades and Technology following the Budget Speech.

Sir, I said at that time that I did not condone nor did I approve of any civil disobedience, destruction of property or bodily injuries during any demonstration. I have simply stated, Sir, that I felt that the students were justified in their symbolic act of delaying the reception. I stated quite clearly that I neither condoned nor did I ever attempt to incite such activity, but I did feel that the students had a justifiable case.

Now, Sir, following that, certain charges were made and

we can probably pass - if the page would pass this to the honourable the Speaker and to the clerk. Certain charges were made, Mr. Speaker, and I refer you to tape 575, IB-1, Mr. F. Rowe, and I will read out, Sir, the verbatim report so that the House of Assembly can hear it as accurately as possible.

"Mr. F. Rowe: I will not have the honourable Minister of Fisheries nor any other member of this Committee, Sir, stand up and put words in my mouth. It is as simple as that. I have not advocated everything that is illegal except violence." Prior to this, Sir, the member for Placentia East said that I condone everything that is illegal except violence. Unfortunately, Sir, and I apologize to the House, I was not able to find that because we had to go through ten or eleven tapes up there earlier this morning. I never heard of anything so ridiculous.

"Shut up! Shut up! Shut up!" - Some honourable member.

"Mr. F. Rowe: I simply said that I did not even say that I condone." As a matter of fact, I said I did not condone these things. I simply said that the actions - now listen to this - "the actions of these students in my opinion were justifiable when the Minister of Education had written them a letter in November promising something for the Spring and they reneged on their promise and they broke their promise. There is nothing legally, morally or anything else wrong with any group of people in this province symbolically. They did not occupy the place and close it off for two or three weeks or days or hours. They symbolically delayed a reception which I attended and enjoyed very much. They made their point and they were justified in doing so."

Sir, then the honourable Minister of Fisheries gets up and justifies his advocating civil disobedience in this province. The Minister of Fisheries very conveniently forgets that the constitutional expert in Canada, Senator Eugene Forsey, at the very time, a good Newfoundlander, at that very time said the previous Liberal Administration had every constitutional right to remain in office at that particular time. They got

out of office when they constitutionally have to get out of office."

Then, Sir, we go to the same tape, page IB-3, and we pick up the continuation of the Honourable Member for Placentia East's statement, the last few sentences, Sir. "It is shocking for the press to record tomorrow that two elected members of the House of Assembly in Newfoundland stood up in their places and said they agreed, they have just as much right."

Now, Sir, my colleague for Hermitage got up and essentially made the same point that I did, and defended my particular stand on this issue.

Here is the charge, Sir. "They are inviting rebellion in every public building in this province. Supposing tomorrow, Mr. Chairman, that the public servants decide that they just do not like the wage offer or what is happening in Treasury Board, they had a letter that they were supposed to get this much money or that much money, Confederation Building should be closed down - "

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, you know, the honourable gentleman has not said what this - I mean what is happening here now? He has not said what breach of privilege he is complaining about. He is reading a Hansard to us. Could it be explained what the breach of privilege is supposed to be?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order. It has always been the custom of this House that an honourable member is allowed to state his - you know, subject to Your Honour's ruling, and not to the gentleman for St. John's West. My colleague eventually when he is - all he is doing now is outlining the subject matter. He is not doing it at any undue length. He is not being dilatory. Obviously the breaches of privilege concerned are to be found - they are of the type referred to on page 101 of Beauchesne, Citation 111 (1) Wilful misrepresentation of the proceedings of members. That is one of the heads. The other is Citation 108 (3) Libels on members have been

constantly punished. And it is obvious, Sir, that to accuse an honourable member of attempting to foment rebellion is a libel. And I submit that my colleague should be allowed to state his point. Your Honour will then rule as Your Honour sees fit on the evidence presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair is certainly willing to hear the honourable member for St. Barbe North, and if needs be will take the matter under advisement, and rule on it as early as possible.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, Sir, at that particular time I appealed to the Chair on a number of occasions, on a point of order, to ask the Chair to direct the Member for Placentia East to retract that very serious charge. Sir, the Chairman at that time stated as you can see from the verbatim report - "I must say the Chair does not have the powers of complete recall." In other words he could not remember or he did not hear the honourable Member for Placentia East say these words. I at that time, Sir, asked for the tapes, and this was rejected.

Now, Sir, my point of personal privilege is this, that when an honourable member stands up in this House and accuses other honourable members of inviting rebellion in every public building in this province that is a most serious charge. Now, Sir, I appeal to the Chair under the section indicated by my honourable colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, I appeal to the Chair to invite the Member for Placentia East to retract the two charges -

AN HON. MEMBER: Without qualification.

MR. F. ROWE: without qualification. The one that is documented here - they are inviting rebellion in every public building in this Province - and the one, Sir, I was not able to document in print because I could not find it on the tape up there where the member said that - I personally am approving of illegal action as long as it does not cause, any kind of illegal action as long as it does not cause bodily injury or destruction of property. I ask the Chair

May 20, 1975

Tape 581

PK - 3

simply on a point of privilege to ask the Member for Placentia  
East to retract these statements without qualifications.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Unless we get into some debate on this point of personal privilege right now, I shall take it under advisement and obtain a full transcript from the point at which the Hon. Member for Placentia -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I shall obtain a full transcript of the proceedings from the point when the Hon. Member for Placentia East rose to speak until the adjournment of last night's proceedings. I am not prepared to hear any argument re this matter at the present time.

MR. AYLWARD: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I certainly feel if you are going to entertain -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: - you certainly should both sides of the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair has ruled that it is not prepared to hear any comments or any discussion re this matter at the present time and shall rule on the matter as soon as possible.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, if I may, to a point of order. If a question of privilege has been submitted to the Chair, then you obviously intend to rule on it in the absence of any further argument. Well, I certainly feel that the other side is entitled to make some submission to Your Honour before you make that decision.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. AYLWARD: Now -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: Just a moment, Your Honour -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: If I may, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: This is a point of order, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: The privilege is -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is the custom of this House and any other House I guess, that when the Speaker rises, other members take their seats. Now if the Chair decides that a valid point of privilege has been raised, the Chair certainly is willing to hear argument re this matter. If no point of privilege has been raised, then that is probably the end of it.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. Mr. Speaker, what you are now deciding is that when any member raises a point, before you hear any argument whatsoever from the other side, you are going to go out in your Chambers and decide that. I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that the other party is entitled to make a submission on the point raised.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: Re the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair has not said that it is not willing to hear any argument re this matter. The Chair has said that it is not willing to hear argument at this present time. Honourable members shall be given the chance at the proper time to express their views re this point of privilege.

MR. AYLWARD: Before any ruling is made by the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.



MR. AYLWARD: Okay, that is what I wanted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: This same privilege applies to any honourable member, of course.

MR. AYLWARD: If I may, Mr. Speaker, to this point of order again. I want it abundantly clear myself that since I am involved in this, before any ruling whatsoever is made as to the merits or demerits of that, the other side is entitled to present argument.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: Have you all got that?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair has said that all honourable members to my left and to my right shall be given the opportunity.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, he is disregarding the rules.

MR. AYLWARD: I am not disregarding the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal privilege -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Member for St. Barbe North has set forth the necessary circumstances and information because my matter of personal privilege is based on the same information as was laid out by my colleague from St. Barbe North. But just for the record, I want to rise and say that I, too, would invite the Speaker to ask the Member for Placentia East to withdraw without any qualification whatsoever the charges he made last night as documented by my colleague from St. Barbe North.

MR. EVANS: In your case, they will throw away the key.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

HON. L. BARRY (Minister of Mines and Energy): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of the people of North Harbour, Placentia West. This is a petition, Mr. Speaker, which was organized by the Lion's Club of North Harbour, members of the Lion's Club and which has been signed by, I believe, just about all of the residents of North Harbour. And the prayer of the petition is to request that the Branch road and community roads of North Harbour be upgraded and paved. They make the request for the following reasons: First, the road has already been partially upgraded and can be made ready for pavement at very little cost to government. Secondly, all of the roads in the area have been upgraded and paved. A large number of men at North Harbour work at the refinery or at Clarenville and paving the road would cut travelling expenses and prolong car life for these taxpayers.

Finally they say that they cannot understand why the road was not designated for paving last summer when Southern Harbour, Sunnyside, and other roads in the district adjoining were paved within twenty miles of North Harbour. What was that?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this petition comes at a very opportune time in that I am informed today that the road is in a very bad condition because of the, I suppose, it is Spring weather, although I say that at a peril, but the warm temperatures have caused the road to become soft and it is very difficult for men working outside the community to pass over this road. As a matter of fact, it is almost impassable Mr. Speaker.

I have made representation to the Department of Highways to see what can be done to improve matters in a short term. I ask that this petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates in the hope that we can have earlier long term measures taken to improve the condition of the roads for North Harbour.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House support the prayer of the petition of the people of North Harbour in Placentia West. The Minister of Transportation and Communications is not in his seat today, but we have been hearing over the years a number of petitions and a great number dealing with the upgrading and the paving of roads. We look forward to having the Department of Transportation and Communications publicize their five year plan and to designate what areas they were to do some work in. We have not heard it yet. So, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House do support the prayer of the petition. We hope that the government will take action to correct all the bad road situations that exist in the province. We look forward to hearing the five year plan that the government have said they would put forward to this province. We hope that the member for Placentia West will get the paving done in the North Harbour area.

HON. E. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, if we have finished on the gentleman's petition, may I present a petition on behalf

of the citizens of Main Brook. I would think the Minister of Municipal Affairs would be particularly interested because it involves the problem about which a delegation from the Main Brook Council and I saw him last week. The prayer of the petition, Sir, is that the government take the steps necessary to provide the Community of Main Brook with an adequate water supply.

The petition is signed by 211 citizens in the community which is just about every adult citizen of the community of Main Brook. It is a petition, it is an original, it has been signed in the original by the several petitioners, but it is one of four copies of the petition that were made following a public meeting which was held on February 10, 1975, a month and a half ago.

The petition, Mr. Speaker, put by the petitioners is really quite simple. The Community of Main Brook does not now have an adequate water supply. The water supply which they are using is not adequate. It is not adequate in quantity and it is not adequate in quality. Some years ago, I think 1968 if memory serves me, the government made an initial survey to determine what it would cost to provide the adequate water supply. The cost was much higher than envisaged for the proposed cost, and at that time we were looking at a water and sewer system.

There has been much discussion back and forth, many delegations, many phone calls, many letters. The matter has now come to the point where it is agreed I think that the community, a water supply would serve it. We do not need to look at the question of a sewer system as well. The delegation met last weekend. I would say we had a very courteous hearing from the minister. The minister has undertaken to update the figures. We have tried the expedient of seeing if we could have artesian wells built to provide a water supply. That proved to be impractical. We are now left with only one possible solution, that is to bring water a matter of about two miles from the nearest possible water supply, a pond. It is also going to involve a pumping system, a very expensive system perhaps. It could be \$200,000 or

\$300,000 or possibly even more, but not too expensive when one realizes, Mr. Speaker, that this involves the future of this community, that without an adequate water supply, there will be no community. People cannot live there. People cannot

continue to live. They have their homes there. They have their schools. They have a community, a viable and functioning community but it cannot last with an adequate water supply.

Now, I know that the minister has undertaken to have further investigations made with a view to raising the matter for his Cabinet colleagues with a view to seeing whether the government will fund the project this year. I do not propose to press that now, but I have been asked to present the petition and so I do. I support it without any reservation at all, Sir. We hear a great deal of talk of priorities in government these days here and throughout Canada.

As far as I am concerned, there is nothing, Sir, that can possibly be of greater priority than an adequate water supply. We are going to spend \$30 million or \$40 million in St. John's with substantial assistance from the Government at Ottawa to provide a water supply and that is well and good. We are spending millions at other communities throughout the Island and that is well and good, but, Sir, Main Brook's needs, the 600 people in Main Brook, their need on an individual basis is just as great as that of any citizen of St. John's or any citizen of any community in the Province.

I support the petition without any reservation and I do hope that the community of Main Brook will very shortly get a positive answer from the minister, an answer saying that the costs have been determined, that the government are willing to provide the assistance that is necessary.

I might add in closing, that the people of Main Brook at this time on February 10 said that they were willing as a measure of their concern and of their almost desperation, Sir, to pay, each citizen, \$20 per month towards the cost of a water system. I know of no place in this Province, Sir, where the water rates are that high, \$240 per year. The average rate at present would be \$7 or \$8 for a community. I understand the government target rate is \$12 per community. The people of Main Brook, Sir,

who are not wealth, they are a hard working people, they are mainly loggers who work in the woods industry, they are willing to pay \$20 per month. They are willing to accept the highest rate of any community in Newfoundland, if only they can get water.

So, I present the petition in the hope that it will be acted upon favourable and will be acted upon quickly.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

HON. B. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, let me, first of all, say that I support the prayer of the petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition. To further amplify my comments, just let me say, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, as he is perhaps well aware, I think he is, I am very familiar with the area in question, Main Brook, Roddickton, Englee - places that are now resettled, Canada Harbour, Hooping Harbour, Williamsport, that whole area, and spent some considerable time in that part of the Province, and hence I am, cognizant of the needs of the people of Main Brook for a decent water supply.

As a result of their recent delegation to my office with the Leader of the Opposition, we discussed at length how we could best tackle raising the funds and getting a proper water system there. Moves are underfoot within the department now to have a proper estimate done on a water system, for say, for the community and after those kinds of figures have been ascertained and put together, then this project will be put with the rest on our list for capital projects for 1975 and hopefully, that some work can begin before this year is finished.

REPORTS OF STANDING OR SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

HON. E. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the report of

matters transacted by the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations during 1974, as well, the report of the Newfoundland Labour Relations Board for 1974 and the report of the Minimum Wage Board for 1974.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, last evening, late last evening, the Minister of Finance asked and as far as I know, was granted leave to table some documents. Have these been distributed? If so, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Ah! I only have to ask and they come. Well, fine. Thank you, Sir.

MR. ROBERTS: Typical of the Minister of Finance. He is twelve hours late.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

HON. W. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance who is not in his seat here today, I would like to table some - three special warrants which were recently signed by His Honour that cover the Legislative vote, \$17,000; the Justice Department, \$841,000; Transportation and Communications, \$2,200,000. The additional funds were needed in the Legislative to cover salary increases for certain staff. For justice, this is also salary increases and the collective agreements concluded last year with the Constabulary and the Fire Department and the additional funds for Transportation and Communications were to cover DREE commitments and overruns in construction. There is a copy here for the Opposition, Sir, if they so desire.



ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

HON. B. PECKFORD (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to a question asked by the Hon. Member for Bell Island a week or so ago concerning legal fees on the West Coast, in relation to mortgages that were done by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. So I hereby table the answer to that question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Social Services.

HON. A. J. MURPHY (Minister of Social Services): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table an answer to a question by the Hon. Member for Bell Island on the Order Paper of March 13, with reference to the number of heads of families on social assistance as of January 1, 1973, January 1, 1974 and January 1, 1975. On January 1, 1973, Sir, we had 25,227. January 1, 1974 we had 21,715, a reduction of something like 3,500, Sir. But tragically on January 1, 1975 there is an increase of approximately 100 on that which is due to a tremendous increase in a lot of areas of this province, Sir, of fishermen who were forced to get assistance for their families. I have a prepared statement ready for it on my estimates. I think there were some 1,208 families due to the late season of the ice going and the strikes and everything else. So I am very happy to table this answer. There are copies here for the press and so on and so forth.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Sir, and ask the minister if he is yet in a position to make an announcement on the funding of the Bell Island Town Council to carry on essential services and to replace old worn out water lines over there so people will not have to bring their water in buckets?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. PECKDORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position yet to announce the action that the government intend to take to alleviate the financial

straits that the town council presently find themselves in. It might be a week or ten days before I will be in a position to make that statement. The wheels are in motion and hopefully I will be able to make the statement at that time definitively on the whole question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the Hon. Premier tell the House what action he has taken to fulfill a promise made in 1971 and in 1972 to make the Bell Island ferry service a part of the provincial highway system?

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, is within hearing distance of my voice? If he is, the minister, I think, is on his way back to his seat - no, that is not the minister. I will wait for the minister to come in, Sir. I wonder if the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, Sir, could give the House a report on whether or not either he or any of the officials of his department are involved in anyway in the strike of plumbers over here at the Health Science Complex? Are they being given any assistance to try to resolve this problem they have had with this come-from-away foreman that they have over there?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

HON. E. MAYNARD: (Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations): To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, there has not been any assistance requested from our department.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Manpower care to inform the House if his department is involved in anyway in the strike at the Marystown Shipyard, If they are being given any assistance to try to resolve the dispute they are having down there with bringing in plumbers into Newfoundland, when we have plumbers in Newfoundland who can do the same work?

MR. MAYNARD: Again, Mr. Speaker, we have not been requested to provide any assistance. As I understand it, the strike at the

Marystown Shipyard is an illegal one, and certainly we do not get involved in illegal strikes. For the Department of Labour to get involved, it would mean the government condones them. However, we have from time to time helped parties to arrange an arbitration or something like that. But again we have not had any requests from these people.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there are conflicting reports made by the Minister of Industrial Development and the Member for Port au Port concerning the possibility of a cement plant on the Port au Port Peninsula, would the Minister of Industrial Development care to clarify the situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Industrial Development.

HON. C. W. DOODY (MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT): I can certainly tell you the situation, Mr. Speaker, with regards to the proposed cement facility in Port au Port. I hope that will not conflict with the impressions that the honourable member has received. The situation is that some time ago the Department of Industrial Development introduced a company called Lehigh Cement to the area and they expressed an interest in establishing a facility out there.

Subsequent to that we got them together with the BRINEX people who hold a concession for the limestone deposit on an area. And the two companies together did a feasibility study on the market survey in the Eastern Seaboard of the United States. Lehigh Cement unfortunately has seen fit to withdraw from the joint project because of the condition of the construction industry in the United States. They are over extended, they have invested heavily in other aspects of construction, condominium business. I understand the condominium business down in Florida is not what it used to be a couple of years ago.

In any event, they have found it necessary to withdraw from the project. The feasibility of the plant, the pre-engineering and so on has demonstrated that it is an economic and viable operation. And with this in mind the BRINEX people have entered discussions with another company, with two actually, both Canadian companies, one of which has undertaken to do a market survey in the Northeastern part of the U.S. to try to get a piece of that market, in addition to their own central Canadian markets.

It is too early yet to say whether this second attempt will be a successful one. We hope it will. The indications are favourable. But it is too early to say at this time whether or not this second partner of BRINEX's will be more successful than the first one.

As I said, Sir, the operation has been demonstrated to be a viable and feasible one. The market conditions are such at the present time as to make it difficult to finance it and to sell the package to the financial community. But there is no question that this problem will be overcome. It is a matter of when. Hopefully the new partner will be more successful than the original.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. the Premier could enlighten the House -- if I could get the Hon. the Premier's attention there for a moment. Does the Hon. the Premier now have any additional information concerning Bowaters close downs in the current calendar year? How many do they anticipate? Can the Premier give us a progress report on what is happening concerning Bowaters? And if the market conditions have improved? Or are improving?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Premier.

HON. F. D. MOORES (PREMIER): I cannot give a progress report on Bowaters, Mr. Speaker, what I can do is confirm the fact that everybody knows that they are closing down. I have had contact with the company, they have advised me it is because of high inventories, the recessionary tendencies in the U.S. They certainly have not, upon request, expressed that they were going to have any further close downs this year. And to the best of our knowledge they are not, but that is up to Bowaters to decide, and there is very little we can do about that.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, can the honourable, I do not know if the Hon. the Premier wishes to answer this question concerning the Linerboard Mill. Have all the employees that were laid off at the Linerboard Mill been recalled? Will there be any major shut downs of the Linerboard Mill this year? Any cutback in production? Could the minister give us a report on what is happening concerning the Linerboard Mill?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what employees the honourable Member for Bell Island is referring to. It has been reported to the House before that the Linerboard Mill will be having some down time during the year. In fact, I think, there is going to be some down time now at the end of next week, for eight or ten days. And it is very likely that there will be down time later in the year also, because as all members of the House know the linerboard market is not good. And as a matter of fact the only company in the linerboard industry in North American that has not had any down time up to now is Labrador Linerboard Limited. All the rest of them have been having down time for a week, some of them as much as two weeks, every month. So there will be down time. The first down time is going to be in the next week over the Easter period.

MR. NEARY: Does the minister anticipate any minor or major permanent layoffs as a result of a cut back in production? Will employees who are now laid off, will they be recalled when the mill starts up again?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any employee laid off or whom the honourable gentleman is talking about. I do not know of any other anticipated layoffs. Certainly if there are any employees that were not necessary at the mill or were found not to be necessary and they were laid off, well I do not want to disagree with that. That would be a management decision. There are no layoffs that I know of nor are there any contemplated.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Social Services could tell us if he is yet in a position to announce his day care programme, what assistance that department is going to give people who have applied to establish day care centers. Has he yet found the money in his estimates that he is reported to have said that he could not find this morning on radio?

MR. MURPHY: He must be one of the greatest radio fans in the country, you know. Mr. Speaker, no, unfortunately I am not in a position at this moment to announce it. We have a few people who are very anxious to know just what is going to happen to day care money. We have homemaker money. We have the blind looking for money. We have so many more looking for money, but unfortunately, Sir, I am not in a position at this time until the actual budget is gone through, to know just how we can allowance it out to whom. All I am wondering if I had a bit of the \$10 million that the member for St. Barbe North is going to throw away, I would not mind using that for some of my needs.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, another question for the Minister of Social Services. I am glad he mentioned the blind, because that was my next question. Is the minister yet in a position to make an announcement concerning increased assistance for the blind people of the province as promised last year by the minister?

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Over what they are getting now, special allowances for the

blind. The minister promised it last year.

MR. MURPHY: No, there are no special - the minister promised no such thing. I would like that stricken from the record, Sir. That is an absolute - I cannot say it is a lie - it is an untruth. I never made any such statement. I said I would see in the budget if there were monies available to give the blind an increase. I might lay aside here now any reference to a \$75 allowance for the blind. If the blind people are in need, they do not only get \$75. They will get the same as any other person to fill the needs of their families or anything else. So, in other words, they come under a substantially greater allowance than just \$75 as a blind allowance.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister aware that Miss Elizabeth Madden, director of legislation for the Canadian Council of the Blind in a public statement made recently said that she had received assurances from the minister that an effort would be made to bring the Newfoundland assistance level to a par with the Maritime Provinces? Is the minister aware of that statement?

MR. MURPHY: I just told you I assured her we would do everything to bring it up.

MR. NEARY: Yes, but the minister just denied having made any -

MR. MURPHY: I never said. I said we would do everything to get it. I did not say we would.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: We would do everything we could.

MR. NEARY: Does the minister want to speak -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: I have been further in touch with Miss Elizabeth Madden who represents a group. I do not know. I am also in constant touch with Mr. Eugene Pike of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind. There are two different groups. I am sure that I do not know what the story is on it, but we have Miss Madden who makes statements of different kinds. I have yet to have a statement from Mr. Pike or anything else on it. So, as far as we are concerned, I assure her, as I assure everybody,



that I will do everything in my power to get extra assistance for them if the money is available. That is all I can do. I do not say I am going to get it. I will do everything in my power to get it as I suppose does every minister of the crown. Say, for water and sewerage, we will do everything in our power to do it. That is all we can do.

MR. NEARY: When can they expect an answer?

MR. MURPHY: The second Tuesday of next week.

MR. NEARY: Okay, Sir, we will be asking the minister another question the second Tuesday of next week.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Arrogance again.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I wonder if the Minister of Justice, Sir, would care to inform the House as to the position of a boat known as the "Shirley Blanche" that is held in custody by the minister's department in Twillingate. What is the position on this? Who is paying the security, the watchmen aboard this ship? When will a decision be taken by the minister's department to dispose of this matter that has been going on now since sometime last year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Bell Island is referring to a matter that is presently before the courts. If he is referring to the matter I think he is, the matter that came before a magistrate in a preliminary hearing in Cander, and the magistrate then ordered the accused to stand trial in the Supreme Court. It is indeed to the Supreme Court and not to my department. If that is the matter, then it would be highly improper for me to comment on any case that is still pending in the courts of our Province. I am quite sure from that it is the case.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister aware that this is a private matter, a private prosecution?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, that question -

MR. NEARY: And is the minister aware that that matter is not before the court?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

That question or matter attending the courts is completely out of order.

MR. HICKMAN: It is, totally out of order.

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am merely asking the minister if he was aware of it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

That type of question is out of order.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, - okay, I will not pursue it any further, Sir. I would like to point out to Your Honour that the matter is not before the court, the matter is before the minister's department and that is why I am questioning the minister on this matter because it is up to the minister to make a decision.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

The Hon. Member for Bell Island is now proceeding to make a speech from the previous question asked. As such, he is certainly out of order.

MR. NEARY: Okay, Sir, I will get back to the Minister of Mines and Energy. I would like to find out from the Minister of Mines what his department intends to do - and I have asked this question three or four years running, three years running - what his department intends to do with a fund of \$30,000 or \$40,000 that was accumulated by the former administration through the sale of DOSCO assets and rentals from houses on Bell Island? What is the minister intending to do about this fund, if anything?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

HON. L. BARRY (Minister of Mines and Energy): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member for Bell Island never took the time to have a discussion with the Mayor of Bell Island, the Town Council of Wabana, -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: - the Mayor of Wabana, he would have found out that this government have already communicated with the Town Council of Wabana and have indicated that government are prepared to have these funds released to the Town Council of Wabana for use to benefit the people of Bell Island, the purpose to which these funds are to be put to be worked out in consultation with the Department of Municipal Affairs, this department, and the Department of Industrial Development. So within the very near future, I understand, there will be a meeting between the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Hon. Minister of Industrial Development, myself and the Mayor and other representatives from the Town Council of Wabana to decide the best purpose to which these funds could be put.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that the Town of Wabana does not represent the whole of Bell Island, just a part of Bell Island? If so, if the money is being turned over to the municipality, would the minister

care to tell us whether any of this money is going to be used to maintain regular municipal services? Or will it be earmarked for pensioners, recreation and youth and other representative community projects?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, first of all we are aware that the Town Council of Wabana, the municipal boundary, does not take in all of Bell Island. We are also aware, however, that this is the best vehicle in our opinion for ensuring that these funds are put to a use which will benefit all the people of Bell Island. Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to say at this time to what use these funds will be put until we have had our meeting with the Mayor and with the Town Councillors of Wabana and until we have had their input into just what their opinion is as to the best use these funds can be put to benefit all the people of Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister prepared to consider giving the outside areas, the areas outside the municipality, representation on any committee that may decide the use of these funds on Bell Island?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to consider representation from anybody on Bell Island as to how these funds should be used, to anybody on Bell Island, Mr. Speaker. We are not talking about forming any committee. We are talking about meeting with the Mayor and the with the Town Councillors with a view to deciding what use these funds will be put. We will consider representation by anybody else on or outside of the council, but we do not see any need for setting up a committee when we have the vehicle, the Town Council of Wabana there, which can be held responsible, Mr. Speaker, for ensuring that these funds are put to a proper use. Unlike, I might say, Mr. Speaker, incidents that we have had in the past where funds have gone from government without the proper controls and have not been used, Mr. Speaker, to their maximum affect -

MR. NEARY: Like Rural Development.

MR. BARRY: - either on Bell Island or elsewhere.

MR. NEARY: Like the Rural Development Authority.

MR. BARRY: This government are determined, Mr. Speaker, that when the taxpayers' dollars are being spent that they be spent through a body that can be held accountable and responsible to the use to which these funds are put.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY: This we intend to do in this case, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Justice. Would the minister care to clarify what have now been considered to be strange statements made concerning promotions and seniority and so forth in the Police Brotherhood. Would the minister care to clarify that situation because the police seem to be terribly upset about certain statements the minister made recently concerning an agreement?

HON. T.A. HICKMAN: We have a collective agreement with the Police Brotherhood and we follow the letter of that agreement and we will continue to do so.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Industrial Development, Sir, would care to tell the House whether negotiations for the reopening of the Green Bay Mining Company are going on or if they have ceased, and if the Green Bay Mining Company now, is there is no possibility of reopening in the future? Does the Minister of Industrial Development care to comment on that? I am asking the minister about the Green Bay Mining Company. What is the situation there now? Are negotiations for reopening the Company ongoing or are there no negotiations?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

HON. W. DOODY: No, Mr. Speaker, there are no negotiations going on now. It has been concluded that until the price of the mineral increases sufficiently in the world market the mine will have to remain closed. It is the matter of the difference between a profit and loss situation and it is predicated entirely on the price that they can get for the ore. The situation is as I just said. The mine is now closed. Hopefully, it will reopen just as soon as the markets repair themselves.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for either the honourable Minister of Justice or the honourable the Premier or the honourable Minister of Health, whichever one has the answer, Sir, and I understand one of them does. Would either one of these gentlemen care

to say whether or not they have received representation from anybody on Bell Island concerning a gentleman who was fired recently from the Newfoundland Telephone Company for a breach of the Secrecy Act? Has the Premier's office been notified of it?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Health.

HON. DR. A. ROWE: This matter has been brought to my attention yesterday morning - I had been out of the Province for two days - the matter which is being referred to. I have asked that I be provided with full particulars and I have nothing further to say on that at this point of time.

MR. NEARY: A question to the honourable minister, Sir. Would the honourable minister care to table the particulars that he has been handed in the House, so that we can all have a gander at it?

DR. ROWE: That will be decided at a later date. I have not even had the result of my investigation yet. So I can hardly say whether or not it will be tabled to the House.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the minister care to indicate what action he intends to take on this matter? It involved a couple of the doctors on Bell Island.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have heard only rumors so far. I have no facts of the case. I have asked for particulars and an inquiry. I can say nothing further than that at the present time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Justice could tell the House, Sir, whether or not crown prosecutors have yet been appointed for Corner Brook or Grand Falls?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: In your estimates?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Sure, why not?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the crown prosecutor in - We have had a crown prosecutor in Corner Brook now, I thought - I disagree with

March 21, 1975.

Tape 589

RH - 3

the statement by the honourable the Minister of Social Services that the honourable gentleman from Bell Island continuously listens to the radio. I am sure he does not. He missed an announcement - Oh! It must be nine months ago, that a very capable crown prosecutor in the person of Mr. Gerard Martin, known as Stan Martin, has been retained when he left my department in December of 1973 and has been acting as crown prosecutor on the West Coast of the Province, indeed, and Labrador and he has done work in Central Newfoundland since that time. In Central Newfoundland, I will not name the gentleman, but we have a crown prosecutor who will be assuming duties this year, 1975, in Central Newfoundland and



MR. HICKMAN: I would avail of this opportunity to indicate to the House that for the first time since I have been in political life, lawyers are beginning to show some sense of public willingness to serve the public of this province, and to work for my department as Crown prosecutors at a reasonable salary and to gain the experience that inevitably flows from that position, the exposure that one gets to the courts that would not be available to those in public practice with the same continuity. And I am delighted to see that the legal profession is responding to that need. And from here on in as far as Crown prosecutors are concerned, and junior lawyers are concerned, I do not anticipate any real problem.

If any honourable gentlemen in this House or outside can assist me in persuading my colleagues at the Bar that a great service can be performed to the people of Newfoundland by applying for and becoming legislative draftsmen I very earnestly solicit their support. As this House is undoubtedly aware our chief legislative draftsman, whose work is unsurpassed in Canada as a legislative draftsman, Mr. R. Austin Parsons was -

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that a fact or is it your opinion?

MR. HICKMAN: I know. It is not my opinion, it is a fact - compelled to retire last year at a very early age because of ill health and we have not been able to replace him.

May I say for the benefit of all honourable gentlemen, one of the procedures that is required under the Constitution is that when all the Acts are passed here I am obliged after the House closes to submit them to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council with a short reasons, signed, and these Acts are then all transmitted to the Governor-General, and the Governor-General in turn transmits them to the appropriate ministers of the federal government. This is done ostensibly to see whether or not the Government of Canada will exercise its prerogative of disallowance.

What really happens is that these Acts are very carefully considered by the Department of Justice to see if this House have inadvertently invaded the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada.

I was told by the chief legislative draftsmen of Canada, who incidentally is a Newfoundlander, Mr. Ryan, a Newfoundland lawyer named Ryan - from Port-aux-Basques - that they were never able to find an Act passed by this Legislature drafted by Austin Parsons that ever invaded, that went beyond the jurisdiction of this Legislature.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: But this - But no, no, I have been waiting for this opportunity - this gentleman, Mr. Parsons who has done so much work for this Legislature for the past fifteen years, in my opinion, you know, deserves recognition.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: And I was told -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: I am being harassed, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that Your Honour rule that I am entitled to be heard in silence. And this harassment is throwing me off.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Hon. Minister of Justice is certainly entitled to be heard in silence. I would submit that his is taking an unusually long time in answering this question and also that the thirty minutes for the question period has now expired.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: With your permission, Sir, just before the question period expires. A little while ago the Member for Bell Island asked a question relative to the Marystown Shipyard strike. I have just been informed that the manager met this morning for two hours with the union executive and the membership. The situation has been ironed out, the background reasons for hiring the outside people were explained, and the union agreed to resume work on Monday morning. The strike down

March 21, 1975

Tape 590 (Morning)

PK - 3

there is over.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page thirty-five, the estimates, 612-01.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If I may now I just wish to get some notes on that subhead here. Could I ask you the page, Mr. Chairman, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

If the honourable minister would permit. There is some question as to whether we have in fact arrived at 612. Pardon.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: 611-07.

MR. F. ROWE: That is right. That is right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 611-07 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, just briefly, because, if I recall, last night did seem to get off the point for just a couple of hours or so and just off it. However, under this vote which is the capital vote, I recall pointing out to members of the committee last night what it was, but I will go over it again because in the heat of argumentation it may have been lost. This is a vote of \$500,000 as a capital expenditure vote. The breakdown is essentially \$300,000 for renovations to buildings, the former Sanitorium. This will allow an additional 300 students to be processed for a year. Most of this is in the areas of medical technology and paramedical technology, nursing assistants. That is where the bulk of the \$300,000 will be involved.

Then the \$200,000 is for equipment, some replacing and some new. That essentially is the \$500,000 under that.

On motion 07 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 612-01 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I will give an explanation in general of the material covered here. That of course, it says at the heading there, is vocational training. Really it is vocational training and adult education. I recall in the opening statements giving a fairly detailed outline of the adult education programme, a breakdown of numbers in the kind of activities, the academic and non-academic craft training and that.

So, I do not plan to go into that now unless there are some specific matters that people want looked at.

This vote here of course refers to the district vocational schools across the Province. The overall number of students, of people served, will be approximately 5,300. That is not counting the 4,000 in pre-vocational programmes. If one counts them, then it becomes about 9,300. Without counting the pre-vocational it is 5,300. They are approximate because with all of these schools there is a certain amount of coming and going because they are short courses.

The breakdown between the manpower and provincial students would be approximately on the overall year, fifty, fifty. Fifty per cent each one. I have the breakdowns for the various schools, and the various courses and there is a great deal obviously of detailed information. To the best of my knowledge honourable gentlemen may not wish that, but if so, I can read it through or make it available to them by handing it to them if they wish.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): The Hon. Member for Labrador North.

MR. M. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, if I may make a few brief remarks on vocational training, which I think is very important. My chief concern and I suspect the concern of a number of people throughout this province is what type of training or what sort of curriculum will be set up for students to train, to take advantage of employment in the offshore and exploration industry, which is, as we understand today, coming about very rapidly? Maybe the minister can have a few words and tell the committee what steps his department is taking in this respect in conjunction with Industrial Development and Mines and Energy? I know it is a big concern of a lot of people in Labrador, where we have very few skilled trades, who would like to take advantage of getting involved. They hear so much about what is happening, the offshore oil discoveries, the natural gas, the uranium deposits that will be developed within a very short period of time, but no one has taken the trouble, Mr. Chairman, to see that those people can fit into that type of industry and take advantage of the jobs that will be offered.

We have had the unfortunate circumstances over the years where we have had an influx of skilled trades, not only from the Island of Newfoundland but from all across Canada, coming in and our people, which are primarily a labour force, truck drivers and that, are being envious of other people coming in taking the good jobs, getting good accommodations, because they are skilled tradesmen and the industry depends so heavily on them. We have not only seen this take place in Goose Bay, but I suspect that if you look at the Labrador City-Wabush area, there is a certain amount of discrimination in the ranks of the labour force in respect to skilled trades and unskilled trades.

I would like to think in terms of, maybe, with our younger generation coming up that this government would see fit to bring that gap closer together by offering in a curriculum at a vocational training school, the type of trades. No, I do not

know if the minister is familiar or if the Minister of Mines and Energy is familiar with what type of skills that people will have to have in order to take advantage of this employment. But it is very important. I think the timing should be now. If we are going to fit our people into that industry we should immediately be looking at a curriculum that is going to be set up in our vocational training schools so the young people can train for those particular jobs. I do not know what effort the government have taken, but I am sure it is very vital and important, as far as the people, not only in Labrador, but indeed the people throughout the whole of the island. I understand, as I mentioned here yesterday, that very few of our people have taken advantage, although we have had drilling off the Labrador Coast over the last three years. Other than having a cook's helper, and maybe a dispatcher getting involved in employment in that industry, all the other people have been imported, and we have heard very little of it.

So maybe the minister on this particular subhead, Mr. Chairman, can elaborate somewhat on what direction his department or his government are going to take in this respect.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, certainly the honourable gentleman from Labrador North has raised some very important and very interesting points there. In general at the College of Fisheries, of course, instruction is given in a wide-range of offshore activities in preparation of seamen, mates, navigation, electrical, electronic technology afloat in these areas. The companies involved in exploration, in terms of the drilling, the actual drilling operations, the companies involved wish to and indeed, to the best of my knowledge, sort of insist in doing their own training, their own on the job training, in running their own training programmes. We too

at the College of Fisheries have a wide area of activities certainly related to various offshore technologies. We are also studying, with the recent and encouraging finds off the Coast of Labrador, we are studying the possibility of a course at the Happy Valley Vocational School. In the area of servicing and the technologies or skills required on an onshore basis, on an onshore basis, because as I say, in the general offshore from the marine technology and marine electronics and seamanship, etc., in that broad area, the College of Fisheries is involved and, of course, there have been co-operate ventures with the College of Fisheries and different district vocational schools. As a matter of fact, at the Vocational School in Happy Valley there is a unit especially designed for this.

So, that essentially is the situation. As honourable gentlemen may know as well, there is what is called a Manpower Needs Committee which is a joint Federal Provincial Committee. It is made up entirely of officials, the actual Committee is, but it has many subcommittees. It is made up of the Deputy Ministers of Education, provincially, Manpower and Industrial Development, somebody from Intergovernmental Affairs and the Minister of Fisheries and then the federal component, people from the Federal Department of Manpower and a representative of DREE.

Now, while this committee is entirely made up of officials, they have numerous subcommittees in practically all areas of training and employment opportunities. But I certainly assure the honourable gentleman that we are aware of the very important opportunities which hopefully will develop for employment for Newfoundlanders with the development of our offshore through the vocational school system and through the College of Fisheries. We are doing a certain amount now. We are planning to, we are doing a certain amount now in terms of the offshore navigational or marine oriented activities.



I point out that from the point of view of drilling and what is associated with that, companies insist on doing their own training and that we are exploring the possibility of starting a course with particular reference to the onshore skills associated with offshore development.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, it surprises me to hear that there are so many imports, more or less, working along on this oil drilling and components. We have oil drilling for so many years now and has there not been a special effort made by the Trade School to train men for this specific purpose? As far as the marine officers, navigators and mates and cooks and etc. etc., that is an ongoing thing. They are being trained every year, but I would have thought that with this drilling going on off on the Grand Banks, that some special effort would have been made to accommodate and train those men. There is no reason with the unemployment that we have in this Country today, in this Province, there is no reason why anyone should be brought in to do a job that our own men can be trained to do.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I should point out that training has been going on the past number of years in these areas. In the offshore technology area, in terms of, you know, work aboard the - what do they call it? It is not - the drilling rigs, work aboard the drilling rigs, what is related, you know, to navigation, to marine electronics, to mechanics, to seamanship, to what is called ship's cooking, in all of these areas training is going on and this is related to the employment opportunities. But I pointed out, in the actual drilling operations and what is immediately associated with that, these companies insist on doing their own training. They insist on doing their own training, but in the various offshore activities of a marine nature, then we have been

March 21, 1975.

Tape 593

RH - 3

training and are continuing to train. What we are looking into and hoping to start in September would be, of course, related to the onshore activities, but naturally there is no sense having a couple of hundred

or this or that, people trained in the onshore technologies, you know, years before there is going to be any employment onshore for them. It is a thing which has to be carefully timed with not so much the exploration but the exploitation because the onshore activity to a very large extent is going to - the timing has to coincide with the bringing the product ashore. In terms of the marine activities, the sea activities, training has been going on on a continuing basis.

CAPT. WINSOR: Is the training for a specific type of work?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: For example, in the courses, certainly it is relevant to this. I think there would be two courses, one for, let us say, marine electronics for somebody on a ship which is moving and marine electronics on a rig which is usually stationary because from what I understand the electronics is essentially the same. Certainly the needs of offshore marine installations are totally borne in mind. I know that the faculty at the College of Fisheries are extremely aware of this and keep it under continuing review. The training that is going on in these marine areas is relevant and related to the various skills and occupations required in the employment opportunities which could develop on offshore rigs.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I think my two colleagues raised a very important question, one which I was about to raise. We get in here into a sort of a cross over with the College of Fisheries and we are discussing the salary under the vocational training. Sir, you know, it was this administration that promised in the Spring of 1973 that there was going to be an Offshore Manpower Needs Conference. Now, since then, we have learned from the minister that they have scrapped that particular idea of having the conference. So, one naturally asks the question, what specifically has the government done in the vocational schools of this Province to try to prepare students in order that they may obtain employment in offshore mineral and oil exploration.

The minister suggests that they are aware of it and it is borne in mind and all this sort of thing. One question I would like to put to the minister is, you know, what efforts - he stated

that the companies insist on training their own personnel. Now, does that mean personnel from outside of Newfoundland or personnel in Newfoundland or a combination of both? The question I would like to put to the minister is what efforts have the government or his department made to get the various companies involved to train Newfoundlanders where obviously jobs are very badly needed, to train Newfoundlanders either on the job or to have these companies have an input into the vocational or the technical or the Fisheries College of our Province? What effort has this administration made or efforts has this administration made to get the companies to train Newfoundlanders, number one, and also to develop programmes within our own vocational or technical institutions so that our young Newfoundlanders will have a greater opportunity to gain employment in what is a very skilled and technical field?

I realize that the personnel of the various institutions bear it in mind and are concerned and are aware of the job opportunities and the need for training, but what emphasis has this government put on ensuring that companies train Newfoundlanders, number one, and have a certain input into the make up of the curriculum of the vocational schools in this particular cast. That is the first question.

Secondly, Sir, the minister might have answered the question during some stage of the Committee, I would only require a brief answer, and I will make the question brief. The minister announced last year this extended day concept for the vocational schools in order to accommodate students that would otherwise not be accommodated in the vocational schools. I was wondering whether the 1,000 additional students that was anticipated, extra vocational students, whether that number has been achieved? And whether the problem has been resolved, that is, the problem of lack of accommodations for students wanting to get into the vocational schools of the Province? So it is a two part question! How many extra students have the vocational schools been successful in attracting to the extended day? And has this resolved the problem of students wanting to get into vocational schools?

The third question, Mr. Chairman, is the vocational wing concept to existing schools. The minister mentioned this during Committee stage. And I would like to get some indication from the minister as to the nature of the programmes or the curriculum that is anticipated for these vocational wings on these existing regional and central high schools. Whether the curriculum will be similar to existing vocational schools or whether it will be pre-vocational school education that will be taking place in these particular vocational wings that the minister has referred to?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, essentially three questions raised there with respect to the efforts of the government. The training of Newfoundlanders for the offshore employment opportunities. I think I have answered that. We are doing that through the various marine technology courses, vocational courses, and short courses at the College of Fisheries. This is for the marine area in terms of the servicing industries inshore, this through the appropriate subcommittee in this overall manpower needs approach. There is contact with people involved in the industry in the development of appropriate areas of instruction for employment opportunities which will develop on shore, when in fact, you know, the product is coming on shore or getting close to coming on shore or one can anticipate when in fact

it will get on shore.

With reference to the extended day, which we announced last year in accordance with maximizing the use of our facilities. One hundred additional students were provided for at the College of Trades, and 440 additional ones throughout the district vocational schools for a total of 540. There were an additional 485 places which could have been made available, and indeed for approximately 200 of those, and these would be for vocational students, it would not be all in one place, it could be one or two in this class, one in that class, and that would be in the vocational schools throughout the Province. So 540 additional places were filled. There was the possibility of 485 additional places. We advertised when there were vacancies for up to 200 and were unable to fill them. As I say I should point out that these are vocational schools across the Province. It could be that John Smith would apply in such a place to go take such a course, and maybe he would not get in, it would be filled. It could well be that the same course would have been available in a vocational school in another area, and in many cases apparently, you know, John Smith did not go then and take up that place.

So in general 540 additional places were used, and there was the potential of 485 additional places. I should point out that last September across the Province we did advertise for these additional places.

Now there was a third matter the gentleman raised, yes, with reference to the pre-vocational wings.

As far as the high school people would be concerned, the purpose here would be a broadening of educational experience, and a knowledge of skills required in industry. It is an educational programme and obviously that is what the emphasis will be on. Activities could be in working with wood, working with metals, home economics and industrial crafts in these areas. But I emphasize that the purpose behind it would be a broadening of educational -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes. This is not to prepare people to go out to any specific job but rather to broaden their educational experience to give challenge, initiative and interest to people whose interests and aptitudes are not exclusively or primarily, perhaps to a large extent, academic to keep them interested and involved. The concept would be that these centres would also be Manpower and Community Education Centres and that various adult education programmes in areas could centre around those, including the upgrading, which is undertaken by the provincial department in conjunction with Canada Manpower. That is certainly the upgrading courses and perhaps some additional ones as well so that they would have the educational component and reason for being and then the Manpower - Community Education one for the adult or non-day school population as well.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I find it rather amazing that the minister mentioned the fact that there were approximately 200 student places not filled when they implemented this extended day programme in the vocational schools. And the minister has given a satisfactory answer or reason for that and that is that, you know, a student may apply for a certain course if he lives in Cook's Harbour and wants to go over to St. Anthony, and that course happens to be filled in St. Anthony and the opening may exist down in Corner Brook or some other section of the Province where he cannot afford to pay for his board and lodging and this sort of a thing a little way from home.

I might ask the minister in most of these cases, would these be students who would qualify for the Provincial Student Allowance Programme rather than the Canada Manpower Allowance Programme? Because I think this is where the problem really lies that there is a vast difference between the provincial allowance for students attending vocational schools and that for students attending vocational schools or the College of Trades and Technology, who qualify under the Canada Manpower Student Aid Programme or whatever, you know, the actual name of it is. This is why, Sir, that we have advocated that the Province undertake to negotiate with the federal government the possibility of working out a formula whereby various students in the different post-secondary institutions in this Province come under similar and equitable student allowance or student aid programmes. Because really some students are being discriminated against, and I think that the minister has actually given us evidence of this very thing. That, you know, now that the space has been made available, students are not going into them simply because they obviously cannot afford to go to another area.

Now we cannot stick up vocational schools all over the Province, but surely we can formulate some programme in order that students can be mobilized, can go to a vocational school where an opening exists. I would like the minister just to reflect on, you know, what his administration or his department is doing about negotiating with Ottawa in order to formulate a student aid policy for all post-secondary educational students in order that we have an equitable programme no matter which institution or what type of programme a student wishes to qualify for. Because, I think, we all have to admit that the provincial government simply does not have the resources to put into effect a Provincial Student Aid Programme nor a University Aid Programme equivalent to the Canada Manpower Training Allowance Programme.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, essentially what the honourable gentleman is referring to, of course, is different rates of payment between the provincial students and the technical schools, vocational schools and the Manpower rates of pay. Of course, this is



something totally outside the Province's jurisdiction in the sense of what is paid out in Manpower allowances. The Manpower allowances can go anywhere from approximately \$50 a week to \$135 a week depending upon if the person is married and how many dependents one has. The vast majority of Manpower students would be married. The vast majority of provincial students would be unmarried. Of course, the Manpower allowances are sort of geared to the labour market.

If, for example, the federal government in all the money it gives for Manpower payments, for payments in Manpower allowances, if that were given or made available to the Province and the Province then added what it made available in provincial allowances and the discretion were left to the Province upon the allowance payment, then obviously one could have a uniformity. But that is just not the case, and the Federal Department of Manpower is very zealous in preserving its own independence there, of paying its own rates to those whom it recommends for training in the various vocational schools.

As I say, if the federal government were to agree to make this money available, then you could get a uniformity, but it has not and indeed it does not appear at all to be willing to do that. Representation has been made on a number of occasions because now in order to qualify for Manpower allowance, in order to be a Manpower student, the person has to be out of school for at least a year. In some cases - the number of cases could perhaps be exaggerated - there could well be some cases where two people are sitting side by side taking the same course - this would be an example of what could happen and no doubt does happen occasionally - you would have two people sitting side by side in the same vocational school taking the same course, one out of school a year and one out of school two years. The one out of school two years would be recognized by the federal government as a Manpower student and would get the federal rates. The person who had not been out of school over a year, would not be recognized by Manpower as a Manpower student and would not qualify.

On a number of occasions representation has been made to the Manpower people, but they insist upon the one year break between leaving school and qualifying for Manpower. So, as long as these things continue, then there is no way of having a policy there.

On motion 01 to 03 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 04 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, on 04. Now, there is an amendment to be made. Perhaps I will explain it briefly and ask my colleague, the honourable House Leader, to then make the amendment. Actually there is an increased amount of money will be there, but the expenditure and the revenue are the same. Through some clerical or other error or some other reason, the amount of \$300,000 presently included as expenditure under this subhead should be increased to \$2.8 million. The revenue associated with the total vocational training expenditures which presently are shown as \$7,750,000 should be increased to \$10,250,000 since the amount is 100 per cent returnable with the federal government.

This is what is called the - and the federal government comes up with initials and sometimes you cannot even have acronyms - DMI-UIC projects, Department of Manpower and Immigration-Unemployment Insurance Commission projects.

This is a special programme that the Federal Department of Manpower has made available. The vast majority of people involved in it are unemployment insurance recipients. There are some welfare recipients and we were hoping to be able to broaden the number, to increase the number, and these are courses, usually of fairly short duration for six, eight weeks in a vast array of areas. There are basic upgrading courses and these upgrading courses are continuous intake. In other words, people come and sort of set their own pace. Then there are, for example, twelve week courses in welding, upgrading; twelve week courses in carpentry, upgrading; twelve week courses preparation for service station attendant; twelve week courses in brick and block laying; motor vehicle repair, body work, upgrading, twelve weeks; hostess training and catering, and these are held in centres throughout the Province, practically every area of the Province.

So, I would now ask if the House Leader would move that amendment.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I move that 612-04 be increased by \$2.5 million so that it will be \$2.8 million. Just to keep the record straight, although it is not part of the estimates, 10-03 which shows related revenue be changed from \$7,750,000 to \$10,250,000.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, presumably this is the reason why the stated reason the minister just gave, is the reason why the revised estimates for 612-04, Manpower Training Programmes, is \$1,100,000 this year as compared to the estimate of \$300,000 last year. That is the reason.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is correct.

MR. ROWE: Thank you.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: (First part inaudible) and the part of it that was operative in the fiscal year about to end.

On motion, 04 as amended, carried.

On motion, 06 through 08, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 613-04 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, on 613-04, the College of Fisheries - Again I would like to give an overall view of activities and numbers involved in various training programmes at the College of Fisheries. Here the number of Manpower students, the percentage of Manpower students is very high, approximately eighty per cent which would leave twenty per cent provincial, approximately 1,041 manpower students, 280 provincial and then a small number, 65 or so who would be evening students.

As honourable members know, also of course, in the course of a year the number of people being served by the College of Fisheries would be much larger than the actual enrollment at the College because there are the travelling schools held in many areas of the Province and practically all over the Province. These are courses of three and four weeks duration. I will just read out a few of the places, not all of them: Paradise River, Raleigh, Wareham, Old Bonaventure, Morton's Harbour, Beaumont, Wesleyville, Bay de Verde, St. Shott's, etc.

I think the general work of the College of Fisheries is quite well known. They are doing a great deal of work up there now in the upgrading through Manpower, the upgrading area, and then they have the departments of electrical engineering technology, food technology, mechanical engineering technology, nautical science, naval architecture and then, of course, the extension service which is for the itinerant schools throughout the Province.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask one question on the College of Fisheries. Last year when I contacted certain officials of the College of Fisheries in order to ascertain, you know, whether or not they were particularly satisfied with the grants made to the Fisheries College,

it was brought to my attention that their basic problem with the College of Fisheries at that time was not lack of money for purposes of expansion or the Fisheries College itself, but their basic problem was the difficulty in getting students to come in to take certain courses at the Fisheries College. In other words the suggestion was made that many of our Newfoundlanders are sort of turning away from, and not availing themselves of, the courses at the College of Fisheries. Now that may be in part due to the fact that, you know, many young Newfoundlanders had to leave relatively small distant communities and come into the City of St. John's to study courses in the area of fisheries, and this may have been alleviated now by the fact that I understand the government are increasing its programme of bringing the Fisheries College out into the field which I think is a commendable idea, and I know in my own district in certain instances the courses that have been conducted by the Fisheries College in some of the communities of St. Barbe North have been absolutely invaluable to the fishermen. And presumably this is the same sort of thing that is occurring throughout the Province.

I wonder if the minister could indicate to the Committee, Sir, whether or not this problem still exists of getting students into the College of Fisheries itself. And if this is so, is the alternative policy or emphasis of the College of Fisheries going to be to go into the field, go to where the fishermen are at, if I can put it that way, and try to give sort of almost on the job training, sort of, programmes.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, one point I should make and that is that the employment opportunities for graduates of the College of Fisheries are excellent, are absolutely excellent. With respect to the honourable gentleman referred to the difficulty in recruiting students for certain areas, the main area where the difficulty was people who would go and then would have jobs at sea, and thinking particularly of, you know, at sea aboard trawlers where they are so long and back so long, at sea, you know, for a period of time before they

get home. this was where the difficulty was in recruitment, and not because the employment opportunities were not there but because it was a different way of life than life on land. That is essentially it. Now I think that the College has made significant progress there in two ways, (1) as the honourable gentleman referred to and that is the stepped up programme of travelling schools, or bring the College to as many communities as possible. And also they have a very broadly based programme of going to various high schools on career days and education days, and you know any number of reasons, the College of Fisheries has a very broadly based programme of keeping in touch with high schools, of being available for counselling of high school students, pointing out various career opportunities which would be available to them, and through different courses in the College of Fisheries.

So I think these two moves have help alleviate the problem. But there is no doubt, in that there is a reluctance on the part of a large number of young people to be interested in employment opportunities which will keep them at sea. I would certainly hope that the College will be able to change that outlook because in Newfoundland there are going to be employment opportunities for people at sea, and they are very good ones, and the pay is quite good, living conditions are good, we are right here surrounded by water, and hopefully that, you know, that attitude will change. But, of course,

all the government or the College of Fisheries or anybody can do is point out the opportunities that are available and encourage and do everything possible to encourage people, but naturally you cannot force them.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, it is a serious problem because basically what we are doing here is changing the whole social structure of the fisheries in this province where people over the centuries have been more or less used to a kind of an inshore fishery situation where they harvest the products of the sea and at the same time grow vegetables and this sort of a combination. I think that what we really need here - I would not go so far as to recommend that George McLean make up a film or something like that to advertise the opportunities available at sea, but, Sir, I would suggest that the government could take the initiative in co-operation with the College of Fisheries and really put on a, not hard sell, but a very dynamic programme to encourage and entice and point out the benefits of going to sea, and to point out and make comparisons with other countries of the world where fishermen go to sea for very long periods of time.

Probably, as the Minister of Industrial Development suggests, probably when this - I did not want to get into that realm for obvious reasons - probably when this whole strike situation is settled to the satisfaction of both the trawlermen and the companies, if there is satisfaction on both sides, we may have that problem solved. It is as simple as that. In the event that we continue to have this problem of students being reluctant to enroll in courses related to deep sea fisheries and having to leave home for long periods of time, I would suggest that it is incumbent upon the government in combination with the College of Fisheries to put on a very effective advertising campaign to try to attract young Newfoundlanders into this field which if we do not exploit, Mr. Chairman, if Newfoundlanders do not exploit our own resource, it is useless for this provincial government to call upon the federal government to make certain demands at the Law of the Sea Conference because what will happen,



of course, we will make certain demands for jurisdiction over the Continental Shelf or 200 miles whichever is the furthest point from land, we make the demands, we get them and the next thing you know it is discovered years in the future that neither Newfoundland nor other parts of Canada possibly are exploiting the fisheries resource off our shores. So, I hope we are never caught in that very embarrassing position. If we make certain demands for jurisdiction over a certain marine area, we have to ensure that our people are going to exploit that. I do not think it is none too soon, Sir, for the government to put on this very strong campaign to attract people into that particular resource because it is a resource that will bring money into the pockets of the people involved and will bring revenue, very badly needed revenue, into this Province. If we do not exploit it, other foreign countries will.

On motion 613-04 and 07 carried.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, here we are on the vote for Memorial University of Newfoundland. As can be seen, the total here is of a grant-in-aid, \$31 million up from \$25 million last year, the revised estimate. Therefore, an increase of \$6 million. I informed the committee in my opening remarks that I would give the breakdown of the vote, the various departments of the university,



and what I will do rather than read out so many hundred thousand dollars or so many hundred, I will round it out, all right? And most of these things are self-evident. The Faculty of Science, and that is the various Science Departments, chemistry, physics etc., \$5.6 million. The physical operations, and that of course is maintenance, heat, furnace and all of these things, \$3.5 million. The Faculty of Arts is pretty self-evident, the various Arts Departments \$3.5 million; the Administration which includes Controller's Office, and the Registrar's Office, and the overall administrator of quite a big facility, \$2.8 million; the library, \$2.2 million; the Faculty of Education, \$2.1 million; the Junior Division approximately \$2 million. Then what would come under the general benefits, and that is the pension plan, and the insurance plan of the University, \$1.6 million, and that would include insurance as well, you know, disability insurance etc. The Corner Brook Campus, \$1.5 million; the Extension Services of the University, \$1.1 million; Computer Services, \$991,000; Marine Sciences Research Laboratory, \$658,000; what is called here campus services, and that is essentially security, \$499,000; the Department of Physical Education, \$470,000; Graduate Studies Division for the various departments, \$435,000; the Educational Television, and that is basically the E.T.V. for extramural studies, \$421,000; the School of Nursing, \$415,000; the Thompson's Student Centre, \$394,000; the School of Business Administration and Commerce, \$365,000; the School of Social Work, \$298,000; the Department of Co-ordination, now this means that in certain areas especially Commerce, for Engineering as well, there is a programme whereby students study so long and they are out working and they are back studying and they are out working, and it is that work term concept, \$220,000; the Institute of Research and Human Abilities, and this is largely associated with diagnosis of learning disabilities, \$167,000; counselling services for students, especially undergraduates, \$150,000; the Institution of Social and Economic Research, I think the general work of that institution is very well known, they have studies made into, and publications with respect to

essentially socio - economic problems of Newfoundland related to the fishery, related to rural problems etc. \$100,000; the Centre for the Development of Community Initiatives \$100,000, this is a fairly recent centre at the University, and people there work especially with rural communities in helping them to identify their needs and plan programmes, I suppose one would call it a kind of community development, \$100,000; for the interest and amortization of Harlow Campus, \$50,000, and this is used for internships especially for teachers and sometimes for engineers and for social workers as well, and the amount there is for interest and amortization; Vice-President's Research Fund, \$50,000, this is an amount which usually will start people in research so that they can get far enough whereby they can then apply to foundations, but it gives them that start; Church College Grants, that is \$40,000, and what that comes to is \$100 per resident student to the three church colleges; staff recruitment and travel, \$35,000, and miscellaneous, which would be for emergencies etc, \$50,000.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if the minister could supply me with a copy of that list that he just read out. And I might ask the minister if that does represent the making public of the University's Budget? There has been some statement made recently, I do not know whether it has been made by the President or the Minister of Education if the University is now willing to make public its budget, am I correct in that? Well, the minister can refresh my memory on it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: At the opening of the Department of Education's estimates on Tuesday, I stated that when we got to the vote for the university, I would be giving a department by department breakdown of their expenditure. That, in fact, is a department by department breakdown of their expenditure.

MR. F. ROWE: If I could just ask another brief question, Mr. Chairman. The total provincial budget to the university is \$39 million.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is correct.

MR. F. ROWE: What is the total university budget, period? I am thinking of, you know, funds that would come through private corporations such as the Alfred D. Sloan Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation and this sort of a thing. What I am trying to get at, Mr. Chairman, is this. What percentage of the total university budget is public money? Is money coming from either the federal or provincial government? Would the minister have that generalized percentage at the present time?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It would be, Mr. Chairman, a very high percentage. It would be a very high percentage. Because the amount that is voted here is entirely provincial and this makes up the vast bulk, and there is a certain amount of federal money and of grants, which would come from the federal government. There would be some grants from different foundations. There are a few, but very few endowments and this is unfortunate because many universities have a continuing and predictable source of income from endowments and, of course, there is some revenue in tuition which is a different matter as well. But certainly the provincial government's proportion would be a very, very high percentage. I would rather have it figured out than, you know, state it without having figured it out mathematically.

MR. F. ROWE: Would it be, you know, safe to say, Mr. Chairman, that, you know, the public money put into the university would represent in excess of ninety per cent of the total university Budget?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, that is correct.

MR. F. ROWE: Okay, you know, whether it is ninety-two or ninety-five or ninety-eight is irrelevant to the point I am going to make. The point is this, that the vast majority of the expenditure of the university and the budget of the university comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers. It is public money. And it is my sincere feeling, Mr. Chairman, that the university should be accountable for all of the public money that is expended by that university, should be held accountable to the public of Newfoundland -

MR. CROSBIE: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. ROWE: - for its expenditure. The Hon. Minister of Fisheries agrees with me. I mean I can take him seriously this time. He is not being sarcastic. He is being sincere.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It is our budget. We have to vote for it.

MR. F. ROWE: Right.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not want to interrupt the honourable gentleman but we need to raise the committee.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, I obviously would like for the minute to -

MR. CROSBIE: You do not want to carry the vote this morning, I do not think.

MR. F. ROWE: Well let it go on record that the Minister of Fisheries does agree.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not want to have to get up on a point of privilege.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the various items that have been approved to date and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having made progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of Supply reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and report having made progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 1:00 P.M., I leave the Chair until  
3:00 P.M. this afternoon.

The House resumed at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Order no. 4 which is a Committee of the Whole.

On motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on the said bill. Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro-Electric Corporation."

On motion, preamble carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Clause (2) carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Clause (2), Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to add a new clause (e) - this is the interpretation section - and to add a new clause (e) defining Labrador. "Labrador" means all that part of the Province situated on the mainland of Canada. Then to amend the present clauses (e), (f), (g) and so on. All have to have their lettering changed. (e) would become (f), (f) would become (g) and so on and the rest of the interpretation clauses.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: You have a copy.

So, I move, Mr. Chairman, that section (2) be amended by adding a new clause (e). "Labrador" means all that part of the province situated on the mainland of Canada and that the present clauses (e) to (l) be changed accordingly, (f) to (m).

There are a couple of other minor changes in the clause, typographical errors. Actually there is one typographical error to be corrected. That is in the last clause of section (2), the third last line which says now, the development, generation and production of power, substitute the word or for the word and, the development, generation or production of power.

On motion amendment carried.

On motion clause (2) as amended carried.

On motion clause (3) carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause (4) carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Clause (4), Mr. Chairman, has some typographical errors. Subsection (3) of clause (4) - these just need to be noted I guess. The word agreements is not properly printed. Then after Labrador Hydro in subclause (3) you had to put a full stop. These need to be adopted by the committee. Also the typographical errors - these are just noted. We do not need any changes.

On motion clause (4) and clause (5) carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause (6) carry?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I think the government wished to move an amendment to that as I understand it, but I also wish to move one. It is a bit of a procedural question. We are both talking about subsection (8). My understanding of the copy I am been given by the minister is that in effect the government wished to delete (8) and replace (8) with the present nine. You know,

just renumber. What I wish to do, and I ask Your Honour's guidance on how we go about it procedurally, is to delete (8) and replace it with another subsection altogether.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. CROSBIE: If we delete (8) first, then you can move your -

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Well, alright, that is in order. I mean - And then mine just says, no member of the House of Assembly shall be eligible to be appointed director of the corporation or to receive any remuneration from the corporation. If the page would come, there is a piece out of the amendments I wish to propose for the minister.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, let us get (8) out and then I will move it and we will have a chat on it.

MR. CROSBIE: I move, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. ROBERTS: I asked to have those taken - if the page would accept my - that is for the minister. I have copies for the Chair and the Chair will certainly have them.

MR. CROSBIE: However, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. ROBERTS: Sorry, "Fred", but I asked him to take them over there.

MR. CROSBIE: I would move that subsection (8) of section (6) be deleted. That is the section that says, notwithstanding the Legislative Disabilities Act, if a member of the House of Assembly is appointed a director, his seat does not become vacant by reason only of his appointment and acceptance of remuneration as a director, and that the remaining subclause be renamed (8).

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.



On motion, amendment carried.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, I would now move that a new subsection (8) as per the words I just sent up to the Chair to read as follows: No member of the House of Assembly should be eligible to be appointed as director of the corporation or to receive any remuneration from the corporation. I think this speaks for itself, Sir. The effect of it would be to state positively a rule or principle whereas now the act is silent. The only legislation that would bear if this clause is not amended in committee would be the Legislative Disabilities Act which may or may not serve the purpose, but even if it does serve the purpose, nothing at all can be lost by this further positive reaffirmation of the principle which I understand has been accepted by the ministry, that simply no member of this House shall be eligible to be appointed a director of the corporation or to receive any remuneration of any sort from the corporation. I think it is an important principle and accordingly I move the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): The Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, if I could speak to that amendment. There is absolutely no reason for including that in the act. The Legislative Disabilities Act applies. Once the original section 6(8) is removed which says notwithstanding the Legislative Disabilities Act, it is possible for a member of the House of Assembly to be appointed a director. Once that section is removed, then the Legislative Disabilities Act applies and any member of the House of Assembly can become a director, as I understand it. In doing so, he would forfeit his seat in the House of Assembly. Is that not correct?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: - in the House. Certainly raise that question.

MR. BARRY: In any event, Mr. Chairman, we submit that we cannot support this amendment because it is totally unnecessary. Obviously the Leader of the Opposition feels that for his own reasons he wants to make a point, but we see that there is nothing to be gained. It is unnecessary, and therefore we cannot support it.

MR. MURPHY: It would have to be in every bill that was passed.

MR. ROBERTS: It might not be a bad idea to put it in every bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Shall the amendment carry? Those in favour "aye", those against "nay", carried. In my opinion the nays have it.

On motion, clause (6) as amended, carried.

On motion, clauses 7 through 14, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Shall clause 15 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I move an amendment to clause 15.

Add in the fourth line after the words, sole and exclusive right and franchise, add the words, limited to the Island of Newfoundland, I guess we should do them one at a time. All that this clause says is that subject to the rights of any person that exists now the corporation has the sole and exclusive right and franchise limited to the Island of Newfoundland to sell certain power.

MR. ROBERTS: Why?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The ministry doubtless have an answer. I would like to hear it, Mr. Chairman. You know, on the face of it, and I realize there may be more later, but on the face of it appears to put us back where we are now where the government some years ago by legislation took an exclusive franchise to the new development, the further development of power sites on the Island, not on the Labrador portion of the Province. This apparently does the same thing, I mean, what is the reason?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it there is a condition in at least one of the trust indentures, the contracts entered into when the Power Corporation or the old Power Commission went to the market to borrow funds that makes necessary this section, and which has to be considered in light of a further amendment which the Leader of the Opposition should have a copy of, in section (25) with respect to the grant of a franchise in Labrador. It is felt that to avoid problems possible, and in effect are legal technicalities with respect to the wording of the bond indentures, it is felt that rather than make the franchise of the Hydro Corporation apply automatically to all of Labrador that it may be necessary to deal with the granting of the franchise to Labrador separately in the event that there are particular circumstances that have to be dealt with at that time. As I understand it if it were put in, if Section (15) were left as it is and the writ of the corporation was applicable to Labrador that would immediately make it fall within certain restricted covenants in the bond indentures that now

exist that were created when the old Power Commission went out to the capital markets to borrow money. So it is a technical legal reason.

MR. ROBERTS: It makes sense to me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

MR. CROSBIE: In subclause (a) of that clause, Mr. Chairman, amend certain words there. It says now to sell in the first instance either for consumption, And after the words consumption, by way of domestic, industrial, or any other use whatsoever. Those are the words to add. And then it goes on - or for resale all power generated by the Corporation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

On motion amendment carried.

On motion Clause (15) as amended carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Clause(16) carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Clause (16), Mr. Chairman. I would move that the present Clause (16) be deleted, and that a new Clause (16) be added. Rather than reading it all I believe the members have got a copy of the suggested amendment, which is to do with defining of subsidiaries of the corporation, and what is a subsidiary.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well this is, perhaps the minister - I understand it is some legal requirement so it is quite clear what is a subsidiary of the corporation. There will be several subsidiaries of course, including the Gull Island Power Corporation.

MR. BARRY: Again, Mr. Chairman, this has to be looked at in conjunction with a later amendment, (17)(1), for example, lend monies to any subsidiary of the corporation, where they spell out certain additional powers which it was felt useful to spell out rather than just leave the Section (1) as it was generally to do all things which the corporation deemed necessary, convenient or advisable etc. There were certain powers spelled out, more specifically one of which deals with - more than one actually - a number of which deal with the

the relationship of the corporation to its subsidiary, and for that matter it was deemed necessary, thought necessary by the law officers involved in the drafting to spell out specifically who is or who could be a subsidiary of the corporation, and that is why the Section (16) is in there as it is.

Afternoon Session.

March 21, 1975

Tape no. 606

Page 1 - mw

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, we are quite prepared to vote for it, but what happens to the present section 16?

AN HON. MEMBER: It comes out.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, but is it to re-surface in another form? You know, presumably, it had a raison d'être for being in there to begin with.

MR. BARRY: The aim applies with the Labrador bit and it is dealt with in section 25, I believe.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not sure I understand it, but I mean when we come to section 25, we will go into it. Section 25 does not seem to be quite the same. Section 25 deals with Labrador.

MR. BARRY: The power to sell at retail is already in section 15, if you look at section 15.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. You know but the fact remains that section 16 was put in originally -

MR. BARRY: Because -

MR. ROBERTS: - but it did not specifically just deal with Labrador. Section 16, as it was, you know, in the second reading print of the bill deals with, you know, the entire province. In other words you got section 15 giving the power to sell at retail within the Province which will now restrict it to the Island of Newfoundland but section 16 then dealt with everybody.

MR. BARRY: If you look at section 16 -

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is a very important bill, but it is not giving the members on this side of the House a chance to see what the amendments are. The amendments are included and posted in the bill that the government people are using, but we do not have the amendments that we are discussing now. And I suggest that copies should be made available to everyone as the minister made available to me this morning and the Leader of the Opposition is using so that the members can see what is going on and what the amendments consist of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague has a point. I have copies of the amendments in front of me.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are there.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, but I do not need them thanks, I have them in this. But I got them only a few minutes ago, and I certainly have not had any chance to read them, which, I think, is obvious by the questions I am asking. The bill, I realize, is a very important one. The government tell us it is urgent and yet the fact remains the government have chosen not to call it before this. It was passed second reading a week or ten days ago. Unless there is some urgency that we do not know about, which we could be told about, why cannot this matter stand over? There is lots of business before the House, Your Honour. Why cannot this matter stand over until Monday rather than rush it through with, you know, important amendments? As the minister has indicated, these are important amendments. The government may have finished drafting them this morning or they may have drafted them a week ago but the fact remains that the House has only seen them now. So I ask perhaps that they could stand over until Monday, and I will take whatever time is necessary to read them and so will all of my colleagues and then we will be able to debate them with some knowledge as opposed to this process here.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, I did present the Hon. Member for Labrador North with the amended copy before lunch. I realize that that is no great length of time, but at the same time, I submit, that the amendments that are suggested here are not fundamental to the principle of the bill -

MR. ROBERTS: We are not debating the principle of the bill here.

MR. WOODWARD: You must admit that it is confusing to the people who do not have -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: We have settled the principle of the bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: If I could, Mr. Chairman. We also have prepared photostatic copies of the amendments with respect to each section, and we are now dealing with section 17. There are only two other amendments of any substantial size, and when I speak about size, I am talking about the amount of printing involved.

MR. ROBERTS: We are still on section 16. We have not gone off section 16.

MR. BARRY: I am sorry, section 16. Okay, there are three. There is section 16, 17 and -

MR. ROBERTS: Section 25.

MR. BARRY: - 25 that involve any amount of new typing.

But I submit that any member here is in a position to read these in a matter of five minutes and see just what is there. There is nothing, as I say, fundamental going to the substance of the bill, but they are matters that for technical reasons and to enable greater efficiency on the part of the corporation, once it is in operation, they would be desirable to have included in the final bill passed by the House. I would ask the honourable members to consider proceeding with it. I should point out also that there is one reason for moving ahead with the bill at this time and that is that



if the bill is passed prior to the termination of this fiscal year, and if certain arrangements are taken with respect to the relationship of this corporation and CFLCo particularly, the Province could be enabled to save approximately \$1 million because of taxation and royalty arrangements between CFLCo and the Newfoundland Hydro Corporation. This is the reason why government would like to see the Hydro Corporation Bill proceed as quickly as possible.

I can understand the - I believe there was some confusion. The honourable Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs or Fisheries had photostatic copies of each section to be distributed to the members. Our understanding was that they would go out as we come to each section just to point out what is involved in the amendment for each section. But again I can only say I do not see where there is any fundamental amendments to the principle of the bill. I would ask the assistance of the honourable members opposite to get the act completed and through committee at this stage.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the minister, I could make three or four points which I think are very relevant to this. First of all, Mr. Chairman, the question of the fundamental principle of the bill is not an issue in the committee. The House disposed of that question at second reading stage. There is no question of that. What we are now talking about is the stage by stage examination of what, by all descriptions, is a very important piece of legislation. Granting the fact that \$1 million is certainly worth the saving, today is only March 21. Monday is March 24, a day of happy memory, the day of the Saunders' Memorial we will call it, perhaps, and we will have a holiday, a day to remember William P. Saunders.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do not get into that again.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, a day of solid reckoning that is to come.

Mr. Chairman, the fact remains that these amendments of which no real notice has been given - I realize that no real notice is required under the rules - but the fact remains that these are fairly important.

They are fairly technical. I do not see - I must admit that I do not see any reason why the members on this side - I am the only one who is "learned" in the sense in which we use that. I do not pretend to understand them. My colleagues who are not as learned in the law as I allegedly am, I am sure would wish to think about the matter. (I wish you would not put that in front of me when I am trying to speak. I am sorry but you know -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I could tell you where to put it but that is not parliamentary. Thank you.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do not be so ignorant, boy.

MR. ROBERTS: Is there any reason why this cannot stand? We are going to meet Monday.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No reason.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, if you agree to it, I will not have to speak.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, do not speak.

MR. ROBERTS: Agree to it. He was not agreeing.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we do not want any false issue raised about these amendments. These amendments are just technical, legal amendments prepared by the draftsmen of the bill. We do not want the public getting any false impression that we are moving amendments that the poor old Opposition have not had time to study, and dire things are being done. We are quite agreed. If the honourable gentlemen want to wait until Monday and study these amendments and peruse them over the weekend, fine, we will do it. So, I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having made progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and report having made

March 21, 1975

Tape 607 (afternoon)

IB-3

some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Shall 614-01 carry?

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, before dinner I was about to get into a certain aspect of the University budget. It was estimated by myself and confirmed by the Minister of Education that in excess of ninety per cent, it is not important exactly how much, but in excess of ninety per cent of the total University budget comes from the pockets of the taxpayers whether it be from the provincial government or the federal government. And something less than ten per cent of the total University budget comes from private sources or foundation or areas of research and this sort of a thing.

Now, Sir, the point that I was about to make before it was called 1:00 o'clock, was that under these circumstances since the University is to the most part financed by the taxpayers of this Province and of this Nation that the University should be made accountable for its budget. In other words, the budget of the University should be made as public and as open to scrutiny as the budget and estimates of the various departments of the provincial government.

Now, Sir, I say this after a great deal of thought. I have been thinking about this since I have had the pleasure or the honour of servicing in this honourable House, Sir. And the question was advanced to the Minister of Education two years ago, and we did not really get into any great discussion over this particular point. But, I think the time has come now, Sir, when it is reasonable to ask the administration, the Minister of Education, what consideration they have given to requesting the publication, the complete detailed publication of the University budget along the lines of the document

that we have in front of us at the present time, vote by vote.

The minister read out a list this morning, I still do not believe I have the copy, I was hoping -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes. But it was basically the University's budget broken down by departments, and that revealed very little information.

Now, Sir, I would like to make it abundantly clear that we on this side of the House do not in any way feel that money is being wasted, squandered, or spent in the wrong way - we are not making that accusation whatsoever. I do not want anybody to try to interpret our stand on this point as being suspicious of the way that the money is being spent at the University.

I think that in this democratic society when an institution is spending public money that it is the right of that institution, it is the responsibility, I mean, of that institution to make its budget as public and in as much detail as possible.

Sir, I have had the pleasure so far in my lifetime of having been a student at that University and having been a teacher in our school system and having taught in the University itself, taught and carried out research in the University and I am familiar with the University from the point of view of a student and as a person who taught there. I am also familiar with certain attitudes of certain elements of our society towards the University. It is a very popular thing, Sir, for certain people to come out and cast criticisms upon the University. We hear such phrases as that crowd up there in the ivory tower, a bunch of educated deviates, why do they need all this money anyway? We had a certain one of our mayors in Newfoundland, quite recently, compared, asked the question why should the University get this \$6 million additional dollars in grants and aids this year and started to compare it with the needs of the St. John's City Council. There is no comparison there, but, Sir, for the very protection of the University itself against certain elements in society who always have a suspicious eye about the University, for the University's own protection, I think the University itself would be only too happy to open up its budget to the public of Newfoundland. This does not mean it has to be carried in one of the daily newspapers. It means that in the Department of Education, in the breakdown of the estimates for the University, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 614, there could probably be a more detailed breakdown of the estimates for the University itself.

Indeed, Sir, one might use the same argument for other institutions such as the College of Trades and Technology, the vocational schools and possibly even the school boards

where public money is being used. We do not have people, obviously, elected as president, vice-president, heads of departments, as professors, research directors and what have you at the University, but they are spending the peoples' money.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: No, I have no -

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Okay. To answer the minister's question, in the University community itself, I have heard both arguments. There are certain professors who, and certainly staff members, who would certainly like to see the, you know, the more detailed aspects of the University's budget and there are other individuals within the department, Mr. Chairman, within the University, Sir, who get off on this business of interference with academic freedom and what have you.

I submit, Sir, that the publication or the making public of the University budget in this Province will in no way interfere with academic freedom, in no way. I mean, there can be argument, but my humble opinion is -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Yes, well, yes. I am saying in my humble opinion, this need not necessarily interfere with - what was it?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Academic freedom.

MR. ROWE: Academic freedom. This need not interfere with academic freedom.

MR. F. ROWE: We may have to - you know, I do not know whether it would be necessary to get down and itemize the exact salary of a specific person or professor or a head of department, but let us not forget that in the case of teachers in this province, their salary scales are public, and the civil servants. And all we got to do is find out teacher A, find out what teaching grade he has and, therefore, you can find out what the salary he is on and consequently you can say, Mr. A receives a salary of \$14,500 a year. That money comes from the public, and I am saying, basically, that in the case of the expenditure of public funds in the university the budget should be as public as that of the government departments themselves in this democratic society of ours. Because, Sir, there have been some very unhealthy criticisms levelled at the university over the years, sometimes by politicians, sometimes by other people who are in competition with the university for public funds. But there have been some very unhealthy criticisms of the university and these have been carried on television and interviews have been carried on. Blanket statements have been made, and this is our only university in this Province, Sir. It is the only institution in this Province where a young Newfoundlander, without having to go away to the Mainland, can obtain a university degree, a Bachelors' degrees in many cases, some Masters' degrees and some Doctoral degrees. This is our only university, Sir. We have had a very serious cut back in enrollment at the university. I would submit the university has not been getting adequate grants-in-aid over the last few years, and that the facilities at our university, when compared to some of the universities on the Mainland leave, a little bit to be desired. The president of the university has indicated that there is less money spent per student at Memorial University than any other university in Canada, and that can only mean, Sir, that it is conceivable, it is possible that the -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: I am not saying it is, but it is conceivable, when you take that factor into consideration that our students are not getting



the same opportunity at Memorial University of Newfoundland as students in other universities throughout Canada. I will take one example, the physical educational facilities at our university are far below the standards that you find in universities much smaller in the other Atlantic Provinces.

MR. MURPHY: Is that a fact.

MR. F. ROWE: That is a fact. Yes, that is a fact.

MR. DOODY: That is right. Physical education is not -

MR. F. ROWE: No, I am just using that as an example, Mr. Chairman.

I can use other examples. I have made the point that it has been stated by none other than the President of our University that less money is being spent per student than any other university in Canada. And that can only mean one thing. It can only mean, if it has any affect at all, if it has any affect at all, if it has any affect, it lowers the standards, physically or educationally or culturally, at our university relative to other universities in Canada. Now I am not saying that the calibre of a university is directly related to or a direct function of the amount of money. It is conceivable to give an institution \$100 million, and they waste \$50 million of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Oh, I am not saying that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. F. ROWE: I am not saying that at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: I am not saying that. It would even be worse, Mr. Chairman, if we had to maintain the student enrollment that we have had at the University over there. The student enrollment has decreased over the years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: And that decrease in student enrollment has been attributed to this administration's student aid policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: It is not an opinion. It is a document for everybody to read and this is the conclusions and recommendations of that document which is about that thick.

MR. DOODY: That is one of many reasons.

MR. F. ROWE: The actual report. One of major reasons.

MR. DOODY: One of many reasons.

MR. F. ROWE: One of the - now, Mr. Chairman, here we go again. Last night everything was going along quite smoothly, Sir, -

MR. DOODY: I am sorry, Sir,

MR. F. ROWE: until something hit the fan, as a result of this kind of babbling from the other side of the House.

MR. DOODY: if I got him excited I will stop.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, if I have to be provoked, I might find myself, you know, becoming irrelevant.

MR. DOODY: Do not get provoked! Do not get provoked now, "Fred".

MR. F. ROWE: I might even fly off the handle.

MR. DOODY: No, no carry on.

MR. F. ROWE: I might be named.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not get all excited. Do not fly off the handle.

MR. DOODY: No you are doing a good job, carry on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The honourable the member has a right to be heard in silence. However during the Committee stage it is not infrequent that two honourable members may engage in a

conversation across the floor, each agreeing that the other has the right to do so. And the Chair agrees not to interfere. That is what was happening. But I must agree that the honourable member was getting a little bit angry with it so I presume his right to be heard in silence has to be enforced. Accordingly the honourable member may be heard.

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

Now the basic point that I was making is that I wanted the minister to reply to another positive proposal made by some honourable member in Opposition who has been often criticized for criticizing in a non-constructive fashion. But we submit that the time has come for the minister to indicate to this Committee, Mr. Chairman, what his policy is, what his administration's policy is with respect to making the University's budget public. And I would just like to reiterate that this question does not come about as a result of any suspicions on our part of misappropriation of funds or waste of funds at the University. I would submit that there is the same waste of funds at the University as any other educational institution or any other private enterprise or any government, be it local, provincial, or federal. There are always cases when you can question the expenditure of funds in any of these levels of institution or in government.

MR. HICKMAN: Suppose the honourable gentleman would explain to the Committee what he means by the budget. Are you talking about the detailed budget, or the budget that was presented this morning by the Hon. Minister of Education?

MR. F. ROWE: No, if the minister was in his seat or listening he would have heard exactly what I was asking for. So at the cost of boring the gallery and other members of the Committee I will repeat for the information of the Minister of Justice exactly what I wished the minister to answer, and that is this, that in excess of ninety per cent of the University's full budget is coming out of the public purse, one way or the other. I am asking the minister what his feelings are with respect, and the government's policy is with respect to making

the University's budget public. Now the minister can say, I already made it public by that list this morning. I am saying that that list this morning, Mr. Chairman, was a very vague, fuzzy, general, non-productable information kind of a list. And I was suggesting, this is probably what the Minister of Justice missed, I was suggesting probably that the University budget could be itemized in heads and subheads something similar to the vote of a department.

MR. HICKMAN: Not like that yellowed cover book that you have there?

MR. F. ROWE: Now, now, now I know what the minister is trying to get at. He is talking about the salary estimates now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F.B. ROWE:

This is what I would like to hear from the minister. There is no reason why there could not be a block vote for salaries for certain departments. There is certainly no reason for that. Now, the question is whether you would want a detailed itemized salary list of estimates like the salary estimates. This is what the minister is asking. The only comment that I had to make on that is that in the case of civil servants and in the case of teachers under the NTA, their salaries are public knowledge as indicated by the minister. The little yellow book gives the breakdown of the individual civil servants in this province.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Just about. You know, I realize that there might be a vote of say a clerk number three, four clerks, \$20,000 or something like that. So, there may not be four clerks getting \$5,000. There might be one clerk getting \$6,000 and the rest divided up accordingly.

In the case of the NTA and the teachers, a teacher has a salary grade assigned to him dependent upon his university qualifications and his years of teaching experience. You just ask teacher A what his salary grade is. You can look up in the NTA hand book and find out his salary. It is there for public knowledge, and rightly so, because it is public money.

I am saying with the exclusion of expenditure of money coming from private foundations or any other private sources for, say, research, that the university should be made accountable for its expenditure. I will say it for two reasons, for the very protection of the university itself, because it is very easy and quite popular and wrongly so in some cases for certain people to come out and cast aspersions on university personnel and the university concept and university students.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: What is that?

MR. DOODY: This casting of aspersions.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that there have been

times when, for instance, the Minister of Fisheries, who was then Minister of Finance, during the first year of this administration when I got up and made a speech in connection with the university, thought it appropriate and popular to get up and call me the honourable member for the university.

MR. DOODY: He said that to you?

MR. F. ROWE: Oh, it was absolutely devastating, Mr. Chairman, absolutely devastating.

MR. DOODY: What is the question?

MR. F. ROWE: Absolutely devastating.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. DOODY: Sorry I asked.

MR. F. ROWE: Okay, Mr. Chairman.

That is the first point. I think I probably made that point and expect a reasonable answer from the honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. DOODY: He got my vote after that.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Here we go again, I am beginning to feel like I am in government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. F.B. ROWE: I will entertain a question from the Minister of -

MR. HICKMAN: I am only doing this because I know that my colleague the honourable the Minister of Education is very anxious to precisely answer the question. But I would like, when the honourable gentleman from White - from -

MR. F.B. ROWE: St. Barbe North.

MR. HICKMAN: St. Barbe North talks about the university budget and making it public, similar to what we do with government departments in what manner are you suggesting that this budget be made public? Are you suggesting that it would simply be the manner in which the crown corporations are tabled in the House? Or is the honourable gentleman suggesting that the university be brought before the committee to explain to the committee its budget. As I understand, in what province does this happen?

MR. F. ROWE: Indeed, Mr. Chairman, these are details that would certainly have to be worked out. You know, first we get a statement of principle from the Minister of Education. Right? Secondly, once a principle is agreed upon, supposing the honourable the minister agrees with the proposal that we are making here now, supposing he agrees, well, obviously the mechanism, the way of making it public has to be worked out and presumably this mechanism will have to be worked out between the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and the university administration itself. You know,

I am not suggesting for one minute that this government slam down the hammer and say make it public. I am suggesting, I am asking, I am asking what the minister's philosophy is in this particular instance. And if the answer is affirmative and in agreement with what I am sort of suggesting here now, I do not think this is quite the time to talk about the mechanism and a way in which this can be done. The Minister of Justice himself has made a certain suggestion of a way - it is done in one - has given an example of a way that it is done in a certain Province. It could be simply written up as a financial report from the University that is tabled before the House or could be included in the government's estimates under the vote for the Memorial University of Newfoundland. That is point number one -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Not that I am aware of, not that I am aware of. Probably, it is my understand Mr. - without any great deal of study on this, it is my understanding that many universities are much more fortunate than our University in the amount of private funding that it gets. If this is consistent with what the honourable the Minister of Industrial Development is inferring or suggesting and he is really confirming more or less what I am saying, is that if such a large proportion of the University's budget is publicly funded, probably it should be made public how it is expended.

So, I would like an answer to that question, if I may. Now, the second point that I would like to make with respect to the University, Sir, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Answer, Mr. Minister.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: No, I want to



MR. NEARY: Before the minister answers my colleague, Sir, I have a few remarks to make on this particular matter and maybe I could save the minister the trouble of rising in his place twice to comment on some of the points that I may make, but, Sir, I wholeheartedly concur with the recommendation of my colleague. This is one matter, Mr. Chairman, in which I had been absolutely consistent down through the years.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is the only one.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, there are a number of other matters that I could raise and will raise from time to time, but on this particular matter, Sir, I have been completely consistent, both when I was in the former administration, when I sat on the government side as a private member, as a backbencher, just inside the rail down there, when I was a minister, without divulging Cabinet secrets, Sir, and now over on this side of the House, this is three years in a row that I have spoken on this particular matter of the University making public its budget.

Sir, I make no apologies whatsoever to our dear and beloved University for asking that they make their budget public. I am not walking on egg shells, Sir, like the honourable Minister of Justice on this particular matter. I am absolutely sincere, Sir, and my colleague pointed out that the University is spending or gets ninety per cent of its revenue from the taxpayers of this Province and of Canada as a whole. Why should they not make their budget public, Sir? Why should they not, the same as the various government departments have to do? Why should they not show revenue and expenditure and why should they not, Mr. Chairman, show salary details the same as we have in this mustard coloured document that was tabled in this House on one of the days when I sitting out in the public gallery? Why should they not do that, Mr. Chairman? Any reason? I cannot think of any logical reason why they should not do it and I am not suspicious of the University,

March 21, 1975.

Tape 613

RH - 3

Sir. I do not say that anybody is pocketing any of the money over there. I do not say that the money is being spent improperly, but I do say this, Sir, I do say this, Mr. Chairman, that according to the rumors and the reports that we hear, Sir, I would suspect

that they got their priorities slightly mixed up over at the University. And, Mr. Chairman, some of the rumours we hear are apparently true. Now, Sir, I have nothing against the University sponsoring a conference, for instance, on the tsetse fly, a fly that apparently carries tropical disease.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I cannot hear my colleague. But, Sir, I have a clipping right here, under this pile of papers that I have on my desk, taken from "The Evening Telegram" were the University, Sir, took great pride in announcing that they are going to have a conference on the tsetse fly. I have nothing at all against it, Sir. If we had everything else in this Province that we need, I would be all for it having a conference to see what we can do about this fly carrying a tropical disease. And I think it is going to be a long time, Mr. Chairman, in this Province before we have to worry about tsetse flies, with the kind of climate we have here, carrying around the tropical disease.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I have come in contact with the black fly. If they were researching the black fly, well, I would be all for it because once I was down in Bonne Bay, down in Western Brook camping, and I nearly got eaten alive with that little fly, it is called the black fly is it "Fred"? Now if they were holding a conference on that in Newfoundland to see what we could do about that, well I would be all for it.

And, Sir, one day I had the privilege to go down here to the Marine Science Laboratory, an interesting place, Sir. I do not know if honourable members have taken the time to visit the Marine Science Laboratory but if they do, Sir, I am sure, like myself, they will find it

to be a most interesting experience. But, Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat disappointed to learn of some of the things that are going on inside the walls of that Marine Science Laboratory. Now, Sir, if they were investigating ways and means to process fish in Newfoundland; if they were investigating ways and means to tell us how we could build up our stock of fish in Newfoundland; if they were investigating ways and means of telling us how we can diversify our fisheries, and how we can catch this kind of fish that has been laying around Newfoundland waters for years, and nothing done about it - if they were doing this sort of thing, Sir, my chest would have come out about six inches.

But, you know, Mr. Chairman, one of their major projects, and again I have nothing against it, Sir, if we had everything else in this Province that we need, if the University, Sir, had everything on campus that they needed, I would have nothing against it. But they had a codfish there, Sir, called George II, and what they were doing they were spending a great deal of their time teaching George II to ring a bell so that he could feed himself. Poor old George II! Maybe they could not teach him how to ring the bell and he passed away, but George II was now there, proud, in all his glory floating around the tank in the laboratory that I was in, and he would go up and touch this bell, and automatically feed himself. A great accomplishment, Sir. And I have nothing against it. Nothing against George II feeding himself providing that we had everything else over here at this University that we needed.

AN HON. MEMBER: ... George III.

MR. NEARY: Well they may have George III there now, Sir, because George II was looking a kind of pale that particular day I was there, and I do not know whether he has passed away since then or not.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of thing that gives people the wrong impression of the University. They kind of got the priorities all mixed up. Down here, Sir, in this laboratory, again, when they

operate on the brain of a fish, they bring in scientists, and they bring in surgeons, experts in these fields from all over the world, all over the world, Mr. Chairman. I do not know whether they pay their expenses to come to Newfoundland or not, but I have a strange feeling they do, and we will never know unless their budget is made public. But I have a feeling that these scientists and these fish surgeons and these experts are brought in from all over the world. And, Sir, if you want to get some poor little cripple child sent up to Toronto for a heart operation or for some other sort of operation you got to - it is one of the biggest battles of your life. Yet down

here, Sir, these people are brought in from all over the world at the expense, I would suspect, of the taxpayers of this province and of Canada to perform these operations, to perform surgery on the brains of these fish. Well, Sir, this may be a very good thing. But I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, that it is a luxury that we can ill afford at this particular time. That is why, Mr. Chairman, that I concur with my colleague 100 per cent, that the budget of the university should be made public.

Mr. Chairman, we also hear that certain classrooms, certain buildings, the facilities at the university, are not being used to the maximum extent that they could be used. We hear, Mr. Chairman, that professors and associate professors - I do not know, look I have never attended a university and my learned friend, the member for Placentia West is a graduate of the university, but I never had the privilege to attend any classes at a university, but I have in the last ten or twelve years had the opportunity to visit many, many times both by invitation -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The school of hard knocks.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I came from the school of hard knocks. That is correct. I have attended the university both by invitation to speak to groups of students, individual students, groups of professors. Maybe they would like to take my brain and dissect it and have a look at it but I have been over there quite often, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They would have to have tweezers.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we hear these rumors about the facilities not being used, and I have walked time and time again through that university and I have seen classrooms in the middle of the day vacant. Now, there may be very good reasons for it, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps my learned friend can tell me. There may be a very good reason for it. You know, Mr. Chairman, one day, I had to pass by this door and I had to go back and pretend I had dropped something or forgotten something and take a second look. I saw an honourable gentleman, Sir, an instructor, if that is what they call him, or a professor up on the desk stretched

out asleep in the middle of the day.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, this does not do the reputation of the university very good because I am not the only one -

MR. BARRY: I have seen members of the House in the same condition.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the members of the House have to sit in their seats, and the key to your success here, Sir, is to be able to sleep with your eyes open. Over at the university, Mr. Chairman, you can get up on the desk - you can do it in the House of Commons in Westminster but we do not do it here - you can get up on the desk and have a nap in the middle of the day.

Now, Sir, this is certainly not doing the reputation of the university any good. Mr. Chairman, I do not know, I could be wrong again, but I am told, Sir, by people I believe who are in the know that these professors and associate professors that we have gone to great expense to bring here from all over the world, only actually instruct three and four hours a week. Now, Your Honour is a graduate of the university. Is this true or false, Your Honour? I do not know. I have never attended - yes, I did, once I attended the extension service. I took a course, what was it - in labour relations anyway. It was the extension department which sponsored it.

Once I went over to take a course in French. I think it was twenty weeks and I got involved in this controversy with the lawyers at the time and about half way through it I had to drop the course. I was in such demand on radio and television, the newspapers and in the House and in public debates on legal fees that I had to drop the course.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. At the time I think we passed an act in this House, that everything in this House would be published in English and French. I do not know whether we are doing it, Mr. Chairman, but we passed an act in this House. I wanted to learn how to read French and if necessary speak French. We only had one honourable gentleman in that House at the time who spoke French and that was the Minister of Education, the honourable Dr. Frecker, who is now Chancellor

March 21, 1975

Tape 615 (afternoon)

IB-3

of the university. It was too bad that I did not - it is one course that I agree with at the university, Sir. I would like to be bilingual, and I think more people should be bilingual. But, Mr. Chairman,



is it true? Is this true, Sir, they only actually instruct three or four hours a day, or three or four hours a week rather. Then, Mr. Chairman, they read from a textbook. Is this true, Sir? I wish Your Honour could answer me, I know Your Honour cannot, because Your Honour is sitting in the Chair. But if this is true, Sir, I mean, you know, this is unbelievable, is it not? Unbelievable! Now they can argue they spent the rest of their time doing research. My honourable and learned friend nods his approval of that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fundamental research.

MR. NEARY: Fundamental research.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Ask your colleague he -

MR. NEARY: No, my colleague was not the one who was asleep on the desk, the gentleman who happened to be asleep on the desk had a beard.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: It was not Rip Van Winkle either, Sir, I can assure you.

Sir, if all these things are true - well if all these things are true, Sir, is it any wonder that people would look askance, look at the University with suspicion? This is the hard-earned taxpayers money, Sir, that we are spending over there. And, Mr. Chairman, there was a time when - my colleague is right - there was a time when you would be considered to be unpatriotic, you would be almost run out of the Province if you dared say a word about the University. But as Wick Collins says, "Old fearsome Steve"

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Wick Collins says "Fearsome Steve", in the faith -

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Oh, oh, well fearsome Neary or whatever he calls me. Even, Sir, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Even as far back as ten years ago I believed that the University should make its budget public. They should, you know -

maybe my colleague is right, that they should not do it in a heavy handed way, they should not hit them on the head with a sledge hammer and say, look you have to make your budget public. But, Mr. Chairman, when they come back to the government looking for more money, Sir, as they do, probably with two or three pieces of hard bread in their pocket to prove to the Minister of Finance that they need more money over there at that University, when they do that, Sir, the Minister of Finance and his colleagues in the cabinet should say, okay gentlemen that is fine. You have your own autonomy over there at the University. You are doing a great job. You are fine fellows. But do you not think it is time that you proved to us that you need this additional money.

Now I know the Minister of Education has over there a couple of xeroxed documents. That is not what I am talking about, Sir. That is not good enough. We want a statement, Sir, in detail of the revenue and expenditure. And the Minister of Justice says, well, how do you make it public? Do you bring the President of the University before the House? Not necessarily, Sir. But you would certainly table the reports in the House. The House, Sir, has every right to demand and to know how the taxpayer money is being spent over at that University.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we here, when I was a minister in the government, and my colleagues who were in government at that time, and probably the present Minister of Fisheries can verify, this, that we were told time and time again that about a month or two before the end of every fiscal year at the University you could not go down to Torbay Airport but there were professors, administrative staff, officials, associate professors getting aboard of a jet and jetting around the world somewhere because they were told, look you have a balance in your account and instead of having - what we used to call, I think, when I was in government a drop balance - a drop balance, carrying it over or you would lose it. They do not want to lose it. So they issue instructions, orally I suppose, I do not suppose they would be foolish enough to put

March 21, 1975

Tape 616 (Afternoon)

PK - 3

it in writing, we have to get rid of this money.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, I -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Can you prove it?

MR. NEARY: No, I cannot prove it. I started off by saying that we were told.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, has the honourable minister heard these rumors?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, maybe we should not listen to rumors or hearsay, Sir, or these kind of statements, Maybe we should not listen to them, but we will never know whether they are true or false, and I am one of these people who has faith enough in human nature to hope that they are false, they are not true, Sir. I hope they are not true.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I tell you, I was out of the House, Sir for five days and I tell you this, that I do not mind the honourable members interrupting, because I love sparring with them. Sometimes, you know, you have to go on a little fishing expedition like I did at the question period this morning, before you can get the information you need, but Sir, these rumors are widespread. You can hear these rumors, Sir, all over the Province. And they may not be true and I hope they are not, but there is only one way to find out and that is demand a statement of revenue and expenditure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on and on on this matter, but I think I have said enough to prove my point and to give my colleague the backing that he needs in this recommendation. It is a good recommendation. It makes a great deal of sense, Sir, and I think my colleague is right, that if you are going to remove any suspicion of extravagance and waste over at that University, if you are going to remove any suspicion of people giving themselves increases in pay whenever they feel like it,

if you are going to remove that suspicion that they are told to get rid of their balances before the end of the fiscal year, if you are going to make certain, Sir, that our taxpayer dollar at the University is being spent wisely and that we are getting the value that we should be getting over at that University for our tax dollar, the only way, Sir, that this can be done is to have the University submit in detail year after year a budget showing revenue and expenditures and showing their salary details like the mustard coloured covered document for that particular year and not showing minimum salaries either, Sir, showing actual salaries paid, because these documents can be very deceiving too, Mr. Chairman. Sometimes they just show the minimum salaries and not the actual salaries.

I understand that it is the practice in universities in other parts of Canada, Sir. I would hope that this is not done here and when you show a list of salaries, it is not the actual salaries being paid, but it is the minimum salary for that particular classification.

So, Sir, I will be greatly relieved -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. ROWE: They have floors and no ceilings.

MR. NEARY: And I will feel much - floors, that is right - my colleague says they have floors and no ceilings, but I would feel much more comfortable, Sir, and I would feel much more happy if every year when we are passing the University estimates and I hope, Sir, that we will be able to find ourselves in a position to give them all the money they want to do all the things they want over there, that I hope, Sir, that we will have tabled in this honourable House a detailed account of their revenue and expenditure.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, for the first time in twenty-five years today, the budget, by programme, by department of the University has been given to this House. I repeat that. For the first time in twenty-five years, under thirty-seven headings, the breakdown of the budget of Memorial University of Newfoundland has been given.

We have heard for a number of years that the budget of the University should be made available to the House and this year we have made it available and I say, thirty-seven headings I wrote out and photostatic copies have been made, one has been tabled, one is available to the Opposition - I went over them this morning - at least I gave it to a page to give it to the honourable gentleman.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: On your desk I am told the page put it - and I went over each of those thirty-seven headings this morning and gave brief explanatory notes. Most of them are self-evident. School of nursing is self-evident, Institute for Social Economic Research, most of these are self-evident, but there

are thirty-seven headings of expenditure, and when you add them up, the total is there, and the amount is there. There are three columns, one shows - this is the university's terminology - they say estimate 75-76, I suppose, that should really be called, you know, original or hoped-for estimates, and then revised, you know, the estimates in light of what was actually voted to them and then a column which shows any increase or decrease which the university imposed. It is in fact the middle column which is what, in our terminology, would be the estimates. That is a different terminology. The university is using revised estimates. We use that in a different context. It is the middle column which constitutes the operative estimates.

So under thirty-seven headings expenditures have been given for every department or institute or centre within the university, and this for the first time since Confederation. But now it is becoming clear, or it appears to becoming clear, what it is the Opposition want. Because under the College of Trades, we had five votes. In the estimates, there were five votes. They are called - it is pretty straightforward what they are called - there is a grant-in-aid, there is a rental purchase, there is a furnishing and equipment and then expenses voted in other departments. It is identical for the College of Fisheries. There is a grant-in-aid, expenses voted in other departments, furnishing and equipment. There are three there. We have given thirty-seven headings under the university. So certainly if the expenditure for each department and each activity of that university is not a budget, is not the budget, then what is it? What about the four headings for the College of Fisheries? What about the five headings for the College of Trades and Technology? There is much more detail in expenditure on each programme and each department than we have had for any other institute. So when we heard over the number of years it was the budget, any sensible person would think that this is the budget, and it was with pride that this government for the first time since Confederation

presented to this Legislature and to the people of the Province these detailed department by department estimates of expenditure by Memorial University. And we think that that is appropriate. That, I think, is what this committee would want to know, and that is what the people of this Province want to know. They want to know that within that thirty odd million, how much is being spent by the various departments, by the Faculty of Science or Arts or the Institute of Research in Human Abilities or the Centre for Development of Community Initiatives or the Marine Science Research Laboratories, and obviously any additional information on the activities of those various departments or centres, people might wish to know that, and I can give them some and obviously the catalogue of the university would give them a great deal more and that would give a total description of the function and work of every department and every centre at the university. That is found in their catalogue, which I have not bothered to read through, but every department, every centre, every programme activity is outlined in that catalogue and the various courses given. So we have to ask ourselves what is it that the Opposition are looking for? It would appear salary details, salary details. How much this professor or this associate professor or this lecturer or this individual or that individual is making in salary? It would appear as well that it is being suggested that this House should vote upon what conferences the university should hold, what research projects it should conduct, in other words the programme content of the university.

Now gentleman do any of us here wish to sit and decide what conferences the university should have? What research they should be involved into? What books they should buy for their library? What professor should be hired? What professor should be fired? Is that what we wish to do? Is that not the duty of a Faculty Council and a Board of Regents and of the administration of the university? We have given more detail, there has been more detail



March 21, 1975

Tape no. 618

Page 3 - pw

given in consideration of the university's budget than there has  
for any other post-secondary institute or any school board in the  
province or any

school under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education, more detail given this year in the university's budget than for any other educational institute in the province. So, it would appear that it is not just the budget in the sense of what is being spent on what different activities, but we hear references to salary details. We hear references to conferences. We hear references to certain research projects and certainly the logical inference is that this House wishes to - or not that this House but that some people, that there are some in this House who wish that we should vote on matters like that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think it is essential for the university, but much more important than that it is essential for this Province, that is what really counts, it is essential for this Province that we have a university free to exercise all of the purposes of the university among which is the exercise of its critical function. One of the most, or among the most important functions of a university is its freedom and independence to criticize, to suggest alternatives, to make criticisms of the government, of social institutions, of social structures, of an establishment of what they wish. They must have this freedom. It must be responsibly exercised, obviously all freedoms have to be, but a university must have this freedom to exercise its critical function. If not, society and the Province lose.

If we are to put ourselves in the position of voting on this one's salary or that one's salary, then human nature being what it is, it could just well be that this one might be a bit too critical or that one a bit too something else. If we are going to put ourselves in the position of deciding what conferences, the financing for what conferences or for what research projects, etc. are to be approved, then I think we would have done the university a disservice. That is quite secondary. We would have done the Province a disservice. That is why we are here, to serve the Province, not the university, the Province.

If we undermine the critical function of the university and

its freedom to exercise it, then we will have done a great disservice to the Province and its people. That, I think, is to be avoided. Also we have heard references to rumors about people flying off here or jetting off there, various rumors. All I can say to any honourable gentleman here is that certainly it is not my intention, and I do not think it is the intention of any of my colleagues, to take any action or initiative on rumors which might originate with respect to people at the university or people at a school board or people in a hospital or people working in highroads or anything whatsoever. We really cannot concern ourselves with rumors. If anybody has any prima facie evidence, and if he wishes to make it available to the President of the university, to the Board of Regents at the university, and indeed to me if they wish, I will certainly draw it to the attention, but rumors as such certainly are not something that we can or should be concerned with.

Now, it should be clear as well that all of the financial statements of the university are audited by the Auditor-General's department. It should be clear as well that the university is not a department of government. It is not a department of government in this province or nowhere in Canada to my knowledge. It is a department of government in some states. In certain developing countries it is a department of government. Certainly in Eastern Europe it is more or less a department, a division of the Department of Education. But here -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Oh, no, the university is not a department of government.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Education is a department of government.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, education is a department of government but the university is not a department of government.

MR. WOODWARD: It is an intricate part of education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Oh, it is an intricate part of education, but the university, we should be very clear on this, is not a department of government. The university is not directed by the Minister of Education.

March 21, 1975

Tape 619 (afternoon)

IB-3

The governing body is the administration, the president and his associates and the Board of Regents. That is the governing body. It is not the Department of Education. It is not Treasury Board. It is not this House. We are responsible for voting the money but we do not run the university. Neither the legislature nor the Department of Education or Treasury Board run the university.

A couple of comments, there were a couple of comments with respect that the University, because its funds are public funds, to a very large extent public funds, has to be accountable for the expenditure of public funds and with that certainly there is no quarrel. Certainly all public funds, their expenditure, one has to be accountable for. The University is accountable, I suppose in three ways and let me make it clear that the University is accountable for the expenditure of public funds. That is a basic premise which we all accept. It is accountable in three ways. It is accountable to the Board of Regents, and they exercise a public trust. They are set up by statute, a statute passed by this House, no other way a statute can come into existence.

So, this House enacts a statute and under that statute certain appointments are made to the Board of Governors and under that statute certain elections are made for the Board of Governors. So, they are accountable to the Board of Governors which is created through a statute of this House.

They are responsible to the government, which is the elected government for putting their case, for the amount of money made available and they are responsible to this legislature in the voting of it because the government merely proposes.

In the heading that we are now under, Memorial University grant in aid, \$31 million, we have gone two steps of the accountability, so to speak, through the Board of Regents and through the government because this is the amount government exercising its responsibility has proposed to the legislature, has proposed to the committee, he voted.

So, there is the Board of Regents accountability. There is the government accountability. The final accountability for the expenditure of these funds, for the legalability to

spend them is in this committee, is in parliament and honourable gentlemen can vote for it and honourable gentlemen can vote against it. But there is accountability, except it is not the direct line of accountability of this individual civil servant to that deputy minister or to that minister. The accountability is a three way thing with the Board of Regents, through the government and finally to the legislature through the voting for this committee.

Now, I would suggest to honourable gentlemen as well, those few, those couple though there may be more, but those very few gentlemen who are interested in the salaries of specific individuals or of any individuals, or in salaries in general, or in authenticating or denying what appear to be rumors and of checking on this conference or this piece of research, that if in this area they wish additional - if they wish information then obviously they should ask the President of the University, they should ask the Chairman of the Board of Regents. This government has confidence in the administration of the University. It has confidence in the Board of Regents. It recognizes the accountability of the University and of everybody else who has public funds, the accountability for the expenditure of those public funds, but the accountability in the case of the University goes the route that I indicated.

In summing up, I think the most important point to be made, or the most important two points, I just wish to summarize, is that we have given expenditures under thirty-seven headings. There was not another educational institution, post secondary or otherwise with anything near that number of headings. As I said, the College of Trades, five; the College of Fisheries, four. Under thirty-seven headings we have given expenditure.

The other point I wish to make is this, is that it would be very wrong for this legislature to do anything which would nullify or undermine the exercise of the critical function of

the University and that, I think, would almost inevitably happen if we were to be asked to vote on this one salary or that one salary or this conference or that piece of research, if we were to make that because then we should become the Board of Regents with the University and not the legislature of the Province.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dunphy): The Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. ROWE: I thank the minister for his answer, Mr. Chairman.

We have been accused of being long-winded on this side.

Mr. Chairman,

the Minister of Education deliberately ignored something that was contained in my comments some three quarters of an hour ago, when relating to the publication, or making public of the University budget. I stated quite clearly that the same thing should hold true for any other institution that spends public funds. That point was made quite clear. It is a weak argument for the Minister of Education to stand in his place and say that we have a vote or a list consisting of thirty-six items for the University as compared to only five for the College of Fisheries, or four, and five for the College of Trades and Technology. I stated very clearly, I thought, to the honourable the minister that the same thing should hold true for these other institutions and for that matter for school boards in this Province, public accountability for the expenditure of public funds. That is a basic principle that we adhere to, and the minister, I am sorry, has taken the strategy that I expected that he would take. He has taken a few words or phrases used by myself or my colleague and focused in on them. A few of the many examples that we used.

Sir, he decided to suggest that - oh he knows what the Opposition wants. The Opposition wants to find out the exact salary that every individual professor is making at our University. Well I say, so what, to that. So what! We know the exact salary of other public servants in this Province and of teachers in this Province. And we are submitting that there is no reason why we should not know the salaries of teachers, be they University students, College of Fisheries teachers, or College of Trades and Technology teachers, or Vocational Schools. And we are certainly not suggesting or casting suspicions-

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: on salaries. And we are not setting the salaries.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: We are just asking for publication of these things.



Now, Sir, the minister makes a great ado about thirty-seven items, the thirty-seven item budget for the University. Let us just look at one of these items, the Faculty of Education, \$2,256,000. I could have picked any faculty or any department. Therein lies a great deal of information, Mr. Chairman. The Faculty of Education. The biggest faculty in the University, I think.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: No, the Faculty of Science, the biggest professional faculty anyway, one of the biggest faculties in the University. The wealth of information that we had concerning the Faculty of Education or the Faculty of Science or the Faculty of Arts or the Marine Sciences Research Laboratory or the Department of Physical Education is one lump sum of wealth of information, Sir. I contend, Sir, that the people of this Province, and this honourable House require more detailed information.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: I add - look I do not know if the honourable minister was in the House when I answered a similar question both from the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Industrial Development.

I do not care whether it is done anywhere else in this world. That is completely irrelevant to the point. The principle that we are enunciating is that the expenditure of public funds require public accounting or accounting to the public. That is the principle, public accountability. This is the principle. This is the premise on which the argument is based.

Now I am saying, Sir, that what is wrong with, for example, having under the Faculty of Education, a vote, say, for salaries? There is nothing wrong with that. What is wrong with having - supposing, for example, we find a gross differential between the Faculty of Education's salary and that of the Faculty of Science. It might be a worthwhile question to ask why? There could be a vote for conferences and work shops under the Faculty of Education, and I submit, Sir, that that should be a very large vote because surely one of the functions of a Faculty of Education, besides teaching academic courses and professional courses at the university, is to assist teachers in the field through work shops and conferences and this sort of a thing. I think honourable members in this committee have the right to ask whether this X dollars being spent on conferences is being spent in service training to our teachers in this province or whether it is being spent by personnel flying off to foreign countries to certain conferences, some which can be extremely valuable and some of which amount to nothing but holidays? Similarly, too, certain conferences that honourable members of this House of Assembly may be asked to attend, it may be a completely educational or learning exercise, it might be a pleasure trip or it might be a combination of both. I am suggesting, Sir, -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: This is something that I got jotted down here. I will reply to that in due course, Mr. Chairman. There could be a vote under travelling, conferences, labs and what have you, and this is the sort of information, I think, that we have to have at the university and

the College of Trades and Technology and the vocational schools and the school boards and the College of Fisheries and the university. If they are going to expend public funds, they have to be accountable for it.

Now the minister suggests that such a suggestion or such publicity or the presentation of the university budget would undermine the critical function of the university, the critical function of the university.

Sir, he said that this would interfere with the workings of the university, that we would, in effect, be deciding the curriculum and the nature of the research and the salaries of individual professors. Sir, that is absolutely ridiculous. We do not decide. The government, if anybody, decides, the government decides what research or the amount of research, the quantity of research, the amount of salaries, the amount of travelling, the facilities, the number and diversification of programmes. This administration decides that when they pass over \$36 million to the government,

to the university, I am sorry. If anybody decides it is the government that decides. We are not trying to decide anything or to interfere with anything or to suggest what the nature of the curriculum should be or the nature of research. But surely heavens, Mr. Chairman, if it is the people's money that is being spent, surely the people have the right to know how it is being spent. And the minister says the university is accountable to the Board of Regents, one phase he says, the university is accountable to the government, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, phase number two.

Now let us look at these two phases, Sir, Does the Board of Regents and does the government have the equivalent of an Opposition, and are all meetings of the Board of Regents- I cannot remember this, I have to ask the question - are all meetings and decisions made by the Board of Regents and Senate made in public?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No. The Board of Regents does not meet in public.

MR. ROWE: Exactly. Precisely.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Any more than the Opposition or the -

MR. ROWE: Precisely.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - or the Cabinet or -

MR. ROWE: Right. Precisely. The honourable minister says that the university is accountable to the Board of Regents and accountable to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, both of whom make decisions and meet in sworn secrecy.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The Board of Governors of the College of Fisheries, they do not have public meetings either.

MR. ROWE: I agree. The minister was strolling around outside but I assume that he was listening to me or probably could not stand much more of me.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, attentively, yes, Sir.

MR. ROWE: But the argument that I am using for the MUN, Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting can be used for the other institutions that I have mentioned. So the two phases or stages of accountability that the Minister

of Education has mentioned so far are far from public accountability. If anything the only way it can be described is secret accountability. We have to rely upon the integrity and the intelligence and the wisdom of government in making decisions in that respect. And do not let the honourable Minister of Education try to say that this is interfering with the programmes of the university. The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, the Cabinet, Sir, can tell Most Morgan to get off anytime they wish, or we will slash your budget.

Who does President Morgan meet with, Sir? The President meets with Cabinet and/or the Treasury Board. And if we want to talk about interference, I would submit that more threats and more interference can be made in a private meeting between university representatives and in Cabinet than can be made in this Chamber, Sir, so I reject the honourable Minister of Education's argument entirely. He says it is logical to infer - it is completely illogical for the Minister to infer that the Opposition wishes to interfere with the university curriculum, the nature of the research, the amount of the salaries and this kind of thing.

I would submit, Sir, that if this government, and I am using the thing collectively now, including the Opposition and the elected administration, if this House of Assembly wish to interfere with anything at the university, there is the press sitting up there, Mr. Chairman, there are the public in the gallery, if we interfered or tried to interfere with the workings at the university, it would become pretty public and

this distasteful act of interference would be public whereas at the present time you can have all sorts of interference, threats of do this or you do not get your money. Let me make one point, I am not suggesting for one minute that this administration nor any administration has threatened the president or the Board of Regents or anybody else in this Province. But I am submitting this, that since such negotiations and accountability are private accountability and private negotiations when coming to a conclusion with respect to the amount of money that the university gets, that more interference indeed can take place and more threats can be made than would be the case if this was considered here in the chambers of this House or at the committee stage.

So, Sir, I reject the honourable the Minister of Education's reasoning entirely. He used - I preface my remarks, Sir, by saying that I have been giving this some very deep consideration over the past three years. The Minister of Education is absolutely right. This is the first time in twenty-five years that we have seen this much, and I commend the Minister of Education for it. But I am saying, Sir, that this does not give us the information that is required and neither is the information under the other institutions, post secondary institutions, enough information. As a matter of fact, as the minister has indicated, it is not as much as we find in here. I am the first one to congratulate the minister and commend his administration for a step in the right direction. I preface my remarks by saying I have given this very serious and deep consideration about detailed publication of the university budget.

One of the reasons, Sir, that I and my colleagues have given it deep consideration was the danger of being accused of the sort of thing that the minister accused us of today, of political interference with the university. Imagine! I repeat, Sir, that determining the nature of research at the university or interfering with it -

MR. CROSBIE: Harassing it. You want to harass it.

MR. F. ROWE: Harassing the university.

MR. CROSBIE: Three years you have been harassing the university.

MR. F. ROWE: Harassing the university.

MR. CROSBIE: Ever since you were -

MR. F. ROWE: Interfering with the university.

MR. CROSBIE: Ever since you were flang out.

MR. F. ROWE: I would like to ask for a complete retraction of that statement, Mr. Chairman. If the Minister of Fisheries has any evidence that says I was so called flang out, wherever he got the word, flang out of the university. It was probably a rumor. I do not know where he could have picked it up.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Like the other rumors. How dangerous these rumors are. Now, the honourable gentleman -

MR. F. ROWE: They are very dangerous, which goes to show, Sir, that probably the budget and all aspects of the university should be open to determine whether the honourable member for St. Barbe North was flang out of the university as the Minister of Fisheries said.

MR. CROSBIE: I will admit he resigned.

MR. F. ROWE: I did not resign either. I was gently asked - a leave of absence, Mr. Chairman.

Now, where was I, Mr. Chairman? The honourable member on the other side have a neat habit of dragging me off course from time to time. I think I have probably completed about all I can say about - oh, yes, the minister just in passing said that, you know, the university is not a department of government. We do not need the Minister of Education to tell us that the university is not a department of government. That is completely irrelevant, has nothing to do whatsoever with the public accountability. The minister is forgetting, Sir, that what we are talking about is public accountability for public funds spent. He is just glossing over it completely.

He says that the - all right, I have dealt with the first two stages of the so called accountability which are secret accountabilities. He says, the honourable minister, that the third great phase of accountability is this committee.

And this is the only document which is an improvement over previous years, twenty-three years of Liberals, three years of P.C.'s. This is a midget step forward. A midget step forward, Mr. Chairman. Now we are looking for the reasonable step, the giant step forward in this direction.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I said that I had two points to make -

MR. NEARY: It is only ten minutes to five yet.

MR. CROSBIE: You made them interminably.

MR. F. ROWE: I had two points to make, and I was kind enough to suggestion of the Minister of Fisheries to yield, so the minister could answer. That has occurred. Now I want to make my second point.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: Now what was your first point ...

MR. F. ROWE: If the Hon. Minister of Fisheries could not comprehend the logic and wisdom of my articulation on this particular subject, Mr. Chairman, I would refer him to an institution other than the University.

MR. NEARY: If the Minister of Fisheries does not behave himself he will get -

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Order!

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Chairman, the University has been subjected to an austerity budget for the past three years.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: I am not talking about the Medical School, nor the Engineering School. Coincidentally with this so-called austerity budget or cutbacks in the rate of expenditure at the University by the provincial government, a student aid programme was instituted which had the affect of reducing student enrollment.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is irrelevant.

MR. F. ROWE: No, it is not irrelevant. The affect of that, Sir, was to resolve a critical situation at the University that would



have existed if we did not have the cutbacks in enrollment, a decrease in enrollment. The University's problem basically was the fact that they were having a significant increase in enrollment up to about 1971-1972 - a significant increase - and the University was bursting at the seams. Now I know what I am talking about because I was there at that time, for six years. The University could not cope physically with the number of students that were coming in to the University, could not cope physically in terms of academic space or residential space. But they were relieved of this continuing increase in student population, and this crisis within the University was averted because of the student aid policy which caused a decrease which has been documented, a decrease in student enrollment.

Sir, it might have been a salvation to the University administration that this happened - to the University administration - at the cost of hundreds of young Newfoundlanders deciding that they could not afford to go to university, however, over the last three years. Hundreds of young Newfoundlanders denied a university education for three years, over the past three or four years because of the student aid policy of this government. It has been restored to the identical level of the last year of the previous Liberal Administration - taking inflation into account, Sir, it has not even been restored to that level.

But, Sir, what concerns me is the fact that since the student aid programme has been restored to some semblance of

what it was during the last year of the Liberal administration, it is conceivable that there could be - this is just conjecture on my part - it is conceivable that there could be a reasonably radical increase in the student population at the University next year, and if this takes place, Sir, I submit that what President Morgan has had to say with respect to the grant in aid to the University is quite true. It is totally and completely inadequate.

This administration, Sir, has had a dismal record, an abysmal record when it comes to grants in aid to the University and, as I have mentioned, the student aid policy. The University and the students of this Province, a Province in which less than one-half of the national per capita average attend University, a Province that only has one University, a Province that only got a University in 1949, there is a lot of catching up to be done. We should have twice the per capita average in attendance at our University just to catch up with other Provinces of Canada.

Sir, I do not want to give any adverse publicity to our University. I think it is a great University, but I maintain that if we compare the physical facilities that exist on our campus with many other campuses across Canada, that we have a lot to be desired.

I submit that the standard of education, the standard of education relative to the facilities that exist, is great, but the standard of education has to suffer as a result of the physical facilities that do exist and as a result of the fact that the government has not provided this administration with sufficient funds for operating and capital costs.

Now, Sir, as the Minister of Industrial Development has mentioned, this University is receiving a fair amount of its budget, in excess of ninety per cent, suggested by the Minister of Education, a great amount of its budget from the public purse,

from the government. It may even be, if we check the record, that probably on a percentage basis, this government may contribute more to our University than any other government does to any other university in any other province of Canada. That may well be so, Sir. This is the way it has evolved.

One of the most unfortunate, one of the most unfortunate aspects of our University is for some strange reason we do not have private, substantial private contributions or estates left to our University. Why this is, Sir, is something that I cannot understand. Heavens knows, the previous Premier did everything in his power to get certain individuals to contribute financially to our University, but, Sir, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: I know. I can pick out a few gems. I realize that. But, Sir, it has not happened to the extent that it has happened in other universities throughout Canada. This is why the Province has to accept such a large expenditure of the funds spent at our University.

So, Sir, the only thing I can say in closing here is to reject entirely the lack of logic of the minister's rebuttal to our suggestion of a detailed accountability of the university budget, reject entirely. He took the cheap way out. Secondly, that as a result of the Student Aid Policy and the lack of funds going to the university from this provincial administration this year and in the three previous budgets, this administration has an abysmal record with respect to providing this Province with the kind of a university that it was intended to be in the first place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. ROWE: It is as simple as that, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): The Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, I have sat here all afternoon listening to the honourable member opposite.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is doing a good job, 'Leo.'

MR. BARRY: Really, I did not expect it of him. I suppose there has been such an attack on the academic freedom of our university or of any university in the history of our Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, I asked the honourable member, while he was speaking, to where else does this proposed system take place? Where else, Mr. Chairman, do we have the university accounting for the salary that it pays to such and such a professor that is doing such and such a type of research?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The University of Warsaw.

MR. BARRY: At the University of Warsaw, the University of Moscow -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Prague.

MR. BARRY: Prague.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable member says that there is more to the university than salaries. Yes, that is quite correct,

Mr. Chairman. But it is also a fact of life, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, that the productivity of the university, the ideas, the new concepts that come from a university, are directly related to the amount of money that a university has available to it, are directly related to the salaries paid, in specific faculties and in specific areas of research. It is all very easy to say, Mr. Chairman, that there would be no interference by politicians for their own short-term ends, there would be no restrictions on the areas of research that a university could get into just because we get into the fine points, the nitty-gritty of the dollars paid in each specific area for each specific research member of the university.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that, while this is probably not a very popular concept, that the honourable member opposite can probably make some political points in the Province, maybe, I would hate to think he can, but maybe he can. Maybe it is easy, Mr. Chairman, to stress the short-term, to aggravate a situation where we have, in all corners, not just of this Province, but I suppose in every province of Canada, areas where there is concern about pressures on municipalities for increased services, pressures on individuals because of the rising cost of living, and in the short-term, Mr. Chairman, the tendency is, I suppose, for all of us at sometimes to say, what is happening here? Why are we spending these millions of dollars on researching how to cure the river blindness caused by the tsetse fly of North Africa or South Africa or why are we spending all the money on other areas of fundamental research or pure research in the university, while we need a water and sewer system here or we need a bigger hospital here or we need to have our roads paved here? I submit,

Mr. Speaker, that that is the first thing that would happen. That is the first thing that would happen if we brought the debate of the specific details of the university before the politicians of the Province, that the short-term pressures put on all of us, put on all of us, Mr. Speaker, the short-term pressures would see, not just a look at what this professor is getting paid as opposed to this professor, but, Mr. Speaker, would see us as experts, deciding well, this is not a very worthwhile area of research in geology or this area of science is not very worthwhile, let us cut out a few dollars here and a few dollars there and let us put them into another paved road or another water and sewer system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that would probably gain votes in the short-term or gain a positive response in the short-term but, Mr. Speaker, it would be so criminally irresponsible in the long-term in looking at what is in the best interest of the future of our Province, not just of our Province I submit, Mr. Speaker, of our country, because our university is making a contribution, and I expect will continue to make a contribution to our country as a whole. Mr. Speaker, it would be so criminally irresponsible to start permitting this short-term political pressure to interfere with the academic freedom, Mr. Speaker, that traditionally has been exercised, not just by our university, not just by other universities in Canada but I submit, by all universities in the western world. Is this not the case as I understand it?

Mr. Speaker, we have a tradition that has built up over hundreds of years, if not thousands of years, that has merit, Mr. Speaker, and that I submit our people democratically have decided has merit over the years, over the centuries, they have seen that maybe it is protection against ourselves, you know. Maybe we all recognize the short-term pressures that sometimes lead us to make short-term decisions that are not best in the long-term. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is an element of that in this division between town and gown I suppose, if you want to trace it right back, this special status for the university,

this special type of accountability of public funds that go into the university, that recognize the dangers to academic freedom of having these short-term pressures placed on the university.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, you would have- it is not just as simple as the honourable member opposite has said, oh we will just list the salaries of each of the various professors at the university, Mr. Speaker, How do you stop then from members of this honourable House, who I would submit are something less than experts in esoteric fields of academic research that I personally feel are worthwhile at the university, how are we going to prevent then the arbitrary lopping off of funds because, oh we do not think that this is a very worthwhile area of research. Let us cut that out. Do you not think that the system that we now have where we have members of the community elected to sit on the Board of Regents, to analyze the budget of the university, where we have the university having to come to Treasury Board and to government and to this House every year in order to present the lump sum that it is going to be permitted to spend. And where we have this fantastic breakthrough of where we can see some, what is it thirty-four, thirty-seven -

MR. ROWE: Thirty-seven.

MR. BARRY: Thirty-seven areas where money is being spent, Mr. Speaker -

MR. ROWE: What information can you get from the Faculty of Education?

MR. BARRY: Do you not think that a system that has grown up over hundreds of years, if not thousands of years, that there is something to be said for that, that maybe we should give a little more analysis to the suggestion of the honourable member opposite before we vote on this today? Do you not think that this weakened insight of the honourable member opposite might, in setting aside the wisdom of the ages, deserve just a little bit more analysis before we take that step?

MR. ROWE: I am not demanding a vote right away.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it is very easy, as I have said, to go for short-term political points.



I submit it is also very difficult at times to see where a particular area of research is leading, not just by members in this honourable House or members of the public who are not experts in a particular area, but even, Mr. Chairman, by the professors at a university, by experts in particular fields. There are times, Mr. Chairman, when you have an insight being developed, concept being developed at a university because of their opportunity to engage in freewheeling discussion at conferences, which the honourable member for Bell Island has shot down as being a total waste of money, an exchange of ideas between their academic confreres.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order. If the minister is going to quote, let him quote me correctly because that is not what I said, Sir.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, the inference was that this House should decide you know, what conferences were worth-while -

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, that is incorrect, Sir, and I do not want that to stand on the record. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, Sir, that the minister withdraw that statement.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw that if that is not accurate. Let me just say that -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I believe that is a disagreement between two honourable members. If an honourable member is going to quote another, he should endeavor to be as accurate as possible.

Since I now have the floor, which I have been attempting to get for a few minutes, I would like to welcome to the galleries thirty-two Grade XI students from Lester Pearson High School at Wesleyville who are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Fred Melindy, Mr. Tiller, Mr. George Cross. I would like to welcome you to the House of Assembly today on behalf of all honourable members and I trust that your visit here will be interesting, informative and valuable.

MR. BARRY: Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, just a few brief words in closing.

We have seen the - I have pointed out the difficulties that arise from short term pressures. I have also pointed out the difficulties in seeing in particular areas of research just where money spent in a particular



area or work, done in a particular area, is going to lead. I would just like to throw out a couple of examples, one which took place some time ago and one that is happening now more recently.

Mr. Chairman, who in this honourable House would ever have been prepared to support, to put the hard-earned taxpayers' dollar into the hands of this long haired kook who had as his philosophy, that well, I will not cut my hair. What is the point in cutting my hair because it is only going to grow again? This was back in the 30's. Who, Mr. Chairman, paid almost no attention to what was going on around him, who would have been immediately labelled, Mr. Chairman, and was at the time, would be, I submit, today, somebody who was totally out of it, totally out of touch with reality and who, Mr. Chairman, would have expected that this honourable gentleman would have made breakthroughs that even today we are not getting the full realization of, that are heating millions of homes today - I am talking about Albert Einstein, Mr. Chairman. I am talking -

MR. NEARY: I thought you were talking about me there for a minute.

MR. BARRY: No, it is not the honourable member for Bell Island. I am talking about Albert Einstein who, it would be a kindness to say, that he was an unusual character, somewhat eccentric, someone who, as I say, Mr. Chairman, I doubt very much if this Honourable House would have had any great confidence in lashing out the hard-earned taxpayers' dollar to support his work.

Yet we have, Mr. Chairman, theories developed by him which are, I suppose, having as fundamental effect on all our lives today and will have as fundamental effect on the lives of our children, as any other concept or theory developed in the history of man.

Let me give you a more recent one, Mr. Speaker, that is having direct application off our Coast today. The concept of continental drift and this great debate that raged within the field of geology - and the honourable member opposite is more up on this philosophy than I am. I confess that I have not the time to read as much in various scientific fields as I would like to - but you have the, I think they call it plate tectonics, the study of the sliding crusts of the earth and the concept that the continents are drifting apart and have been drifting apart and presumably moving together over somewhere in the Pacific Ocean, sliding over each other.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, the work in this area and the geological inferences that could be drawn from this pure fundamental research is directly related to our having oil rigs drilling off our Coast for the past few years and this year and continuing on for several years, I hope, and I hope will be directly related to our finding commercial quantities of oil and gas off our shore. But the point is, Mr. Chairman, that ten years ago, fifteen years ago, if somebody had come before this honourable House and asked this House to put the hard-earned taxpayer's dollar into this area of research, Mr. Chairman, as much as I would like to think that we would have been enlightened enough and far-seeing enough to support this area of research, I have my doubts, Mr. Speaker, as to whether we as politicians with the short term pressures that are put on politicians, with the short term pressures that exist on all individuals just to try and survive - it is not an easy world. It is a hard world - Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we would have supported this research.

I think that that is an area we would have chopped out as irrelevant, as a frivolity, a luxury, an area of luxurious, frivolous research that was not going to see

results in terms of benefits to our people. That is the danger, Mr. Speaker, that I want to point out to the honourable member opposite. We have a situation now where there is accountability, Mr. Speaker. There is accountability to the public through the Board of Regents. There is accountability to this House through the fact that the University has to come to this House every year to get the funds with which to carry on for the forthcoming year. But, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is dangerous, highly dangerous for us to intrude into this area of academic freedom, even though, even though in the short term it might be politically popular. We might get points, Mr. Speaker, for showing that we saved any part of \$34.5 million and cut it out of the University and put it into municipal services or paving or what have you.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is an area where leadership must be shown. This is an area where we must think long term. We must think of the future of our Province and I for one, Mr. Speaker, will be very hesitant to limit the academic freedom of our University.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I will be extremely brief in my rebuttal to that particular line of reasoning. The minister essentially has made two points. One is that if any university is accountable to politicians the work at the university, the type of work that would be going on in the university, may be decided upon short range motives, short term motives

rather than long range motives and maybe decided upon political factors rather than intellectual factors, if I am precisising what the minister has said correctly. What the minister deliberately, I would suggest, leaves out is that the University is accountable to politicians at this very point in time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: In fact, Sir, they are accountable to a much smaller group of politicians than this Committee or this honourable House. And if he is going to talk about motives, Sir, I would suspect that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and-or the Treasury Board, or the President of Treasury Board could be just as politically motivated and short ranged in his thinking or deranged in his thinking as any honourable member of this House of Assembly. The essential difference, Sir, is that such decisions are made now by politicians secretly and in private. And if the minister is concerned about such motives, and I tend to agree with him, there is that danger. If the minister is truly concerned about such motives I would much rather that motives be open to the public so that the press corps and anybody else who would wish to read Hansard or study Hansard or come into the public galleries, the public would have an opportunity to see the cheap, short-ranged political motives of politicians -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: you know, if that is the case.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: You recently brought my attention to the necessity of quoting, Mr. Chairman, correctly when quoting the honourable member. I would like to point out that my point was that it is the degree of detail to which the University must account.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes.

MR. BARRY: The degree of detail, whether it be the Treasury Board or cabinet or this honourable House. And the point is, is that,

I am saying that a certain degree of freedom, of flexibility more so say than it is left to a government department should be left to the University. That is all.

MR. F. ROWE: I do not have any objections, Mr. Chairman. I am the first one to defend academic freedom, and the nature of research, and the right of professors to criticize government or any other institution that exists in a province or in a nation, the first one to defend, Sir.

But I would like to point out that the honourable minister and myself are in complete agreement that that danger exists. And it exists to a greater extent at this moment than it would if more details were brought into this Committee rather than the details being brought in to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, or in the cabinet.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Oh, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Sir.

Now, Sir, the second point that the minister made, he pointed out Dr. Einstein -

AN HON. MEMBER: Albert.

MR. F. ROWE: Albert, and Dr. - I have forgotten his name, an Norwegian chap who was responsible for the theory of Continental Drift, which by the way was a theory up until quite recently and now has become more or less a conventional law of geology.

I would like to point out, Sir, that in both instances the research carried out by both these gentlemen were financed by private foundations, and indeed, talking about the wisdom of government, in the case of Albert Einstein, if I remember correctly, it has been a long time since I have been reading science, since I got into this field -

AN HON. MEMBER: You would not understand ....

MR. F. ROWE: If I remember correctly Dr. Einstein had all the support of the Federal American Government, and in fact, might have been financed by the equivalent of the American Atomic Energy Commission.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

So, Sir, the minister's argument works in reverse.

MR. BARRY: After he derived his theory, then he got support.

MR. F. ROWE: He got support. You are absolutely right.

After he developed a theory at a very young age, twenty-three years of age or twenty-one years of age in Germany -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): I wonder if honourable gentlemen will not agree that this is straining the bounds of relevancy for two honourable gentlemen to be arguing about Mr. Einstein -

MR. BARRY: The German Reich in 1936.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): - from where he derived his funds has very little relevance to Memorial University and its grant-in-aid. Maybe we could move on to items that are more pertinent and relevant.

MR. F. ROWE: I would like to close by trying to sum up the point, Mr. Chairman, by saying that in many instances, similar to the two examples that the minister used of so-called intellectual eccentrics working within the confines of the university, in quite a number of cases they were working on funds derived from private foundations and in some instances, on funds derived from government. I fail to see the point of his argument by referring to these two great scientists. It is as simple as that.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I think it is most appropriate today, Sir, that we should have in the public galleries a group of young students from Wesleyville at a time when we are discussing a matter that is of concern, I am sure, to these young people as it is to all the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, Your Honour, these young people in the galleries may wonder what is actually taking place here on the floor at this very moment. Well, for the information of these young students from Wesleyville, we are discussing the budget for the year for Memorial University, and the debate at the moment, there are a lot of other things involved, the debate at the moment hinges around whether or not the university budget should be made public. It is not a debate on whether or not the government or

the politicians or anybody else should interfere with academic freedom at the university. This is not what the debate is all about, although the Minister of Mines and Energy, who spoke in the debate and the Minister of Education, have confused the issue. They have muddied up the water and have left the impression that what my colleague and what myself have talked about this afternoon, would involve interference in the running of the university. Sir, this is what we call in politics, a red herring. It is not a red herring, Mr. Chairman, it is a whale. It is a big red whale that the minister has drawn into this debate.

Sir, let there be no doubt in anybody's mind that we on this side of the House do not believe that there should be any interference whatsoever in the academic running of that university.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Let there be no doubt about that, Sir. Having said that, Mr. Chairman, we feel on this side of the House, that a university that is spending the taxpayers' money should give an account of their revenue and expenditure in detail before we approve the budget in this honourable House for Memorial University for the coming year. That is what we are saying, Sir.

MR. BARRY: What is it we should do?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, my honourable learned friend says what is it that we should do?

MR. BARRY: And we want to be able to do it.

MR. NEARY: And we want to be able to do it. We want to be able to read the documents, Sir. That is what we want. We want to be able to take up the details in salaries over at Memorial University and say, oh, professor so and so or not the name but the professor teaching say - what is it?

MR. BARRY: Assistant professor, associate professor, full professor,



MR. NEARY: No. They have an instructor over there teaching Newfoundland culture, I think it is. Well, folklore. A professor teaching Newfoundland folklore over at the university earns \$25,000 a year. Mr. Chairman, that is only right and proper because every civil servant, Sir, his classification is listed here. His salary is shown. Why should we not be able to pick up a mustard coloured covered document like we have here, salary details of civil servants?

Mr. Chairman, over at the Newfoundland Liquor Commission, they have to show the classifications in salaries. Mr. Chairman, why should we in this honourable House give Memorial University a blank check? Why should we?

MR. BARRY: We are not. We are cutting into \$35 million.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education passed over to my colleague, two xeroxed sheets of paper, two. Here they are look. How much is on them "Fred". Mr. Chairman, look - no, one sheet I am sorry. It is not two. One sheet of paper, \$36 million. \$36 million, that is unbelievable, Sir, on one sheet of paper.

The government itself spends \$1 billion. They have 143 pages to show how that \$1 billion is spent. Poor old Memorial University, all they have to do is to send us over one sheet of paper with the figures as xeroxed asking this House to give them \$36 million without any explanation. What kind of fools do they think we are, Sir? Do they think we are naive and stupid? Why should they not have to -

MR. CROSBIE: Vote against it, boy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the minister says vote against it. It is not that clear cut. It is not a clear cut issue. You vote against it, yes, and you are voting against giving the university, you are voting against mother, giving the university \$36 million to carry on its operations this year.

MR. BARRY: Do you not have the courage of your convictions?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: \$31 million, \$31 million.

MR. NEARY: \$36 million it says on this sheet.

MR. BARRY: Middle column, middle column.

MR. NEARY: Oh, \$34 million is it, \$34,500,000?



AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: \$31 million in the budget. This sheet of paper is \$36 million.

Mr. Chairman, why should we be asked to give the university a blank check? Why should they not account to the people of this Province, the hard pressed taxpayers, for every cent they spend at that university? That is not interference in academic freedom, Sir. They can spend it on what they like. All we want to know is what they are spending it on. What is wrong with that, Sir? Does that make sense?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No.

MR. NEARY: It does not make sense?

MR. MURPHY: Let them spend it how they like. What do you want to know for?

MR. NEARY: Let them spend it how they like.

MR. MURPHY: No, not at all. That is what we would want to see it for.

MR. NEARY: That is why we are asking to have a report tabled in this House every year showing revenue and expenditure.

Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that when President Morgan approaches the President of Treasury Board and the government on behalf of the university to ask to have another big building put up over on the campus, I would say, Sir, the President of Treasury Board, the Minister of Finance and the government would be quite within their rights to say to President Morgan, look, Mr. President before we approve this, before we give you more of the taxpayers' money, we would like to do an inventory of the buildings on the campus of the university to see if they are being used to the maximum capacity. Could there be anything wrong with that? The President of Treasury Board would be praised by the taxpayer for protecting his dollar by seeing to it that these buildings that we already have on the campus are being utilized.

There is a point I made earlier this afternoon, Sir. It was that from the reports that I am getting -

March 21, 1975

Tape 633 (afternoon)

IB-3

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Table them.

MR. NEARY: Table the reports? They are verbal reports, Sir, from people who have graduated from that university. I

have a feeling that they might have some idea of what they are talking about. Some have gone on and gotten their doctorate and they are now professors in universities on the Mainland, some have come back to Newfoundland. I believe these learned gentlemen do have some knowledge of what goes on within the walls of that university. Does the minister concede that they might?

Well, Sir, certainly an uneasy feeling has been put in my mind about whether or not the facilities, the existing facilities at the university are being used to the maximum capacity. So the President of Treasury Board would be within his right to say, look, we want to send in an independent consulting firm to do an inventory of all the buildings that we have over there before we spend one more penny putting up new buildings on the campus of the university.

Ah the minister concurs, there is nothing wrong with that. Is that interference in academic freedom?

MR. DOODY: No, that is Public Works.

MR. NEARY: That is Public Works. Sir, it would be a very good thing to do in my opinion. Mr. Chairman, my colleague earlier this afternoon made reference to the fact that the enrollment at the university is down drastically and my colleague, rightly so, laid the blame right on the doorstep of the administration. Right on their doorstep, Sir, because of their cutback in student aid, and my colleague, right by so, pointed out that a lot of young Newfoundlanders, boys and girls, young men and women, will not be able to get a university education because of the heavy finances that are involved. Well, I say to my colleague, hear, hear.

Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that if a young boy or girl, a young Newfoundlander has the academic qualifications, all that young boy or girl should have to do if they want to get a university education, is to go down to the registrar at the university and say, Mr. Registrar, here are my qualifications, and the registrar should look at him and say yes, boy you certainly have all the qualifications for admission to this university and we accept you and you will not have

to worry about another cent as long as you are attending this university. If you are brilliant, if you are a genius, you should be put through on scholarships and bursaries. But if you are only just a poor old sock like myself, just able to plod along, never got inside the university doors.-

AN HON. MEMBER: Mediocre.

MR. NEARY: A mediocre Newfoundlander like myself, not a university graduate, not a doctor or a lawyer but with a lot of Newfoundland common sense. Maybe, Mr. Chairman, if they had had that policy in my time I might have gone on to university. But I did not get the opportunity. My poor old father was not born with a silver spoon in his mouth. He had to get out and slug it out for a living.

MR. DOODY: He did not get much of a prize after, did he?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon.

MR. DOODY: University might have done you a world of good.

MR. NEARY: It might have. I might have ended up a lawyer, Sir, and then I would have really have found a milch cow.

Mr. Chairman, the point that I am making here, Sir, is this, that if you are qualified and you have the desire to attend the university, it is only a matter of going down and producing your qualifications and you are accepted and you do not have to sign your name on the dotted line and put yourself in debt to the tune of \$14,000, \$15,000 or \$16,000, so that when you graduate from the university the first thing you have got facing you is a note from the Credit Bureau or some collection agency saying look boy, you are now graduated, you have got to pay up.

The Minister of Education looks over at me under his eyes, the minister knows that is what is happening today. Graduates of the university, Sir, who have not yet found a job are getting letters, ultimatums, from collection agencies downtown or they will be hauled into court. That is not good enough for our young Newfoundlanders, Sir, but my colleague indicated to the House the major

part of that blame. But I am going to go a step further, Sir. And I am going to say, Mr. Chairman, that another reason - maybe not quite as big a reason as my colleague gave - another reason, Sir, is because we have graduates from Memorial University, Sir, with B.A.'s and B.Sc.'s, and what do you call political science, Sir?

MR. NEARY: A B.A. in political science, out working in bars, driving taxis, working in offices because they cannot find jobs. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see the Hon. Premier back in his seat giving me the old wink - this trophy by the way is not for the Premier, it is for the Legion Club over on Bell Island for their Dart League.

MR. MOORES: Are you the board or the dart?

MR. NEARY: The dart, Sir, aimed over at the government.

MR. CROSBIE: They deserved the trophy.

MR. NEARY: They deserve the trophy. I was going to give it to the Minister of Fisheries but he did not behave himself this afternoon. But, Sir, there was a time five or six or seven or eight years ago when the thing to do was to get a university education, get that piece of paper from the University, you were told. You talk about a propaganda campaign that swept all over North America.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who put that out?

MR. NEARY: Pardon? I am not only talking about poor old Newfoundland, right across North America.

AN HON. MEMBER: Burn your boats, he said ....

MR. NEARY: No, get a university education, and you are guaranteed to find the Pot of Gold at the end of the rainbow. And suddenly, Sir, suddenly these university graduates all over North America were faced with the situation that they would not find jobs, although they had their piece of paper, and they were told you are guaranteed to get a job. They could not get jobs and they became disillusioned. Remember the stories there about two years ago about the graduates that nobody wanted. You see, Mr. Chairman, we are living in a technological age and the trend today is towards technical and vocational training. There

seems to be a desperate shortage of technical and skilled workers. And young Newfoundlanders are no different than anybody else. They sense this, and the sense the fact, Sir, that if you are going to get a job in Newfoundland or in Canada and you are going to earn good money that you have to get a trade or you have to get some kind of technical training. It is no good getting your little B.S. or B.A. in political science or B.Sc. whatever it is -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Or B.S. whatever they give them over there. Because your little piece of paper you get from the University, Sir, is no good to you.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Pardon.

AN HON. MEMBER: Cut the vote back.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not going to cut the vote back. I would like to be able to give them more.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, if we give them \$31 million we have every right -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: We have every right as elected representatives of the people of this Province to know how that money is spent. But, Sir, these young boys and girls here in Newfoundland who are no different than they are in any other part of Canada, suddenly came to the realization that you have to have technical training. Not everybody has to be a technician, not everybody has to get a trade. There is a place for university students - I am not saying that all of the courses at the University are bad. I think, I mentioned it in this honourable House before that the twenty-four medical students that are going through that University are twenty-four young Newfoundlanders that we should be proud of.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: And the various other courses that they are giving over there are good, Sir. But my advice to young Newfoundlanders is before they enroll at the University to make sure, Sir, that they have thought through what it is they want to do, If they want to be lawyers why should you have to go over and waste three, four or five years at Memorial University if you want to be a lawyer. Why cannot you go into Law School?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Who will not let you go?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Law Schools will not let you.

MR. NEARY: The Law Schools - well it is about time we changed them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Unfortunately I have no jurisdiction over the rest of Canada -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No we do not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: We are forcing our young people to go in and waste two, three, four and five years of their lives, the most important

years of their lives and then nine chances out of ten they do not even bother to graduate. They quite the University and go over to the College of Trades and Technology to become an electronic technician.

So, my advice to young Newfoundlanders is to think their future through before they make a decision, before they make the fatal mistake that a lot of our boys and girls have made. Mr. Chairman, over at the University a few weeks ago they had a conference and the conference was suppose to decide the future of the University. I was invited to that conference, Mr. Chairman, but when I got the agenda in the mail and I looked at it, I did not have the stomach to go to the conference. The agenda, Sir, left no room at all or very little room for public involvement, for public input, for input by the parents of students who are attending the University or potential students at the University. The agenda, Sir, was designed in such a way as to limit public participation.

Mr. Chairman, they had invited into that conference intellectuals and academics from all over Canada and maybe one or two from the United States, I do not know, and they had - I think the honourable the Premier, I do not know if the honourable Premier spoke at one of the seminars or at the banquet that was given by the government- they had a bunch of politicians down there speaking to make it look like it was -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, to make it look like, Sir, it was real, to make it look like they were sincere, but, Mr. Chairman, on that agenda, and I still have the agenda in my possession, there was very little room for involvement by the general public, by the parents of students who were in school and in the University. The whole thing was a farce. They set out



to do a P.R. job.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not care who participated. Maybe the Leader of the Opposition made the best contribution over there. I do not know. I did not attend it. I decided to boycott it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You made the best contribution.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I certainly did, and a good many more people like me. The conference, Sir, the conference which was meant to do a P.R. job for the University turned out to be a flop. Most unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, it was very unfortunate indeed because I had high hopes when I heard that that conference was going to be organized. I had high hopes that the people of Newfoundland, the people that foot the bill, the people that pay the price, the people that give -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: the people of the University the money to run that University, that they would have some say in the future of that University. Then, Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friends on the government benches feel that we are a little bit critical of the University, and I am sure they hear the talk as well as we do, if they had gotten the public involved at that conference, they would have seen something, because, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, unfortunately, Sir, the people of this Province are fed up to their eyeballs about hearing about the high cost of education and the high cost of running that University. They are fed up with hearing about it, Sir.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is not what my buddy said. The Member for Harbour Grace should pay attention and maybe he will learn something from my honourable colleague. But, Sir, I want to end up by saying this, Mr. Chairman, that it is not the dollar, Sir, that is going to make that University. It is not the amount of money that you put in that University.

March 21, 1975.

Tape 636

RH - 3

Sir, that is going to make it or break it. It is going to be the people who run it, Sir. That is the thing that will make or break our Univeristy, not the amount of money that you put into it.

Mr. Chairman, as a layman, I have no intention of becoming involved in the academic freedom of Memorial University, but as a layman, Sir, and I am sure there are 510,000 more Newfoundlanders like me, they would like to see the budget of that University, the details of the salaries, the details of the revenue and expenditure made public. I think they have

every right to this information, Mr. Chairman, after all they are the ones who are paying the bills.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

On motion 614-01, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 615-03 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, on 615-03, I would like to give some information on this. Actually this is basically grants to teachers who are going to take specialized subjects, in other words, and in courses of study not available in the Province; home economics, industrial arts, art itself, they would be the main areas and that is what the bulk of that is for.

On motion 615-03, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I have just noticed a flash bulb in the corridor upstairs. For the benefit of anyone who is armed with a camera, this is not allowed.

On motion 04 and 05, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 616-03-01 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, just, if I may. I think these next several are pretty self-explanatory, for example, this Dalhousie University, and this is an assessment made by the university for dental students and this is, for example, to allow six dental students next year to go. The next few are somewhat similar.

On motion 03-01 through to 04, carried.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, during the minister's opening remarks he had a list of expenditures, capital expenditures for the expansion to schools and perhaps if the minister has got the list - do you have a list that I can get?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I have one. I can make one the honourable gentleman can have because this is my own writing in shorthand, but I can -

MR. WOODWARD: If I could get the list - I do not want to take up the time of the House to read the thing now, but I would like to have it. The other thing I would like to say in this respect here, Mr. Chairman,

is the fact, that although we are dealing with Eskimos and Indians, I think we have had a very sad experience in the past of what has happened in a number of communities, and I do not know if our education system does not have the expertise to deal with it or does not lend the time nor the patience to deal with this type of education. But it is gradually becoming a major problem in Indian and Eskimo communities.

I recall, even as late as last year, and going back a couple or three years ago and then from there on in, it was nothing but chaos to attract our teachers to go in to the remote communities on the Labrador Coast to teach the Eskimo and the Indian children. I recall on a number of occasions where we brought the people who volunteered their services, coming in from the United States and also coming over from Cape Breton, and I suspect that the minister is aware of the problems that one can have where at the best of circumstances, where you have a teacher coming in from the United States, coming out of Boston or out of New York and going into a remote community, like Nain or Makkovik, it is a monumental job of adjusting to that type of living when they have no idea of what type of educational system we have here. Then when they get involved into teaching the children and starting off teaching English, if you want to call it that, when a number of children cannot understand the language, and there has been some very valuable time wasted just trying to make contact or communicating with the students.

In the minister's opening remarks, he did state that we are trying to promote the people who can interpret in the schools, the people in their own language, coming out of the community. But, this, Mr. Chairman, I suspect has been a big set back. Maybe one of the reasons why, as you look at a community of Nain that has a population of over 800 people and they are only teaching up to Grade VIII in a seven classroom school - the federal government have been more than generous with the funds both in operational and for capital expenditures. So, I personally would like to see and I am sure that maybe the minister would like to see some emphasis put on developing at least a Grade IX or Grade X and eventually with a programme going into high school in those communities rather than moving the children out.

We have a very large percentage of dropouts at the Grade VIII level. Rather than be uprooted and taken away from their family and moved into dormitory living there or in Wabush or coming down to St. John's, the children agree to stay out of school permanently. There is no alternative and there is nothing there offered in their own community. This is not only upsetting to the students or the children themselves but it has a real effect on the parents. If a child is reaching the stage of Grade VII or Grade VIII at the age of twelve or thirteen and then is removed from their parents, and then want to seek a university career, from that time, that age, then they are separated from their families, maybe, in lots of cases, if you take them out, and for that period of time when they go back into the community, their life is so distorted that they cannot adjust to the conditions in the community and they do not fit into that type of society, Neither do they fit into our type of society. We end up with a lot of problems on our hands. This is one of the reasons why the minister is looking for correctional institutes for native people.

I suspect, Mr. Chairman, in the light of this - I am sure that the minister is probably aware of it - maybe we can now do some planning and put some emphasis on developing, utilizing this money to

develop a proper system. Maybe utilizing money to have experts and training experts in that particular field, to deal with the native groups.

On motion 03-05 and 07 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 08 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, 08, miscellaneous associations, the bulk of that is made up by the assessment of the Province of the Council of Ministers of Education of Canada and then the Canadian Education Association. These are assessments done on a per capita basis. There are some other organizations to which we have made contributions, Frontier College, Canadian Council for Research in Education, World University Service of Canada and several others.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: So far only one.

On motion 08 to 618 carried.

On motion that the committee rise, report having passed Head (6), Education and ask leave to sit again. Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred, and have directed me to report having passed Head (VI), Education and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of Supply reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and report having passed Head (6), Education and all items and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I am going to move that the House adjourn until three o'clock Monday afternoon. So, we will sit Monday afternoon and evening on Monday rather than the morning. So, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, March 24, at three o'clock in the afternoon and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion that the House at its rising do now adjourn until Monday, March 24, at three of the clock.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MARCH 21, 1975

1960

MAR 21 1975

Question: Have any solicitors been appointed by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation to act in their behalf in respect of applications for loans and/or mortgages made by residents of Western Newfoundland, if so, which firms and solicitors have been so appointed?

Answer: With respect to mortgage loans for residents of Western Newfoundland, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, uses the services of two legal firms as follows:

1. Stagg and Wells - Stephenville
2. Martin, Easton, Woolridge and Poole - Corner Brook

Question: What amounts of money have been paid by the Corporation to each of these firms and/or solicitors since April 1, 1974, indicating the purpose for which such money was paid. The list to include any payments made by the Corporation in behalf of applicants for loans and/or mortgages as well as any money paid by the Corporation for legal services rendered to it?

Answer: The amounts paid for professional services, the amounts paid for disbursements in registration fees etc., and the number of mortgage loans involved, are shown below relating to the period from April 1, 1974 to date:

<u>Firm</u>	<u>No. of Mortgage Loans</u>	<u>Professional Fees</u>	<u>Other Disbursements (Registration Fees etc.)</u>
Martin, Easton Woolridge and Poole	8	None to date	None to date
Stagg & Wells	39	\$7,737.11	\$2,415.80



Answer to Question 27

Order Paper 11/75

March 13th, 1975

1.	January 1st, 1973	25,227
	January 1st, 1974	21,715
	January 1st, 1975	21,834

March 18th, 1975