

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.  
FRIDAY, APRIL 21, 1978

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

On behalf of hon. members

I should like to welcome sixty-eight students from Grade IX classes of Mary Queen of the World School on Topsail Road accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Lavigne and Mrs. Hall.

I know all hon. members join me in welcoming these students to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, I have two statements today. First, it gives me great pleasure to announce the government has decided to appoint a task force to study the implications of declining enrollments in elementary, secondary education in the Province.

I might say at this time, Sir, that the Minister of Education and his officials have worked very diligently on this and have been together with myself in contact with the NTA and other interested groups who concur with the setting up of the task force under the terms and conditions which I am about to announce.

The terms of reference of this study will include the following. Number one, an examination of the quality of education in the light of declining enrollments with particular reference to the following:

- (1) the allocation of teachers and professional staff, the school boards and their deployment and utilization within educational districts;
- (2) existing educational programmes;
- (3) operational grants and the formula for distributing them to school boards;
- (4) the provision and utilization of classroom facilities;

PREMIER MOORES:

- (5) teacher supply and teacher training;
- (6) post-secondary education.

Number two, a survey of declining enrollments by school district and the impact of this decline on individual school programmes, class size, teacher deployment and class and grade organization in each school district for the year 1978-79.

We are suggesting, Sir, that report containing this data be submitted by June 30th of this year.

Number three, the formulation of recommendations concerning appropriate and realistic courses of action which government and administrative groups in education should adopt in order to take advantage of the declining enrollments to improve the quality of education in our Province.

I am also very pleased to announce that two very distinguished Newfoundland educators have agreed to undertake the study for us. They are Dr. Frank Riggs, head of the Department of Curriculum from the Education Faculty of Memorial University, and Dr. Bob Crocker, who is in charge of the Institute for Educational Research and Development at Memorial.

These two gentlemen will constitute the task force and begin their study within the next few days in accordance with the terms of reference indicated.

To assist them in their work, appropriate arrangements will be made for adequate support staff including research assistants.

As they proceed with this assignment they will be inviting submission from interested groups and individuals who have a point of view to put forward.

I would emphasize that every necessary step will be taken to ensure that interested parties are given every opportunity to make their proposals or recommendations to the task force.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Premier and the government have finally bent to the public pressure brought upon them to bring in this task force to look into the quality and standards of education in the Province. It has been asked for by ourselves and members of the public, and members of the various professions associated with education. I am glad now that the government has decided, finally, to do something.

Our position, Sir, has been made quite clear and that is that until the results of a task force and enquiry on education are brought in and made public, there should be no cuts of any kind in the field of education -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE:

- that it is hypocritical to make cuts in the number of teachers, to make cuts to the university requiring the raising of tuition, to raise the amount which students have to borrow in order to go to university and so on and so forth. It is hypocritical to do that, Sir, because it is a little like sentencing a man to execution or to life imprisonment first and then having the trial afterwards. Let us have the trail first, let us find out what the situation is -

MR. HICKMAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order has come up.

MR. HICKMAN:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition is allowed to make certain comments, he is not allowed to enter into the realm of debate. And may I draw to his attention that the report must be in by June, so that he will not, even if he is in debate, the first part of it -

MR. NEARY:

The cuts are being made now.

MR. SPEAKER:

On the point of order, I would point out that after a Ministerial Statement the only

MR. SPEAKER: remarks allowed are  
comments and requests for explanation. Debate on the  
substantive issue is not permitted at this time.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Right. Quite correct,  
Mr. Speaker. What I am doing is making a comment, Sir,  
and I am leading up to a question that I am going to put  
to the Premier on the statement which he just made.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

I say that we should not have the sentence first and the trail afterwards, we should have the enquiry first and then we should decide on what to do. And I am asking the Premier this question, whether he on behalf of the government will consent to stop the teachers' layoff, for example, to increase the amount to the university to allow them to continue in a normal way without raising tuitions; if he will make sure that school boards do not have to undertake a substantially larger portion of the cost of operating school buses; if he will make sure that the student loans are not raised, and student tuition is not raised and so on and so forth until such time - all these matters - until such time as the report, the results of this enquiry, this task force are, in fact, in the hands of the government and full study has been made of it? That is a reasonable, rational request, Mr. Speaker.

And secondly, Sir, I do not want to cast any aspersions at all on the two gentlemen named as forming the task force because I am sure that they are excellent men from the university, excellent men, but, Mr. Speaker, there are more people concerned about education in this Province than two university professors or the university of this Province. What about some representation from the trade schools? What about some representation from the parents who have the greatest vested interest on behalf of their children and students?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE:

What about some representation on the task force from the school boards who, I would say, are perhaps second in order or priority, second only to the parents when it comes to the provision of basic education in this Province?

MR. NEARY:

A white-wash job.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I say, Sir, the task force should be enlarged to include some intelligent, rational concerned representatives of other groups in society who have a grave concern and an interest in making sure that the quality of education in this Province is not allowed to diminish and that the standard will continue to go up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

MR. NEARY: Ah, sit down boy, sit down!

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I also have another statement to make this morning. I have a statement to make which I believe will be of great interest to the people of our Province. I believe that the announcement is, to date, the most significant we have made in the history of the Province since Confederation, as far as the fishery is concerned.

There are actually two specific announcements contained in the statement which I am about to make and I will be dealing with both in detail. However, I would like to make a few brief remarks before getting into the specifics of the announcements.

Hon. members will recall that in the Budget Speech a great deal of emphasis was placed upon the future growth and development of the Newfoundland fishing industry. It was indicated that the fishing industry is one of the bright spots in Newfoundland's economic future and that the fishery contained the greatest potential for economic growth and progress. As well, the Budget Supplement stated that the fishery - over the next five years - will be the most dynamic sector of the Provincial economy. It outlined a shift in Government policy from one of supporting a marginal industry to the fostering of a viable industry, capable of independently financing its operational and expansion requirements. Government's role over the next five years will be both supportive and developmental and the

PREMIER MOORES: financial assistance programmes - which I will be announcing today - are in keeping with this approach. I might add here that private sector confidence in the future of the industry is very strong and we expect a large infusion of private investment in new facilities over the next five years.

As a first step in achieving a strong and viable fishing industry, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador is pleased to announce further expansion in our programme of fishery development.

This programme is directed toward the modernization and expansion of necessary catching and processing capacity which will be required as the fishery resource is renewed and regenerated.

The opportunities that are presented to us are, and these opportunities arise, because of the expanded 200-mile limit which gives us greater control over the supply of fish in our waters.



PREMIER MOORES: In addition, the availability of bouyant world markets for our fish provides a strong encouragement for expansion of the industry. As foreign effort is withdrawn and as stocks are regenerated, there will be an abundant supply of fish to the Newfoundland fishing industry. There will be opportunities for further processing and there will be new species to be exploited. We are convinced that, with proper development policies, Newfoundland can become the world capital of the fishing industry and it is our intent in Government to pursue this aim.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: It is recognized that over the past several years, due largely to depletion of fish stocks, that the financial returns in the industry have been inadequate to allow for very much new investment. The low financial return in the industry was not adequate to ensure that fishing operators in the Province have a strong financial base from which to meet the challenge of the next five years. If steps are not taken to create the necessary financial environment for expansion of the fishing industry, then the full growth potential will not be realized. Government therefore takes the position that construction and development of new facilities must be undertaken now in anticipation of regenerated resource stocks. If we are to fully displace foreign activity and foreign effort in the fishing industry then we shall have to take an aggressive approach.

We are therefore happy to announce today a new programme which is intended to give the necessary financial support immediately so as to lay a firm foundation for future expansion. What this

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: What this means is that the the fishing industry will be given the necessary support now rather than later, while laying the ground work to ensure that the industry becomes financially self-reliant as financial

PREMIER MOORES:

returns improve.

I would like to stress that

this programme is supplemental to existing financial programmes and is not intended to to replace other programmes that exist to fill a demonstrated need. These programmes, of course, include regional development incentive grants from DREE, loans from the Newfoundland Development Corporation, financial assistance through the Department of Rural Development. as well as the newly announced loan programme for processing equipment. This new programme is intended to ensure that firms in the fishing industry can obtain the necessary financing from commercial financial institutions on acceptable terms. Such financing should be available on terms which will allow these firms to develop now, as I say, rather than later. The programme is designed to ensure that the prime responsibility will remain with the operator.

The responsibility for arranging financing and for repayment will be the concern of the operators. Government's role will be one of providing a guarantee to the lender over an interim period until the industry is capable of generating sufficient financial returns to sustain development and growth without Government support.

The financial assistance, I am happy to announce, will be provided in the form of what is known as deficiency guarantee. In general terms, a deficiency guarantee means that the Province is prepared to guarantee that the lender will be reimbursed in the event of default. Government is prepared to guarantee that in the event that the firm cannot meet its financial commitments and should the lender be unable to recover the loan, then the Province will, as a last resort, provide reimbursement.

In addition to this new policy of financial assistance to the industry, I am pleased to announce a specific application of this policy dealing

PREMIER MOORES: with a well established Newfoundland firm. I might say, Sir, at this point that this programme is available to all companies in the industry and not, as has been the case for far too many years, of each company being dealt with individually under different types of programmes. This programme applies to all the fishing companies in the Province so that they can compete with national and international companies on a financial basis.

However, before getting into this aspect of the announcement, I would like to make a comment on a number of features contained in this new programme which are designed to strengthen the fishing industry and to provide appropriate assistance to those companies which wish to expand.

The main terms of the new programme are:

- (1) The firm will negotiate the terms of the proposed financing directly with the bank or other financial institution and this will be done in joint consultation with the Province;
- (2) The deficiency guarantee will be for a period not longer than five years from the date of completion of the capital expansion being financed, although the financing may be for a longer period of time. In other words, it is anticipated that as the industry recovers, the need for a Government guarantee will be eliminated and Government can withdraw its support and allow the private sector to continue on its own.
- (3) Again, in the same spirit, the deficiency guarantee will be reduced on a sliding basis which will be faster than the rate of repayment of the loan. This reflects the growing strength of the private sector;

PREMIER MOORES:

(4) In these return for these guarantees, Government will charge a reasonable service fee for taking the risk associated with this new programme and the operator will be asked to apy a few which is not greater than 1 per cent of the total amount involved; and,

(5) It is understood that the operator concerned must be able to demonstrate the ability to repay the loans over the period projected. Also, it will be a requirement that each firm provides adequate security which is satisfactory both to the lender and to the Province.

PREMIER MOORES: The purpose of this programme therefore is to enable companies in the fishing business to borrow at a favourable interest rate with the hope that, when the guarantee has been lifted, the borrower and the lender will be able to continue their relationship without further Government support.

The programme is intended to make loans available, to finance capital expansion plans and to provide the necessary working capital for successful business operation and expansion. The intent of this programme is to help companies that have basically sound ideas and want to expand so as to meet the challenges presented by the fishing industry potential in the future.

I am pleased, Sir, to announce that the first application of this policy is a proposal presented to Government by Fishery Products Limited and at the same time announce that the Company plans to carry out a major expansion of its fishing operations in the Province.

This expansion will be undertaken during the next three years and will create 640 new jobs, most of which will be on a permanent basis.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: Fishery Products Limited, I might add, is the largest private employer in the fishing industry in Newfoundland with a total work force of 4000 and a total of eight major fish plants.

With regard to Fishery Products Limited, the Newfoundland Government has given its approval for a major refinancing package whereby the Company will be provided with \$25 million (U.S.) or \$28 million (Canadian) loaned by the Bank of Nova Scotia which will be partially guaranteed by the Province through this new financing programme, the details of which I have just outlined.

PREMIER MOORES: Fishery Products Limited began operations in Newfoundland in 1940 and since that time it has grown to become the largest fish catching and processing operation in the Province. Indeed, it is one of the largest fishery enterprises in Canada. In addition to its eight plants, the company has a modern fleet of deep-sea trawlers.

The \$28 million loan will be guaranteed under the new financial package and the money will be used for capital expansion as well as to strengthen the working capital position of the Company.

I might also say that as part of this arrangement, the company will repay certain debts, including the \$1.8 million owed to the Province and it will redeem the \$3 million in preference shares in the Company now held by the Province, which means that it is the first time in over thirty years that the Company will not have any direct debts with the Government of Newfoundland.

The financial package will not only strengthen the Company's working capital position but it will give in the short-term flexibility which it requires in order to withstand the many fluctuations in the industry, as well as to finance increasing inventories required for the expanded business. The Company, as a result of this guarantee, will be able to carry out its expansion now rather than have to wait a number of years to build up the necessary capital.

Government's approval of this financial proposal represents a withdrawal of Government's involvement with Fishery Products. Upon the completion of this project, Fishery Products will no longer have any direct debts owing to the Government nor will Government hold shares in the Company. Instead, this financial guarantee enables the Company to secure its financial requirements directly from the bank without the

PREMIER MOORES: direct involvement of Government, through loan or equity participation.

I am sure all hon. members will be pleased to learn that this guaranteed loan is completely secured in view of the fact that Fishery Products has provided a first mortgage on 14 trawlers which have been appraised recently at more than \$29 million. In addition, the guarantee by the Province is secured by first mortgages upon various fixed assets belonging to the Company.

In accordance with Government's new policy, the Province's guarantee will be reduced at a much faster rate than repayment of the debt. In other words, as the resources continue to recover and as the Company becomes more profitable it will be able to shoulder a larger share of the financial burden. Therefore, the Province will be able to accelerate its withdrawal as the fishing industry recovers so that the private sector, and Fishery Products in this case in particular, will be in a position of financial independence.

Through this process of gradual withdrawal, banks and other lending institutions will be assuming their proper role without looking to Government for continued support. If the Company meets present expectations for financial success, then the Province's guarantee on the new financing will no longer be required after 1984, when the company will be completely on its own. The guarantee will be withdrawn in 1984 although the loan does not have to be repaid until 1989.

I would like to make it clear that the guarantee to be provided by the Province is not a full guarantee but rather a deficiency guarantee. This means that Government will only be obliged to make certain installment payments on the loan should the Company be unable to make them.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, this is not shovelling Government money out at all, it is guaranteeing

April 21, 1978, Tape 1334, Page 4 -- apb

PREMIER MOORES: an industry which is viable  
in this Province, which is necessary in this Province and  
obviously, which the Opposition are not in favour of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right! Right! Hear, hear!



PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it abundantly clear that the primary purpose of this programme is to allow all Newfoundland companies to compete with fishing companies everywhere with the understanding that these companies are economically viable. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the formal part of my statement. However, I will be only too happy to answer questions. I will be with Fishery Products Limited having a new conference later in the morning. I might say, Sir, in the way of information that in the expansion programmes it is the equivalent of eight new plants, eight major new plants being constructed in the Province, and with that and the jobs that it is going to create and getting ready for the future in this industry, it is unfortunate that the Opposition do not agree with that particular stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: What a con job.

MR. W. ROWE: The Premier has a sense of humour. I have heard it all now, Sir, I have heard it all now. I believe 'crook' is the proper word to characterize this particular announcement. It was a bit difficult to follow, Sir, in that the first half of the announcement pretended to be proposing a programme, a revolutionary programme on the fisheries to the Newfoundland people. It turns out, Sir, as the programme unfolds that a deal has already been struck with Fishery Products Limited; before the announcement was ever made publicly about a programme going into existence, the deal is already struck, a deal already made, and this House is treated as usual with the contempt which we have grown to expect from the government. He comes in here and gives the programme -

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is

MR. HICKMAN: debating again. We know he feels it is a crock, he is stuck with that world forever, he will regret it before the day is over.

MR. W. ROWE: I will not regret it, Sir, I will use a few more words as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Actually I was going to intervene myself to repeat the rule and to point out that the only comments allowed now are general comments, requests for explanations, but not debate and not the developments of reasons for disagreement or the things that constitute debate. Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Right, Sir, absolutely correct ruling. Sir, the point I was making was that it would have been a courteous thing for the Premier to tell us and the people of Newfoundland what the programme was before a deal was struck. Now perhaps, we do not know, we are hearing this for the first time, this may be a good thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. ROWE: I do know this, Sir, that the programme announced by the Premier is a crock, a deal has been struck with Fisheries Products Limited, Mr. Speaker, a deal is struck which might be good, it might be bad, nobody knows, but the programme, which the Premier had the face to come in and say is now in existence some days or weeks or months, we do not know, after a deal has already been struck, that, Sir, is a farce and a crock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: And I will say it again, and again, and again. Coming in here, Sir, and talking about getting rid of foreign involvement in the fishery and at the same time the Premier is acting for the main spokesman for Nordsee in trying to get them in here in Harbour Grace and so on. The hypocrisy of it, Sir, is revolting.

MR. SIMMONS: How many shares, 'Frank,' how many shares have you got, boy?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. HICKMAN: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: I could not help but overhear the comment made by the hon. member for Burgeo-LaPoile -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. NEARY: Not LaPoile, not LaPoile.

AN HON. MEMBER: Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. HICKMAN: Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) -

MR. NEARY: That is better. Get your facts straight.

MR. HICKMAN: - and I would ask that he withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The point brought up is that the remarks with respect to how many shares, and then there was an immediately previous mention of Nordsee, and there is an imputation there which I am sure the hon. gentleman would not wish to leave and I would ask him to withdraw it.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I was a little bit late coming in and I wanted to say 'Good Morning' to the Premier and I asked him a fair question but if it is unparliamentary I withdraw it. It was a fair question nevertheless.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I do not think the hon. member had the floor in order to ask the question. Just to get the record straight I have no shares in any fishing company in this province. I do not even have shares in trailer courts -

MR. NEARY: How about land holdings?

PREMIER MOORES: - where the trailers were bought from the government at fixed rates.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! These matters are really peripheral and the whole procedure on Statements by Ministers and the type of comments which come thereafter will be put into total disarray if hon. members persist. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Sir, I would like to finish my few remarks, factual statements and comments. I hope, Sir, that Fishery Products is able

April 21, 1978

Tape No. 1335

AH - 4

MR. W.N. ROWE: to expand and continue the development of the fishery in the Province. My own district, Twillingate district, has a plant down there being run by Fishery Products which I understand may be expanded, I hope will be expanded to accommodate the needs of the fishermen in the area. I hope

MR. W.N. ROWE: that will take place. What I am saying about this particular programme, Sir, is that there seems to be very little in it which is different from what has been done in the past, namely, the former administration and other administrations in this Province helping out the fishing industry. That was done for twenty-five years and now this government is coming around to doing the same thing. But where the farce comes into it, Mr. Speaker, and where there is an attempt to pull the wool over the eyes of the Newfoundland people is trying to characterize this as some great new universal programme when in effect it is a deal made between the government and a specific codfishing company and then in order to, as my hon. friend said in another context yesterday, in order to give it a sugary coating the Premier comes in and comes out with some wishy-washy motherhood ideals with regard to the fishery, including, Sir, a statement -

PREMIER MOORES: Guarantee -

MR. W.N. ROWE: - Sir, for the last year and a half, or two years I personally, and members of this Party, have been talking about turning around the fishery in Newfoundland and making Newfoundland and Labrador the world capital of the fishing industry. Let us have that aim in mind and that view in mind. Now we hear finally -

MR. NEARY: Not band-aid -

MR. W.N. ROWE: - a statement made by the Premier in which he himself has seized upon this buzzword, Again, Sir, they have been goaded into trying to put forward, promulgate to the Newfoundland and Labrador people some semblance of a policy, even taking over the buzzwords of the Opposition, even taking over the slogans of the Liberal Party in an effort to put something forward to the Newfoundland people. Maybe this is a good thing, Sir, and we will have to study the document and I will have to have enquiries, talk to the industry to see if this is a good thing. I hope it means that expansion of plans

MR. W.N. ROWE: can take place. When the Premier and the government strikes a deal with a particular fishing company, let him not come in here, Sir, and try to make it look as if it is some brand new programme, stealing even the slogans and policies of the Liberal Party Opposition in an effort to pull the wool over the eyes of the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that as was undertaken in the Budget, the government has completed its study of the feasibility of exempting school boards throughout Newfoundland and Labrador, and Memorial University of Newfoundland, from paying retail sales tax on electricity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: In light of the recent increases granted Newfoundland Light and Power, and in light of the budgetary constraints placed of necessity on school boards in the Province, and Memorial University, I am pleased and proud to announce that effective July 1st, 1978, school boards throughout Newfoundland and Labrador, and Memorial University of Newfoundland, will be exempt from paying retail sales tax on all electricity consumed. This action by government will result in an annual saving to school boards of \$400,000 and to Memorial University of Newfoundland of \$125,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise in response to the announcement just made by our hon. friend opposite, the Minister of Finance, Minister of Justice, and House Leader, etc., to say how pleased we are obviously to see that the sales tax has been removed from heating for Memorial University and also for the school boards. We have had enormous numbers of representations, all members on this side

MR. NOLAN: and I am sure members opposite, from members of school boards and also the government now is obviously crumbling under massive pressure that even they can recognize, from fishermen, from farmers where they have had to backtrack, now from Memorial, where we have talked about this before, and from the school boards, already so heavily, dreadfully burdened that they too have got to look for new sources of revenue and they have to operate, as we all do, in the highest tax area in all of Canada.

So what we have now is an obvious back up, backing up and backtracking by the government, who walked foolishly into one of the most massive financial messes ever put on anyone's plate in any Province in Canada. The shame that must be experienced by some of the people opposite surely will drive some of them, if not to walk over here with the Liberal, at least to go independent, go somewhere but do not stay where you are now because you are in real trouble. And maybe it should be led by the Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Opposition are for or against that, I have to put them down as doubtful.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that negotiations have been completed for a \$30 million private placement by the Newfoundland Municipal Finance Corporation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: The issue has been arranged by the Province's fiscal agents, Byrne, Fry Limited and A. E. Aimes and Company Limited and is being placed privately with a small group of Canadian investors. The corporation debentures will provide for an annual sinking fund of two per cent with an interest yield of ten and three-eighths per cent priced with a discount of ninety-nine and one-half per cent, yield 10.43. This issue marks the first long term financing by the Newfoundland Municipal Finance Corporation since September, 1976. The issue is scheduled to close on May 3rd with the corporation receiving the proceeds on that date. I know that municipalities who are seeking improvements, water and sewer, etc. will be very grateful for that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am not even sure what the minister said. He has a way when he is saying something that he is kind of embarrassed by of lowering his head -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!



MR. SIMMONS: - resting his chin on his chest and mumbling away. I am not sure what he said, but I got part of the drift of it. He said '\$30 million' and he said 'municipalities' and he said 'most assuredly'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: So, Mr. Speaker, most assuredly, we welcome any help this government can give to municipalities. The absence of such help has been so prominent that anything they can do over there will be significant.

MR. NEARY: But this is the paper (inaudible) is being done.

MR. SIMMONS: But, Mr. Speaker, I sense the announcement for what I heard of it, and I admit I did not get the full drift of it, it sounds like a \$30 million borrowing for the Municipal Finance Corporation, if that is what, indeed, it is. That is what it is, is it fellows? Is that what he is saying?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, Approximately the same amount they pay in interest (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, that is right. So if it is for work that is already done, well, of course, what is the minister taking the time of the House for at all? - the same old desperation tactic that is becoming the hallmark of the administration, particularly since their present Minister of Finance took over.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: They are desperate over there for announcers. One day last week they had a diarrhea - nine ministers on the same day - they forgot it was not Private Members day or something. But how much longer, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) now what is your -

MR. HICKMAN: I am the only parliamentarian in the free world who has got tired of party whips. Now what is your -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: The minister's sources are as good as ever, Mr. Speaker, but no better than ever.

MR. NOLAN: (Inaudible) 'Roger' make him withdraw that.

MR. SIMMONS: No, that is not worth -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NOLAN: I mean, he is supposed to demonstrate justice and fair play.

MR. SPEAKER: If one hon. gentleman speaks at a time it will be beneficial. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he has not concluded to conclude - perhaps he has, I am not sure. But I would ask other hon. members not to interject.

MR. SIMMONS: Now what did I do? What did I do? I am here trying to make a few remarks, the deposed Whip for the party over here trying to make a few remarks, being attached from all angles, Mr. Speaker. I would much rather be the deposed Whip than the undeposed, bungling House Leader for the government side. At least some people know when to step down, when they are beaten, when it is time to give up and take on some other job.

AN HON. MEMBER: We can -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, we welcome the announcement of the Government House Leader whatever it was he said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W. N. ROWE: Should there not be something in the Orders of the Day? Resignations of ministers or something?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. N. ROWE: I am always expecting to hear Your Honour say it.

MR. SIMMONS: Perhaps the Premier should tell us who has not resigned yet today.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier, who has graced again our assembly with his presence today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: It is so unusual, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Only for half an hour though, that is all. He will be gone now in a few minutes -

MR. W. N. ROWE: When the Speaker says, 'Admit strangers,' in comes the Premier.

MR. NEARY: - gone down with his buddy, Etchegary, and Monroe.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier, since I have gotten nowhere with his colleagues, the Minister of Health or the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, concerning

MR. W.N. ROWE: the tabling of documents or giving of information concerning of alleged scandalous activities surrounding Exon House, Mr. Speaker, and the need for a public inquiry. And for two or three weeks now have assurances and promises made by two hon. ministers that they were going to table in this House documentation concerning the hiring practices of one Syrett when he was hired on as the administrator of Exon House and, secondly, documents concerning the procedures undergone when he was hired on as the Director of Medical Records at the General Hospital. Nothing, Sir, no information, no documentation, no nothing! So I ask the hon. the Premier will he undertake to give a commitment to this House to direct his colleagues to provide that documentation forthwith?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, first of all regarding the preamble of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's remarks about my attendance in the House. As a matter of fact I think he will find if he checks the record that I have been here for more Question Periods than he has.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. NEARY: We all know your attendance record when you were up in Ottawa.

PREMIER MOORES: I was certainly here last week when he was in Quebec City at the very prominent Liberal Convention, and of course everyone has to go to Quebec City for their party conventions, and I suppose PEI and wherever else there is one. But -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

PREMIER MOORES: Pardon? Are you saying something or what?

AN HON. MEMBER: You are misleading the House.

PREMIER MOORES: I am misleading the House? On what?

MR. HICKMAN: On a point of order.

PREMIER MOORES: I said if he would check the record you will probably find that yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to get the question that the Leader of the Opposition asked. I would refer it to my two

PREMIER MOORES:                   colleagues, the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation and the Minister of Health, who I think are in a position to respond.

MR. H. COLLINS:                   Mr. Speaker, if I may respond to the hon. Leader of the Opposition with regard to the employment practices which were in place and which were used in employing the gentleman to which the hon. member refers, I indicated a few days ago that the hospital referred to, the General, is operated under the provisions of the General Hospital Corporation Act, which is similar to the Hospitals Act in that the administration derives their powers from the board under the legislation and are in control of hiring and firing of staff. I have discussed the matter with administration of the hospital for the job which Mr. Syrett was hired, Patients Records Manager. An advertisement was placed in local papers, advertisements were also placed in the national hospital journals across the country. A selection panel was set up, two senior members of the administration as well as the personnel director. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that this gentleman referred to came out as number one of sixteen applications received. References were obtained from his previous employer, which was the Wellesley Hospital in Toronto, where the gentleman had a good record and was highly recommended. He had three courses in terms of hospital administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as I can determine everything was completely above board to refute what has been coming from the Opposition that there is hanky-panky going on, two senior members of the administrative staff plus the personnel director of the General Hospital. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something else: the board of governors of the General Hospital in this city possibly ranks as one of the strongest, most capable hospital boards across Canada and certainly the administration which they put in place speaks for itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:               Hear, Hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE:                   A supplementary. Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:                   A supplementary, the original questioner.

April 21, 1978

Tape 1338

DW - 3

MR. W.N. ROWE:

Sir, the ability of this government and that minister particularly to drag a red herring, a red whale across the question, Sir, is simply amazing. Nobody questions the competence, the ability, the dedication of the Board of Governors of the General Hospital. I am trying to find out, as are we all, and members of the media, press, public what kind of scandalous activities went on with regard to certain government institutions, particularly with regard to hiring practices, and to get to the root of this particularly what went on in Exon House, now under the control of the hon. minister - now involved in an animated conversation and totally unconcerned, apparently - to get to the bottom of it, Sir,

Mr. W. Rowe: we have been trying to trace the chain of hiring of this particular gentleman. And it is not enough, Sir, for a minister to get up in that kind of a way, Sir, the partisan, polemic type of way he has chosen to do so, to assure us that everything was all right. It is not enough. The public of this Province demands a public enquiry into these matters.

And I now ask a question of the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation: when is he going to table the documentation and other information concerning the hiring of the former Administration of Exon House so we can see what went on there, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I will table the document right now.

How is that for action?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is performance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. DINN: Take one foot out and put the other

in.

MR. HICKEY: - I told my hon. friends opposite that I would table them when I was able to and when I was ready to. I have not been ready to until now. As a matter of fact, I was not ready to table them during the appropriate time.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: So let the hon. gentleman not indicate, you know, that we have just held them back deliberately or anything.

Mr. Speaker, I table first of all a copy of the advertisement which called for applications for the position of Administrator of Exon House; the request to the Public Service Commission for the filling of that position; the application by one, David Syrett, which goes into detail as to his background, his academic standing, his various experiences, and quite a resume of all of the positions that he had, which I am sure after hon. gentlemen

Mr. Hickey: read will be self-explanatory. A document signed by Miss Eleanor Maddick to the Chairman of the Public Service Commission in relation to the appointment. The appointment of Mr. Syrett has been approved. A reference, Sir, one written reference - I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I think I skipped something here - hon. gentlemen when they go through the documents will see that in the resumé of Mr. Syrett there are some names given as references and they will find two of them, which are local, ticked off with a tick opposite their names, and a notation which says, Positive references or good references, and those references were gotten by telephone by the Public Service. And also a double check by my department before the final choice was made.

Of particular significance, and the only written reference which is on file either at the Public Service or my department, is one from the Wellesley Hospital which I am told is one of the largest hospitals in Ontario, the Toronto area, and that is the only written reference which is on file. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read this into the record because I think it is of some significance. It is addressed to Mr. M. O'Keefe, Assistant Director, General Hospital, Forest Road, St. John's, Newfoundland.

"Re Mr. David Syrett, Chief Admitting Officer employed from 1966 to the present time." It is dated by the way, March 31, 1975.

"Dear Sir:

It is a pleasure to recommend Mr. Syrett to you for the position in admitting and medical records. Mr. Syrett is a pleasant likeable person, and has a friendly manner. He is well thought of by his peer group, does not hesitate to work long hours if the need presents itself, enters into discussions and presents honest opinions. Mr. Syrett is married, and his wife is a very gracious person, a native of New Zealand. Mr. Syrett has prepared a system for the admission, transfer and discharge programme which will enable the automatic preparation of the daily and monthly reports which are vital to management and government statistical reporting. All this will be processed by remote computer which



April 21, 1978

Tape 1339

PK - 3

Mr. Hickey: eliminates the manual preparation for such reports.

The above is an indication of his diligence and his

MR. HICKEY:

interest in looking to the future. He completes the HOM course this Spring and I truly feel he has a great deal to offer in the hospital field." And that is signed, "Yours sincerely, Miss E. Dorothy Arnett, Assistant Administrator, Patient Services."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I table probably what is the item of most interest to hon. friends opposite, because it is around this particular one the questions arose; I table the recommendations from the Public Service Commission, signed by the Chairman, dated November 26, 1976, and it is addressed to "The Deputy Minister, Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation. The Public Service Commission recently held a competition for the position of Administrator at Exon House. The following candidates, whose names are listed in order of preference were found to be qualified for this position. (1) Mr. David Syrett, 68 Allandale Road, St. John's," and a telephone number. Number two, number three, and then it says, "Your staff request 48 refers."

Mr. Speaker, I have number two and number three blocked out, as hon. members will see. The names and addresses of those two persons is private information, private to this House, I suggest, private to certainly their present employers, private to the public at large and I find in checking with the Department of Justice that this is not the kind of information that should be tabled and consequently I have blocked out those names.

I will suggest, as one last ditch effort to convince the Opposition that we on this side have not now, nor never have had any reason, or any wish, to hide any single fact or any single bit of information surrounding this case, I offer as a gesture to my friend the Leader of the Opposition, if he so wishes, I will provide those names, number two and number three, of course with the understanding

MR. HICKEY: that they are in confidence. Here they are, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, Sir, The hon. the minister made reference to one written reference, I believe, and a number of oral telephonic references which he received or the Public Service Commission.

AN HON. MEMBER: The telephone ones we want to hear about.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Would the hon. the minister care to divulge to the House now what other referees were contacted either by telephone or in writing or by meeting in person?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation.

MR. HICKEY: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I do not know exactly where those names appear.

Yes, Sir, I have the list of names of people given. One is the person with whom the department had been in touch with and the General Hospital had been in touch with in the initial hiring, Miss Dorothy Arnett, the Wellesley Hospital, in Toronto. That is the reference which I just tabled. Another one is Dr. Lorne A. Klippert, Deputy Minister of Health, and there is a check after this name and a note which says, "Good reference." Mr. A.M. O'Keefe, Assistant Administrator, Patient Services, the General Hospital, Forest Road, St. John's, there is a tick after that name and also a notation which says, "Good reference."

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I think as a point of clarification, Dr. Klippert, who is now the Deputy Minister of Health, was an employee of the General Hospital at the time that Mr. Syrett was hired.

MR. NEARY: Was he also at Wellesley Hospital?

MR. HICKEY: No, there is no reference or no indication that I know.

MR. NEARY: But the minister does not know that

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: A final supplementary, Sir, I just note in passing

MR. W.N. ROWE: the resume of David Syrett. The only evidence that I have here that he held all the positions which were mentioned. Sir, except for the letter from Wellesley Hospital, is apparently his own resume. There may be other evidence of the fact that he was supervisor of special services -

MR. NEARY: - is when he went to the General.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Right. Executive of environmental services, there may be other evidence, Sir, but most of it seems to be his own evidence, his own statements of fact that this is what in fact he had done during his professional career. Now, Sir, I put -

MR. NEARY: That is for the General job or the Exon House?

MR. W.N. ROWE: That was for the General job, I believe. I have not had a chance obviously to size it up yet. I put to the minister, Sir, by way of a statement and question, that if it is possible for a person who is, apparently, professionally unqualified to slip through the Public Service Commission methods and processes, procedures now and end up in a highly responsible, highly delicate, highly discreet position, as administration of a home like Exon House, or any similar government institution, Sir, if that is possible what the minister has said confirms the suspicion of the public, the press and ourselves that there must be, Sir, a public enquiry in order to ascertain whether in fact the procedures used are adequate for the choosing of people who are going into highly responsible positions, dealing with the very lives of people, Mr. Speaker, the lives and health and well being of people. It is possible for him to have slipped through the snares so easily, apparently, and what the minister has told us today emphasizes the need, Sir, for a public enquiry. I ask the minister, in all sincerity, Sir, will he now consent to advise the government to have a public enquiry held into the hiring practices and other aspects of this whole matter with specific reference to the Exon House matter, Mr. Speaker? Would he consent to a public enquiry? What he has told us today points up, even more emphatically than before, the need for a public enquiry into this whole affairs.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, obviously my hon. friend has not read through the documents and, you know, there are a number of them there and I do not expect him to be able to do that that quickly. But I suggest it is too bad, Your Honour, that seeing he has not been able to do that he should have probably waited until maybe next week to draw some conclusions.

He says there is only verification of one place of employment. But if he looks at that verification he will find that it covers a span of something like close to ten years. Most, if not all, of the gentleman's time was spent in hospital administration. Ten years, Mr. Speaker, is not to be sneezed at. Ten years experience in the one particular field, going from one position to another, that is verified, Mr. Speaker, and signed by the Assistant Administrator of one of the largest hospitals in Ontario. Surely that is not to be dismissed. The gentleman also, if he goes through the resume as provided by Mr. Syrett, will see that the - he says that he is not professionally qualified, I believe this is what I read into what the Leader of the Opposition said. I have to take issue, Mr. Speaker, with that, that the gentleman, whatever his academic standing might have been, grade ten or thirteen, is really not important. At this point in time we are dealing with the professional qualifications, or otherwise, of this man in a related field, namely, hospital administration, namely, administrator of an institution and this man was quite qualified, Mr. Speaker, in this regard, and the courses that he had taken, listed as had taken were in fact verified, two out of the three were confirmed. I am not prepared to say that the other could not be confirmed, I do not know, but certainly two out of the three were, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see any reason,

Mr. Hickey: the slightest reason for a public enquiry.  
I would be the first to agree with my hon. friend if he is going to say to me, that obviously as a result -

MR. W.N. ROWE: I am not the only one.

MR. HICKEY: No, no. Okay. All right. But anyone else -  
I would say to anyone that obviously as a result of this case certainly there will be a tightening of the lines insofar as the Public Service is concerned. I would not argue that. It would be crazy for anyone to argue that. I am sure there will be. But to suggest that this warrants a public enquiry?

After all, Mr. Speaker, I should say this; in conclusion, it is not my place to defend in the total sense or to the last word the Public Service Commission. Those people are quite capable of defending themselves. So what in fact -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: What in fact am I saying when I say, no, to a public enquiry.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: I say no to a public enquiry, Mr. Speaker, because it involves an institution, namely, Exon House that has been dragged across the floor for quite some time, not only this session but for many sessions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: An institution, Mr. Speaker, where there are two people now toiling daily in the persons of Sister Mary Lucy and Dr. Stare, two very competent people, who got that institution under control, and who are making daily progress.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: To subject that institution, Mr. Speaker, to a public enquiry now, I would not deserve to stay here two days longer as minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: I would resign gladly. If I were -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: - crazy enough to acknowledge a request for a public enquiry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Before recognizing any hon. member I would like to welcome to the galleries eleven Grade X and XI students from Presentation High School, Regina High School of Corner Brook accompanied by Brother Carruthers. I know hon. members join me in welcoming these students.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port followed by the hon. gentleman for LaPoile.

MR. HODDER: A question for the Minister of Fisheries. Recently in the media and even as late as last night we understood that some lobster fishermen in the Province are getting \$1.80 a pound for lobster. I checked with the Bay St. George-Port au Port area today and these people got \$1.30 a pound yesterday and \$1.50 a pound today. My question to the minister is could he tell us what is happening around the Province? Why are some of the fishermen receiving \$1.80 a pound? Why \$1.50 a pound? Obviously there is a market price, a set market price for this? Would he explain what is happening in the Province, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the price of lobsters is being negotiated by the Fishermen's Union, and the price negotiated by the union with the company in question was \$1.80 a pound. We are certainly not going to interfere with the normal collective bargaining procedures practiced by the Union in behalf of the fishermen to negotiate prices for lobsters or indeed any other species of fish got in the Province.

We have been in constant contact with the industry on this one, and the Union. And while at first I did have certain reservations with respect to maybe the company with whom they were

Mr. W. Carter: negotiation but certainly I have no reason to believe now that company will not perform. Indeed we have wired the company to the effect that we are going to be monitoring their operations pretty closely in the Province. And the first indication that they are doing anything that will have the effect of deceiving the fishermen or lessening the amount of - or at least the price being paid for their lobster that we will revoke their licence. Well certainly to this point in time I have no reason to doubt their credibility, and, in fact, I think the price being offered is a good one, and hopefully will set the pace for other lobster buyers in the Province.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. HODDER: I understand that a statement made by Harbour Foods about a month ago, they claimed that they could handle most or all of the lobster, I think, the figure they quoted was about the same figure, the total figure that the Province - the total catch of the Province each year. But it seems that - I spoke to the manager and he did not know where Port au Port was. Will the minister



MR. HODDER: work with this company to see that they have their buyers in every area, or will the minister be consulting with this company because at the present time they seem to be just buying from certain areas but yet they say they have markets for almost the total catch of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat what I said a moment ago that most fishermen today, inshore fishermen, are members of the Fisherman's Union. That union is now negotiating the price of lobsters with the company mentioned, and others. Certainly I have no intention of interfering with that normal collective bargaining process. I issued a warning last year to lobster buyers, and in fact introduced an amendment to the Fisheries Act in this House later to the effect that if I find out that they are in fact gouging the fishermen or not paying them a fair price for their lobster, or doing anything detrimental to the lobster fishermen, well then certainly we would take a second look at issuing them a license. And in fact the amendment to which I referred a moment ago now makes it necessary, mandatory for a lobster buyer to apply to the Provincial Department of Fisheries to get a special license to purchase lobsters. Before the amendment went through the House anybody could buy lobster on a general fish processing license, but at this point in time there must be a special license issued. I can only hope that the Fisherman's Union will continue to fight for better prices and certainly in that regard we will support them.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. HODDER: If the company has said that it will buy the total catch of the Province and has markets for that amount, surely the minister will try to insure that all fishermen benefit from the \$1.80 per lb. price rather than just those people who are in the Fisherman's Union?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, that goes without saying naturally we will endeavour to do what we can to ensure that all fishermen get \$1.80 per lb., in fact if it is possible maybe more than \$1.80 per lb. But certainly what can be done will be done, my department working with the union and the fishermen themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. gentleman from Terra Nova.

MR. NEARY: I would like to direct my question to the hon. the Premier. In reference to the statement made by the hon. gentleman this morning about Fishery Products, as the House knows, Mr. Speaker, it is the people of this Province who practically own Fishery Products; It was nationalized two years ago practically by the government. What I would like to ask the Premier is now that the Minister of Finance has abdicated his position under strain and stress, would the Premier tell us who represents the taxpayers, who represents the government now on the Board of Directors of Fishery Products?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, before this arrangement today it was the Deputy Minister of Fisheries and the Deputy Minister of Finance. After today they will have an independent board because no longer will there be a direct involvement by the government. They will be taking advantage of that extra bit of guarantee required to do massive capital financing as will other companies in the Province. And I might say, Sir, that there are a couple of other companies in the Province getting ready for proposals under the same scheme and we could say this being as much \$100 million for capital expansion. As I said, it is unfortunate that the Opposition are opposed to it.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a crock, it is a crock.

PREMIER MOORES: It is a crock, yes a crock, they refer to it as a crock.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

PREMIER MOORES: I have not finished the answer yet, Mr. Speaker. I almost forget what the question was now. But the fact is, Sir, that the government direct debt will be paid off by this guarantee financing and the financing is done through the Bank of Nova Scotia. As they have paid off the direct debt to the government, the government feels that there is no necessity to have representation on the board of a private company.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 5.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act To Regulate The Discounting Of Income Tax Refunds," carried. (Bill No. 21)

On motion, Bill No. 21 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

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

April 21, 1978

Tape 1344

EC - 1

MR. NEARY: Sit down, boy! Sit down!

You had the floor last night. Sit down!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1601-01.

The hon. the member for

Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, thank you very

much. I just barely started my two minutes on last evening -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! By way of

explanation, perhaps I should point out to the hon. Committee

that no one can adjourn the debate in Committee. This is

undoubted. It does not necessarily follow that because

someone spoke in the Committee last when the Committee rose

that when he is recognized he is being recognized as having

adjourned the Committee. The Chair attempts to be fair in

these matters and goes back and forth. It has been well

established in the past, and this has applied to members on

both sides of the House, where a member has had just a

few minutes before the Committee rose, to make his remarks

that the Committee has often recognized that member again.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not in the context of

having given that member a right to have adjourned the

Committee, which, of course, he has no right to do. The

Chair has merely considered that this has been fair and

has applied this rule to both sides of the House, and it

would be my intention to be as fair as possible in the

future.

The hon. the member for

Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, indeed I appreciate

Your Honour's ruling.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: First of all, I think it goes without saying that what we have witnessed this morning in the Legislature when the hon. the Premier presented one of the most progressive statements that has been made in the Legislature in recent history on rural development involving Twillingate, I understand just by the vibrations I have picked up that the bulk of the attention from the announcement will go to Twillingate, one of the most rural communities, places like St. Anthony and the like. It was summed up in the most unparliamentary terms by the Leader of the Opposition in a way which I am sure he is very unhappy about now.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Do the members of the House have to stand here and listen to the -

AN HON. MEMBER: You must sit in your place and listen in silence.

MR. W. N. ROWE: If it were any member of the House, Sir, I am sure Your Honour would protect him from having some other member say about him that he spoke in unparliamentary terms. If I spoke in unparliamentary terms, Sir, the Speaker would have drawn me to order or someone would have raised a point of order, I ask that Your Honour ask that hon. member to withdraw the statement that I or anyone else spoke in unparliamentary terms in this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: It is not a point of order, it is a difference of opinion, a difference of interpretation between two hon. members, and the hon. the Leader of the

MR. PECKFORD: Opposition now is acknowledging by getting up on such specious points of order that he has made statements which he is now sorry for and he is trying to use the guise of the point of order to acknowledge that kind of situation.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order,  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I think the Chair is in the position to rule on this point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I believe I have heard from both sides of the House, from the Leader of the Opposition in one case and from an hon. minister in the other case. I believe I am therefore in a position to rule on the point. If the imputation was that the hon. member has made remarks which may have been unparliamentary, I would point out to hon. members that derision and the accusation of being unparliamentary is out of order, and if the hon. member would withdraw any imputation in that regard I am sure it would help the work of the Committee.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I meant to use in talking the phrase 'undignified language'. I believe the hon. the Leader of the Opposition quite sincerely right now regrets the way that he came on this morning in referring to one of the finest bits of evidence of rural development that we have had in this Province is summed up in his word today, his attitude about rural development. But I want to get on to something a bit more important than that, Mr. Chairman.

Last evening we referred to and tabled in the Legislature the 130 communities that were on the resettlement list when the present Leader of the Opposition occupied the position in charge of the Community and Social Development Department some four or five years ago.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I was shocked and I believe hon. members were shocked when we got the evidence of the 130 communities, many of which today are the thriving communities that were involved.

I remember at one point having that list and refusing, as a matter of fact, refusing until now to get involved in it until the programme was killed, for the simple reason, Mr. Speaker, that communities that knew they were on this kind of a list, where no services would be provided, that they were being depopulated, it was a very discouraging and disheartening type of thing to be hanging over the community and until now of course the thing has been kept pretty quiet.

I am proud to have been associated for a couple of years with a department that has been working to try and turn around the resettlement, the concept of destroying the rural parts of our Province. I think we have in the Department of Rural Development one of the finest groups of people that we have in any department of the provincial government, some seventy-five people in the department at the present moment with programmes that are aimed in a very meaningful way to revitalize and re-establish rural development, rural communities, rural existence. It has been my contention that because of the programmes we have been able to maintain a level of stability, economic stability in our Province today, that we would not have had without this type of programme. I think we would have been in a lot of trouble, a lot more trouble, I can say, because we are continuously facing economic uncertainty, a lot more difficulty without the programmes that we have had in rural development.

I believe the rural development associations are emerging as a very strong force in our Province, very underestimated. In many areas of the Province people are not aware of them and many of the members of the Legislature obviously are not aware of them. When

MR. LUNDRIGAN: you listen to the member last evening for Lewisporte (Mr. F. White) getting up and taking on the Exploits Valley Development Association because they carried out an experimental programme - these associations by the way, Mr. Speaker, are incorporated totally independent of government, they operate as a corporation. They request funding from various sources, carry out their programmes in experimentation - and this was an example of where the member for Lewisporte was totally unaware of the programmes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last evening I heard some wrangling from various members, one of whom was the member for Burin - Placentia West when he talked about the resettlement programme that did away with a lot of communities, and that he thought that was a good thing. I heard the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) calling across the House, would people ever go back? I heard the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) talking about evidence of revitalization of communities that in fact are on this particular list. But that is not my major concern. My major concern is the philosophy and the attitude that exists in the minds of the people who are looking to form the government of this Province, and particularly my concern is, quite sincerely, my concern is the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition. Now people do not change their spots that dramatically. People do not change their attitudes that dramatically.

A very few years ago the Leader of the Opposition felt that there was no future in rural Newfoundland at all, get rid of it, over populated, benefit the young, do away with the kind of attitude. And I do not think the Leader of the Opposition -

MR. NOLAN: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order. Order, please!



MR. NOLAN: I mean surely no hon. member, we are told, is allowed to mislead. Now our hon. friend opposite has now stated that a few years ago the hon. leader wanted to get of all these people, he had no confidence in these communities and so on, that is not so.

MR. MORGAN: It is so.

MR. NOLAN: It is not so.

MR. MORGAN: It is so!

MR. NOLAN: He is misleading the House, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The point brought up I think clearly is in the area -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point brought up I think is clearly in the order of debate, there are differences of opinion, differences of interpretation on this point, but I do not think it is a point that comes under order.

The hon. member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Let me quote from a case study, a Newfoundland community consolidation programme, presented by the Minister of Community and Social Development, to the Harrison Thinkers Conference, November 21st., 22nd., 23rd., 1969. I will quote, Mr. Speaker, and I will give the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) the facts, what the hon. Leader of the Opposition -

AN HON. MEMBER: He knows the facts.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - what he believes in.

MR. DINN: If anybody is trying to mislead, he is.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: "Although the resettlement programme is justified on an economic cost analysis basis alone -

MR. DINN: You know the facts, you were there.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: -"the problem boils down, and the final analysis to a matter of value judgements,

MR. LUNDRIGAN: where a decision has to be taken as to what is to be considered the best mode of life. The best mode of life! The hon. the Leader of the Opposition decided what the best mode of life was. "Why then should many isolated Newfoundlanders be deprived of the choice of resettlement, for the choice does not exist for one who is chained to the rocks by the lack of funds or by the narrowness of vision caused by isolation."

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a great line.

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN: That is the statement of the Leader of the Opposition. "But we are still incumbered with an obsolete population distribution. Prior to government involvement on the resettlement program a population of less than one half a million was scattered throughout 1,300 communities. The plain ecological fact is that coastal Newfoundland is over populated."

MR. J. DINN: Do not try to defend that kind of thing, 'John! Do not try to defend it.

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN: "The provincial Budget speech of 1969" - listen to this as the objective, this is what scares me a little bit. "The provincial Budget speech of 1969 estimated that in about twenty years time the population of the Province will have concentrated itself into thirty-six urban settlements of approximately 10,000 people or more, into twenty-five primary centers of intermediate size, and into 200 communities averaging about a thousand population. If the forecast proves to be correct," the hon. Leader of the Opposition goes on and says, "If the forecast proves to be correct it will still mean that a total population of about 750,000 Newfoundlanders will be contained in more than 250 communities." 250 communities was the objective that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition had in mind for the population distribution of our Province. Today we have 800 communities in our Province.

MR. DINN: 310 municipalities.

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN: "Nevertheless the situation will be at least more manageable than it is at the present time, especially in

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN: respect of public services and economic opportunity that the population expects even now." It will be more manageable. The Leader of the Opposition said that is what we need, a more manageable population, not a more concentrated population in areas where there are economic opportunity. "These forecasts and estimates would appear to indicate that we must anticipate the pace of resettlement application accelerating further from the present level of about 5,000 a year to 8,000 a year. The present pace of resettlement is barely keeping up with the net increase in rural population." As if rural population is a disease! It is barely keeping up with the net increase in rural population. Therefore there is to be a significant dent made in the problem of rural over population." Is this the Leader of the Opposition? Is this to my friend from Conception Bay South some fabrication or my part? This was the philosophy of the Leader of the Opposition. I am not worried about the fact that there are not very many people living on Fair Island today or living on Bragg's Island today or living out in the various arms in Northern Dame Bay but, Mr. Speaker, the attitude that the Leader of the Opposition had and has today and has not changed is that the people of Newfoundland should be living in a handful of urban communities - more manageable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. DINN: Maybe we should all go to (Inaudible)

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, why all the heckling, why cackling, why all the cackling? What is going on? I got a funny feeling, Mr. Speaker, that this is a little bit more of a sore point than meets the eye. What has been happening in the last - ever since I can remember being involved in politics, with a number of people federally and all over the place, we argued with the federal government and argued here we had to do something to revitalize the rural economy of our Province. Ten years ago you could leave there and drive north along the Northeast Coast of our Province and the whole economy was in a mess. Almost no rural community had any prospect of any future. The basic reason was that the government did not, the Leader of the Opposition did not believe it should

April 21, 1978

Tape 1346

DW - 3

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN: continue to exist. Mr. Bob Hart, the father of resettlement at the federal level, a great friend of the Leader of the Opposition, argued and said that there is no reason for these communities to exist.

April 21, 1978

Tape 1347

EC - 1

MR. LUNDRIGAN: they should be resettled, we cannot manage them. There is no future in the inshore fishery. Now what a mess we would have been in today if we had followed the programme that the Leader of the Opposition had in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather ironical that the Leader of the Opposition representing Twillingate, a very rural community, can stand up in his place day after day and criticize this government because of its rural development policies. I find that amazingly contradictory. If there is anything that this government can stand for and stand behind and be proud of, it is the fact that we have brought back to life the rural parts of our Province. I grant you we have many problems in the more urban areas; I will grant you St. John's does not have the level of opportunity it had.

One of the comments which really rocked me, a couple of months ago I was down on Fogo Island and I was driving from Fogo Harbour to Seldom with Mr. Stagg, the manager of the fish operation there, and he said, 'You are representing Grand Falls.' He said, 'You must have an awful pile of problems in Grand Falls.' He said, 'I sometimes wonder what the people are going to do in Grand Falls.' 'What are they going to do,' he said, 'the new generations, the younger people?' and I agreed with him. That is one of my major concerns in a more urban setting. Ten years ago on Fogo Island, I went down with the member for Gander looking to be elected in 1968 and I came away depressed. I was up until 3:00 A.M. with people knocking on my door - problem after problem after problem.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I went to Tilting Harbour. People said, 'What are we going to do, Mr. Lundrigan?' 'Where do you stand on resettlement?' I said, 'I am against resettlement. You have to look to yourselves. You have your air, you have your resources, you are going to have to try to build it, revitalize it.' There was total depression. The population had gone down to over 4,000 people and the people were in danger of being moved off their island. Today the population is well over 5,000 people; one of the healthiest economies in the Province; I understand they have one of the highest levels of bank deposits of any community in the Province - a very, very prosperous Newfoundland community, or group of Newfoundland communities.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: At one point - the Leader of the Opposition will recall this story; I have not heard it contradicted, it was not contradicted last year by the former member for Twillingate who is no longer with us in the Legislature -

MR. FLIGHT: Why did you go out to Alberta?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - Fogo Island was to have a major announcement, as the story goes, and I will throw it out for the Leader of the Opposition - he was part of the planning group that was going down to make a major announcement on Fogo Island, not the type of major announcement we heard today - and the then Premier was going to tell the people of Fogo Island that he had a great opportunity for them. If they were willing to move over to Musgrave Harbour, he would provide central port facilities, regional high schools, water and sewer for them. And it was announced as a major conference for

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Fogo Island people. They had the platform all set up, all ready to go when the then Premier -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: I know Your Honour gave a ruling there a few moments ago that Your Honour likes to go back and forth, but in all fairness - and Your Honour was trying to be fair about this and I appreciate the comments of the Chair - but does Your Honour not think in all fairness that the time that was consumed and wasted by the hon. gentleman last night should not be added to the twenty minutes? Is that not only fair too, Sir, to this side of the House rather than have obstruction and delay tactics and using up the five hours that we have under this sub-head, Mr. Chairman?

. Including five minutes

last night.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, for the record, if Your Honour will recall, it was two minutes and twelve seconds, I think it was, when the hon. gentleman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: - two minutes and twelve seconds?

Well, whatever it was, it was a modestly short time, but in any event it is not a point of order. The hon. gentleman knows that. He knows it is not a point of order and he knows that any gentleman when he rises has twenty minutes to speak. So where is the point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Order, please! On the point of order I think the issue is quite clear. Our rules state that if an hon. member is recognized in Committee he does

April 21, 1978

Tape 1347

EC - 4

MR. CHAIRMAN: have twenty minutes and I am afraid that the Chair has no other option but to recognize that.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I will get quickly to the point. Just as the Leader of the Opposition as one of the advisers to the then Premier was on the way down to Fogo Island to announce this beautiful scheme they had for resettlement, there was a petition came in out of Musgrave Harbour asking that they be relocated to Come By Chance, because at that time Come By Chance was being talked of as the Mecca - and also the fourth or fifth or sixth mill, whatever the case might be, I forget the numbers.



MR. LUNDRIGAN: this is an example of the way that rural development was going. Today Musgrave Harbour did not, thank God, resettle because last year they got a new fish plant, they have all kinds of earnings, twenty-two new homes are being built and you can leave here today and you can go North from here to Nain and you will see a changing face in Newfoundland and it is my hope that in the next number of years, with the upward movements in our economy in Canada and our Province -

MR. NEARY: You cannot make the hon. gentleman any -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - Mr. Chairman, that we will get some other kinds of activity that will help give up a lift in some of the urban areas because this is where many of our problems are today. When I look on a political figure, I am not as interested in the odds and ends that he does or does not do, My main concern is in his attitude, in his philosophy, what he believes in, what his real gut concern is for his people. And when I analyze this document it tells me a whole pile of stuff about the Leader of the Opposition, and I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that the people of Newfoundland - maybe that is what they want, but I doubt it very much. I hope that they get a chance to really learn what the Leader of the Opposition believes with respect to rural development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Five minutes left, I understand, Mr. Chairman, in the estimates of this department, five or six minutes, so it is difficult to grapple with all the things which have been mentioned in the House over the last four or five hours but five minutes should be enough to demolish utterly the hon. member who last spoke. If patriotism, Sir, is the last refuge of a scoundrel, then ancient history must be the last refuge of a frightened incompetent.

This hon. member, Sir, who was a failure as a member in Ottawa, and who could not get re-elected, a man who bolts

MR. W.N. ROWE: from a Cabinet and then comes back again, back and forth, back and forth, does not know where he stands, now proposes to stand up here and think that his words uttered are going to be taken with any credibility whatsoever. What a joke, Mr. Speaker. He does not know where he stands. He does not know whether he is with the government or against the government, Scurry out of the House now, Sir, because he knows that he has not got what it takes. Failure, Sir, has gone to that hon. gentleman's head. Failure has gone to his head, Sir. He cannot make a rational judgement anymore. Anybody who is intelligent on the other side, and there are some, for example the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) - no, for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) rather. I almost make a big mistake there, did I not? The member for St. John's East is not all that intelligent but he is educated, educated beyond his intelligence.

AN HON. MEMBER: Educated fool.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), who has the respect of everyone on both sides of this House, and the public, wrote a little document back in 1959- ancient history- What you need to know about the government's policy on centralizing populations, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go on, is that right?

MR. W.N. ROWE: In 1959, as a government economist, rational, sensible things, said "One point must be made clear in the beginning, is that the government will not move people or in any way force them to move. What we will do is help them to move if they are absolutely sure they want to move."

MR. NEARY: That is the great marathon runner, is it?

MR. W.N. ROWE: So I am not going to get into that ancient history, Sir, Ancient history, we have already established, is the last refuge of a frightened incompetent, a man who made a mess of the government departments he was in, Industrial Development, Rural

MR. W.N. ROWE: Development, then scurried out like a scared rabbit pretending - trying to save his own skin, knowing he was on a sinking ship represented by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has come up.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, you know, if this is allowed to go on - Look, it says that abusive and insulting language is not to be used with respect to another member in this House. The hon. member has long ago transgressed that particular rule. He does it again and again. I do not know the reasons. You usually find this kind of reaction from people, you know, where somebody has hit home, or they have something to hide or what have you. But the point of the matter is this, that this House is disintegrating around our ears, and it is disintegrating because language like this is allowed to be used. Language of this nature requires, Mr. Chairman, prompt interference, I suggest that there be prompt interference and a requirement that the Leader of the Opposition, above all people here, as leader of a party, refrain from this type of attack because all it is doing is just dragging this House and this Committee down in the mire and down into the ill repute which the public now holds it in.

MR. NEARY: You should know that, you have been down the -

MR. W.N. ROWE: On that point of order, Sir -

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - I withdraw, under the onslaught of the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), I withdraw everything that I have said to date. Now if I can continue my few remarks?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point of order has been disposed of.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: It has been disposed of. I have withdrawn everything, Sir. Let me make this little comment, though, that the hon. member, Sir, who could not get in a rural seat in this Province had to scurry off the most urban P.C. seat to get elected, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: - has the face to come in here and talk about rural Newfoundland. What a joke, Sir!

Let us talk not about ancient history, Sir, in the minute we have left - the last refuge of a frightened incompetent - ancient history to cover up the blunders of the present and the lack of planning or position or policy for the future. Let us talk about the present, for a moment, let us talk about the new resettlement programme, the new resettlement programme, fostered, developed and devised and contrived by this government, Mr. Chairman. The new resettlement programme.

MR. NEARY: Across the Gulf!

MR. W. ROWE: Twenty per cent unemployment -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: - fostered by that hon. member when he was Minister of Industrial Development. What industry except closed down. Let us talk about the resettlement programme from Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: Eight thousand gone.

MR. W. ROWE: Let us talk about resettlement programme from Come By Chance, let us talk about the resettlement programme from every other community in this Province - to where, Sir

MR. NEARY: St. Lawrence.

MR. W. ROWE: To another part of Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. NEARY: Goose Bay and St. Lawrence.

MR. W. ROWE: No, Sir, Iran. Resettle the people of Newfoundland under this minister's policy to Saudi Arabian. There is your spot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: Under this hon. Minister of Industrial Development policy, Saudi Arabian.

SOME HON. MEMBERS Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: Now, Sir, just get a little closer to home - let us resettle whole families, and young people to Calgary.

MR. PECKFORD: Gay Paris.

MR. NEARY: Fort MacMurray.

MR. W. ROWE: Toronto, Sir, Every single year for the past six years, thousands of young people and families in this Province forced out of this Province to resettle themselves, not from the Horse Islands to LaScie- an urban population of 1,500, LaScie - not from the Horse Islands, where there were no hospital facilities, twenty children, no schooling facilities, to LaScie where they were within driving distance of a hospital, excellent schools, water and sewer systems and so on, not from the Horse Islands to LaScie, Sir, but from Stephenville -

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, that is right.

MR. W. ROWE: - to Saudi Arabia.

MR. NEARY: St. Lawrence.

MR. W. ROWE: From St. Lawrence, Sir, to Calgary. That is the new resettlement programme, devised, contrived and executed by that hon. minister who has resigned from a government in disgrace.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I do have to point out that I am afraid time has elapsed.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By leave?

I understand leave is not given.

On motion 1601-01 through 1604-02-03, carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! The officers at the table have difficulty in calling out the headings.

April 21, 1978

Tape No. 1349

NM - 3

On motion 1603-01 through 1607-07-03, carried.

On motion Head XVI, carried without amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page twenty-nine, Head VI - Education, 601-01.  
The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, in introducing the Education estimates I am asking for the grand total of \$305 million, and a net expenditure of \$285,447,000. This is a very large expenditure, a large portion of the total provincial budget, and of course is a very significant and important aspect of provincial development, as we do consider the development of our people a very important resource.

We have now, at the present time, just under 156,000 pupils in our schools in the Province, and at the present time 7,865 teachers. Both these will decrease next year, both the student population and the teacher population as we have indicated by 127. We also have about 18,000 pupils of all ages, I guess, in the post secondary aspect of education. About 9,000 full time equivalents, I guess, at the university and 9,000 in our vocational schools and various colleges, the Fisheries College and the Trades College.

In addition to that, of course, there is about 20,000 people involved in adult and continuing education. When one realizes, of course, the magnitude of these numbers it shows that we have a large percentage of our people who are being educated, perhaps the biggest percentage of any province in Canada. And these statistics, of course, show it takes a lot of manpower to train, a lot of facilities, and a lot of accommodations.

It also presents a great challenge to us in curriculum, programmes and of course administration and financial wherewithal, and I think that last one is very important. We look at the cost this year of the Education budget, it is gone up by about five per cent, which incidentally is in line with what the other provinces are doing. And there has been an effort, and I make no apologies for it, and I think it is a general trend across the Western world, particularly in Canada, to try to curb costs. Because

MR. HOUSE: if we had had the growth, if we had continued the growth we had at the beginning of the last five years, we just would not be able to stand it financially. And the great challenge with the department, and with the school boards in the Province, is to try to curb costs, which they have done a marvellous job on doing, and to maintain or even improve quality.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps it is popular to be able to say that we are spending a lot more this year than last, and this seems to be a trend, but again I am going to say I make no apologies for trying to be fiscally responsible.

I think that with regards to costs the same can be said about education as the Federal Minister of Finance said the other day in bringing down his budget; he said something to the effect, "We have grown in Canada too big too fast." Well I would not go that far to say that totally about education. I agree that we have got to stand back and take a look at where we are going with respect to costs and education and to review their relationship between cost and quality.

Mr. Chairman, if we look back at the preceeding decade, we had a rash of royal commissions, and I use that word royal commission because in the sixties we had these grandiose plans developed and one would want to read them to see how these commissions reflected into the expectations of people. And I am not referring specifically to the commission report we had here, which was a good report, I was thinking -

AN HON. MEMBER: Warren?

MR. HOUSE: Yes. I am not reflecting on that but I am reflecting on some of the - the Worth Commission out West and the Grand Commission in Nova Scotia.

MR. NEARY: There was one in Ontario -



April 21, 1978

Tape No. 1350

NM - 3

MR. HOUSE: Yes. That is right. That was a big one. And of course they attributed a lot of qualities to education that perhaps we could not meet. It certainly did develop people's expectations and of course that was as a result of people being involved

MR. HOUSE:

in it. And anyone, I think, who would take these and read them today would realize that a lot of what came about from them was much more based on philosophical argument than on good empirical research. And this is what we have got to have today, I think, in our education programmes and our development is to look back at what real research says.

MR. NEARY: The parents had no input in these (inaudible)

MR. HOUSE: Oh, yes, the parents had a lot of input in these Royal Commissions.

MR. NEARY: They (inaudible)

MR. HOUSE: Oh, yes.

MR. NEARY: They were not on the commission.

MR. HOUSE: No, they were not on the commission but they certainly had input.

MR. NEARY: Like the one announced today, the task force (inaudible) but no parents.

MR. HOUSE: I will mention that one a little later.

MR. NEARY: All right.

MR. HOUSE: Now, Mr. Chairman, there are two or three things in the Budget that are going to appear to cause us some problems. The boards - they have the busing problem where we have laid an extra 5 per cent to the school boards. That particular thing can be offset somewhat by the announcement this morning by the Minister of Finance about an extra \$400,000 saving by the retail sales tax; the other one is the teacher layoff which I will mention: textbooks' where we gave all free textbooks up to Grade VIII, including Grade VIII, and now we have asked that they

MR. HOUSE: purchase their consumables which will average about \$5, but front-end loaded to the younger pupils, and I think the most they will have to pay there, except for one board that has a very extensive programme in one particular discipline, it is going to be about an \$8 cost. The other thing is the teacher layoff, and in the last few weeks, as a matter of fact about three weeks before the Budget, we announced that of course, there would be 127 less teachers in the Province next year. The word 'quality' of course, has been bandied about. We have heard people discussing that quality of education is going to suffer drastically as a result of these 127 teachers distributed just about all across the Province. And one is led to believe - and I have had petitions from areas where they are losing one teacher. Now I have been saying and we have been saying and we still maintain that the layoffs will not have an appreciable effect on the quality of education.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is an assumption, of course.

MR. HOUSE: It is an assumption the same as everybody else is making - that is right. And of course, there has been a very well orchestrated protest and I think everybody recognizes and realizes that it is well orchestrated because there have been letters gone out from the NTA - and I do submit that they are making a protest and they are making a point - but the whole thing about it is that I believe that we are emphasizing the loss of quality too much there and I believe that one other thing to be taken into consideration - I agree that the teachers, themselves are concerned with quality, but they are also concerned with job security just the same as I am concerned with that kind of thing. And that thing cannot be overlooked.

MR. HOUSE: So there are a few things I cannot understand about the argument that quality is going to go down. I cannot really understand that. When a population is growing, a one to twenty-six ratio seems to be fairly adequate.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HOUSE: Well, we are not getting the reaction from the boards that have the one to twenty-six ratio. It seems to be a pretty good situation. But when the population declines, a one to twenty-six ratio is terrible. Now I cannot see that. And I have been involved in education, I have been involved where there have been declining enrolments, and I know there are going to be some inconveniences, but I do not think there is going to be any appreciable loss of quality. But I do believe that if it went to the extreme that was talked about at the beginning where somebody had said there is going to be 27,000 pupils less in the next five years - we are going to have 1,200 pupils less - I think, of course, that would have an appreciable effect and I do not think we have any intention of letting that happen.

Now the purpose of the task force that was announced this morning is to look into the problem with a view not to dealing alone with the problem of declining enrolments, but to try to maximize what seems to be a negative into a positive, and with a view not to maintaining quality, but a view to improving it. And I would hope that the various groups, the NTA,

MR. HOUSE: the school boards, the PTA, will recognize what it was set up for and give us a chance to review the situation.

Now there was some talk morning about the task force when it was announced and some reaction to it. If hon. members would understand the main reason for the task force is to try and look at the whole gambit of education just on the periphery, to take into consideration the declining enrollments and to look somewhat into quality education and the development of programmes, and the allocation of school board grants and monies.

The thing is we wanted to do with that rather rapidly. The NTA want us to have a report in by the 30th. of May, of course which we think is virtually impossible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, can we have a quorum call?

AN HON. MEMBER: Come in 'Steve,' boy, and sit down. Do not be so foolish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: There is a quorum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the Clerk to count the House.

A quorum is present.

The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: I said that first of all they wanted a report by the 30th. of May and we felt that we could not get it by the 30th. of May, the 30th. of June would be a more reasonable date. And the other thing, they wanted the full study to be completed by the end of the calendar year. And of course you know that was going to necessitate a lot of intense work. So we have appointed these two co-chairmen, which was stated this morning.

Now the reason for not going to the general public is because of the fact that there is just not time to get it done and the other thing is getting representative groups, all interested groups

MR. HOUSE: in education, and you can name off dozens of them, to have representation you would have an unwieldy group to work with and I do not think we would be able to do it as efficiently and we would not get it done in the time frame that we want. And on the other hand too we had discussed it with the other groups, and the NTA for instance is generally totally in agreement, the NTA officials we contacted, with going the route that we have gone.

So that is the reason for that approach. The other part of it is that we are not forgetting all the various agencies because we are soliciting information, input from all the other organizations in education and in that way we think we will get a better consensus than by having just one representative.

I am very happy with the task force, the terms of reference and the enthusiasm which the two people who have been appointed are going to work on the problem.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having talked about the budget and saying that I make no apologies for it, but recognizing that there are inconveniences and economic restraints, we are still making progress. Growth, to use sometimes educational jargon, is not only horizontal, it can be vertical or vertical and horizontal. The fact that no new structures are added in terms of total programmes do not imply lack of development. There has been much made in curriculum and one of the things I saw a little while ago in the Throne Speech debate was the Leader of the Opposition making some reaction to education and talking about the archaic curriculum.

Now there has been tremendous growth in new curriculum programmes in the last two or three years and it is still ongoing, and if the curriculum is not adequate, if it is not what people expect, it is because it must be the blame cannot be squarely laid at the department because we have involved all levels of people in curriculum development. And I

MR. HOUSE: want to point out to the hon. House that any programme that is put in the schools is put there with the blessing and with the input, total input from the teaching profession. I think that has added to the quality of education in the province. We have had a number of new programmes in science, math, completely new, french, physical education and of course we always get people coming back and saying to us, why do we not have labour education? Why do we not have fishery education? Why do we not have consumer education? We do not have all that embodied in the curriculum but there is latitude for school boards to do that. I was very interested last year to see a tremendously good programme put on by the school out in Conception Bay on the fishery. The other day I picked up the Daily News and in consumer affairs of course there was an exam on consumer education and this was in fact coming from a school where the grade tens, I think, were doing a full total course on consumer education and I would almost challenge anybody in the House to be able to write that exam that they had published there and get, say, seventy or eighty per cent in it.

So there has been continued growth and development in that respect. In our vocational education programme and this has been eluded to a number of times about the weaknesses and that the Department of Education is responsible for pre-employment programmes in the province and we recognize that there has been weaknesses in keeping programmes up-to-date. We have appointed or getting put into place now curriculum specialists to develop programmes. There are two or three developments in vocational education that should not go unnoticed and that is the performance base programmes where students go at their own rate. They are doing this now I think in business education and this is the second year. They are doing it also in some of the trades. There is one in carpentry that I am aware of going on in Clarenville.

So there is continued development there and again that is coming largely from the teachers themselves and we are giving

MR. HOUSE: them the encouragement and also the specialists to help them with it. One of the great things I think last year which would be interesting to the -

MR. W.N. ROWE: A quorum call.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I do not recognize that a quorum is not present.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is a quorum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I may just allude to the rules for a few moments just to make clear the situation, I would allude to standing rule 4 (d) which states, "When the Speaker's attention has been directed to the fact that there is not a quorum present," I will not go on from there but it implies that a quorum must not be present. If the Speaker's attention, and this applies in Committee also to the fact that there may not be a quorum present. There is no call, I do not think, on the Chair to do anything about it. It states here to the fact that there is not a quorum present. So a quorum has to be not present for the Chair to need to do anything. In my own knowledge at the point, including the Chairman, one has to include the Chairman in the count, that there was a quorum present at the time.

The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I was just about to refer to one of the newer developments last year which was in a pilot last year and that was the Bay St. George Community College, which is to be officially opened next Wednesday. I want to point out that that college is having a tremendous success. We have a board put in place there and this college is certainly responding to the needs of the community. When I looked back the other day at the remarks that were made last year when we put it into place, I think we can prove conclusively now, and I have some documentation, that really what we have done there is we are on the right road. It is going to certainly change the post-secondary education development throughout the province if we can come up and initiate it all over, because I have seen programmes put on just at the behest of a number of people and we are very happy with it.



April 21, 1978

Tape No. 1353

JM - 3

MR. HOUSE: Of course we are not developing there as fast as we would like to but again it is all tied into financial restraints. But what we are doing I think is in the right direction there.

The other thing that was mentioned the other day about the Fisheries College and I wanted to bring that in

April 21, 1978

Tape 1354

EC - 1

MR. HOUSE: how we are responding to the public because -

MR. NEARY: You are about five minutes over time already.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. member has just about twenty seconds.

MR. HOUSE: I just want to mention there that the Fisheries College has gone to about sixty communities helping put up programmes for fishermen in these communities - sixty communities involving 1,125 people engaged in the fishery.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do have to bring to the hon. minister's attention that his time has elapsed.

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, just listening to the minister, the minister said a few minutes ago that he did not feel - and this has been the argument that has been bandied about - that he did not feel that there was any quality lost in education due to the teacher layoffs, but every time he has mentioned that he has never given any reason for his assumption. And I will try to show if I can - and I am sure that if the hon. members on the other side were to go into the classrooms and talk to some of the principals of schools in this Province they would find that there is a loss of quality and will be a loss of quality of education.

I also think, Mr. Chairman, that the announced task force this morning - I do not know why this was done this morning except to perhaps throw a smoke screen over the estimates and over some of the ministers' and the government's failings.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. HODDER: Because, Mr. Chairman, that particular task force was announced, it was called for by the NTA and I must say that I am surprised - you see, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the cutbacks in education were done in much the same way as they were done in health. When a question was put by my hon. colleague from St. George's (Mrs. McIsaac) to the Minister of Health just after the Budget about the \$3 medical fee, he did not know how it was going to be applied. Well, the same thing happened with the Minister of Education's part of the Budget because these cutbacks were taken with no idea of what the consequences would be, with no consultation with the teachers or with the school boards or with the students, and so we now see that these cutbacks are causing great hardship throughout the Province, but yet the minister can only now boldly face back and say that there is no such thing as a loss of quality of education. Mr. Chairman, there has not been such a backward step in education or in enlightenment since Atilla the Hun. What the government has done in the last Budget to education in this Province will be remembered forever more. I can see the minister when he looks back on his years as Minister of Education and I think he will look back with regret because he will be remembered as the minister who had most to do with taking education back to the 1930s.

Mr. Chairman, this government must define what the social needs of this Province are and they must also define what the economic needs are. We are well aware that the Province has been suffering economic pressures during the past six years since this government took over. And before we tamper with education

MR. HODDER: we must know what we are doing. I know that when the economic needs of the Province are acute there is a tendency to think in terms of cutback on social programmes and I am sure that there are social programmes that can be cut back on, but we cannot neglect the advances that we have made in education since the 1960s and we cannot have a reversal. I believe that money can be saved in education, but any attempts to do so must be done carefully. And I welcome the task force to study education. I think that is a step in the right direction, but it is a step taken too late. Perhaps we should look at why the parents across this Province are so upset because of teacher cutbacks. It is not because the parents of Newfoundland children care greatly about the teacher layoff. It is not particularly that, because there are so many people losing their jobs themselves in this Province that perhaps a couple of hundred jobs does not mean an awful lot, but it is because the Newfoundland people realize the strides that have been made in education and they are looking for even greater improvements.

Up to 1950, Mr. Chairman, the people of this Province had onerous social controls placed on them. It was a control based on economics

MR. J. HODDER:

supported by the government and perpetuated by church and schools. Fishermen were vassals to the merchants, and the government was composed of merchants and the upper classes, and the schools taught us to maintain the status quo and our curriculum was set up in England somewhere with English textbooks and this was a tight class structure where no one got out of the outports to further their education. This class structure started to break down after Newfoundland joined Canada and efforts were made to encourage students into the university and large amounts of money was available for education. So as late as 1955, when there were only 700 students at Memorial University, there was no vocational system at that time, the majority of students still came from St. John's, Corner Brook, and Grand Falls. Then in about 1960 changes took place in the Province, physical changes, a new university, the College of Trades and Technology and vocational schools were constructed throughout the Province. Then after 1965, after that particular building period we saw a leap forward in the quality of education in this Province. We saw the introduction of multiple programs in schools, an attempt was made to get away from American textbooks. The handicapped and the disadvantaged were taught, were given special attention as well as students who had special abilities. In recent years we have seen the public exams have been done away with in grade nine and ten and attempts have been made to make the curriculum part of the local environment. And teachers have had more input in curriculum in the schools, and we have had physical education, music, industrial arts, home economics and badly needed guidance programs in the school. These are not frills, these are essentials. But why are parents so upset presently and why are Newfoundlanders concerned? It is because we do not want to return to the past, and the changes announced in this Budget can only reverse the trends of the 1960s and 1970s.

I see, Mr. Chairman, that from the cut-backs taken in education that we will be returning to middle of the road teaching, standardized testing, teachers dependency on textbooks

MR. J. HODDER:

all of those things, Mr. Chairman.

At the present time we have plans for accreditation of schools.

Will this disappear? In the Budget, blocks were put in the path of students attending university and school boards were given financial responsibility that they could not afford, and the most important reason why teachers and students and parents are upset is because their dreams have been shattered. We thought we were moving forward but instead we are returning to the things that I just mentioned.

And at the present time let us look at

some of the things that we would like to overcome in our schools today. At the present time we have an alien curriculum, textbooks are written on the mainland and are geared to an Ontario value system, and I think it is crucial to this Province that we develop a curriculum geared to the needs of Newfoundland students. Students must learn to appreciate the Province, the life and death struggle, if you will, that we have with nature in this Province, and the problems we have trying to make a living from the forest and from our fishery. And if this Province is to develop, Mr. Chairman, we must educate our people to the needs of this Province. We must develop a curriculum so that we understand what we are, who we are, what we have and how to deal with what we have. And these are the strides that we were hoping to see in our school systems and these are the things that can only be done if the teacher has the wherewithal to do it, and the school board has the ability to run the program and the teacher has the proper ratio in his classroom and the proper time to develop programs. I think we must also learn to articulate our needs in this Province. One of a lot of problems in rural areas in this Province is that many people have not been trained to articulate their needs. The schools are doing nothing about it and I believe that we must teach children to become active, participating students who understand our Province and the functioning of its political, economic and social system.

Mr. Chairman, the announced cut backs in education have stopped this, stymied this effectively. I believe that we are on the right track, the teachers were on the right track, the educators were on the right track in this Province, but we need time.

April 21, 1978

Tape 1355

DW - 3

MR. J. HODDER: There are many teachers in the Province who are moving in the right direction, and some of those teachers were younger teachers, and these younger teachers, who are full of energy and bright and have just come into the school system, they are the first ones to go, Mr. Chairman, and so what we are losing is we are losing some of our best talent in the schools.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, the minister says that the quality of education will not be affected. I think that there are misconceptions both on the government side of the House and in some parts of the province as to the effects that cutbacks will have on the children in Newfoundland schools. At first look it would seem that if you have fewer students you can have fewer teachers and education will not suffer. Fine. You know, it makes sense for anybody who does not think about it - fewer children, fewer teachers. But the fact is that students do not leave school in any set pattern. They do not leave in a set pattern, Mr. Chairman. A school could lose students from every classroom with only a small drop in the enrollment of each class and yet lose one teacher for the whole school. If this happens in a high school, then the choice must be made by the school who to let go. They want to try to keep instruction in the classroom so who is the first to go? The specialist. I heard the minister the other day, or some time ago, talking about that if you want to go into education now you should go in the specialist field because there are too many teachers and there is a sort of a crunch.

Mr. Chairman, what happens with those cutbacks and you cannot manipulate the teachers who are teaching in the regular classroom? Who are the first to go in some of those schools? I can name right them now. The specialists are the first to go. The physical education teacher or the guidance counsellor or the home economics or the industrial arts, these are the people who will go first, and then the non-tenured young teacher who is coming into the system. Now what is happening in the primary and elementary schools in this province? It is the disadvantaged child who has the most to lose since presently small classes have been set up to help those children. I think I gave an example here in the House the other day where some seventy or eighty students in a class, and it was loaded in a particular reading programme so that there were about thirty students in one class doing enriched reading programmes, the middle group, who were doing sort of



MR. J. HODDER: a standard programme with emphasis on grammar and the mechanical skills, and the third class which was a very small class and this is happening in this school. This is one example that is happening with the group of the more disadvantaged students from homes perhaps where they did not have the opportunity for academic achievement. These students will all have to be lumped into two classes next year so there will be no programme for those disadvantaged students. That is happening and it is happening in more than one school. But in the primary and elementary schools it will be the disadvantaged child who will lose most since presently small classes have been set up to help those children and the students who need the most help will be the ones that will suffer the most.

Mr. Chairman, we look at what is happening in the university. The requirements have been raised for student loans to \$750.00 and tuitions are going up and all that sort of thing. I remember talking to, and I have talked with many, many students; as a matter of fact I spoke to one last night and there is one in this House of Assembly as well who sits in this House who says if it were not for free tuition back during the time of the former administration he would not have a university degree today and would most likely not be sitting in this House. Now I know, Mr. Chairman, we cannot have free university education the way it goes but we do not make it harder. In this province students must come to St. John's from all over the province -

AN HON. MEMBER: Or Corner Brook.

MR. HODDER: Or Corner Brook, but if you want any advanced education you have to come to St. John's. I know students right now, Mr. Chairman, in the community of Lourdes, two students who are not going to be able to go back to the university next year if they have to pay more money, who have come from very poor homes. One is the daughter of a widow who is scraping to try to get there. We are also in a province where student unemployment reaches about fifty per cent during the summertime. What we are doing now is we are going back to the time when I went

April 21, 1978

Tape No. 1356

JM - 3

MR. HODDER: to university in 1957. We were at the old building, which is now the Fisheries College and there were about 700 students there and about a third of them were from St. John's and the rest were from -

MR. HODDER: and everybody had parents who could afford to send them. And that is what we are going back to because the people in the rural districts, the people in Fox Island River and Black Duck Brook and Cape St. George, where their fathers used to work in the woods with Labrador Linerboard or whatever it happens to be, and who are now drawing unemployment, all of those students, those are the ones that are going to be hurt. And the other shocking statistic, as regards the rest of the Province, only about 50 per cent of Newfoundlanders in that particular age group go to university. So I think the administration should hang its head in shame.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: We are going back to the days of the Tory regime in Newfoundland before Confederation when merchants ran the government and the Tory government was tied in with the business of this Province. That is what we are going back to, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: And let us look at busing, the effect it has on rural areas now that the school boards have to pay 10 per cent rather than five. Now some school boards do not have any busing at all, but the school boards that have centralized schools and a lot of busing, these are the school boards which are going to have to pay a very high cost for busing, so that there is a discrimination, Mr. Chairman, between rural areas and the areas which are more centralized.

And there is another disparity which exists, Mr. Chairman, as far as school boards are concerned in this Province. At the present time in

MR. HODDER: Newfoundland schools, most schools are dependent on the school tax for a great deal of their funds. Now I will just take one example. In 1977 the school tax in Stephenville/Port au Port district was \$55 as compared to \$75 in St. John's. The amount collected in Stephenville/Port au Port district was \$29 per student as compared to \$105 for a student in St. John's, and no allowance is being made for financially depressed areas. And now, besides that we are going to hammer it to the school boards which have the highest rural population. So, Mr. Chairman, it certainly seems to me that those school boards that are in rural areas are being punished by this government and that the policies of this government are backward and are not thought out in any way, shape or form.

Mr. Chairman, I might say something else, that I think that the Minister of Education should be moved from his portfolio - either moved or taken out of the Cabinet or whatever, - that is the Premier's decision - but he has lost the confidence of the teachers, totally lost the confidence of the teachers, lost the confidence of the parents of this Province, lost the confidence of his own staff, and, Mr. Chairman, the only solution when a minister loses the confidence - the Minister of Education loses the confidence of the teachers and parents in this Province is to move him to another department or move him out altogether.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not get nasty.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, if I could have the floor for a minute or two, there are a few points

MR. J. CARTER: that could be made and should be made.

I notice from the estimates that there is approximately \$285 million to \$295 million allocated for education and the disparity in the figure is whether you take the total amount or just the provincial input. This works out to anything from \$1,800 to \$2,000 per pupil, which certainly is expensive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Could I ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to quiet the noise in the corridor?

MR. J. CARTER: Pupil/teacher ratio, I understand, is about one to twenty-six. Now for this amount of money we should be able to educate our population, but the comments that I get going across country, and trying my best to keep my ear to the ground, are that Grade XI graduates can neither read nor write. Now this is not true of all of them obviously, but employers say to me that more and more they are

MR. J. CARTER: finding that grade eleven graduates can read and write less and less. And this is a very unfortunate comment upon our educational system. And without telling any tales out of school, or giving any names, I can recount an incident that I had personal involvement in when I was with the department, and that was a young man who came in and said that he wanted to have his geometry exam re-read, this was his final exam. He said when he had taken his geometry exam in the school he had gotten over eighty per cent and he felt that since this final exam was in two parts, because his mark was so low, that one half of the exam must have been lost and mislaid and would I please have his exam re-read. So I said, 'This time I will, I will call for it and have it re-read but in future if you want this, or anyone wants this done again, we will have to make a minimum charge.' And when we had his examination re-read, his final examination re-read, it was utterly illiterate and yet that boy had gotten eighty per cent in the school exam. Now I would like to know what was wrong. The sad fact is, I am afraid, that student's marks are being granted and they have nothing to do with the student's performance. So I think that some of the schools should be very seriously indicted on this point.

The libraries, in my view, are not adequate and I realize that libraries are expensive but I think there has been too little effort made on the part of school boards and school authorities to get donations, not donations of cash, but donations of books from individuals. Nowadays the Time, Life series and the so-called coffee table books that are more illustrative than wordy, they provide an excellent background, or an excellent quickie look at anything from the sea, to the earth, to the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Kind of expensive though.

MR. J. CARTER: They are expensive. They are quite expensive. That is why I say I do not think school boards can afford to go out and buy a whole lot of these books. But how many people have these books at home. They have had them for a while, they have looked through them, everybody is familiar with them, They could either give them or lend them to the school boards or to the schools and they would make a very welcome addition to their library. I realize that books have a fairly high mortality in the school because they are being handled so much, but these are well bound books, not magazine type things, and I think that the general public should be encouraged to donate these type of books to the school libraries and I think it would make quite a difference.

Again, another point that I would like to hear the minister comment on, and also hon. members opposite, is to what extent do they feel that school buildings are adequately utilized? At three o'clock in the afternoon the only thing in the schools are possibly the few ghosts that may be floating around. The gymnasiums, the sports facilities, even to get the use of a school at night for a meeting is very, very hard, and I think this is a sad commentary. You know, here is all this money being spent and so little use being made of it.

So one of the big problems, and one of the reasons for all this is that the school boards, and I am looking at the estimates now, and I am looking at 605-03 -02, Operational grants - it is in the estimates there - \$23,500,000, and this is the operational grants for all the school boards. And of course the school boards have to make do with that; all the other expenses are beyond their control, the teachers salaries, the amount for busing, the building and equipping of schools, the insurance, the salaries of teachers, superintendents, etc., all that is totally outside the school boards' control.

MR. J. CARTER: Now the federal government forces the provinces to take block funding and I often think that we could take a leaf out of their book. If we are forced to accept block funding from Ottawa, why do we not make our agencies that depend upon government accept block funding? In other words, take the total amount of the Education vote, or a great deal more of it than \$23,500,000, and divide it by the number of school boards, or on some equitable basis which everyone could agree on, or that a neutral third party could agree on, and give it to the schools and say, "Here, go ahead." Either do that or else take over the running of the schools ourselves as a government. I do not think you can have your cake and eat it too. And without meaning to be unkind, I think the previous administration, and the administration before that, I do not think you can blame it all on the previous administration, but you can blame some of it on even the one before that, has to take some of the responsibility for the way they have set up our education. And we certainly are a product of our history, but I feel that this is one



MR. J. CARTER: great error that we have made and I think that this would be one great improvement that could be effective. The other thing that I deploze, and again I think there are reasons both for and against it, and that is the tri-level division of schools from kindergarten to grade six, from grade seven to grade nine and then from grade ten to grade eleven. This results to some extent in needless duplication. It results in a loss of school identity. I myself went to three or four schools. Which school would I contribute to if there were a fund drive? I do not feel the sense of identity that perhaps I should feel. Now I realize that you have to make do with sometimes a bit of overcrowding and sometimes a lack of facilities if you go from kindergarten to grade eleven, but still and all -

I am just speaking for the St. John's schools that did go from kindergarten to grade eleven - the graduates of those schools are almost fanatical in their support for that school, or were while those schools still existed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two levels is not so bad.

MR. J. CARTER: Two levels, perhaps I could accept two levels; but three? I choke at three. I really do and I think all hon. members would agree and I think the school authorities agree too because this is less common. They do not mind the split taking place, say, at grade seven or grade eight, but I do not think they want to see the tri-level. Of course, I cannot get on my feet and talk about education without deploring what happened in my own district of St. John's North, the decision to close Blackall Elementary School, one of the schools that had the finest record although it only went from, initially, kindergarten to grade eight and now kindergarten to grade six. Still it had such a fine, fine record and for that school to be phased out of existence I think is a great, great pity and it is extremely sad. I have done what I can to prevent it. I have spoken to the various officials concerned and they say their hands are tied. They do not have the funds to operate it. The school enrollment is going down. The

MR. J. CARTER: counterargument though is that whereas the school population may be going down in the immediate area, Blackall Elementary School is located right next to Memorial University and there must be enough children of employees of Memorial University to keep that school going. Why are they not considered to be part of the school population that can be drawn on? Just because the children do not happen to live in the immediate area is no reason to close a particular school. Why not say, well how many people work in that immediate area and anyone who works in that immediate area their children can be deemed to be in that school's area and can properly be drawn upon. I think that is the best way of looking at it and also of course it would help with the transportation of school children. If the parents have to drive right by the school door to get to work then it is not much extra trouble for them to drop their children off there. Classes start about the same time. Most people go to work at nine o'clock and most schools start at nine o'clock or around there, eight-thirty, nine o'clock, and it should not be that hard to do it. The other thing of course is the organization of the school day. The children are left with an hour for lunch and in many cases only a half hour for lunch and of course they have to do with a quickie lunch. It is the only place I know where you can buy pimples for seventy-five cents for that is what the school lunches amount to as far as I am concerned.

Now a more important suggestion, less frivolous perhaps, and that is that I see that the insurance for the schools - 605-03-03 - \$2,157,900. I am quoting from the subheads because I know that this discussion will never get into the subheads as the pattern of handling the estimates is such that we do not get beyond the minister's salary, so I am referring to a particular subhead. This one here, 605-03-03 - \$2,157,900, that is the total of all

MR. J. CARTER: the property insurance for the schools. Now here is a suggestion and I would like members to consider this. Why does the government not carry its own insurance? The risk is spread among 800 schools and it is unlikely that all 800 are going to burn down. The government is never going to be faced with 800 school to rebuild and all you do in insurance, Mr. Chairman, is you try to spread the risk. And I am saying that if the government were to carry its own insurance and were to say, 'Right, if a school burns down we will replace it at replacement cost or 90 per cent of it or 80 per cent of it' - we do not want to encourage incendiaryism, we do not want to encourage firebugs. So I think you would have to say, 'Well, if a school burns down we will replace 80 per cent of it.' Then the government would immediately be saving this \$2,157,000 and I doubt if the total aggregate cost of fires even in the school system is that much. So I would suggest that if the government were to take one million dollars or one and one-half million dollars and put it away each year, they would be saving right away one million dollars a year and would be building up a fund that could be used for the replacement of schools.

How much time do I have,

Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) Your time is up in three minutes.

MR. J. CARTER: But I am glad the hon. gentleman has come back in the House because I have something directly to say to him. I got a letter just today -

AN HON. MEMBER: Good.

MR. J. CARTER: - I received a letter just today about the hon. gentleman, and with your indulgence.

April 21, 1978

Tape 1360

EC - 2

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote from it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Table it.

MR. J. CARTER: No, it is a private letter.

MR. J. CARTER: "It is my considered opinion -

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

MR. J. CARTER: May I read this letter?

AN HON. MEMBER: - table it.

MR. J. CARTER: "It is my considered opinion that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is a useless, ill-tempered, overbearing buffoon and that his lackey, the Leader of the Opposition, is a weak-kneed, spineless toady." Now this is a communication that I have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, you cannot refer to any member of this House, Sir, under the unparliamentary language listed in Beauchesne, and the hon. gentleman writing a letter to himself used an animal, Sir. And you cannot describe a member of this House even though you would feel like it every time you look at the hon. gentleman, but it is not allowed, it is unparliamentary, Sir, and you cannot say indirectly what you cannot say directly, and Your Honour knows that. So I would ask him to withdraw.

MR. J. CARTER: As I understand a previous ruling, private communications may be quoted from and not tabled.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER: And I have quoted from it. But I would like your decision on this.

MR. NEARY: You cannot use unparliamentary language, Your Honour.

April 21, 1978

Tape 1360

EC - 3

MR. J. CARTER:

Well, I am waiting -

AN HON. MEMBER:

a letter.

- (Inaudible) writing himself

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman.

I did not write this letter,

AN HON. MEMBER:

Table it.

MR. J. CARTER:

I have to.

Not unless His Honour says

MR. NEARY:

language (inaudible).

You cannot use unparliamentary

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) Order, please! I will make a

ruling. I feel that in his quoting of the private letter he does not have to table the private letter, but if it is unparliamentary language that is used, I would ask him to withdraw it.

MR. J. CARTER:

I do not have to table this letter, but I have to withdraw the implications. Well, I will withdraw the unparliamentary parts. Perhaps if I were to re-read it leaving out the unparliamentary bits? "It is my considered opinion that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is a useless and overbearing"- How about that? - that is not unparliamentary?

Mr. Chairman, as I understand,

MR. NEARY:

That is unparliamentary, too, if Your Honour will check the unparliamentary language, Sir. And in the process of the hon. gentleman writing himself a letter, he cannot use that term either, Sir. What is the page?

That is unparliamentary, too,

MR. F. ROWE:

131.

MR. NEARY:

131, I believe is the page, and if the hon. gentleman will look at it, you cannot use that term.

131, I believe is the page, and

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that because it is unparliamentary.

I would ask the hon. member to

April 21, 1978

Tape 1360

EC - 4

MR. J. CARTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am certainly in your hands. I will withdraw that. However, I thought the Committee would be interested in the opinion of someone of the general public.

Now to get back to the discussion.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I asked a few minutes ago how much time I had left so I could structure my remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: About four to five minutes.

MR. J. CARTER: Four to five minutes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

One of the things we should remember, Mr. Chairman, is that the total population of

MR. J. CARTER: Newfoundland is only 564,000, That is less that the borough of Scarborough in the city of Toronto, and can hon. members imagine the borough of Scarborough having 800 schools? It is just impossible to imagine. I do not know how many schools Scarborough has but it is certainly nothing like 800.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many?

MR. J. CARTER: I say I do not know how many schools the borough of Scarborough has but it is certainly not 800, or anything like it. I would guess that it would be something under 50.

MR. F. WHITE: Not scattered like Newfoundland is.

MR. J. CARTER: Well that is the problem, Therefore, you know, our educational costs are going to be considerably higher than the city of Scarborough or the borough.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you in favour of resettlement?

MR. J. CARTER: No. I am just pointing out a fact that we cannot escape, that our costs of bringing services to our population are greater than some other places.

One other point I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, is that in my opinion and in the opinion of many, the individual teachers do not have the amount of control that they should have in their class. Now I understand, and hon. gentlemen can correct me if I am mistaken, that a teacher is not able to throw out of his or her class students who are creating a racket, like the hon. members opposite.

AN HON. MEMBER: At least we would have a quorum.

MR. F. WHITE: Or the Premier when he -

MR. J. CARTER: If a teacher had such an unruly pupil as, say, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) what would he or she do? She is not able to name him.

MR. NEARY: Go back to the savoury patch.

MR. J. CARTER: She is not able to name him. They are not able to ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to bring the hon. gentleman in on the floor

MR. J. CARTER: in chains and have him whipped, You know, what can she do? The strap is no longer allowed. And you know one of the things of course that could be done in our schools for the continuing education of pupils is to take the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and parade him about. He would make an excellent example of the missing link. Any anthropology class would be very, very delighted -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will realize that derogatory remarks are not in order.

MR. J. CARTER: Sorry. I was pointing out that some of us are further advanced along the evolutionary scale than others.

MR. NEARY: - anthropology.

MR. J. CARTER: And in my opinion the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is less advanced along this lines than some others. I feel he is more of an unsuccessful mutation than the rest of us. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, with those few remarks, some of them serious, some of them light, I will resume my seat until I have the next chance to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: I was about to comment on some of the points made by the -

MR. F. WHITE: Former Minister of Education.

MR. LUSH: - hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) until he got on that latest tirade and that spoiled the speech so I cannot comment on these now, and I will get onto some other issues.

Mr. Chairman, I have got all sorts of statistics here and I do not know whether I am going to be able to get through them all in the twenty minutes that I have at my disposal. But first of all, just some general remarks directed towards comments that have been made in this House in the past few days when members were talking to petitions sent in protesting the teacher cut backs. Some hon. members spoke about the fat in education and about the administrative structure, wondering whether or not we were getting our dollar value from the present administrative structure. As an educator, Mr. Chairman, I would



MR. LUSH:           be the first to say that there is fat in education, just the same as there is fat everywhere else, particularly when you are talking about monies upwards to \$285 million. But I think the thing that we must remember is that the administrative structure is a new structure for this Province and we are learning to iron out the bugs in it, but we have been only in it for about seven or eight years now, the new administrative structure, and there is bound to be things there that are not right, as you go through your growing pains and learn how to mobilize your people. But I for one would not want to see some of the advantages that we have gained in the administrative structures, with board offices

MR. LUSH: and the kind of personnel that are there. I would not want to see that changed. I think we have some good people there and as they learn their various roles, as they gain experience, I am sure that we are going to see more productivity from the present structure that we now have, and some of the fat will disappear as we learn from experience how to grapple and wrestle with the various problems that we have.

Mr. Chairman, carrying on from the last remarks of the spokesman on education, our spokesman, whom I thought gave a good speech, lots of meat in it, and following on from his later remarks I want to carry on and say what this province lacks right now in education is good, dynamic leadership, progressive leadership from the minister. This is our greatest problem right now, Mr. Chairman. As an educator, Mr. Chairman, our present minister is a man who gained a lot of respect and it is only, I think, through the code of ethics of the teaching profession that the minister has not been criticized more because this is not the way we operate in our profession, to be critical of our fellow colleagues, and it is not within my personality, not within my character to do that. But, Mr. Chairman, even though the minister was a successful educator, a concerned man, he has been an abysmal and a colossal failure as a minister. As I have said before, if there were anybody else in that portfolio right now other than an educator that person would be forced to resign that position because of the backward steps taken with respect to education by this administration in the past three or four years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Minister of Education is more concerned about the fiscal restraints, the cutbacks in this budget than he enunciates. He is more concerned about it than that. He is not on the defensive in his own mind about these cutbacks. The hon. minister knows very well that these cutbacks, these teacher cutbacks in the fiscal restraints are going to affect the quality of education. But the minister must be held responsible

MR. LUSH: because he was not successful in convincing his colleagues of the importance of education and for that he must be held responsible. Now the hon. minister could have ducked out from that responsibility like did a couple of other cabinet ministers in this present administration, the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Tourism. He could have come out and broken Cabinet solidarity and collective responsibility, all of these traditions of a good Cabinet. He could have ducked out but he did not. So we have to give him some credit for that. He is sticking with it but still that does not minimize his responsibility and the harmful effects that his policies are going to have on education today.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot said about educational quality and equal educational opportunity. To me these two things are not separate. Indeed they are interwoven. You cannot have one without the other. I do not want to get too philosophical but it is very difficult for an educator to not use the jargon of his profession. But quality, Mr. Chairman, and equal educational opportunity are almost one and the same thing. Now we can talk about quality in its very narrow sense. That quality is if you are offering four or five courses to offer these courses well, to teach them well. That is not quality. That is a very narrow view of quality. The philosophy that we have and I could stand here today and philosophize and fanticize about the good old days, about the number of people who were produced, the four or five fellows who made it through school with me in Gambo. I could do that but, Mr. Chairman, I am more concerned about in my school with the twenty-five others who were coerced out of the programme because the programme did not meet their needs. I am not concerned about the four or five who finished grade eleven with me. I am concerned about the twenty-five or thirty who were pushed out of the school because the curriculum did not meet their needs.

MR. T. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is where we have come today. We have come to talking about a curriculum that meets the needs of individual students. We are not talking about offering them six or seven courses, we are talking about offering a program as comprehensive as possible, a program that will go to meeting the needs of all the students. That is the kind of philosophy that we believe in today. Mr. Chairman, I am not the one who should be saying it, but I think we have made great progress in this respect. And I think we are educating a large number of students today, students who under a different system would have been forced out of school but because of our educational philosophy we are keeping them there, and we have to aim to keep more there. But that is quality education, Mr. Chairman, quality education offering a variety of programs to meet the needs of students; not a restricted program where students got to get into courses they do not want, courses for which they have no aptitude, courses that are going to doom them to failure. And today our educational processes programs are not comprehensive enough. Even though we are moving in that direction, we are far behind other provinces throughout Canada and the Western World in that kind of effort towards broadening the curriculum, making it as wide as possible so that we can cater to the needs of every student. And because we are behind, these fiscal restraints by this provincial government are going to affect this Province more than any other province. So, Mr. Chairman, equal educational opportunity and quality—they are related. If my son cannot go to a school in Gambo to be offered the same course variety that he would get in a school in an urban center, in St. John's, then he is not afforded equal educational opportunity nor a good quality education. And that is what is happening throughout this Province now in our rural areas that there is such a narrow curriculum, such a small number of courses that our students do not have the same—or the students do not have the same equal educational opportunity that students in the urban centres have. Neither do the students in Newfoundland in the urban centres have the same quality or the same

MR. T. LUSH: educational opportunity as do their counterparts spread throughout Canada.

Mr. Chairman, that is one of the reasons why I became a politician. I wanted to have some influence on educational policy in this Province to try and eliminate these inequalities and these iniquities.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. T. LUSH: No, Sir, I am just a member of this House a man with some knowledge about education.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. T. LUSH: And that is why - does not every member have that right, to try and influence policy? That is why I am here. I must say I am not getting very far but that is why I am here.

Mr. Chairman, what are some of the things that affect quality education? Because the minister's has been saying he does not believe that the budgetary restraints of the government will affect education; I have said it is just an assumption; he counters with it is just an assumption by the other people as well who say that they think that these cut backs will affect quality education. Mr. Chairman, does it not seem rather obvious that if we cut back teachers, that if we cut back the money that it is going to affect quality education? Does that not seem rather obvious and rather logical? The Minister of Health would not dare say that by laying off thirty-five or forty doctors in this Province that that would not affect the health of our people. I am sure the Minister of Justice would not agree that cutting out or laying off some of our police and RCMP would not affect the lawlessness of our people. How can we say that laying off teachers will not affect the quality of education? It is ridiculous, Mr. Chairman, ridiculous to try and defend that position. It is an indefensible position.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at some of the factors that affect quality education, and there are several and I have just got a few here. One of the factors is the socio-economic status of the family, the kind of jobs that people have.

April 21, 1978

Tape 1363

DW - 3

MR. T. LUSH:

There is a very high correlation  
between the socio-economic standing of a family and the education  
of their children.

MR. LUSH: We have got a large number of people living below the poverty line in this Province. We have got a large number of poor people living on incomes that are well below the poverty line. And, Mr. Chairman, if that affects quality education then it behooves us in this House to be doing something about it.

Educational level of parents, Mr. Chairman, is another one and we have got the highest illiteracy rate in Canada. The educational level of parents affect the education of their children. School buildings, certainly no one would refute the fact that school buildings have some relationship to educational quality. Mr. Chairman, I have taught in schools with seams in the floor, where your pencil would fall down through and I have taught in schools with carpet laid all over the place. I have taught in schools with nothing in them other than chalk for the teacher to work with, and I have taught in them where I had all the modern equipment, the modern technology that a person could ask for. If you were to ask me today which school I would want to teach in it would not take me long telling you which school I would want to teach in. It would not take me long to tell you which school was going to give me the easiest job to be able to teach students and to impart knowledge to them and to meet their needs. There is no question about it, schools that are modernly equipped.

Variety of programmes, Mr. Chairman, I have alluded to that. That certainly affects quality of quality education equal educational opportunity.

The number of teachers per student, obviously that is a factor, the number of students that any one teacher can work with, obviously that affects quality and educational opportunity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these are just some of the points, and having listed some of these points let us look at some at some of the budgetary cut backs and see how

MR. LUSH: they will affect some of the things that I talk about that go to make quality education and equal educational opportunity.

Government's share - these are the cut backs - government's share of the cost of transporting school children has been decreased from ninety-five to ninety per cent, putting another five per cent burden on the school boards and hence back to the parents, because that is where it has got to go.

All consumable work books and activity books will in the future have to be paid for fully by the students, another financial burden put on the parents. The provincial assistance provided under the Student Aid Programme for university students has been cut back. Now, Mr. Chairman, a student has got to borrow up to \$700 before he can qualify for a grant. Mr. Chairman, think of the hundreds of students in this Province who need to go to university or who want to go to university and do not have the financial arrangements to take them there, and now we are forcing them to borrow \$700 over a five year programme which most students are going in for today, \$3,500 debt, that is what the student has to look at, and providing he can get jobs in the Summer to carry him through.

Mr. Chairman, this is a terrible, terrible policy and a great step backwards. No consideration at all for the poor people in this Province, the poor people who do not have the money to go to university. They are making the university now an elitest place, an elitest place, an elitest place forcing the student to borrow \$700, Mr. Chairman, \$700. It is a terrible, terrible, terrible policy, terrible.

And then another point, Mr. Chairman, that I am informed about is there will be a reduction in the number of courses offered in certain vocational schools, That will not affect quality, I suppose, reducing the number of courses. That will not affect quality.



MR. LUSH: That will not affect educational opportunity, that will not affect that, reducing the courses.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at what teacher cut backs can do, just 127. They must do something otherwise why were they there? Is the minister prepared to say that they were useless?

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible).

MR. LUSH: They were useless.

MR. HOUSE: The students were there.

MR. LUSH: That is fine, but what is happening, Mr. Chairman, is that we are not losing a grade, we are not losing a classroom, we are losing students scattered all over the school

MR. LUSH: And what is happening, what teacher cutbacks is doing is forcing a multiple grade situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. LUSH: Instead of a Grade I, Grade II, Grade III, now schools are forced into the position where they have to have two, three grades. That is going to result in quality education, Mr. Chairman? That is going to result in equal educational opportunity, no question about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a bad thing to have two grades (inaudible)

MR. LUSH: You had better believe it it is a bad thing. If a teacher is trying to meet the individual needs of a student, you get enough discrepancy, you get enough variety and ability within a one class of thirty. In a classroom of thirty it is possible to have five different levels - if you are teaching one class of thirty, five different levels.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. LUSH: I am right in the eighties, Mr. Chairman, right in the eighties.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) that in 196 (inaudible)

MR. LUSH: Yes. Mr. Chairman, in any class a teacher is going to have three or four divisions. Now by putting two classes in you have doubled these divisions. Whereas a teacher had five, with another class he probably has ten divisions. Ah, no, Mr. Chairman, you cannot convince this hon. member.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. LUSH: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. LUSH: I spent most of my time in rural Newfoundland. I will tell you what the problem is. No, I will not say it, Mr. Chairman, under these circumstances. But in any one class - and I have a funny feeling that there are an awful lot of hon. members who do not understand this - in any one class a teacher can have the equivalent of three or four classes to meet the individual needs, and does. Any good teacher has these different groupings - three or four. Put in two? I want to tell hon. members there is no way I will put my students in a double class with one, two classes or in a class of Grade VIIIs and IXs. There is no way this hon. member is going to do it. And I would not want to teach in that situation either and would not take it. Mr. Chairman, that is one result of the teacher cutbacks. It causes multiple class situations.

Another effect that affects the programme, it must, how can you lose a teacher and not affect your programme? You must drop a course somewhere. You have to drop a course. Either that or you have to force the course on somebody who cannot teach it as well. Is that a situation - if you have to put a teacher into a course who is not qualified to teach this course, does not have the necessary expertise to teach this course, is this going to result in educational equality, in quality of education and equal educational opportunity? No way, Mr. Chairman. Another result - what is happening is that many of our principals are now being forced to teach, principals who are in their schools, giving their teachers advice, giving advice on curriculum development, giving advice on teaching techniques, now they are forced into the classroom. A ridiculous situation, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LUSH: If I am principal of a large school, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to teach. I want to spend my time working with teachers, working on methods - this is what I want to do - working with teachers and making the programme more effective.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. LUSH: I do not want to spend my time in the classroom.

Also, because of the budgetary restrictions to the board, it is affecting the support personnel that a principal can bring in. I am talking about secretaries. One of the largest elementary schools in this Province has a secretary now for one day a week - teaching about 700 students with a staff of forty, with a secretary for one day a week. What hon. member would want to work in that kind of a situation with forty people under him, teachers, and 700 students, to have a secretary for one day a week?

Now, Mr. Chairman, this relieves the principal, no doubt, to work in curriculum development, try to improve programmes and to work with teachers to beef up their teaching methods - that is a progressive policy, that is. That is a progressive policy, that is a policy that is not going to affect the quality of education and equal educational opportunity in this Province. Mr. Chairman, a terrible situation.

MR. RIDEOUT: - (Inaudible) the member for Green Bay is an expert on everything.

MR. LUSH: Retrogressive policy,

Mr. Chairman.

How much time do I have,

Mr. Chairman?

AN HON. MEMBER: Raise the Committee.

April 21, 1978

Tape 1365

EC - 4

MR. LUSH:

I did not get into my statistics to talk about monies allocated by other provinces and the amount spent per student in other provinces. I will come back to that later. I will get another chance. But let me end up by saying that there were never any policies in recent times that are going to have the harmful effect on education that these budgetary cutbacks in education that this government is now enunciating.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed estimates of expenditure under Head XVI - Rural Development, all items without amendments and to report having made further progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at two of the clock and that -

MR. W.N. ROWE: Why do we not meet on Monday?

MR. HICKMAN: Because I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, why we do not meet on Monday because there is a large segment of the population of this province who are direct descendents of the South of England and we like to celebrate St. George's Day. We are going to celebrate St. George's Day -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: - and if there is no affection on the Opposition benches for those of us of English descent that is their problem. I move that the House do now adjourn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved the House adjourn until Tuesday, April 25, 1978 at 2:00 P.M. Those in favour "Aye," contrary "Nay," carried.

The House stands adjourned until Tuesday, April 25, 1978 at 2:00 P.M.