



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 1

1st Session

Number 33

VERBATIM REPORT

Monday, June 19, 1972

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

HONOURABLE FRANK D. MOORES (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement to the members of the House regarding the meetings in Halifax over the weekend of the five Eastern Provinces with the four Atlantic Premiers and the Vice-Premier of Quebec.

The result of those meetings was a seven-point agreement outlining the areas of co-operation between the provinces. In arriving at the seven points, a number of topics related to offshore resources were discussed including ownership, financial arrangements and development.

The seven points are:

1. The proposal concerning offshore mineral resources made by the Government of Canada on November 29, 1968, and as announced in the House of Commons on December 2, 1968, is not acceptable to the five Eastern Provinces.
2. The Governments of the five Eastern Provinces have agreed to the delineation and description of the offshore boundaries between each of these five Provinces.
3. The five Eastern Provinces assert ownership of the mineral resources in the seabed off the Atlantic Coast and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence in accordance with the agreed boundaries.
4. The five Eastern Provinces as a united group will seek discussions with the Government of Canada concerning arrangements related to the development of the offshore resources in those areas.
5. The five Eastern Provinces are prepared to discuss with the Federal Government the delegation of certain aspects of the administration of the mineral resources in the

seabed off the Atlantic Coast and the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

6. The Premiers agreed that the concept of a Regional Administrative Authority was worthy of further study by the Provinces concerned.
7. The matter of financial arrangements in the offshore area will be a subject of further study and we have arranged for ongoing consultations.

Mr. Speaker, apart from the agreements themselves, the meetings also provided two very real benefits. The greatest benefit is perhaps the creation of a solid front to voice a single strong opinion on the offshore question rather than fragmented voices as in the past.

The second benefit is the joining of the Province of Quebec with the Atlantic Provinces in this matter and the common decision of each of the five Provinces that further meetings should be held soon.

The depth of co-operation and the readiness to discuss this problem by all those present at the meetings would indicate that inter-provincial co-operation on a number of other issues might be expected as well.

It must be stressed that the meetings did not attempt to make concrete decisions on particular problems. It must be clear that the meetings succeeded only in creating a common philosophy on the question and a procedural method will follow through.

Premier Regan of Nova Scotia, who chaired the meetings, stated strongly that further co-operation between the Governments represented and the gathering of a great deal of scientific and other information must come before final decisions are made on matters such as sharing administration costs and duties.

Steps have been taken to inform the Prime Minister of Canada of the decisions that were made.

I think the meetings were very worthwhile, not just for

Newfoundland but for Eastern Canada as a whole. I think that if we work and produce on the base built in Halifax over the weekend, we can come up with some really worthwhile achievements.

Newfoundland has a unique case, Mr. Speaker, regarding offshore ownership. All the five Provinces in Eastern Canada have claims to offshore resources, but Newfoundland has a claim in writing, drafted and signed by Federal Authorities and that is Term 37 of the Terms of Union.

Legally and constitutionally, Newfoundland has the strength to fight any attempt to take these resources away.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to report the degree of co-operation that there was between the ministers, the first ministers, at Halifax, and to report back to the House that it was a very united position that the five Eastern Provinces took in this very important matter to our Province.

MOTIONS

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide A Pension For The Retiring Registrar Of The Supreme Court." On behalf of the honourable Minister of Highways, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Highway Traffic Act, 1962." On behalf of the honourable Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Nomenclature Board Act, 1959."

HON. J. A. CARTER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND YOUTH): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Memorial University Act."

QUESTIONS

HON. J. G. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question 100 tabled by the honourable Leader of the Opposition on the Order Paper dated June 12. The answer to a verbal question, Mr. Speaker, asked by the honourable member for Bell Island concerning employment at Stephenville. This is a report for the week ending June 11. The name of the employer - McAlpine, 312 Newfoundlanders, sixteen from outside the province, 94.9 percent Newfoundlanders, Frazier Brace staff, four Newfoundlanders, twenty-three from outside of the province. Frazier Brace Trades, 584 Newfoundlanders or Newfoundland residents. 137 from outside of the province. There is no need for tut, tut; The honourable gentleman knows that these are pipefitters, instrument mechanics and millwrights which position cannot be obtained here in Newfoundland. Frazier Brace, Woodroom, ninety-two Newfoundland residents, nineteen from outside of the province, subcontractors 340 Newfoundland residents, thirty-eight from outside of the province, Specialist Erectors, no Newfoundlanders, nine from outside of the province, Bonavista Foods, fifty-eight Newfoundland residents, four from outside of the province, E and B. Cowan, four Newfoundlanders and seven from outside

MR. CROSBIE: of the province, Labrador Linerboard, eleven Newfoundlanders, two from outside of the province, for a total of 1,405 Newfoundland residents and 255 outside residents or 81.9 percent of the work force Newfoundland residents, the total work force is 1,660 people.

There are some copies here for the honourable member and the press.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the honourable Minister of Economic Development, Sir, I would have thought that it would go to the Minister of Fisheries but apparently on a newscast he said that the Minister of Economic Development was responsible for this particular matter, so I will direct the question to him.

Would the honourable minister briefly give us the government plans regarding the continued operation of the Burgeo Fish Plant? And more specifically, have the government found a buyer and if not will the Lake interests continue to operate the plant or will some other party do so?

MR. CROSBIE: In respect to that question actually I think it should be directed to the Minister of Fisheries or the Premier. But the position at the moment is that the government are operating the Burgeo Fish Plant and no one else, No agreement has been entered into on it, that I know of in any event.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Do the Lake interests have anything to do with the operation of the plant now, besides the boats, in the operation of the plant itself?

Answer inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the honourable the Premier? I wonder if the honourable the Premier would inform the House what measures the Government is taking or has taken to make sure Newfoundland interests get preference to the permanent job opportunities

MR. NEARY: at Churchill Falls?

MR. MOORES: I will take notice of that question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is a rather urgent matter, I wonder if the Premier could indicate when we could get an answer to the question?

MR. MOORES: I took notice of it, Mr. Speaker, and I will get the information as quickly as I can.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries, for the sake of the record, the minister has already indicated to me before the House opened what steps he has taken. But for the sake of the record, I wonder if the minister would

inform the House what steps he or his department have taken to remedy the almost criminal waste of fish at Torbay which has to be dumped almost daily due to lack of markets.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was actually and at one point, before the honourable member for White Bay rose, to rise on a point of personal privilege in connection with your question. It would appear from news reports, both in the "Daily News" and one or two of the radio stations that there was some confusion concerning the situation at Torbay and in fact the interpretation of what had been said or done about it. Since this will give me an opportunity perhaps to clear up the entire matter:

First of all, on Thursday and Friday the Department of Fisheries were aware of the situation that existed in connection with the surplus of fish being landed at Torbay. Our officials had been in touch with the fish plants in the immediate area, that is in the area which was considered practical to take up this surplus, including the fish plant located in St. John's itself. We have been in touch with the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation and we are pleased to obtain the cooperation of the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation, through their agents, to take up some of the slack.

Now it was reported afterwards that the traps had been hauled on Saturday because of the statement attributed to me, because of another statement attributed to me that I had assured the fishermen that this situation would not arise again. Of course it is erroneous. I made no such statement. I think you would have to be, any man would have to be a braver man than I am to make such a statement regarding fish landings anywhere in Newfoundland.

However the department is fully aware of the situation, as it exists. It is a most unfortunate situation. It is, in this day and age when every pound of food is needed, then certainly every effort must be made to

utilize every pound of fish and in fact to see that the fishermen through their earnings get the benefit of their catch. To this end our department has been for the past four or five days and will continue to follow the situation closely and to be of whatever assistance we can.

One further comment I would like to make also was the fact that it would appear again from press and radio, which I had an opportunity to straighten out, I think with radio stations this morning, perhaps for the benefit of the press now, I was in town and available all over the weekend. I hope— does that answer the question?

MR. NEARY: I thank the honourable minister for giving me the answer to the question. I hope that the department will continue to follow up that situation. I was not referring to the honourable minister when I said that the fishermen could not contact the government representatives. I was referring to the absentee and ill-tempered Minister of Social Services & Rehabilitation, the member for the district of St. John's East, Extern.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways. Because traffic at the present time is very heavy on the Trans-Canada Highway, we are having many highway accidents. Would the minister inform this House when his department will start painting white lines on our highways?

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, the reason for the delay in painting the white lines should be obvious to most people. Mother Nature saw fit to keep the snow on the ground a little bit longer than usual this spring. But the contract for painting of the — I must correct that, it is yellow lines — is let, the work is going on now and it will be completed as soon as possible. We have our own machines on plus the contractors.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Highways, do I take

June 19, 1972.

Tape 800.

Page 3.

it from his statement that this year all lines will be yellow?

MR. MAYNARD: All main lines, centre lines, passing lanes, this sort of thing will be yellow.

MR. WINSOR : May I direct a question to the honourable Minister of Highways?

in view of the very dry weather we are getting now and the very dusty roads through certain communities in Fogo District, namely Carmanville, and Gander Bay and Stoneville. These are centres where you have the heavy traffic moving to and fro, one from Fogo Island and the other to New World Island. Can the minister inform the House whether it is the intention of the Department of Highways to oil the streets there? Some reference was made some time ago that those roads would be paved but, as I said, I am not that naive to think that they will be all paved this summer. But surely the minister can inform us whether it is the intention of his department to provide oil to keep the choking dust down a bit.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Department of Highways now and the policy which has existed for a number of years in relation to oiling of roads through communities is simply this, that if the people in the community, either through their council or through any recognized group representing the public in the community, will undertake to purchase the oil, the Department of Highways will undertake to supply their equipment to spread the oil on the road. But the Department of Highways has not in the past, and the policy has not been changed at this time, whereby they buy the oil and spread it too. If the communities will buy it, the Department will spread it.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I can understand communities where you have local improvement boards or community council but in communities where you have no organizations at all, and it is very difficult, and I am thinking now of Clarke's Head and Stoneville, there is no local improvement board there or community council. Maybe if the department would undertake to provide the oil and perhaps make some arrangements with the local people there, because Mr. Speaker, it is a desperate situation down there now with all this dry weather.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 4,000 miles of gravel roads in Newfoundland and if we do it for one mile of gravel road in any one community, quite naturally we will be obligated to do it

for all the people. In order to do even one half of those gravel roads, it will cost in the vicinity of \$2 million and this is obviously money that we do not have and will not have for this coming year.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

On motion a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Registration And Regulation Of Automobile Dealers And The Salesmen Of Such Dealers," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion a Bill, " An Act Respecting The Registration And Regulation Of Collection Agencies," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Registration And Regulations Of Credit Reporting Agencies." read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Order no. (1).

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

Heading VI, Education and Youth, 604-04

MR. F.B.POWE: Mr. Chairman, I was in the course of my remarks concerning 604-05 during last sitting when we reached six of the clock.

The point that I was trying to make at that particular time was that we on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, were extremely concerned over the fact that there was a distinct possibility that some students who had intended to or who had planned to attend the university in the coming year, may in fact not be able to do so for financial reasons.

Now, Sir, I will continue to speak about that point at the risk of being accused of, as I fear I am already being accused of, being overly concerned about the university as an institution. Sir, I would like to say that as far as I am concerned, I do not care about the university as an institution in itself, outside of the fact of course, Sir, that considering the contribution that this university will make towards the future development of this province. What I am concerned about, and I repeat again, is some students having to borrow an additional two hundred dollars and finding that they have no longer the opportunity to take advantage of the four hundred dollar special bursary for education students. This may in fact turn some of these students unwillingly away from the university during the coming year. I think that if we are at all approaching the point where we do not have an open door policy for qualified students in our university, the future of Newfoundland is being endangered. Particularly when we consider the fact that we only have half the national average of the students attending our university. Only half of the national average.

When we have a situation approaching where financial capacity

June 19, 1972, Tape 802, Page 2 -- apb

becomes more important than intellectual capacity for attendance at university, I think we are approaching serious trouble.

Sir, one other point that I wanted to touch on, which I think comes under this particular heading, is this business of graduate fellowships. What I would like to know from the honourable Minister of Finance basically, as well as Education, Sir, is where this one hundred and thirty graduate fellowships came from in the first place? We understood from the

budget speech that there was to be a reduction from 130 to 90 graduate fellowships in the coming year. It was never my understanding that there was a number placed on the number of graduate fellowships at the university. My understanding was that the university had a number of graduate students applying to that institution. Some of these applicants, some of these students, if they were admitted to the university, applied for graduate fellowships. My understanding was that the graduates fellowship or scholarship committee met, went over these applications and they recommended a number of graduate fellowships for certain numbers of students at the university. I believe last year it turned out to be something like 116 fellowships were granted to - graduate fellowships were granted to 116 graduate students. I believe another 16 for next year. I thought the criteria obviously used for this was such things as academic standards and residency requirements.

The sources for these graduate fellowships, of course, were both from the provincial government and from the university itself. I think where this 130 or 135 came from is a combination of the 116 fellowships, graduate fellowships already in existence and those which would have to continue on the next year, plus the sixteen new ones for the coming years.

As you know these graduate fellowships for the Masters level is over two years, twenty-four month, I think and as far as doctoral fellowship, graduate fellowship are concerned, it is over a thirty-six months period. Sir, my understanding is this, that there are fifty-nine graduate students at the university this year who have been recommended to receive graduate fellowships, who will not now receive those graduate fellowships because of the new policy as announced by this administration in this budget speech. Fifty-nine graduate students..

Sir, I believe this represents only something like \$147,000. While I, Sir, do not want to appear to be reckless with money, \$147,000 out of a total of \$128 million appears to be a bit of a drop in the bucket. Sir, these graduate students are in engineering, arts, sciences and education. Were it not for the fact that we are lacking in qualified and professional people in this province, I would not be concerned.

But, Sir, we are lacking in these people in this province. We count on these professional people for leadership in our schools, in industry, everywhere around this province. To see the possibility - to see fifty-nine graduate students who have already planned to go to the university not receive these \$2,500 fellowships. Some of those persons are, of course, married with children and have to move away from their homes for this period of study, to jeopardize their chances of getting this professional training and going out into society and making a contribution to Newfoundland, the building of Newfoundland, I think it is a crime.

If I can only take one small area, Sir, We have 850 administrators in the field of education in this province. Eight hundred and fifty persons who are in charge of schools and school systems, administrators. Sir, all too many of these administrators have not had graduate education. In other words they have not had the opportunity, all too many of them have not had the opportunity to really become professionally qualified for the jobs that they are now forced to carry out in our schools and our school systems.

We only have approximately fifteen graduates per year, that is in administration, administration in education, fifteen graduates per year. The suggestion that I have had, Sir, and this is from reliable sources, is that approximately one-half of these students (not a suggestion) are on graduate fellowships. The suggestion that was made to me by a personal authority is that it is quite conceivable that there be a one-third cut back. The total programme in the education

of qualified administrators who serve the schools of this province, this programme will be cut by one-third in this coming year because of the reduction in the number of graduate scholarships that will be available to our students.

Sir, I say again that at the risk of sounding like or being accused of having only the interests of the university institutions at heart, which I deny of course, I just cannot see the sense in cutting these graduate scholarships back this year, when it means so little money being saved by this administration, when we consider how important, professionally, properly qualified people are to the educational system and other aspects of our total community here in the province.

Sir, I think I was going to mention this business. Yes, the honourable Minister of Education in reply to a question that I ask him in the House some time back finally admitted, Sir, that he did indeed say on the platform two days before an election at the university, did tell the students that it was not their intention to increase the amount that a student would have to borrow in order to qualify for provincial assistance. It was going to be held at \$400.00 but since the election it has been increased to \$600.00, a \$200.00 amount. This is the amount that a student would have to borrow in order to qualify for provincial assistance.

Sir, I will not talk about the political sinicism that the Minister of Finance so often uses or the hypocrisy or the political dishonesty of this. I would simply ask why it has been necessary to increase the amount that a student has to borrow in order to qualify for provincial assistance? He suggested in his prepared answer to my question, the honourable Minister of Education, that since that time some adjustment has been necessary. Sir, I wonder if the fact that the provincial election is now over is the reason for this

increase from \$400.00 to \$600.00.

MR. CARTER: There are quite a number of points there, Mr. Chairman, to cover. I will cover them one at a time as best I can. In the first place I cannot really blame the honourable member for St. Barbe North for all the ills that happened in the last four or five years because I think we all agree that the worst ills happened since 1966. His brother and his father certainly must bear a fair degree of the responsibility.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: One moment. I have the floor I believe, Mr. Chairman. However, the reason obviously for any adjustments that have been made is precisely because of the mess that the previous administration left this province's finances in. I have said it before, I say it now and I will certainly be more than happy to say it again, not happy to say it again I will be prepared to say it again. It does not make me happy to say that Newfoundland's finances were left in a mess and it should not make any honourable member happy.

AN HON. MEMBER: You should have known that the day before the election.

MR. CARTER: We did. We knew it very well.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor I believe. Would you call him to order.

The honourable gentleman has suggested that the future of Newfoundland is endangered. I say that the past of Newfoundland was endangered and I am very happy that a change has occurred. Now as to the 604(05), it is really two items. It is the graduate fellowships and it is the M.U.N. tuition and allowances. In fact I suppose you could say it is three headings but for the sake of discussion I think we can call it two headings. The graduate fellowships are pegged at ninety. We intend to reduce the number of fellowships available to

ninety. At the moment we are paying 116 because of commitments. There are seven applications that are going to have to be closely looked at because there are some special circumstances there. We only know of twenty-seven more applications beyond the 116.

Now the thing there is that the honourable member for St. Barbe North left the impression, I doubt if it was deliberate, but certainly the impression was left with this House that if these fellowships were not increased that a number of qualified people would be unable to pursue post-graduate studies. Well that is not strictly correct because graduate students are eligible for the Canada Student Loan Programme and for the tuition and allowances. If the need is there they can qualify for, I believe it is nearly \$2,400, whereas the fellowship is \$2,500. The fellowship obviously is free. You get it and you do not have to repay anything. The Canada Student Loan \$1,400 plus the provincial share, you do not have to repay the provincial share but you do have to repay the Canada Student Loan. There is the difference between the two programmes. But this is not to say that nearly \$2,500 is not available to post-graduate students. So I have to dismiss the charge that there will be graduate students who will be unable to partake of post-graduate studies. It will be that much more difficult for them I will admit.

Certainly you cannot make a comparison between say the City of Toronto and the Province of Newfoundland. In Toronto any student or a student can very easily find part-time employment. The service industries there are so numerous and at such a level that it is very, very easy for a student to find employment whereas here it is not that easy. That is one of the reasons why the Student Loan Programme in Newfoundland is rather more generous than the one in Ontario and I think rightly so, and it is our intention to try and keep it like that.

On the business of increasing it from \$400.00 to \$600.00, I had genuinely hoped that we would be able to keep it at \$400.00 but the more we sharpened our pencils, the more we tried, We could not obviously cut maintenance grants. We could not and would not cut capital grants and still and all under 604(05) last year it was \$3,685,500 and this year it is \$3,780,000, not a dramatic increase, not a big increase but an increase nevertheless. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that 604(05) - M.U.N. tuition and allowances be carried.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Mr. Chairman, I certainly did not suggest that there would be fifty-nine graduate students who would have to give up their studies this year as a result of this decrease in the number of graduate fellowships. What I simply said was that there are to my knowledge fifty-nine graduate students who have been recommended for the graduate fellowship who will not now get this fellowship because of the cut backs and the fact that we have 116 post-graduate fellowships, who have to continue on into next year, and we had already sixteen committed for September. But, Sir, I certainly suggest that there is a possibility, knowing some of the graduate students as I do, it is a great sacrifice for those people with families, with mortgages and being out of town, to come in to this university and do graduate studies. It is a great sacrifice indeed, Sir, and an awful lot of them are depending upon that \$2,500 and some of these people are older people.

Let me emphasize something else, Sir, that these students are all Newfoundland students

They are not outside of Newfoundland students. This is my understanding. The people who get these provincial graduate fellowships or the monies from the Provincial Government are all graduate students from the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. CARTER: On that very point, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman looks at the floor when he criticizes this particular programme. No one pretends for a moment that it is easy for a student, undergraduate postgraduate or at the doctoral level, especially if he is married with children, mortgage, family responsibilities and all the rest of it and moreover to undertake graduate studies and particularly if he has been out of college for several years and has gotten out of the habit of study. Even under the best of circumstances, with all kinds of financial support, it is not easy. No one is saying that it is. In fact it is extremely difficult. All we are saying is that this government is helping to the limit of its resources and if the hon. gentleman wishes to blame anyone I suggest there is the remnants of the former government across there, four members of which are still sitting there and he may very well look at them and should blame them because I said before and I will say it again, it is their responsibility that there is so little in the till.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister is suffering from a persecution complex. I cannot remember having blamed anybody for anything. I was just bringing up a few simple facts that I have collected over the past few days and I simply said that there were fifty-nine students who needed graduate fellowships and I simply made the statement that \$147,000, in a total budget of \$128,000,000, appears to me to be a drop in the bucket when it is compared to the contribution that graduate students can make once they graduate from this university, in the field of education, in the field of engineering, in the fields of science and the humanities, in the art. That is all I am saying. I

am not blaming anybody. Probably I could ask the hon. minister if he would reconsider this cut-back from - reconsider. Since this \$147,000 is so small in comparison with everything else and when we consider the importance of graduate studies in this Province of ours, when we have not had graduate studies for a very long time, where we do not have great numbers of graduate students and we have not had them for any great number of years, I suggest that the more graduates, at the master and doctors level, that we can turn out of this university the better.

We keep hearing cases of having to go outside of this Province for doctors, for nurses, for engineers, even for teachers. There are a lot of foreign teachers in this Province and we have had to go outside to get foreign teachers to teach in some of the schools of our province. In my own district there was one school there, half of the teachers in that particular school were teachers from outside of Newfoundland. I still maintain, Sir, that in the field of leadership, in education in particular, in the field of guidance counselling, in the field of administration, in the field of curriculum and instructional development, that we need a great number more people for leadership in these particular segments of our society.

I will ask the minister if he would in fact reconsider this particular cut back. I think it is really an unnecessary cut back for the amount of money that appears to be saved.

MR. CARTER: I would agree, Mr. Chairman, with the hon. gentleman. It is unfortunate that we have not got \$147,000 more that we can spend on this particular subhead but again I say that we cannot. We have done all we can and I would recommend this entire budget to this House and I feel that we have gone as far as we can go.

This is not to say that the need does not exist, nor that the need is not even greater than the hon. member suggests. I agree with him one hundred per cent. The need is there and it would be a very desirable subhead to increase. But unfortunately we have done the best

we can with the resources we have and therefore, I recommend 604-05 be passed.

MR. ROWE (WM.): Mr. Chairman, before that subhead is passed, I would like to have a word or two to say on this particular matter.

Mr. Chairman, what do we need more than anything else in Newfoundland and Labrador today? I would submit, Sir, that more than any single thing we need in this province trained people, professionally trained people. People who are trained in various trades and vocational training, engineers, professional people, doctors, all types of skilled labour, skilled trades, and skilled professionals that is the single most urgent need in this province today. We have heard the Minister of Finance get up on one or two occasions and the Minister of Labour get up on one or two occasion and mention that in various projects, seventy or eighty or ninety per cent of the work force is Newfoundland and by inference saying that the fifteen or twenty or thirty per cent who are not Newfoundland are from outside the province. And usually these people from outside the province are people who have special training for special jobs. They are the highest paid people. They are the people who make the most money and ordinarily would make the greatest contribution to a place like Newfoundland and Labrador.

So therefore, Sir, any attempt by any government to cut down on the estimates, to cut down on a vote which goes toward the professional training of people or the skilled training of people in this province is a retrograde step. It is an unprogressive and backward looking step. Now the hon. minister will get up and he will say, "we had to do it because of the last administration." That may or may not be so, Sir, the present administration might indeed have to find an extra \$147,000 from the budget in order to try to balance the budget this year. But, Sir, there are one hundred if not one thousand, there are at least one hundred places in the estimates, not only in the hon. minister's

department but throughout the whole estimates, at least one hundred places \$100,000 would not be missed in some of the larger programmes, some of the larger votes in these estimates before us. One hundred thousand or there about, \$147,000 represents less I believe than one fifth of one percent of the total estimates before us for approval.

I would submit, Sir, that even if the \$100,000 were simply put in the budget without trying to find countervailing savings elsewhere, it would not go very far in bankrupting this province. If, Sir, it would go towards the bankruptcy of this province then I am sure the hon. Minister of Finance, with help from his colleagues, would find \$147,000 from some other subhead, some other vote of these estimates. To come in here and to cringingly state that he cannot find \$100,000 to help the further training of professional people in this province, who are so urgently needed, cannot find money to invest in that very, very excellent investment toward the Newfoundland society, persons who will get this training will more than produce one hundred fold to the benefit of Newfoundland and Labrador, one hundred fold more than the original investment made in them, of several hundred dollars or a couple of thousand dollars. It is a retrograde and unprogressive step to cut out this kind of a programme. The money should be found for it. If it cannot be found in some other subhead in the estimates, Sir, then it should be found anyway, it should be added.

It is just another example, I would say, of the honourable Minister of Education being the head of a department which is much too large for him, which he cannot competently handle. I do not blame the honourable Minister of Finance for insisting that this \$100,000 be cut out. It is not his fault, Sir. His job is to try to balance the budget. But for the honourable Minister of Education to stand up in this House today and say that he could not find or that he could not get in the budget another \$100,000 for such a progressive and urgently needed programme shows, Sir, not a bankruptcy of this province but a bankruptcy

June 19, 1972

Tape No. 805

NC - 5

of competence on his part for him to allow such an urgently needed,
such a wise programme to

2514

MR. ROWE, W.N. be more or less obliterated, well not almost whiped out but to be so severely reduced is a terrible indictment on this handling of the Department of Education.

MR. CARTER: Before the honourable Minister of Finance has a few words, the honourable member for White Bay South is missing the point. I think. The point surely is that although we fundamentally agree that more and more money could be used in this subhead, nevertheless we must not lose sight of the fact that our programme of aid for students is one of the most generous probably in all of Canada.

I am rather sorry to see the official opposition take the position of destructive critics. They seem to have so very few ideas of their own. They are exhibiting sort of a political kleptomania, you know, with no ideas of their own just the ideas that we are trying to put forth, and to criticize them. I think it is unfortunate, I think it is obviously leading to a great prolonging of this debate, of this getting the estimates through. I have no objection in the world to standing up here and answering any and all questions and defending the government's policy. But any casual observer in this House would see that the most charitable complexion that could be put upon the debate so far under Heading - VI is that of mischievous obstructionism.

I would therefore urge that the opposition stop being philosophical parasites and work together to get whatever information they feel should be had, to make any constructive criticism that may occur to them and to be as reasonably co-operative as possible and help us get these estimates through.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the honourable minister, in his remarks just prior to taking his seat there, I am afraid has provoked me once again to enter into this debate. I had no intention, Mr. Chairman, of speaking on this heading. But I would have to say, Sir, that the statement that the honourable minister just made. Sir, the criticism that he just levelled at the opposition for the sterling work that

MR. ROWE, W.N. they are doing and the positive attitude that they are taking towards the estimates result, Sir, from his complete ignorance of the history of this House in the past couple of years.

If he wants to, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the honourable minister that if he wants to see some real delaying tactics and obstructionism in this honourable House that he take time out to consult Hansard, Then he will see some of the talkathons that have taken place and the time that has been wasted in this House by some honourable members sitting on the government side of the House, Mr. Chairman, who tried their level best to see the government ground to a halt in this province over the last couple of years.

The honourable member for St. John's East, outside of the House over the weekend, Mr. Chairman, has been making similar statements about delaying tactics and obstructionism. I want to remind the honourable members who are making these statements, Mr. Chairman, that last year, because of Tory obstructionism and petty bickering, it took thirty-four sittings of this honourable House, Sir, thirty-four sittings to complete the estimates and this year, Mr. Chairman, despite the necessary probing that has been going on by my colleagues on this side of the House, we are performing our duties, Sir, to the taxpayers of this province in a noble fashion. So far we have had only thirty-two sittings of this honourable House, Sir.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Including everything.

MR. NEARY Including everything. Thirty-two sittings, Mr. Chairman, only thirty-two. Thirty-four last year to complete the estimates, thirty-two this year. Thirty-two, Sir, to complete everything and this includes the Throne Speech Debate, the passing of the Interim Supply Bill, authorization of thirty-eight pieces of legislation including the linerboard legislation, Sir, which was dealt with so expeditiously by members of this side of the House. Mr. Chairman, we have completed seven departments in the estimates. The reason

MR. ROWE, W.N. It is taking so long, Mr. Chairman, to deal with the Department of Education, is because of the disgraceful way in which the estimates have been presented to this honourable House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, it is almost a pleasure to hear the honourable member for Bell Island speak. However, I did not rise to address myself to what the honourable member for Bell Island had to say. Last year or the year before when the estimates were being discussed, of course, there was a record of a government for twenty-three years where certainly four or five years were being discussed at the same time. At the present time this government have not been in office long enough to have much of a record for the opposition to probe when discussing the estimates. So I do not think that quite as much time should be necessary. However, be that as it may it is up to the members of the opposition. If they wish to take all the time they want to take, they can. That is the rule of this House. We do not have any number of days set aside for estimates. We have no specific rules of procedure to deal with this, so it is up to them.

I just want to say this, Mr. Chairman, where the hon. member for St Barbe North, in addressing himself to this vote I think he was saying, in effect that it was only \$120 thousand or \$130 thousand can be saved by this particular step and therefore it should not be done and it should be taken off somewhere else. My question to the honourable member is this: If he wants to be helpful, where does he suggest that this \$130 thousand be deleted from? Where are the other -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible

MR CROSBIE: Never mind. Spencer Lake is political nonsense. I am trying to talk sense. It could be taken perhaps from Labrador Linerboard, if the honourable gentleman's colleagues had not cost the province \$160 million, but forget that. Forget Spencer Lake and forget Labrador Linerboard. Where in the estimates does the honourable gentleman see \$130,000 that should not be there? That is one question I would like

MR. CROSBIE: to ask the honourable gentleman.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: This is the silly season, Mr. Chairman. The honourable gentleman fulfils our hopes in that respect every afternoon. Where is he going to save the \$130,000 or if the honourable gentleman opposite cannot suggest to us, forget Spencer Lake because that is nonsense and we will forget Labrador Linerboard, if he can suggest to us the raising of a tax, perhaps we should raise other taxes, then the gentleman would have his \$130,000. Let the opposition press for increased taxes. They want this, they want the fellowships left, they want the mothers' allowance left, they want this spent, that spent, nothing cut, this done and that done, we already have a \$3 million deficit forecast on current accounts. They had almost \$3 million or \$4 million deficit last year. We already have that deficit. Well then if the members of the opposition want to be responsible they should suggest what further taxes should we put up this year. Should we put up the personal income tax five percent so that we can put back these forty graduate scholarships? Should we put up the S.S.A one percent and then we would not have a current account deficit and we would not have to make these cuts or should we put up the gasoline tax so many cents a gallon?

I mean there is the answer. We cannot go on having current account deficit year by year. We will have one this year anyway, unless we are able to save a bit more money during the year. So when the honourable gentleman says this is only \$120,000 or \$130,000, that does not wash. It is \$120,000 or \$130,000 that we cannot afford to put back in the estimates, if we are to make any attempt to break even on current account. As the honourable gentleman opposite knows, if we continue to have current account deficits year after year we will then be in a position where we are going to have great difficulty borrowing money, How then will we have our capital account programme? Where will the \$180 million come from that is going to be spent on

June 19, 1972

Tape 806 (afternoon)

PK - 5

MR. CROSBIE: capital account this year? The \$180 million is or the \$200 million is what we have to borrow. We will not be able to borrow that next year or the year after, if we continue to have great current account deficits. So there is the problem. No one wants

June 19, 1972, Tape 807, Page 1, -- apb

to cut these graduate fellowships. If the hon. gentlemen opposite can suggest, should we cut out the Twillingate Causeway, or should we cut out this or that, or water and sewerage or the operation of a hospital, or what it is we should cut, to put this back, I will be glad to hear their suggestions.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Never mind piping up with Spencer Pond or Spencer Lake, or Labrador Linerboard, \$170 million gone on that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, is the minister finished or what?

MR. CROSBIE: \$274,000 last year on certain housing in a certain area.

MR. NEARY: One on Circular Road.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I thought Wednesday was cranky day for the honourable minister, but obviously he is going to take over two or three days of the week. Mr. Chairman, the minister...

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE: I will, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Finance and Economic Development seems to be labouring under a misapprehension or delusion or something. Does he forget, Sir, that the people of Newfoundland flung us out into opposition on March 24 and made him the government? Well, he would like to think "him" but there are several other colleagues around with him. Mr. Chairman, he and his colleagues are the government of this province and it is up to the Government of this province to use the money which is available to them in the best possible way, according to what they consider to be in the interest of the people of this province.

What we are saying here in the Opposition is that the cutting out of over \$100,000 for graduate fellowships, which represents perhaps the depriving of at least several people from obtaining professional training this year, or perhaps any time in the future, is a wrong use of public funds. What the government should do, in accordance with their

mandate from the people, is to try to reorient policies, or try to redistribute among programmes the money which they do have at their disposal. The pie is limited, the pie is finite, but it is there and they can redistribute the money in the pie and try to come up with a good programme. What we are saying is that the cutting out of money for graduate fellowships or the cutting out of the money for any training programme of any kind, especially in the field of engineering or health or trades, the various varieties, is an unprogressive, backward looking, retrograde step and the honourable Minister of Finance should, with his colleagues, try to avoid taking these backward steps and should try to find the money elsewhere.

It is not my job as a member of the Opposition to tell him where he is going to find the money. He got his answer on March 24th. They formed the government of this province and it is up to them to find the money. If that means that they have to raise the taxes, so be it. Let them take the political and social responsibility, the economic responsibility for raising taxes. The people have given them the right to bring such a programme into this House of Assembly for approval. If, on the other hand, they do not have the moral courage, they do not have the guts to bring in such a programme of taxation, that is their responsibility and their right again.

It is not up to us, Mr. Chairman, to tell the government how it should raise its money or where it should get the money. What we are saying here is that a specific programme, namely the training of certain graduate students, should not be cut. That to me, Sir, is not a negative statement, that to me, Sir, is a positive statement. Our idea, our policy on this side of the House is that the government should not cut graduate fellowships. It is the training of people that should not be cut, when the money is being allocated every year in the estimates. That is a positive statement. We say, 'put back the \$147,000 for graduate fellowships, or put back more money for example in vocational training or put back more money for university or elementary schools

or secondary schools.' These are positive statements on our part.

If the honourable Minister of Finance, who makes a speech and then leaves the House, obviously he is only interested in what he himself has to say, if the honourable Minister of Finance wants some suggestions from the opposition who are not the government, then we over here will be glad to provide some suggestions for him. It is perhaps too late now, but more than \$147,000 for graduate fellowships could have been found from the \$5 million sellout to Javelin Paper Company or the Javelin Interests. More that \$147,000 could have been found from the \$2.5 million free gift, scandalous free gift to the Lake Interests in Burgeo.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE: Well, it was about \$1.6 million free gift.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, Point of Order.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member would not know a Point of Order if it hit him in the head.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, on a Point of Order, I fail to see what the honourable member for White Bay South is presently talking about has to do with subsection 604-05, MUN tuition and allowances.

MR. ROWE: May I speak to the Point of Order, Sir. The point, for the honourable member's edification, is that we are talking about putting back \$147,000 in the estimates for graduate fellowships. I am pointing out to the government, in response to a question by the honourable Minister of Finance, where that money can be found. Now, if the Chairman wants to rule on that Point of Order, of course, he can do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The rule of relevancy is there within limits. Since the matter has been raised the honourable member can refer to items where the money could be found and put back into item 604-05. However, obviously there will have to be limits placed on how wide-ranging this search for other money is going to be. If it were completely thrown open this would give the honourable member opportunity, presumably

to talk on any matter that he wanted to talk on. So, within limits the honourable member can continue.

MR. ROWE: You are absolutely right, Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of debating any of these topics I am talking about. I am merely giving some examples in response to the question of the Minister of Finance as to where this money could be found. The honourable member for Bonavista South would be well advised to leave Points of Order to his House Leader who seems to know something about the matter.

Mr. Chairman, I have mentioned the \$5 million to the linerboard - to the Javelin Interests in respect of the linerboard mill, I have mentioned a \$1.5 million free gift to the Lake Interests in respect of the Burgeo plant. \$147,000 could have been found there. The honourable member for Burgeo would be well advised to be very quiet on the topic of the money to the Burgeo fish plant, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Finance can find the money if he wants to in the elaborate communications system which is apparently being put in for the benefit of the government members, to pass out information, nicely prepared blurbs, to the press of the province, in an efficient manner. I am sure that is going to cost more than \$147,000 of the province's money before it is finished.

I might also suggest to the honourable Minister of Finance that I am sure if he looks through the estimates for the Premier's office and Executive Council and a variety of minister's offices in the province, where the office staff and flunkies and political hacks who have been hired on have been increased very greatly over the past few months, that he will find \$147,000.

The point I am making, Sir, is that if there is any money to be found for any subject, it should be found first and foremost to train the people of Newfoundland professionally or in trades or in skilled labour. That is of primary importance in this province. For the honourable minister to get up and say, where could it be found, is nonsense. That kind of money should be found first, Sir. Then the question should be asked; where can money for other programmes be found? The

June 19, 1972, Tape 807, Page 5 -- apb

first priority, and the hon. Premier is a great man for talking about priorities, the first priority in this province should be in respect of professionally training, skillfull training and training in the trades for the people of this province, so that we can have the high paying jobs, so that we can make the high incomes,

Mr. Rowe (W.N.)

the high income which in turn will bring in increased tax revenue to this province in the years to come. As a result of the investment put into education, we can reap benefits in the years to come and increase our solid tax base. It is one thing to increase our tax base, Sir, by industrialization, by bringing in as much industry as we can and therefore getting some taxes back into the provincial coffers. Another method would be to have as many high paid people as possible in this Province, getting good salaries, because they have good trades and good professions and good training so that their income tax and the amount of expendable revenue they have is greater so that that increases the taxes of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. That is the point I am making. I have given the hon. Minister of Finance three or four or five places from which he can take \$147,000 or from which he could have taken, if the die has not been cast. Even if these glaring examples of the Linerboard Mill, the Lake interest, the communication system in the Premier's Office and other things were not there, Sir, I would still say that the training of people is the first priority. His question should not be: Where can we find the money? His statement should be: We have found the money letting other programmes, other programmes which are lower on the list of priorities, find money for themselves. That is what the hon. Minister of Finance should be asking himself.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): I cannot really understand the reason for the criticisms from the other side of the House in the debate on this particular subhead. As members of the opposition, surely we have the responsibility of pointing out what we feel is a weakness in the estimates pertaining to the Department of Education. We did point out what we considered to be a weakness with respect to the future training of graduate students in this province. The Minister of Education came back at first and simply accused

Mr. Rowe (F.B.):

us of obstructing the House of Assembly, slowing down the House of Assembly, and he was casting reflections back on the past administration. That was his first reaction to us simply bringing this case to this committee, Sir. Then after a little more debate, the Minister of Education did indeed agree with the case that we were putting. There was a need for more money but they could not find it. Then all of a sudden the Minister of Finance leaps to his feet, like he has done several times already during this committee session, as the hon. member for Green Bay had done in the past, and starts asking this opposition for suggestions on how to spend money in the Department of Education, apparently forgetting that he has a Minister of Education and apparently, Sir, forgetting that he has the powers of responsibility in the government of this province at the present time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, seeing that hon. the Premier is in his seat in this honourable House this afternoon, I think the hon. Premier owes it to the people of this province to stand in his place in this honourable House this afternoon and tell the people of Newfoundland how much it is going to cost to set up this propaganda machine to replace "The Newfoundland Bulletin" that we heard so much ramping and raving about?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is now out of order. We are dealing with 604-05, Memorial University, tuition allowances.

MR. NEARY: The point I am making is that the hon. Minister of Finance stood in his place in this honourable House a few moments ago and asked for suggestions on how they could get the money to pay out for these graduate fellowships. The hon. Minister of Education has to assume a part of the responsibility because he is a member of the government. The Minister of Finance has to accept his share of the responsibility, but only the hon. the Premier can referee, Sir. Mr. Chairman, the honourable unsavory minister, if he would just hold tight and sit in his seat for a few more moments until I am finished - he is getting a terrific roasting.

Mr. Neary.

He cannot take it, Sir. He cannot take it. Sir, my hon. colleague from White Bay South suggested that the money could be saved by not going ahead with the programme of putting teletype machines in all the news rooms across this province. My hon. colleague from White Bay South also suggested, Sir, that the expensive flunkies (I believe there are sixteen of them now, at the last count, that have been hired over the last few weeks) be removed from the taxpayers' back. I would suggest, Sir, that the final payment to Spencer Lake be withheld. I would suggest also, Sir, that Mr. McLean and his associates, "The Bay Street Boys" be sent packing back to Toronto. I would suggest also, Sir, that the expensive entertainment that is going on in the hotels around St. John's for the last few weeks, Sir, be dropped. Then, Mr. Chairman, the honourable minister will have enough money to reinstate the mothers' allowance and the graduate fellowships.

MR. CARTER: A serious student of history some generations ahead will look back on this period and will wonder seriously how we ever managed not to cut out the assistance to students altogether, bearing in mind the extremely difficult situation that the previous administration left us in. Since hearing all this debate, I have discovered one source of revenue that might alleviate this shortage and that is that it be wrung out of the obstructive hides of the individuals opposite.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak again on these education estimates but in view of what has happened here in the last few days, I think another minute or two would not hurt.

AN HON. MEMBER: Take all week.

MR. ROBERTS: You have all summer.

MR. EVANS: You can have the summer. I will take the fall to get home.

AN HON. MEMBER: We will never get home.

MR. EVANS: We have had so much criticism here that it is not constructive. We even had an amendment to a motion here from the honourable member on the other side that the minister's salary be cut down to \$1.40. A member who would make such a suggestion, in using up the time of this honourable House, should be obligated to donate his own salary to the widows and orphans in Viet Nam or some such place or other and also be prepared to pay a high rental on the seat he is occupying in the House of Assembly. Then we had the big hassle over the mothers' allowance. I have been all through my district and the only concerned mothers I see are on the other side. As a matter of fact, I think they got fooled up in the way their mail is addressed. "M.H.A." they thought was another new way of spelling "ma."

If there is one area in which the Minister of Education has not been up to par, I would say it was in not making up provision for adult education. He did not realize that there was need of so much. Of course, we will help him out on that. If the honourable members think they are getting any mileage out of it, what they are trying to put before this House, in my opinion they are only getting yardage out of the hole they are excavating in order to bury themselves in political oblivion.

On motion 604-05 carried.

On motion total subhead 604, carried.

On motion total subhead 611, carried.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, 612-02-01, salaries to teachers. Sir, I think probably that the most important aspect of education, whether it is in this province or any other province, is not necessarily the physical facilities that we have for the education of our youngsters nor is it the apparatus, materials, BA's and all this sort of a thing that there appears

Mr. Rowe (F.B.).

to be a greater tendency to spend money on in recent years. Sir, still the most important aspect of primary, elementary and secondary education is the relationship that exists between the students in the classroom and the teacher. I would submit, Sir, that the teacher in spite of all the recent developments in the field of the media, the teacher is still the most important component of the whole educational process.

Now, Sir, we have a desperate situation when we see overcrowded classrooms

in many of our schools. It is my understanding that approximately twenty-five per-cent of the classrooms that we have in our schools today have forty or more students in these classrooms. Twenty-five per-cent of the total number of classrooms that we have in our schools have forty or more students to that one teacher. Sir, this is why the reduction in the student-teacher ratio is so tremendously important. That is only one reason when we have one-quarter of our classrooms that are desperately overcrowded. I can tell you, Sir, and everybody knows this that no matter how good a teacher is or how good the students are or what kind of media you have in that school or what kind of a physical plant that you have for that school or what the training and educational qualifications of the teachers are this one to forty teacher-student ratio will destroy any possibility of ever getting proper education in that particular classroom.

Sir, that is only one aspect of it. Sir, as we all know there have been great strides made in pedagogy, I guess you could call it, over the past twelve or so years. We have had great developments in curriculum and instruction, largely carried out by the Americans, and I mentioned this a night or so ago, When sputnik went up in 1957, the Russians put up sputnik, the Americans got the fright of their life. They figured they were falling behind in the technology race. So all of a sudden they started to look at their educational system, Now I am not suggesting the motive was a particularly good one. The motive may not have been a particularly good one but what came out of it was some of the greatest advancements in instruction and curriculum development, beginning with the area of science. Because of the fact that sputnik went up, the Americans figured they were falling behind in the technological race so they had a good solid look at science education. primary, elementary, secondary, college and university.

Now what happened as a result of this is that we had this emphasis on the educational process spreading into all other areas.

The current emphasis is now on the social studies, but emphasis was also placed in the field of mathematics, language, arts and other areas of education besides science. Now, Sir, one of the things that they found out from their studies is that it is absolutely necessary that you have a low teacher ratio in order to have instruction, according to the inquiry or the discovery, or whatever you want to call it, approach where students are given an opportunity to learn how to learn and to learn on their own through an active process of learning rather than a passive process of learning.

Sir, there is another extremely important thing that grew out of this development in curriculum and instruction in education and that is -

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I understand we are discussing head 612(02)(01) - Salaries of teachers. I have not heard this mentioned since the member has started talking on this particular head. I am wondering if what he is saying is really relevant to the subject.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I submit that I am approaching the point here where I am developing a case for the necessity for the reduction of the student-teacher ratio which certainly pertains, to my understanding anyway, to this 612(02)(01) where we are dealing with teachers' salaries. Because if in fact we are going to require an increase in the number of teachers in this province for the purpose of reduction in the student-teacher ratio, certainly we need an increase or we need to look at the grant to boards for the purposes of salaries to teachers and to superintendents.

Now I would just like to add one other thing, Mr. Chairman, before I sit down on the point of order. The other night I was criticized by two members of the other side of the House for not expounding on and developing education as it pertains to the schools, the primary, elementary and primary schools, so this time I am now doing it.

AN HON. MEMBER: We did not ask you to do it under that sub-head though.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): What sub-head would you like for me to do it under?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! The rule of relevancy is again raised here. The honourable member has stated that he is preparing, setting up the background to establish the need for smaller student-teacher ratio. However, this obviously has to be done within certain limits. Just put in that manner the honourable member could justify giving the House a course in educational philosophy for several months. So I would ask the honourable member to keep in mind that the discussion has to be relevant. The honourable member obviously has a certain amount of leeway but the Chair will have to consider when he is going beyond that leeway.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You are perfectly correct. One could go on for some months in the fields of curriculum and instruction and educational philosophy. I am not an educational philosopher. I think I know a little bit about one small aspect of education, science education, and I was just relating to curriculum development as such, which certainly is related to the money that one has to expend in the area of salaries to teachers, as far as student-teacher ratio is concerned.

Sir, the couple of points that I have made so far is that in order for the educational process to be carried on the way that most psychologists and educators believe that it should be carried on, this necessitates a lowering of the student-teacher ratio or the whole process of education in the classroom where it is most important will not be successful or at least not as successful as it could be with less students per teacher than we have at the present time.

Sir, the other thing that I was going to mention when the point of order was raised is this, that education is finally becoming what one could truly call a science, where programmes are developed,

curricular programmes are developed, instructional models are developed by people knowledgeable in the various disciplines. They are developed, they are experimented with for two and three and four years. At a cost of millions of dollars they are experimented with in the schools themselves. This requires project teachers or pilot teachers or experimental teachers who go into these classrooms and conduct these experimental projects or pilot project for a year or two. Then the administrators in the school and the teachers in the school sit back and they study what happened over that two year period. Then they modify the programme for the particular school, school system or province that they are planning to offer this programme in.

Sir, this requires a reduction in the student-teacher ratio. Sir, for these two reasons alone, to carry out the educational process as modern learning psychologists suggest and to carry out these experimental or pilot curriculum projects so that they can be evaluated and modified for our schools, these two reasons alone put a great deal of pressure on the NTA or on the authorities, to reduce the student-teacher ratio so that these two things can be carried out adequately in the schools.

Sir, another point is that the honourable Minister of Finance, some time ago in this House, suggested that we have an oversupply of teachers, an oversupply of teachers in this province. Sir, I have not seen any documented evidence or studies that have been carried out that have proved that we have an oversupply of teachers. I know there is an individual professor at the university, in the faculty of education, in fact, who is somewhat concerned about the increase in the supply of teachers. This concern is mainly the result of a great number of students who are graduating from the university, coming back and saying, "Look we cannot find jobs. We cannot find jobs

June 19, 1972

Tape 809

JM - 5

in the schools.' Now what is happening here is that a lot of our graduates are not finding jobs in the schools where they want to work. This is the basic problem.

You have a chap from St. John's or a chap from Grand Falls, Corner Brook, Labrador City, Baie Verte or somewhere who has his home there

It is his home there, He has grown up in that particular community and he wants to go back to a particular school in order to teach there. Naturally enough. But, Sir, quite often we find in our larger central and regional high schools that they do have an adequate supply of teachers. Well qualified teachers, experienced teachers and consequently some of our younger graduates just cannot get into the particular school where they would like to teach. There is the reason I would suggest that many people are saying that we have an over supply of teachers.

However, I will concede this, Sir, that we certainly have to look at the number of teachers who we are turning out of this university. It is conceivable that we could end up in the near future with an over supply, it is conceivable. But, Sir, what we have in this province in the field of education in our schools is a situation where we have a tremendous number of teachers who are not particularly qualified to teach the subjects that they are now teaching such as science, language, arts, some aspects of special education, foreign language and this type of thing. This is where we have to get more teachers trained along these lines out into the school.

Another point, Sir, is this, is that in 1970-1971 I understand that there was an unusually high registration of students in our schools, just prior to that the year before I think the same thing. When we started to bring in these temporary classrooms, there was an unusually high registration of students in the school and consequently, of course, we had a corresponding increase in the number of teachers that were hired by the various school boards.

Now, we have a situation apparently where the school registration or school enrollment, primary, elementary or secondary level is starting to level off. It is my understanding, from talking to some people in authority, that there are as many as three hundred teachers who are

presently employed by school boards this year who are going to be laid off. Now, I do not know, Sir, if the Minister of Education have heard any thing about this. But it is my understanding, I have been talking to some people on this matter when they brought it to my attention. Because of the levelling off of enrollment of students anticipated for next year in the schools, there are as many as 300 teachers across this province of ours who are concerned about whether they are going to be employed by their particular school boards in the - can I rephrase that, Mr. Chairman? I did not want to name the teachers, this is why I wanted - there are school boards, Sir, who are concerned about having to lay off teachers or subsidize their salaries next year, in the coming year, because of the present formula that we have regarding the student teacher ratio.

Now, I am only repeating what I am hearing from people in so-called authority. I simply ask the Minister of Education if he has heard anything along these lines or whether he can check this sort of thing out because I think, Sir, it is an extremely serious situation. I found it kind of difficult to believe myself. I was initially extremely concerned over the fact that we just did not have a reduction in the student teacher ratio for the purpose of experimenting with curriculum in order to facilitate proper instructions in the classroom. I was extremely concerned about that. But to my amazement in recent days I have heard that approximately 300 teachers are or may be laid off or school boards may have to subsidize their salaries next year. This is right across the province, because of the present formula being used by the administration.

Sir, I already mentioned that twenty five per cent of the classrooms in our province have one teacher to forty students or more. It is a ridiculous situation in this day and age. The Minister can blame the

previous administration for it if he wishes. But, Sir, parent and teachers associations, school boards, and the professional group, the N.T.A. the Newfoundland Teachers Association, are extremely upset, extremely concerned and have in fact pleaded with the government to have a second look at this whole business of student teacher ratio.

Sir, for the normal class, the average class, we understand from the educational experts that one teacher for twenty-five or thirty students is a desirable ratio. One to twenty-five to thirty students. This is the normal class.

Sir, in the case of special education, slow learners and this type of thing, the experts say that it is. I understand that in the area of special education, slow learners, opportunity classes this type of thing that the desirable ratio is twelve to twenty students per teacher.

So, Sir, just in summary, in terms of the existing situation, twenty-five per cent of our classes with forty or more students per classrooms, with the Americans and the Mainland of Canada, some of the provinces of Canada, and the British having spent millions and millions of dollars on curriculum development, the curricula are right there for us to experiment with and use. Because of the accessibility and the availability of these curricula and the desirability of reducing student teacher ratio to bring them in, I would suggest that that is a further argument for reducing the student teacher ratio.

Sir, I would ask the honourable Minister of Education if in fact he would be kind enough Sir, to take a second look, as the N.T.A has requested, at this whole business of the student teacher ratio.

Sir, just one other very brief point. I do not know, I guess this is probably the subheading under which the Minister probably could expound on his thoughts with respect to collective bargaining for teachers. In my initial comments on the subheading of salaries,

601-01 I asked that particular question at the beginning because I considered it to be a general type of question and the Minister of Education said that he would relate to any question that has been asked when we deal with that particular item under the subhead to which it pertains. So, I hope the honourable minister could give us some indication of the possibility (1) of doing something about the student teacher ratio. (2) giving us some idea of the direction of his department and his colleagues with respect to bringing in legislation regarding collective bargaining for teachers during this present year.

MR.CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I have a long list of things to answer. First of all, I will deal with what I think is the most urgent one. First it is scandalous rumourmongering to suggest that any teachers are being laid off. That is not true. At least it has not come to our attention. I assume that that kind of knowledge would certainly come to our attention very early on -

MR. ROWE: You are not suggesting that we are responsible for initiating these rumours.

MR.CARTER: No, no, whoever is responsible for initiating those rumours is a rumourmonger and nothing else. On the collective bargaining for teachers at the moment there is a committee composed of the N.T.A and the Treasury Board, meeting and sitting and discussing the problems of collective bargaining for teachers. That committee is still sitting and I have not yet received a report from it. When I do and when the report can be made public, I will certainly make it public. But the honourable member may rest assured that that situation is being carefully considered by such a committee and presumably if the N.T.A feel they wish to comment on that particular committee that is entirely up to themselves. I certainly do not feel free to comment at the moment. The committee meets, I have no idea what they have

decided yet. When they do decide they will issue a report. They will give it to undoubtedly. But there is such a committee in existence.

On the pupil teacher ratio, I suppose this is the appropriate heading to bring it up. Certainly it is the heading that deals with teachers. There are 6,400 teachers, there are approximately

63,000 students, that is an average of 25.5, one teacher for every 25.5 pupils. Now that is not to say that a teacher can go into a classroom confidently expecting a classroom any smaller than thirty to forty students. Some of those teachers are specialists, some of them are supervisors, some of them are principals. The classes are still too large. I will grant the hon. member his point and it is a very sore point, it is a very difficult problem. The need for lower pupil-teacher ratio is recognized by every responsible official connected with education. There is no argument there whatsoever. Nor is there any argument that there is a great deal more that needs to be done in education. But what you have to remember is that you do what you can with the resources that you have. I would suggest that these particular estimates this year are an extremely generous attempt to handle the problems that we are facing.

On the over supply of teachers, certainly if the pupil-teacher ratio could be lowered to an acceptable level, I have no doubt that there could conceivably be a shortage of teachers. But given the ratio that we have at the moment, and the resources that we have at the moment, we are not able to increase the supply of teachers dramatically except on the present formula which is a fairly complex one, which result roughly in one to every 25.5 students, although I grant you that a lot of those teachers are not in the classroom nor able to be in the classroom because of other duties. Still I do agree that the school enrollment is levelling off and that we may well see the day, before too long, when we are able to bring in an acceptable pupil-teacher ratio.

The problem of education though is rather like the problem of employment. There is no shortage of work and there really is no shortage of teachers but there is a shortage of employers. There is a

shortage of money and a serious shortage of money. But nevertheless these estimates, as I said before, are larger than any previous ones and I think are a very generous attempt to deal with the present problems.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to become emotional about this whole thing and I will try not to be but it is very, very difficult, and I am not criticizing anybody on the other side, Sir, or anybody on this side but it is extremely difficult to try and relate to people who have not had experiences in the actual classroom themselves. I do not mean this to be a criticism of the hon. minister, who may have been a teacher in the classroom at one time, I have no idea, Sir. But it is very difficult to try to relate the feelings and the experiences of a teacher in a classroom, who has grand ideas and knows what to do that is consistent with modern educational technology, psychology, instruction in mythology and everything else. It is extremely difficult to relate to people concerned with matters of responsibility for the whole province. It is almost impossible to relate the difficulty and the frustration and the confusion that a teacher has in the classroom with students crawling all over the place, not being able to put into practice some of the modern things that he or she learned a year or two before. Within two years, Sir, we got that teacher so frustrated that we got a young bright persons changed into the most cynical individual that you could ever imagine. This happens. It has happened to so many people it is not even funny. After two years of teaching in a school and not being able to do the things that he or she wishes to do, in line with what they learned in terms of modern psychology, learning instruction, what have you, that person gives up, ends up as far away from the field of education as you can possibly think of and what do we end up with, Sir. In all too many cases we end up with the people in the schools who have been doing the same thing for

five, ten, fifteen, twenty, twenty-five years. These are the people whom we end up with when we do not allow a climate to exist in a classroom where you can have a teacher doing what he or she wishes to do which is in line with modern learned psychology. This happens, Sir.

Money should not really matter here. It has to be made available in order to have the proper process of education occurring in our classrooms. Sir, instruction in a classroom is not a dramatic thing. We can make all kinds of noise about the university, and everybody covers it and everybody talks about it, about the university. But talk about instruction in the classroom, Sir, and this is a criticism of members on the other side of the House. As soon as I talk about the classroom or instruction in the classroom, I get the sneaking suspicion that people are bored over there, because those yawns and these little conversations that take place, as soon as I start talking about education in the classroom, is just not merely a coincidence, surely.

Sir, I suggest that the Minister of Education squeeze it, drain it, I do not know how he is going to get it, but get it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Milk it.

MR. ROWE: Milk it. Take it out of Spencer Lake, get this money and put it in education where it properly deserves, into the classroom, because the university is not the most important component of education in this province. It is not the Fisheries College. It is not the Department of Education and it is not the vocational schools as institutions but it surely is the relationship that exists between the teacher and the students in this province. We got nice fancy buildings all over the place, but what is going on in those classrooms leaves a little bit to be desired as long as we have forty students to the class.

I did a survey there, two years ago, all summer it took me to do it. I do not know whether the hon. minister has ever seen it. It has very narrow aspects - science education again, and there are classrooms,

Sir, not too many of them but there are classrooms in this province where we got sixty students in a science class. Sixty-six was the highest one, Now there are only a few of these but there were too many fifties and there were too many forties and still we have this peculiar situation where we might have two or three students in a classroom.

So, Sir, it is not me screaming and yelling here, it is the NTA are extremely concerned about it and believe me the NTA are the last people, with all due respect to them, who want to rock the boat when estimates are coming down. The university is the last institution that wants to rock the boat when the estimates are coming down. When we consider what happened to the NTA and the government, I might add, in the last couple of years, because of the mixing of politics and pedagogy, I think it must be an extremely concerned group when they come out at this point in the game and get on their knees and beg the government to take a second look at the student-teacher ratio. I think it is a brave thing for them to do because they have already suffered not a little from the mixing of politics and education at one stage in the game.

So, Sir, I ask you seriously, do not tell us about the mess in the past, do not tell us that there is no money available, money can be made available if it is important enough to the administration. Unfortunately what goes on in the classroom is not dramatic, it is not even a vote getter but it is extremely important to the youth of this province and where they are going to end up in the future, Sir.

MR. PECKFORD: I would just like to make a few remarks before we finish off this subhead, First of all I would like to say to the hon. Member for St. Barbe North that I appreciate his comments on education and I have tried to remain in the House while he was speaking on it. That is number one. Number two, Mr. Chairman, on this business of curriculum development and so on, as the hon. Member for St. Barbe North pointed out

I think the most important aspect of the whole educational process where the pupil-teacher ratio needs to be lowered, if you had to pick out one segment of it, it would be the primary and elementary sphere of it. I thought somebody was going to mention this. I think this is the critical aspect of the whole thing. I do not think; it is .

I will go on to explain why it is immediate in the high school because I think a lot of educators and educational psychologists have come to realize, in the area of methods these days, that there are quite a few areas within the subject where large group-instruction is perhaps even more appropriate than small-group instruction. There are in quite a few of the subjects offered in high school today, you can, from Grade IX to Grade X anyway to Grade XI or Grade XII, you can have large-group instruction, where the pupil/teacher ratio does not present a very big problem. Where the problem surely lies, at its most critical point, is within the primary and elementary sphere. This is what we usually find. By the way, Mr. Chairman, the forty, fifty, sixty and sixty-six pupils in a classroom, it is not in the Grade IX, X and XI. Until recent years, you would get it. There was a time only five or six years ago that when you started off in school with somebody in Grade IV, where you had forty-five or fifty in a classroom, if you followed your old group of people up through school, your students, you ended up in Grade X yourself with perhaps five, ten or fifteen of those left, out of the forty. I know from myself. Out of the eighteen or so who were in Grade IV with me, I think two of us ended up in Grade X, as a matter of fact. You still have a little bit of this. You still have the drop-out thing, either good or bad, happening so that you do not get the same significant critical pupil/teacher ratio in the high schools as you do in primary and elementary education. I think that is one aspect of it.

I wanted to mention also that there is still - I agree with just about everything the hon. member for St. Barbe North had to say in his remarks recently. Most of it was very constructive and well-worth

saying. That is the only reason why I am up now to perhaps reiterate some of the points that he made. At the same time within the high school area, perhaps the honourable member would agree with me that perhaps it is due to, what he said about the teachers becoming frustrated because of their idealism when they come out of university, but there are far too many after two or three years get in sort of a rut. I still maintain that there is still a lot that can be done on the local school classroom level that is not being done now. Perhaps it should be initiated to a great extent by these supervisors of instruction for the various boards. I am a little weary myself about some of the supervisors, their functions and how well they are performing. I am a little weary from my own narrow experience. I do not think enough is being initiated in that way by these people. I might be all wet about the ears but that is how it appears to me. I have already mentioned, Mr. Chairman, earlier, I think, in this session, about the collective bargaining for teachers. I just reiterate again that I am totally in favour of it and hopefully they will get what they deserve when that report is brought down that the minister mentioned.

Concerning the teacher layoff thing that the hon. member for St. Barbe North mentioned, I too did hear that but I heard it in a different way. Apparently in a number of boards throughout the island, there was some indication that in some of the larger centres there was going to be this levelling off of school population, giving rise to a surplus of one, two or three teachers in the large central or regional high school. The comment was made a number of times in the last eight or ten months that some of these teachers were going to have to be transferred within the same district to a smaller school. I think this is how I heard it. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reiterate that I appreciate the comments of the hon. member for St. Barbe North on the other side and I agree almost wholeheartedly with all he had to say. It is too bad we cannot have the pupil/teacher ratio down. I would

Mr. Peckford

just like to emphasize that it is most important in the primary and elementary sphere of the educational process and that when action is taken, it should be taken in this sphere first before going on to the higher levels of education. There are certain elements of high school programmes that lend themselves even to large-group instruction rather than small.

I support the collective bargaining and I said a few words about the teacher layoff that I heard about.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, I was out of the House when the matter of collective bargaining was brought up. I have one or two questions which I would like to ask the minister. Is it envisaged that the superintendents of boards form part of the people who would be in a bargaining unit or would they be considered as management or staff? What is the situation there? Perhaps the minister could give us some ideas on that; and secondly, can he tell us what is the current salary of superintendents of boards? Has it been increased from last year? That is the question number one, respecting the salary, and could the minister tell us if he has the knowledge of how many boards there are who have augmented or supplemented the superintendents' salary? I believe it was \$12,000 last year or the year before. How much have they augmented it in his particular case? He might not have the information there but I would appreciate receiving that information if the minister could get it.

MR. CARTER: My deputy tells me that the amount or the salary of superintendents attached to boards is approximately \$13,500 at the moment. How many boards supplement the income? I do not know. If that information can be found, if the honourable gentleman wishes to have it, he will certainly have it.

On the collective bargaining, there is a committee of the N.T.A. and of Treasury Board who are sitting down together to discuss this. More than that I cannot say. Their discussions have started. When they

Mr. Carter

do reach some conclusion they will report it to me. If I am able to, I will be more than happy to make a copy of their deliberations available or their conclusions available to this House.

There are a couple of short notes and then I think this subhead will have been debated as far as it can be. There is no doubt about it that we would all wish for more teachers and a lower pupil/teacher ratio, that is less pupils per teacher. I have to ask myself and I have to ask all members of this House what did our predecessors do in this regard? The answer is remarkably little. The pupil/teacher ratio is not that improved. It may well be argued that our predecessors brought education to the present level under some other subheads. I would like to make a comment on that. However be that as it may, we have the present \$52 million for the present teachers, compared with \$46,428,100 last year. Most of that increase is tied up with increments to teachers as opposed to more teachers. I would recommend it to you for approval.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, there are very remarks on this particular vote. I think it is well to draw to the attention of the House (I have listened attentively to all the arguments this afternoon) the fact that this particular vote in itself has gone up practically \$6 million from last year. It will probably go up \$8 million next year and probably \$10 million the following year or progressively whatever the proportion may be. It will certainly go up by very considerable leaps and bounds. Now in all that the hon. member for St. Barbe North has said, which is most desirable, is something that we agree with entirely, the pupil/teacher ratio and nobody will argue against that, the advantages of it, the advisability of it and all this sort of thing, there has to be the question of priorities brought into all this. He, himself, mentioned the word priorities. Just look at this vote alone, which is \$52 million today. That in itself is practically five times the amount - that one vote in education is practically five times what we were spending on the whole

Mr. Earle.

Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources. It is nine times what we are spending on Fisheries in this country. One vote alone for teachers' salaries is practically nine times what we are spending on Fisheries. What does the money come from to pay teachers' salaries? It comes from industry, from increasing people's wages in income so that they can be taxed. How are we going to get these taxes? How are we going to get the wages? How are we going to get the money to pay these salaries? We can only get it from industry and development in this

MR. EARLE: province and if we are going to go up from \$52 million to \$62 million, to \$70 million, to \$80 million and \$90 million and so on there is only one source that it can come from that is our revenue and taxes and what we can bring in. So do not let us talk this nonsense about what is desirable and what we should like to do, everybody recognizes that, everybody sees the desirability of it. But what the honourable minister is pointing out and what all of us on this side are pointing out, that in the light of the situations which we find ourselves, with the stringency of money in practically every vote, only so much money can only go so far. Certainly there are other items throughout this whole budget which in the return that they will give to our people are equally as important as this vote. Now I know that educators will disagree, probably the honourable gentleman who just spoke will disagree. But we simply cannot go on piling upon, piling upon, piling upon, piling upon millions upon millions, upon millions, upon millions unless at the same time we create something in our other natural resources other than the people the boys and girls, if we draw from our other natural resources the revenue to pay for this.

Now it is true that our young people are our preatest assets. Nobody is disputing it. But this one item alone in their training is \$52 million, which is nine times as much as we are spending on Fisheries and five times as much as we are spending on Mines, Agriculture and Resources. I think there has to be some realization of the importance - \$128 million in this whole budget.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: But all of this must take its proper place and I think that the headache this government faces and all other governments have faced is just how much we can spend and how far we can go and if we are getting the best value for our money? Perhaps in the students we may be educating them to a point, I hesitate to say this,

MR. EARLE: but that their priorities are getting out of balance, that education is getting out of balance, that the demands are far beyond anything that this province can cope with.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the honourable member for Fortune Bay is getting at exactly, but I got the impression that the best thing we could do is just sit down and keep quiet about this. Sir, we do not intend to. We feel that an investment in education, as he suggested, is an extremely important investment. To talk about whether educational priorities are getting out of place in this province is absolutely ridiculous.

If we were in British Columbia or in Ontario, I suggest that the minister could very well ask this type of a question. But in a province, Sir, that still does not have enough qualified teachers, still has a student-teacher ratio that is too great, still requires bigger and better schools, I would suggest, Sir, that this argument does not hold water whatsoever.

Sir I am getting just a little bit sick of hearing the Minister of Education getting up and in answer to every single suggestion, proposal or question that we ask him, to start making suggestions that we had enough of this debate now, it is all over with. The honourable minister speaks and his first statement is, this should end the debate.

Sir, the second thing that always comes out is this business of reflections on the past. Sir, if they want to start talking about this increase of \$52 million over \$46 million last year, I would suggest that the government had no control whatsoever or anything to do with this increase.

MR. CARTER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F.B. I did not suggest that you did, I am just making a statement. I did not say anybody said it, I am just making a statement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The honourable member has placed his question to the Chairman and he is, in the heat of the debate, getting on and addressing directly to the honourable the Minister of Education which is obviously out of order.

MR. ROWE, F.B.: For that, Mr. Chairman, I will apologize and I would like to remind the honourable Minister of Education, every member of this House of Assembly also has the right to be heard in silence, Sir, so I would like for you to rule on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again the honourable member is correct, however the honourable member is raising this it appears after the fact and not at the time the interruption was made, which is what the honourable member should have done. But the honourable member, of course, is correct, he is entitled to be heard in silence.

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

Mr. Chairman, what I am simply suggesting is this - is that with a policy, with direction, the increase in the vote for teachers salary could have been a result of say some policy with respect to the reduction of the student-teacher ratio. But, Sir, with the increasing qualifications of our teachers and with the increased number of our teachers and with the increased salaries of our teachers, this increase was all about over last year. So it is no new philosophy or policy that this present administration has come up with that accounts for this particular increase.

The reason, Sir, I say that, is simply because the honourable the Minister of Education says: "Sure! Look, from \$46 million to \$52 million." Sir, I submit that this had nothing to do with educational policy or with direction of this present administration.

MR. CARTER: My mentioning that increased figure is merely pointing out that more of our resources are going into this particular subhead and I said this reflected primarily increases to teachers both yearly

MR. CARTER: increments as well as an overall increase that they were granted sometime ago and that it did not necessarily imply that there were that many more teachers being employed.

I think though, Mr. Chairman, with all respect to honourable members opposite, I think practically every point about this particular subhead has indeed been mentioned, not once but several times with your indulgence, and I would therefore submit, Mr. Chairman, that we pass on to another subhead.

On motion 612-02-01 carried.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Mr. Chairman, there has been an increase of \$1,275,000 in the vote granted to the school boards as operational grants. Sir, I have - and probably the Minister of Education heard this as well, many of our school boards in this province over the past year had an extremely severe winter with respect to expenditures. We have had a situation where there were a great number of problems with respect to the water and sewerage lines going to many of our central schools. In fact quite a few of them have been frozen up and in fact I understand that in my own district the water and sewerage freeze-ups are expected to last until July, as far as the communities are concerned, I am not quite sure about the schools themselves.

But, Sir, what I am trying to say of course is that the school boards had an unexpected expense this year because of the lack of snow on the ground and the deep frost.

MR. CARTER: Tory weather.

MR. ROWE: F.B. It must have been Tory weather. This was something, Sir, that they did not expect and they had to find the money for this somewhere.

The other aspect of expenditures over the past year, Sir, was the fact that we had of course extremely low temperatures and therefore a corresponding increase in the consumption of fuel. The monies that the various school boards had to pay for the fuel during this past year was far in excess of the amount that they had ever expected to pay.

June 19, 1972

Tape 813 (afternoon)

PK - 5

MR. ROWE, F.B. Sir, what we have here now is the school boards of course going into the next year basically short of cash even

2553

with this increase in the operational grants that we see here. As well, Sir, practically every school board that I have been speaking with or members of school boards that I have been speaking with have suggested that they were just barely getting along on the grants that they had during the previous year, and this goes back to pre-Tory days I might add.

Sir, therefore, when we take into consideration the fact that they really felt they could not meet their expenses during the past years and we had these two additional expenses with respect to freeze-ups and the consumption of fuel and when we have of course increased numbers of schools to be maintained, all I am suggesting, Sir, is that this grant, according to what I have heard from members of school boards, will not put them through the present year. I was wondering if the minister could reflect on that for just a few moments and give us some idea of whether he has had representation from school boards on the operating grants and the necessity for a reasonably dramatic increase in that grant.

Sir, while we are on this topic, if it is in order, this sub-head, May, I relate to this whole business of school taxation. I would assume that under operating grants to school -

MR. CARTER: I would think that it is probably out of order in this particular sub-head. I think that there are probably sub-heads farther on where this could equally well apply. I look at 612(08) which is erection and equipment of schools (Capital). I would respectfully submit that that particular point could be brought up under that sub-head. If the honourable gentleman wishes to make a note of that.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): I cannot see it making any great difference, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CARTER: If we are trying to be as relevant as possible it strikes me that there would be great irrelevancy by discussing that particular

topic under that particular sub-head.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): I will discuss that point, Mr. Chairman, under 612(08) although I cannot really see any great difference in it.

On motion, 612(02)(02), (03), carried.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): 612(02)(04): Mr. Chairman, just an inquiry really as I do not understand what this grant is for, if the minister could just inform -

MR. CARTER: That is used to pay the salaries of teachers in St. Brides College, Littledale.

On motion, 612(02)(04), carried.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): 612(02)(05): Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if there is a reason for this dramatic increase in the expenditure under bilingual education.

MR. CARTER: This particular head, Mr. Chairman, bilingual education, is entirely a grant from the Federal Government to promote the teaching of French in Newfoundland schools. I may say at this point that in conversation with officials of Ottawa they are extremely happy about our attitude toward French. Some of this money is used to partially pay the expenses of students who go down to St. Pierre for a few days during the year and also for some who go during holidays. It is a very worthwhile effort and usually it is done on a fifty-fifty basis. The Department of Education pays half the expenses and the school raises the other half or that it to say the pupils do. It is a programme that we can see pleases the Federal Government very much and it looks as though this will be increased. As I say, they are extremely happy about our attitude towards bilingualism and the instruction of French in schools and the possibility of increasing that instruction.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Mr. Chairman, when was this programme initiated?

Was this going on -

MR. CARTER: Yes.

On motion, 612(02)(05), carried.

MR. ROWE (P.B.): 612(02)(06): Mr. Chairman, the school bus transportation. Sir, we had some debate over this particular sub-head or this topic at least earlier in the previous remarks regarding the total grant for education. I would like to say, Sir, how pleased we are over on this side of the honourable House to have been of some use in making positive suggestions as to what could be done with the initial formula that was announced by the honourable Minister of Education some months ago. Sir, we thought that that was a complete diaster at the time, a complete catastrophe and we feel the same way about that formula at the present time because there are many other factors that certainly have to be considered when we talk about transportation of school children, other than the number of school children involved.

Now, Sir, I do not know what the honourable minister is using for the purpose of making grants to the individual school boards. I do not know whether in fact there has been a formula derived for this purpose. If we have a formula I would certainly appreciate hearing exactly what it is so we can have a very close look at it and see whether all factors have been put into that formula that need to be put in, when calculating for individual school boards what kind of a grant they should get for the purpose of school bus transportation.

So, Sir, first I would ask him if in fact there has been a formula designed and by whom and what the nature of the formula is? The second point that I would like to raise is that the grant 612(02)(06) adds up to a total of \$5,910,000. That is the amount voted for the transportation of school children in these estimates. Sir, in answer to an oral question in the House the minister kindly presented a document which breaks down last year's expenditures according to school board for school bus transportation and also there is a column there for each school board giving an estimate of expenditures for

April 1972 to March 1973. Sir, when I add that up it totals \$6,051,705 but there is a factor built in there because it is plus or minus five per-cent which means that the - I do not know what the answer is. Is there one figure for the House of Assembly of \$5,900,000 and another figure that the school boards are getting that ranges from \$5,650,000 up to \$6,351,000? So what I am asking the minister basically to do, Mr. Chairman, is to clarify the meaning of this table document as far as what it means to the school boards. Will they get this amount or will they get five per-cent more, five per-cent less or will it vacillate from one school board to the other and how does it relate to the estimates for the Department of Education and the first point that I ask about, the formula?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, here is where I have to be long-winded. I am very, very pleased to have this opportunity to debate and discuss the school bus situation under the appropriate heading. The answer to the honourable gentleman's last question first. He is concerned about the disparity in the figures that are on that statement and that are in the estimates. Well for his edification there are many different kinds of years or "yaars" as the Leader of the Opposition prefers to pronounce it. There is the school year. There is the calendar year. There is the fiscal year and as many kinds of years as you wish to mention.

The question that was ask by the honourable gentleman applied to the calendar year, if I am not mistaken. But it is because of the difference in the years that the difference in the figures arise. This will become more clear as my explanation continues. First of all we have to ask ourselves what was the situation as of January 18, 1972. The situation was that there were school busses laid on for those children who lived more than a mile from the schools which they were attending. There was some extra provision for children in Labrador and there was some extra provision for

crippled children, handicapped. But basically and for the sake of this discussion we can say that most of the money, that ninety-nine per cent of it was for children who lived more than one mile from the school.

The former administration had agreed to pay one hundred per cent of the cost of transporting children who lived more than one mile from school. The contracts were made by the school board and the bus owners and the government then paid the entire cost of the contract. I will call it triangular bargaining. I do not think that is the correct name for it. In fact I do not think there is a correct name for it because the like of it was never heard before even in a minstrel tale. It is the most unheard of thing I have ever heard of. Two people making a bargain and a third party paying for it. It is not face to face negotiation. It is back to back negotiation if you like. I cannot find the term that describes it and it lead to the following absurdities. It lead to the fact that officials were forced to go out with a measuring tape and measure the exact distance between the school gate and the gate of the other pupil's home. You had the situation of children leaving school after school, crowding on board the bus, the driver obviously could not know who lived one mile away from school and who did not, and some of the children who needed the drive and who had the right to the transportation were left behind.

The provision of school buses of course was never in the equation of school boards when they were determining where they would build schools, what kind of service they would give, You have the absurdity of incredibly long bus routes, even for small children. I can think of some instances of kindergarden children, children being on a bus, never experiencing school other than going on a bus. Empty buses passing each other and going in different directions, belonging to different boards, even though the boards had more or less terminal boundaries, and the cost

beginning to approach the total cost of the maintenance grant. The maintenance grant which we have just finished discussing, which is \$11.5 million approximately, and the school bus transportation cost having arrived at \$6 million and going up, heading in an upward direction.

I am glad to see the Member for White Bay North and the Member for St. Barbe North sitting very closely together because in my view they should sit very closely in this House. The two boards that are in each of their districts, the Vineland Board and the Straits of Belle Isle Board, in the case of the Vineland Board, the cost for transporting pupils is \$164 per pupil. The Straits of Belle Isle, the cost of transporting pupils is \$69 per pupil, extraordinary disparity and yet the topography, the weather conditions, road conditions, approximate distances, are not all that different, I would submit. I think the two gentlemen should sit very, very close together.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: The difference is not that great, certainly not \$100 a pupil, I would not think. So what was the answer? The answer was of course that in spite of the fiction that the previous government had perpetrated, that the bussing of school children was free, clearly it was not free.

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable Premier scores again.

MR. CARTER: Children who live more than one mile away from school presumably they got free transportation, morning and evening. There was nothing laid on for them at lunch time, and in fact it was believed to be, if it was not actually illegal for bus drivers to enter into separate and private agreements with mothers, children, to make extra runs. The whole thing was a mess and getting messier.

so he said, "well the first thing that has to be done is to get rid of this triangular bargaining and back-to-face negotiations. In other words, the school boards should be free to bargain directly with the operators. We felt at the time that a lump sum payment per pupil was best. The honourable members, and I was rather interested to see that in the discussion of the maintenance grant, even though that is on a per pupil basis. It differs slightly from elementary to junior high and senior high. It is the same for all boards all over the island, yet honourable members made no objection to that even though the temperatures and the climates and velocity and direction of the wind and the winter conditions are quite different in St. Anthony than they are in St. John's. I am not disputing that there should be a difference in the maintenance grants having to agree or apply or to recognize these various factors.

The point is there is not, and I am very surprised that honourable gentlemen opposite passed over that fact. Yet, they made a great deal of the fact that the initial proposal made was for lump sum payment, per pupil payment to school boards.

Well, the telegrams started to come in, the school boards and people associated with them started to say, "well we are going to lose a lot of money." When the total predicted amount of lost money exceeded \$6 million we felt it was time to ask them to recheck their figures. They did and they found it was not as bad as they had initially thought. But still it was bad and they wished for us to bring in some differential rates to recognize the varying climatic conditions that exist in and, all over the province and in Labrador.

So we brought in our mathematicians and they are looking into establishing some differentials. I might add too that in private conversation the honourable member for St. Barbe North and the Leader of the Opposition that they constructively criticized this proposal but felt that we were at least trying, we were on the right

track.. The bus situation had gotten out of hand. We were at least trying to rectify an unwholesome situation.

Now, you might well ask yourself what costs difference there can be. The factors that we can think of, only factors that we can think of are the fact that driving has to be done over dirt road or paved road, distance is a factor, one to five miles and beyond five miles and the weather, wind, temperature and the velocity. Of course the population density, the distance the bus has to go to pick up pupils. That will all be fitted into a formula.

Now, in the meantime we know that a great many of these bus contracts were made for more than a year. Since they are made for more than a year, even though they were made by our predecessors, naturally those contracts have to be honoured and will be honoured. They have been assured that they will. It is unthinkable to think otherwise.

That, plus the fact that at least three school boards have been carrying out extensive relocation of pupils in the last year, and this would be (a) their bus schedules, their transportation schedules, we are going to be dislocating, it is difficult enough anyway. They came to us with a special request. We are prepared to look at a formula which involves differentials. We are not ogres. In spite of protestations to the contrary, we feel we are reasonable people and we will listen to any reasonable proposal.

Still in all, we are definite in our desire and in our intention to give the money on a formula basis to the school boards, for

school boards, for them to deal directly with the bus owners and operators. It is our hope that from this will come a more flexible transportation system for the school boards all over the island, recognizing the different needs and wishes of the various school boards and schools, principals, and supervisors, and also that it will allow bus operators perhaps to broaden their service so as to give the beginnings of a public transportation service. A great many of the bus operators do make earlier runs and later runs and in between runs for the general public, but it will now be possible for them, after making the proper agreement with the school boards, to include runs for the general public at the same time that they bring school children to school and we hope that this could well be the cornerstone of a rural transportation system.

I think that that probably covers most of the points on the school bus. It is not a free system. It can never be entirely free, to transport all children to school absolutely free of charge would cost more than the total of the present maintenance grant. Even if money were no object, I would have to say the maintenance grants must take priority over increased school bus grants. I think the hon. members opposite would agree unhesitatingly. However, that is up to themselves.

So those are the points. Any questions that they wish to ask, I will endeavour to answer.

MR. ROWE (WM.): Mr. Chairman, did the hon. minister say whether the increase this year, and there is an increase, there is an \$80,000 increase above last year, for the transportation of school children, is this sufficient in his estimation to put the numbers of students that have to be transported in virtually the same position as the students were last year or will there be some less advantageous position as a result of this small increase? Is it generally the same?

MR. CARTER: Remembering that this estimate here is only designed to take us up to March 31 and that the money for the school buses will be paid to the school boards in ten equal payments, that is one for each month of the school year, except for July and August, unless there has to be some adjustment to cheques sent out, that this is only to take us up to the end of March, but it is to take us from the beginning of April this year. It is to cover twelve months, but it is obviously not the total amount for the next school year. The figures that I gave on that submission are accurate within plus or minus five per cent. This was done. Of course, the question was asked, a very legitimate question too, and I hastened to answer it because not only was this question asked by the honourable Member for St. Barbe North but it was being asked by some bus operators who were anxious to know where they stood and this House is a very convenient method for releasing information and for it to be made public. We were quite carefully in computing these figures and to the best of our estimates, having regard for the formula that we are devising with the differentials that we are more than prepared to put in, although they are not as great as one would think, also bearing in mind the many unexpired contracts, the many contracts that do not expire for another twelve months, bearing all those factors in mind, those figures are substantially correct and correct enough to guide school boards and bus operators for the next school year.

MR. ROWE (WM.): Mr. Chairman, on this point again, we are comparing apples and apples, are we not? I mean the \$5.8 million as compared to the \$5.9 million covers the same period of time in each case. I mean it is not apples and oranges, it is apples and apples.

MR. CARTER: No, it is still apples and oranges.

MR. ROWE: Still apples and oranges.

MR. CARTER: Let me explain. The \$5,825,900, the rule was ten per cent

June 19, 1972

Tape No. 817

NC - 3

of the cost of school bus transportation had to be paid by the school board. I am not sure of the exact month, but

2564

the previous government suddenly announced; 'Oh no, from now on the government will pay one hundred percent of school bus transportation.'

There is a couple of months in there, that previous figure of ten percent, a couple of months. So there is a slight - and of course, in this \$5,910,000 it is an estimate up to the end of March 1973.

It is not as simple as it looks.

MR. W.N. ROWE: To look at it, Mr. Chairman, one would be driven to the conclusion that the increase this year for school bus transportation is a little over 1.5 percent of an increase. But, because the honourable minister, I want to be clear on this, Sir, because we did have a problem there two or three years ago, where the Minister of Education came into cabinet. (It was subsequently ratified by the House, there was no secret to it) looking for another \$3 million, I think, in respect of the education estimates. A great portion of that was borne by the school bus transportation. It had to be gotten in Supplementary Supply. Now, to look at these figures, we see an increase of 1.5 or 1.6 percent, which is certainly unrealistic if we are comparing two things which are comparable. Perhaps two months with the ten percent knocked out would account for some difference, but I would suggest, Sir, that this amount of money, if we can rely on the minister's statement that children are going to be in exactly or nearly exactly the same position as they were last year with regard to school bus transportation, that this amount of money he now asks the House for is an unrealistic figure. I predict now, Sir, that in Supplementary Supply we will see a great increase, perhaps representing three or four or five or six or maybe ten percent, for all I know, of an increase of ten percent against an increase of about 1.5 percent.

The minister will obviously get up and say that this is the best information we have available to us, but I think that the increase is too small and that the statement of the honourable Minister of Finance that there will be no Supplementary Supply next year will be belied, in respect at least of the transportation of school children.

I would submit, Sir, that the honourable minister is not being

realistic and that he will be asking for more money before this year is out.

MR. CARTER: On that point, Mr. Chairman, I would submit that we are being extremely accurate. We may well be out by one or one and a half percent, but I would suggest that we are being realistic. That figure and the amount we will be out will be extremely small. I would further submit that this is the worst subhead, this is the subhead which will have the greatest error. I am suggesting that that error will not be very great.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would be the first to admit that the arrangement that we have with respect to the government financing what goes on between the bus operators and the school boards, probably led to some exploitation and possibly even irregularities, certain discrepancies from one school district to another with similar geographical conditions, and meteorological conditions. But, Sir, let it never be forgotten that my biggest concern at the time that this policy statement was made, was the inequities that would exist from one school board to another as a result of factors not being built into the formula that would make it more equitable between one school board and another, because of differences in distribution of pupil population, weather conditions, road conditions and what have you.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to be permitted to answer that point. I did forget to make one more point clear in this whole debate and it is on that very point the honourable member is asking.

There was no provision in the previous system, (I call it the previous system, because at the moment we are in between two systems) for school boards to locate their schools strategically. Now, you have the problem of either bringing the school facilities to the children or bringing the children to school facilities. In one case you are centralizing and in the other case you are decentralizing. I will admit that, in the last ten years or so, the centralizing factors have been

June 19, 1972, Tape 818, Page 3 -- apb

extremely strong. There have been very heavy demands upon school boards to centralize. Economies that were predicted for building huge, new, central high schools and elementary schools, were considered to be over-powering.

2567

Mr. Carter.

but lately because of technological developments, there is an equally strong decentralizing factor, the possibility apparently in a few weeks time there is to be a new satellite put up that will make television communications even better than it is today. The technology that we have today enables a great many very rich programmes to be able to be brought even to the smallest school. Therefore, it is our intention to give the money to school boards on some formula basis which will not discourage the locating of their schools more strategically. I said at the outset that there were some scandalous situations whereby some children were bussed many, many miles to school. They were spending as long in a school bus as a commuter in New York spends in a commuter train. The prospect of young children having to be an hour on a bus in the morning and another hour on a bus at night was not a situation that I was very happy with. In fact one possible way to relieve this situation may well be to change standard time by another half hour. If we were to go a full hour ahead of Nova Scotia, then it would not be so dark in the evenings in late November and early December. This might be one way of mitigating the dangers of children struggling home, long distances home from school, at that time of the year. In fact, I do intend to suggest this at a later date, that we go on a full hour difference from Nova Scotia. At the present time, there is a half hour difference. I would suggest that we go another half hour to make the full hour. I would like honourable members to think about that and think of the implications and let us know at some future time. Anyway that is by the way.

The other point I did want to make was that we are anxious for school boards to develop some initiative in locating their schools as strategically as possible and this is part and parcel of this school bus suggestion.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): What you are saying basically is that you are in the process of deriving a formula for school bus transportation and

Mr. Rowe (F.B.)

you are taking some of these facts that we mentioned into consideration. At the present time the approximate amounts indicate then this table is what will be going to the school boards this year and out of that they have the contract with the school bus operators to - in other words if for instance in the case of the Straits of Belle Isle Integrated School Board, they are presumably given about \$94,000, plus a minute five per cent, assuming that this is not an extended contract left over from last year, did they have to make a contract with the bus operators, within that amount of money; if they go \$10,000 over, they have to find it themselves? Sir, this was basically one of the problems and concerns that was brought to my attention whether in fact they could, that is the bus operators would in fact transport school children for that kind of money. Now I am not saying whether it is right or wrong. What I am concerned about is a reduction of safety regulations or something like this, as far as the transportation of these students is concerned. There has been some concern expressed to me anyway about whether or not these school bus operators

MR. ROWE, F.B. would operate buses this coming year with a one or a two percent increase over what the contract was last year.

So, I submit, Sir, that in a number of cases we are certainly going to find that the boards are now going to have to subsidize the contracts or the money for school bus transportation. I am just a little bit concerned about the standards that will be maintained in the operation of these buses and I too would be willing to predict, Sir, that you may have to go to supplementary supply for this particular vote or the system will suffer.

So I still express concern over it, Sir, I do not think there is enough money there for school bus transportation, but my original and what might have appeared to the honourable minister the hostile reaction was over the inequities that would exist as a result of the formula that he announced earlier.

There is one other point, Sir, following that and that is the whole question of school bus transportation in the area of St. John's. If I am correct in this, St. John's City itself is the only segment of Newfoundland to which the school bus regulations do not apply. Sir, of course, there are obviously a great number of school children who live a mile or more from the schools they attend. Some of those children, Sir, are certainly not necessarily children of average or well-to-do parents.

What I am suggesting, Sir, it is no good to say whose fault it is, what I am suggesting is that in spite of that fact that we have a bus transportation system in this city, operated by the Municipal Council, the fact still remains that school children are really discriminated against in the City of St. John's. They have to pay their way to school, they have to buy bus tickets. Now, Sir, it is true we have a greater concentration of population, the roads are probably plowed a little more often than in many sectors of our province but the fact still remains that there are children who really

MR. ROWE, F.B. cannot afford it, or families who cannot afford it paying for the cost of bus tickets for their kids to go back and forth to school or they have in fact to walk through what may not be the coldest winter in the province but certainly is the wettest and slushiest winter in the province.

I would just like to ask the minister whether in fact he has given any consideration to this possibility of the situation in St. John's?

MR. CARTER Mr. Chairman, a great deal of consideration has been given to that point but several problems emerge. I first think that it is legalistically, practically impossible to consider putting another hundred buses on the streets of St. John's at lunch hour. You know the traffic situation being what it is, it is bad enough now. In fact I would suggest that it is probably faster to take a horse and carriage to work at rush hour in St. John's than it is to take your own car or to ride on public transportation. So that is one aspect of it.

The other is this, that there is a world of difference between walking two miles to school in St. John's, where the streets and sidewalks are extremely well plowed in the winter, I think everyone would have to agree that the snow-clearing operations in the City of St. John's are second to none, the snow no sooner falls than it is removed. There is a world of difference between that and between a child struggling two miles over a deserted highway, particularly one of these exposed treeless highways, across the barrens, there is quite a difference between that.

Also, of course, there is the fact that in St. John's there are numerous places where a person may stop and find shelter. It is not the same situation at all, if one is concerned about the dangers of letting a small child or a young child walk to school. I have no hesitation at all in sending my own children to school, because it is about a mile from where they live and there are numerous places along the way where they can stop and with a very easy mind, except in very

extraordinary circumstances. Also, of course, is that the practice has arisen in the St. John's area for the use of car pools. It is used much more extensively than one would realize and many rural bus operators are despairing of the possibility of running a viable bus service in and around St. John's. Remember this, that no school bus operator can operate just a school bus by itself as he depends to a large extent on extra income to make that worthwhile, on the charter business and on some public transportation that he gets involved in when he is not bringing school children. So those points have all been carefully considered and at the moment bearing in mind our resources, we have had to leave St. John's out of the school bus picture.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, just one other point. Of course, I do not think it would be really necessary, on the minister's first point, to put addition busses necessarily on the streets of St. John's. These students either walk or they use cars or they use busses at the present time. Probably some sort of a subsidy or a reduced ticket that would be less costly to these students would be a more desirable way of getting around this particular problem.

Also, Sir, I assume that they bus students to school around the Grand Falls, Gander and Corner Brook area if the students, of course, are a mile or more from the schools. I do not think that the conditions would be any worse in these particular cities really than in the City of St. John's, for students walking back and forth to school. The point that I want to make, Sir, of course is that there are obviously a number of students who could use some help with respect to assistance in getting back and forth to school in this city. We are not talking about people who can afford to arrange car pools or people who can afford to take the bus, but there must be some way that we can help these students - probably their folks do not have cars or their folks

go to work at times different from the time that they go to school and who cannot afford the bus. There must be something that we can do to help these students when they have to walk through the city, over a mile from their particular school.

I know the minister has looked at this seriously but I would just like to make that point.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the time the school transportation was introduced in this province the government of the day was warned that they might be creating a monster and I think, Sir, to a certain degree these words have been borne out. There was certainly a lot of truth in what the experts said at the time, warning the government that they were creating a monster. I am sure, if the former Premier were in the House this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, how he is missed in this session, if he were here he would have to take part in this debate and he would have to probably say to the House that to a certain degree, I guess, that we are spoiling our children in Newfoundland today. Members who are now sitting on the opposite side of the House, who took part in these debates over the last four or five years in this honourable House, especially I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, could stand up and talk about how they had to walk a mile to school, a mile and a-half to school or two miles to school, bring their bundle of splits down in the morning, and lit the fire. We do not have this anymore. So they would point out that there is a tendency to spoil the children

of today because we are making it too easy for them. But, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the former administration was absolutely correct in bringing in this bus transportation system. We did not have any choice. There was a decentralization of schools going on in the province. Then we had to take into consideration the climatic conditions in this province. I would say, Sir, that in the rural areas, especially the rural areas of the province, that we did not have any choice.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have grave doubts myself whether we are getting the best value for our money. I agree with some of my honourable colleagues and I think the Minister of Education raised this point. You have situations in Newfoundland, Sir, where you have busses criss-crossing one another. You have busses going in the same direction representing different school boards, Sir.

On motion, that the committee rise and report having passed certain items of expenditure and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have passed estimates of expenditure under the following heading: Heading VI, Education and Youth. Item 604-04 and 05 to 612-02-05 inclusive and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Supply reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have passed certain estimates of current expenditure and asked leave to sit again, presently.

On motion report received and adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now six of the clock I do now leave the Chair until 8:00 p.m.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 1

1st Session

Number 34

VERBATIM REPORT

Monday, June 19, 1972

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 8:00 P.M.

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

MR. NEARY: With regard to 12-02-06, with the Committee rose at 6:00 o'clock, Mr. Chairman, I was just arriving at the point in my remarks when I was about to ask the Minister of Education if he is considering taking steps to stop this crisscrossing of buses in various parts of the province, duplication of services, and above all, Mr. Chairman, having buses, fleets of buses parked all day long.

Now I do not know what the answer to it is. I do not know if the minister or his officials know what the answer is but it strikes me as being rather peculiar. You look down here, Gonzaga High School, there is a fleet of buses come there in the morning and they are parked there all day. I imagine the students stay in there for lunch. Now you can go all over this city and all over the province and we have got busses running out of our ears, Mr. Chairman, parked practically all day. You have got busses under contract to this school board, busses under contract to that school board, all going in the same direction. The amount of equipment that is tied up in this province, Sir, would stagger the imagination. This is the thing that worries me about the transportation system. It is a luxury in my opinion and this province can ill afford it. I think the busses could be put to better use.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to ask the honourable Minister of Education, if there is any conflict of interest. Perhaps the Minister of Finance is the expert on conflict of interest. I understand that we have members sitting on the government benches at the present time who have done quite well on school busses. I would like to

MR. NEARY: ask the minister if these members will still be able to enter into an agreement with the school boards to operate the school bus transportation in their respective areas. After all, Sir, the money to pay for these school buses does come from the public treasury. Indirectly it is the taxpayers of this province who are paying for the school bus transportation. It is just an interesting point, Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the Minister of Finance could advise the committee if there will be a conflict of interest here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we are straying from the heading - Transportation of school children - when we get into conflict of interest.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, is transportation of school children, the busses being operated, in this case by the Members of the House of Assembly ?

MR. CARTER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Oh, the only thing that I want to say about transportation, Mr. Chairman, is that one of the first things that the minister did when the House of Assembly opened for this session was to - he was so anxious to make a speech in the House, to make a ministerial statement, he waited so long to get in on the floor of this House, that the hon. minister rushed in and leapt before he looked, made a ridiculous ministerial statement on school bus transportation, Sir, and he has spent I suppose the last four or five weeks trying to straighten it out.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, after the committee rises tonight, that the school boards across this province will know where they stand for once and for all on school transportation. There is nothing else that I want to say to the hon. minister at this time, Mr. Chairman, because you may as well go out behind Confederation Building and talk to the totem pole out there as talk to the hon. minister. He will not give us any information. At least I hope that one thing has come out of this committee so far tonight, through the probing of my hon. colleague here for St. Barbe North, that the school boards will at least know where

MR. NEARY: they stand on transportation of school children
in September coming.

MR. CARTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the last point first I guess.
The hon. member charged that there is no information forthcoming,
Most of the vital information as far as school boards is concerned
was contained in the release that I made

Mr. Carter.

a few days ago of which the hon. member for St. Barbe North was quoting from a copy this afternoon. Most honourable members have that list. The other point - the announcement was made early and possibly prematurely I expect because that announcement had to be made early (I think it was made early in May) the reason being that school bus operators were getting quite anxious to find out where they were and to get the matter settled with their various boards. On the charge of conflict of interest, the allegation that certain members of this House have school busses which they operate, In the first place there is no conflict of interest legislation so there cannot be any conflict of interest, presumably. In the second place, there is the method by which we are going to handle bus transportation which makes the school board responsible so that any further negotiations will not be between government and school bus operators but between school boards and school bus operators. I do not feel that there will be any more conflict of interest in that than if I were to operate a taxi provided I did not use any undue influence to get the taxi licence. As to the charge that there are fleets of busses parked all day long, I agree with the honourable member. I deplore that as he does. The only thing I can say about that is under the proposed changes this should be less likely, because under the old system the regulations were so strict, so cut and dry, so clearly laid out that busses could not legally pick up children within a mile from the school and certainly could not pick up an adult no matter if he waved a ten dollar bill to the bus driver nor could they stop except at scheduled stops. I think that this will work against that. The school boards will be free to enter into any reasonable agreement with school bus operators. This should possibly, in fact I hope it will form the basis of a rural, the beginning at least of an effective and sensible rural transportation system.

As for the duplication of service, more and more boards are co-operating and sharing in the various facilities, even to the sharing of schools. In fact

Mr. Carter.

the level of co-operation among school boards is something that I am very happy to report on. All sorts of things are possible in education today that would not have been possible five years ago. As for the criss-crossing of busses, well it would be to the school boards interest to co-operate on bus schedules and to save money where possible. All in all I think it is a better method than the former one. It is not perfect, I agree. Then I think in our search for a perfect solution we may overlook many good ones. So I am reasonably happy with it. I will be always more than anxious to hear suggestions from any honourable member as to how it can be improved.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if I might go back on the bus transportation thing for a moment or so, the minister, as I just heard him (If I am wrong, perhaps he will correct me) said that the information in respect of this coming year's school bus amount, the detailed breakdown of the total that is shown in the subhead we are discussing or the item we are now discussing, was given by him in a second statement to the House. Was that the burden of the honourable minister's remarks?

MR. CARTER: Could you repeat that?

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. member for Bell Island asked a question relating to the fact that the original position of the administration as stated by the minister on the 3rd of May, in a ministerial statement to the House, Sir, that position had been changed significantly and substantially. This is what I am getting at. I want to know the basis of the amounts, the breakdown that we now have of this subhead? It is a sub-subhead I guess, Sir. The minister in reply to an Order Paper question in the House, tabled the list that the hon. member from St. Barbe North has just given me, showing the amounts that have been or are being paid to each

of the thirty-eight or thirty-nine boards during the past financial year, together with an estimated amount of the amounts that are to be paid to each individual board in the coming financial year. Of course, it was this answer in reply to a question, ask I believe by the member for St. Barbe North, in reply to that it was this information that gave away the game, that revealed that the policy as announced in the May 3 statement no longer was being applied.

Now what I am getting at now, the minister referred to a second statement he had made in the House and I assume the second statement is this -

MR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Is it? Okay. Well, then perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the minister could tell the committee, if he would, the basis on which the amount shown in the second statement, the amounts to be paid out of this sub-head or sub-sub-head, whatever it is, to each of the boards for this year, the basis on which those amounts were computed. Is it per pupil? If so are there further waiting factors? Because he mentioned this afternoon, I heard at one point that the Vineland Integrated School Board, which happens to include most of the communities in my district, has a very high per pupil transportation cost, \$170.00 in round figures, whereas the Straits of Bell Isle Integrated School Board, just next door, serving Flowers Cove South to Brig Bay, serving that part of the Northern Peninsula on the Western Coast, has a significantly lower per pupil ratio.

I guess the point of what the minister was saying was a repetition of his own policy or the administration's policy of a per pupil grant. What I am trying to get at now is to try to discover the basis on which the amounts shown, in the table given us by the minister, the basis on which those amounts have been computed. All that we know now, Sir, is that the minister made a statement on the third of May that

henceforth the sum would be divided on a per pupil basis and would be paid out to the boards on a per pupil basis pari passu, completely equal amounts, so much for each pupil no matter where they were, anywhere in the province. Now apparently that is changed.

What I am trying to get at now is the basis on which the amount is being divided, to share. I wonder if the minister could perhaps tell us about that.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Leader of the Opposition is missing the point or part of the point. The first and only cornerstone, the most important part of the whole change in the bus transportation set up is the fact that from henceforth the negotiations will be carried on directly between the school boards and the bus operators. They will not be calling in a third party to pay whatever bill or the total of whatever agreement is made. The agreement that will be made between the school boards and school bus operators will be final and binding on both parties without reference to government. In other words the school boards will be the final arbitrators of whether or not a bus contract is acceptable to them or not. In other words they will say, "Will you carry this many pupils this far for this much?" They will either say yes or no, and they will say, "Fine" and they make a deal and they will be entitled to make a deal for one month, six months, two years, six years. It will be entirely between the school boards and the bus owners. That is the first one and in fact that is the basic change, that is the basic point because it will get away from this, what I called triangular bargaining which does not make sense and which has led to all sorts of anomalies. That is the first point.

The second point is that we originally decided to make the grant on a per pupil basis tied to \$100.00, because it was similar to the method of making the maintenance grants which are made on a per

pupil basis and they are the same for all school boards even though the climate and conditions, all sorts of conditions vary all over the island and in Labrador. But the maintenance grant is based on a per pupil. It does have a differential insofar as primary, junior high school and senior high school is concerned, but it is the same for all boards.

Now when we made this announcement we got all sorts of telegrams back saying, "Oh, we are going to lose this much. We are going to lose that much," and when the total estimated loss exceeded the \$6. million we said well somebody's figures are wrong. So we ask for more detailed figures and we were able to establish that the losses would not be nearly so great but still there were problems situations arising particularly because school boards said, "Well we have these contracts that go on for another year, another eighteen months. What do we do about these?" "Well," we said, "obviously these will continue in force." So the figure that is in that piece of paper that the honourable Leader of the Opposition was holding just now and which he addressed his questions about, those figures were arrived at partly because of the residue of contracts and there are a great many of them

and partly out of the hundred dollars per pupil, less or plus a differential rate allowing for dirt roads, paved road, temperature and/or concentration. It is rather a complex formula that I do not have with me, although I can get it. It is not finally worked out, but it is designed to disturb the resources of the school boards as little as possible. There will have to be added refinements, That is why I cannot get any closer than plus or minus five percent and that is allowing for these differentials.

More than that I cannot say at this moment, but I do feel that the information contained in that paper is at least enough for the school boards and for the bus operators to enter into at least initial agreements, so that they will know where they are going.

MR. F.B. ROWE: The honourable the minister still really has not answered the question that my hon. colleague the Leader of the Opposition asked. That is, how precisely or how generally did the honourable minister arrive at the figures for the individual school boards for this year? Probably the Leader of the Opposition would like to pursue this a little later, but there is another question that I would like to ask and that is this; Approximately how many school boards have to call contracts for this coming year?

AN HON. MEMBER: About half of them.

MR. ROWE: About half of them. Well, Sir, I think this is really a serious situation that we have here now because what we have here is this document listing how exactly and precisely how much money will be made available to the school boards for the purpose of school bus transportation.

MR. CARTER: When I said about half, about half of the bussing is under contract designed to continue for more than beyond this June, beyond now, beyond this school year.

MR. ROWE: Right.

MR. CARTER: But that is not to say that half of the school boards have contracts. Some of the school boards have - in fact no school

board is entirely tied to contracts, but each school board may have a few contracts with individual bus operators that are going to go on in force for more than a year. But this is not to say, I am certain there is no school board that has every single bus under contract. That is the point I am talking about.

MR. ROWE: Okay. But, Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to get at, of course, is that these school boards have an amount of money now available to them for the purpose of school bus transportation, still they have to call tenders with the school bus operators for the purpose of school bus transportation. We have a situation now where surely, presumably the school boards have been provided with this information, this is in fact public information. It has been in the newspapers and the school bus operators can figure out almost precisely how much money is available to each school board for the purpose of school bus transportation.

What I am suggesting, Sir, of course, is that there is a distinct possibility here that the school boards will not be able to salvage a contract with the school bus operators at the lowest amount possible. In other words, they know that this money is available there now and obviously, if I was a businessman I would do exactly the same thing, I would ask for the maximum amount that is available, precisely what is listed here.

MR. CARTER: Look at it this way, let us suppose that a particular school board has, for round figures, \$100,000 for school bus transportation. That is not to say that they are not in a position to have two or three bus operators come to them and they will accept the lowest of the tenders offered. You have to grant them some sense.

Now the bus operators, unless they collude and say; "Oh, we cannot possibly do it for less than \$100,000." But it is practically public knowledge anyway. It would not take too much mathematics to figure out what a school board's resources are in the first place.

It is only a matter of a phone call to the Department of Education to find out how the maintenance grants are dispersed. It is only a matter of -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CARTER: No, no, to ascertain how much, how well off a school board is. It is only a matter of a phone call and a little bit of mathematics.

MR. CARTER: It is not hard to figure out what a school boards resources are to within a fair degree of approximation. So that is the first point.

The other point is that you know the school boards are free to handle their bus transportation problem in a variety of ways, up to and including the purchase of buses themselves, which may well be a method of doing it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. chairman. the minister said he felt I was missing the point and maybe I am, but I confess that I have been trying to follow the minister and I cannot find myself any nearer to the goal than when I set out. So maybe I could go back at it again and try again.

The point is this, Sir, the question I am trying to get answered is this; What is the formula under which boards are being allocated amounts of money for the purpose of school transportation, the particular item in the estimates which we are discussing?

Now in the past the minister has referred to the system which occupied in the past which, as I understand it and again perhaps he can correct me if I am wrong, but if he is not intimately familiar, then I suspect that within easy reach he has access to advice that is infinitely better than his own, infinitely more experienced and better in other ways. The system in the past was, as I understand, as follows: A bus route was approved, in other words the relevant denomination, which would be the board, presumably speaking, through the D.E.C. Latterly and before that the superintendents within the departments, the relevant board and denomination would establish a bus route and it would be agreed that there would be sufficient pupils and that it served an educational purpose or what have you.

Considering that many of these routes came into being for one of two reasons, either closing of smaller schools, one and two room schools and bussing the pupils for that or the creation of new central and regional high schools and the bussing of pupils for sometimes quite

MR. ROBERTS: long distances into those schools.

Now the route would be approved, tenders would then be called for and I do not know if a board were able to buy their own busses, Indeed I am willing to bet that the Pentecostal Assemblies people in St. Lunaire, which is the educational centre of the Pentecostal efforts in White Bay North, own their own busses. I do not think they are under contract, I think they are owned and the school committee, the local organ of the board at St. Lunaire or St. Leonard's, hire the drivers. I know that if you wanted to rent the busses for any public purpose you pay for them to the Pentecostal School Committee at St. Lunaire.

So there is nothing new about a board being allowed to own a bus. I would assume they have always been allowed to own busses if they thought this was the right way out. But if they choose not to they would call tenders and sometimes there would be one tender and at other times there would be more than one. In any event, eventually they would come to the point where a board would say, "Very well, this is the operator that we wish and this is the cost." At that point the third apex in the triangle would enter into it. The minister assimilated a triangular relationship. A gentleman down in the Department of Education, Mr. R. Beaufield. I believe, is the Director of School Transportation, and he is being paid a salary and he has an assistant who is also being paid a salary, and these two gentlemen, I think they are both men, would decide whether the proposed cost was reasonable.

As I recall it, there is really little choice in this because if one had gone the tender route, then that was that, one could not get it for less. So Mr. Beaufield or his assistant would mark approved, or whatever the procedure was, and then it would go over to the other division of the department and the money would be paid - it was that simple.

MR. ROBERTS: Now the minister now tells us that negotiations will be directly between the school board on the one hand and on the other hand the provider of transportation. There is something to be said for that. I do not know where it leaves Mr. Beaufield and his assistant, we voted \$18,000 for their salaries. I hope the gentlemen do not lose their salaries but

the minister might wish to tell us what they will be doing from now on. Presumably they will still be with the department, still be employed at useful work. But if the negotiations, Sir, are to be directly between the board on one hand and the bus operator, provider of busses on the other, whether the provider of busses is the board themselves or whether it is a party who has tendered and who has been awarded the contract. In each case, Sir, the board must know how much money they have to play with, whether they have a thousand dollars or a hundred thousand dollars, Obviously that is the key element in the whole policy, I think the minister would have to agree.

If the policy has merit, and I think it does, the minister has managed to submerge the merit in his comings and goings but it has some merit. A board is in effect given a block grant, as they are with respect to maintenance. He told us that was the analogy and it is obvious that that is where the idea came from. Maintenance I believe is a straight per pupil grant. A total amount the committee have voted, divided by the number of students, and each board receives an amount which is the per capita amount times the number of students they have.

Now, it is obviously very essential, if the minister's policy is to work at all. I think anybody concerned with this matter would feel it should work, it is a step forward, just getting rid of this one mile rule is a step forward. We will no longer have the prospect of the students walking nine-tenths of a mile to school and watching the bus drive by half empty. There is not a member in this House who has not got at least one example in his district of that sort of thing. It puts the devil in people and so it should.

So, it is obviously essential that the boards know how much money they are going to have, Without that there is no merit at all to the policy. So, once again, Mr. Chairman, I may seem to be belabouring the

point but the minister has not given us the information. It may be that he cannot. If he cannot then we will understand that. We will even understand that it may be because he just does not know, that the information is not available. But he has given us in response to some questioning the amounts that the boards will get next year or actually the current fiscal year, the current financial year, the year that began April 1.

Now, I wonder if he can tell us either the formula on which that was computed, He got off a lot of words which really could have meant anything or nothing. Because obviously it would have to be a factor for gravel roads opposed to dirt roads, it was obviously there would have to be a factor, such as given distance. These are so obvious that one would have thought the minister's original formula would have included them, the minister's original formula that did not. It was a straight approximately \$100 per pupil, 60,000 people being bussed, roughly \$6 million in the item, therefore \$100 each for the 60,000 students. So could he tell us what the formula is?

Let me just ask two other questions. First of all, could he also indicate to us what Mr. Beaufield and his assistant, whose name I confess I do not know, will be doing now? They may still be director of school transportation and assistant director, but what do the director and assistant director do in the new set-up? I have no doubt there are many things to be done but I would like the minister to indicate to the committee what he does intend them to do.

Secondly, earlier in the committee consideration of the estimates or perhaps even before that, I asked the minister if he would have ready have his officials prepare a list showing, for each of the thirty-eight or thirty-nine boards in Newfoundland, the number of pupils, number of students that each of them busses. I hope he has that now because

really without that information we cannot tell very much about this formula. Now, what I am at actually are the per student costs. The minister gave us two boards this afternoon. There are only thirty-six or thirty-seven more to go. I wonder if he could give that information to the committee, Mr. Chairman. I am particularly anxious about the formula because I have heard from boards throughout the island, not officially but I guess they feel they have a friend over here at times, They have a number of friends, they will have nine when we get around to -

They may even have some friends on the other side, they actually do not include the Finance Minister.

(inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman like to sing, he sings better than he speaks which is not saying very much, Mr. Chairman. But in any event before the Minister of Finance erupted again, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could indicate to us, because as I was saying, before I was so rudely interrupted by the gentleman, the fact remains that boards are anxious to know, We

hear much talk of planning and long range planning and short range planning and medium range planning, it is essential to plan. It is not enough to say what the boards are to get next year. Most of these contracts here are two and three and four year efforts because that is the way the operators, whether it be a board or whether they be some individual or some firm, this is the way they amortize their busses over a two or three or four year period. So it is essential I think that the committee have this information and also that the boards get this information. So I wonder if the minister could give us that now?

MR. CARTER: First of all I find it very surprising that the opposition spokesman should find the initial \$100 per pupil, for bussed pupils grant, absurd and yet see no fundamental absurdity in the maintenance grant as being ... But granting that, granting that they see no absurdity there, the formula is imprecisely devised yet, That is why the plus or minus per cent was put in and that is why those figures were released, although it is premature, although it is probably too early. Hon. members will probably concur when they see that there is a great deal of difficulty in devising a fair, equitable formula to allow for the built-in contracts with school boards. However, the figures that were released are sufficiently precise for boards to get some indication as to where they stand and long before September 1 or September 11, as is the case this year, they will know exactly what they are getting and they will be able to calculate it and check our figures, if they wish. The totals, the formula and the basis for the formula will all be public or sufficiently public knowledge for anyone who is interested to be able to calculate. But at the moment I cannot release it because it is still imprecise, but it is getting more precise daily.

MR. ROWE (WM.): Mr. Chairman, could he say whether the amount which each board is now receiving is roughly the same as that same board received last year? There may be some slight increase, incremenetal increase, but relatively speaking are the boards this year getting the same amounts as last year?

MR. CARTER: The figure that you have over there, I do not have that particular copy in front of me. I think the honourable Leader of the Opposition has a copy in front of him, or the St. Barbe North gentleman. Those figures are the forecast of what the school boards will be getting plus or minus five per cent. Those figures are as close as we can come at the moment to what the school boards will be getting this coming year.

The basis upon which they are computed is, first of all, you have to take into consideration the contract still in force, That has to be taken into consideration. The next basis is the differential for dirt roads, paved roads under five miles and over five miles. It is a complex formula which is only inprecisely worked out at the moment but with enough precision to be able to release the initial figures with the plus or minus five per cent so that school boards know where they are going.

MR. ROWE (WM.): Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the hon. minister misunderstood me or he did not hear me or I did not make myself clear or what, what I asked was; are the school boards, probably to make it clearer, is each school board receiving relatively the same amount this year, under this vote, as that same school board received last year under the vote.

MR. CARTER: The difference should not be too great.

MR. ROWE (WM.): Does the hon. minister know what he is doing? Can I ask that question?

AN HON. MEMBER: He has answered that over the days.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): In my initial remarks on this bus transportation, at the beginning, I suggested that maybe the Minister of Education just did not know what he was doing when he came up with that original formula which basically said \$100 per pupil and some consideration given to this mean temperature of one degree fahrenheit or something along these lines, because of the fact that some school boards may have more than enough money, more than they would need for school bus transportation, and some school boards would have far less than they need. The estimates at that time were anything from \$20,000 to \$80,000 for some school boards. That would be how much they would be out for the purpose of school bus transportation during the coming year. That was based on the minister's original formula.

Now, Sir, after an awful lot of questioning and press releases and everything else, the minister came out with a new statement which is basically represented by this break down of estimates for school bus transportation for next year, according to school boards. Now, Sir, all we are asking is this; How did the honourable the Minister of Education arrive at that figure for each school board? That is all we are asking, Sir. I earlier mentioned that, I do not know if I should go as far as saying this but, Sir, it is on my mind and I might just as well get it off my chest, that this original formula was a premeditated plan to indicate to the school boards that they were going to have a tremendous cut-back for the purpose of school bus transportation, because that is what in fact it meant, this \$100 per pupil. For the majority of our school boards it would have been a severe cut-back. Having received that jolt, relatively speaking, the school board might appear to be relatively pleased if they got at least as much as they received last year.

Now, Sir, I submit that the figure that we see there for each one of the school boards for school bus transportation is, almost precisely, in fact what they got last year for the full year. In other words, the estimates for this year, I have discovered even with the plus or minus five per cent, are in many cases almost precisely what the school boards spent last year for bus transportation, that is from September until the end of June and, Sir, this is what I submit is the basis of this particular statement. That is the formula. There is no formula, Sir. Well the minister admitted that they have not finalized the formula yet, That is understandable. School bus transportation is a very complex thing. There are a great number of factors that have to be taken into consideration. But will the minister at least admit that there is no other basis for these figures other than they simply reflect what the expenditures were for school bus transportation for each one of these school boards last year for the full school year?

MR. CARTER: The hon. member is somewhat mistaken. Of course it is not our desire to come down hard on school boards and to bring into effect a formula that is dislocatingly severe. The initial \$100 amount was designed on the same basis as the maintenance grants are designed. But of course then all sorts of complaints started to come in, as I said, the initial complaints were inprecisely worded and when we sent back asking for further information we found that the complaints were not nearly as warranted nor were the figures as bad as initially suggested. However, in reply

Mr. Carter.

to many requests, we felt that (among them the hon. member for St. Barbe North) we felt that a differential rate could well be indicated. It is with this differential rate in view we came up with a figure that was very, very close to the amount that was actually spent last year, within a few per cent. It is on that basis that that figure was arrived at. The formula was designed to - you see two things were attempted: (1) to build in these differentials and the other was to building in the differentials such that the change would not be that great or that dislocated. This is the result. The result is those figures that I released in that paper. They are correct to within plus or minus five per cent. I would not want to say fairly closer than that.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I think I appreciate the minister's difficulties, at least some of them. There are some things that it is impossible to estimate. What he seems to be saying to the committee this seems to be something like an onion, Mr. Chairman. One peels off layer after layer after layer. I find it rather distasteful to have to sit here and in effect cross-examine the minister. I have my differences with him. I doubtless will continue to have them. Now either the minister is being less than frank or the minister just does not know. I prefer to accept the latter course. I do not think the minister would be less than frank with the committee. He admits now that the formula is ad hoc. No matter what words he puts on it, he tells us that it is with reference to contracts still in force. Obviously that is a known amount. Presumably the information is already downstairs in the Department of Education. There is an allowance for dirt roads as against paved roads. He has not given us any information about that except to say that there is a factor built into the formula. He also says a little further factor for distances, apparently up to five miles is one factor and over five miles is another factor. Again

Mr. Roberts.

he has not given us a great deal of information.

Now out of all that the minister tells us that he has arrived or he and his officials but it is the minister, he takes the responsibility, Sir, has arrived at some (to use his words) imprecise figures. Mr. Chairman, we find that rather hard to accept. I do not find the amount of \$148,825.96 to be imprecise. I do not find the amount of \$82,511.72 to be imprecise. I do not find the amount of \$126,437.49 to be imprecise. I do not find the amount of \$281,893.04 to be imprecise. For that matter I do not find the amount of \$7,350 to be imprecise. They may be inaccurate. It may be that when the total is in, when the butcher's bill is in, when the reckoning comes due, that the boards involved may have spent less or they may have spent more to provide the transportation. But, Mr. Chairman, these amounts are not imprecise. The amounts I just read to the committee are in the second column of the table the minister finally gave to us. He says they are plus or minus five per cent. Well that is fine. I can accept the fact without any difficulty at all that the minister at this moment of the 19th. day of June does not know what will be needed in the school year which begins on the 11th day of September and ends sometime next June. He does not know the amount that will be needed to provide the bus service between Renew's and Ferryland, wherever the children from Renew's go to high school. The minister is not omniscient. We do not expect him to be. When he tell us that the amount is imprecise, that is harder to accept. There is some formula, there is some basis on which these amounts - Mr. Chairman, an amount of \$148,825.96 is not plucked out of thin air, any more than the amount of \$138,807.27 which is what the same boards got in the year that ended March 31, 1972 any more than that amount was plucked out of thin air. All we are trying to get out of the minister - we have been trying now for the better part

Mr. Roberts

of half an hour, is if he will tell us on what basis - he talks vaguely of factors and obviously these factors are relevant but what is the basis? Are the mathematics so complex that the minister cannot at least elucidate them? Maybe we cannot understand them. Surely, it is his duty to elucidate them. Is there a formula? If there is no formula, Mr. Chairman, then we are forced to the conclusion that the amounts are strictly ad hoc. What the minister has done is got in touch with each board, Not the minister, I am not suggesting that he has picked up the telephone and called these four but he has through his officials got in touch with each board and said, "what do you think you are going to have to spend next year? Give us the figure please." In comes the figure and some of them precise to the cent, others of them rounded off to the nearest dollar and one, the Deer Lake Integrated School Board, rounded off to \$83,000. Everything else, Sir, is rounded off to the nearest \$10.00.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is not imprecision. That is a pretty high order of precision when you are talking in the an amount of \$6 million. It is a very high order of precision. The total is \$6,051,705.06. It is hardly imprecise Your Honour. It is hardly imprecise. Now what I want to know from the minister, if he would, is whether these are ad hoc and if so we can accept that. We can accept it. The minister announced a policy then retreated from it in considerable confusion. He obviously things that maintenance grants and transportation grants are somehow qualitatively the same, difficult to equate. Nobody over here said they were or would be. Is it an ad hoc policy, Mr. Chairman, or is there a formula? If the latter, what is the formula? The minister comes before the committee and he is asking for \$6 million. That is over one per cent of the entire expenditure of this province on capital and current account this year. It is a large vote. There are not very

Mr. Roberts.

many items in the estimates, Mr. Chairman, that are any larger than this one. He will not tell us. If he cannot, we accept that. He will not tell us the basis on which the amounts are being computed. If they are ad hoc, we will accept that and the vote will go through like that, at least as far as we are concerned. Maybe some of the honourable gentlemen opposite wish to say a word and if so, they are welcome, of course. If it is not ad hoc, then there is a formula and what is the formula? We have been here now for the better part of three-fourths of an hour. We cannot get an answer. At the risk again of reiteration, which is repetition for the second time, would the minister tell us what Mr. Beaufield and his associate will be doing under the new policy? Will the minister also give the committee a list showing the boards and the number of pupils in each board that are being bussed or alternatively, if he does not have that information, even though we asked him several days ago to get it, would he please give the committee a list showing the per/pupil cost of each board? He obviously has that information because when the committee was at it this afternoon, he gave us that information with respect to two boards, the Vineland Board and the Strait of Belle Isle, both of them integrated. I wonder if the minister - all we want to know, Sir, if there is no formula, that is it. We can accept that. If there is a formula, if there is a basis, what is it? Let the minister not tell us that these amounts are imprecise, Sir. They are precise amounts. They may be incorrect but they are precise and we would like to know the basis on which they have been computed?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I can provide the hon. Leader of the Opposition with an explanation. Of course, it is beyond my power possibly to provide him with understanding. However, be that as it may, I have said and I say again that these figures are imprecise. They are imprecise.

They are imprecise by a fact of plus or minus five per-cent. The odd cents and the odd dollars that are there in those figures are arrived at because the value of the - The question that was ask was how much will the boards be getting in the coming year? Now the amount that they would be, the imprecise that they would be getting was calculated by formula, by a rough approximation of a formula that has already been devised building in the factors, the plus and minus factors of paved roads, dirt roads under five miles and over five miles and adding to that the precise figure the very precise figure of the actual value of the unexpired portion of the bus contract.

So when you add a very precise figure to an imprecise figure the total is still an imprecise figure however it resembles precision in that it has odd dollars and odd cents. I think there was one there ending off with \$171.06. Well that is why the odd cents and odd dollars, that is precisely why. Now more than that I cannot say. I have given all the explanation I possibly can. There is a rough formula in existence at the moment which takes into account certain positive and negative factors and when that is applied and the bus contracts already in force are added to it that is the amount that you come up with.

Now there is no board to my knowledge that has all its bus routes under contract nor is there, I do not think there is any board with no bus contract, unexpired bus contract still in force. So that is why a combination of the formula plus the unexpired portion of the contracts and that is the reason for those odd figures and that is it.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Chairman, I hope I do not repeat anything said in this debate so far but would this be correct and perhaps the honourable minister could take a leaf from the book of the member for Fortune Bay and do a little confessing here to us tonight. Is this what happened, Mr. Chairman? The honourable minister brings in

what he calls a new policy, a new approach to the transportation of children in busses around the province. That new policy is in effect for about two hours, I would imagine, before the minister in his own mind and subsequently after a day or so publicly retreats in ignominious disarray, pulls back his policy and comes out with what he states to be a compromise between the old policy and the new policy.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would submit that what in fact happened was that when the honourable minister had some hard facts brought to his attention he discovered that the new policy which he brought forward and announced proudly was completely hopeless to meet the bus transportation situation in the province and that what he had to do was to go back to the old policy exactly as it existed before. If you look at the figures between this year and last year you will see that they are almost exactly the same as the honourable minister has admitted with a small, a tiny incremental increase in each case. So why does not the honourable minister simply say that his, we will accept it that his first policy statement was so ill-conceived, so hopeless that he had to throw it out the window and that he has now gone back, ignominiously perhaps gone back to the original policy under which the government operated in respect of school busses.

Now why does he not just admit that and what we will do is say, "Okay, you made a feeble attempt to bring something new into the realm of education and it did not work because you did not think it out carefully enough. Perhaps when you give some more considered experienced thought to it and rely on some of the experience in the department and from out around the province you will come up with a sensible, sane bus transportation policy and then we will accept that, Mr. Chairman." But for the time being the minister should simply say, "I was in error. I made a mistake. My policy, my bus

transportation policy was ill conceived, idiotic. I had to retreat in disarray and now what we have done is gone back to the old policy but I promise the House that over the next months I will try to bring in a new policy for bus transportation which is as equitable as possible as far as the school children and the boards are concerned."

Why does he not simply state that and then we can get on to the remainder of his estimates?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I have ask the minister twice what Mr. Beaufield and his assistant will be doing under the new policy which apparently assigns them no role. I mean we voted \$18,000.00, in round figures, to pay their salaries and I would like to know what these two gentlemen will be doing. The committee is entitled to that. I have also ask the minister on two occasions if he would be good enough to give the committee either the number of pupils bussed within each boards jurisdiction or alternatively the cost per pupil for each of the boards within the province. Maybe he could give the committee this information? He writes it down but we would like the information now, Mr. Chairman. We ask for it, The second half, of pupils per board business, we ask for that days ago and the minister surely has had ample time to prepare himself.

On the question of the formula, I guess we will have to give up but I think it is patently obvious that there is no formula. The minister is administering this an ad hoc basis but we do not find that offensive. What we find offensive is that the minister will not admit it but I think it is obvious that it is so even though the minister will not say the words, from stubborn pride or irrational feelings, but nonetheless it is obvious that it is on an ad hoc basis and we are not particularly upset about that. I think it is probably fair to say this is the way it was done over the years because this is the way, in the nature of the beast, it must be done. The minister can

bring a formula in here for next year's session, provided he is still the minister, of course, if not his successor will bring in the formula and we will gladly look at it. If they could succeed in bringing in a formula, Mr. Chairman, I think they would have done very well. This is one of the larger votes that is really in many ways an unmanageable vote because so little of it is within the control of the minister or his officials.

But I wonder, we will give up on that. We will admit that the minister will not give us any more information and it is really senseless to press him further. I think we have made our point and he has not been able to make his. But I wonder if he would tell us about Mr. Beaufield and his assistant and all I want to know is what they will be doing for \$18,000.00 a year. I am sure they will earn it, no doubt at all, but the minister has twice ducked the question and I do not intend to let him duck it. Would he also tell us the list, please, of either the cost per pupil for each board or the number of pupils bussed within each board's jurisdiction and we can do the arithmetic ourselves?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, on the first question first, I guess, Mr. Beaufield, I find it distasteful to have to bring in the name of an official in the department. I do not think that a person's name should be bandied about even in this -

AN HON. MEMBER: The director of school transportation.

MR. CARTER: The director of school transportation. What will the director of school transportation be doing in future? Well, for a while until the whole thing is settled he will be director of school transportation or whatever the title should be. I must say the particular gentleman is a very valued employee and a very competent civil servant and no doubt there will be many tasks that he can successfully perform.

On the number of pupils bussed in each committee's jurisdiction, I would be more than happy to submit these figures to the committee. If my memory serves me rightly, is there no hint of these figures in that other? Well then I will be more than happy, Of course, the offices are closed tonight but I will be more than happy at three o'clock tomorrow afternoon to bring in these particular figures. They are not unavailable.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: Well, that is entirely up to themselves but I would suggest that I can quite easily bring in those particular figures. The number of pupils bussed in each school board jurisdiction, a very easy figure to produce. I did not think it would be necessary for the passing of this vote

but if the hon. gentlemen wishes to have it, and in fact the hon. gentlemen might as well admit that any information that they require is more than available from this department. In fact, I well remember practically straining my back bringing a great yaffle of information about two weeks ago, all I could carry. I would like to know if the hon. gentlemen opposite have digested that?

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. CARTER: Perhaps so, I think I need it. Anyway, I think that is all I can say about this particular item at this point. I do agree that that information should be submitted and I am more than happy to agree that it will be submitted.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister and while he may have strained his back, it is obvious he has also strained his mind on occasion, some of the positions he has taken. I wonder, maybe we could let the item stand and go on with the other heads. There is considerably more and obviously we will be here I would think until eleven o'clock on this item, because the information, Mr. Chairman, we asked the minister for this information a week ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Well all right then, we think the information is vital, We do not doubt the minister will furnish it, That is not my purpose in asking that it stand. The minister was asked thrice, and like Peter being asked on the third time he confessed. He has agreed to give the information. I do not doubt that, I do not doubt for a minute that at three of the clock tomorrow the minister will pop up in his place and table the information. What I am saying, Your Honour, is that it is relevant to this item. It is relevant to these amounts and that is why I asked if the item would stand.

If the majority on the other side do not wish it to stand, then I suppose there is nothing I can do. I do not see any reason why it should not be allowed to stand. The House Leader was on the radio, I am told, on the weekend, prattling on about obstruction and everything.

Well, let him facilitate it. Let this item stand, we will come back to it when he calls the committee, I assume it will be tomorrow afternoon. There are many other items in the estimates which can be dealt with and passed on with. I can only ask, I cannot do more than that. I do think the item should stand, I think the information is relevant, the minister has now undertaken to get it and in view of the fact that we did ask him, Sir, several days ago, if he would be good enough to have this information ready, I guess in the rush of administration and things he did not have a chance to get it ready. Well fine, if he could get it tomorrow, All we want to do is have a look at that and get a per pupil cost and then have a chance to assess the merit of the amount being requested by the minister.

Not very underhanded, not anything, except to me entirely reasonable. So, would the committee let the matter stand and we will go on with whatever the next item is. I can only ask, it depends on the House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, we are not adverse to giving the Opposition any information that they require. If the item stands, I would like to be able to procure agreement, I mean we have heard, you know, we have had an awful lot of quite valuable debate today that has gone on for about three hours over various items on this. I would say, if we do let the matter stand now perhaps we can come to an agreement, that the comment with respect to this item will be restricted to the answer that has been given. If not, let us go on with the rest of the debate on this item so that we will not find ourselves on a circuitous route going on and on and on tomorrow on this one point.

MR. ROBERTS: I think that is reasonable, Mr. Chairman, and for my part and for that of my colleagues, we will undertake that whenever this particular 612-02-06 is called tomorrow, the only debate the only comment will be on matters arising out of the information to be tabled by the minister at three o'clock or whenever he tables it

tomorrow. Are we in agreement on what the understanding is?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, well in that case we will gladly agree to that. Sir, I do not think we will be very long, We would just like to have the information. Ineed, if the minister could get it to us in the morning, if one of his officials could pop it up to us, it might make the thing go a little more quickly, because we could do some calculations then.

MR. CARTER: It seems to me a trifle untidy to leave a matter standing. My deputy assures me that he can get these figures fairly, well not easily but he can get them. I would rather see this matter settled and under our belts tonight, if possible. So, if the honourable Leader of the Opposition would agree, if my deputy can dig out these figures tonight, will that satisfy the hon. gentleman?

MR. ROBERTS: Of course, Mr. Chairman, I did not know that the gentleman was the deputy, he was the associate deputy I understood.

MR. CARTER: The associate deputy, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: If the minister's adviser the minister's official could get the information tonight, I am quite happy to dispose of the matter tonight. All I am saying then is, could we let it just rest in the committee for an hour or so this evening while the gentleman hunts up the information? What I want is to be able to discuss the information to be given by the minister, at least the possibility of discussing it. Unless there is some head to discuss it under, if the House Leader and the minister would agree to let us discuss that item under the total for the department, we would be quite happy, Mr. Chairman. All we want is to be in a position when the minister produces the information to be able to say a few words on it. The mechanics - I am in the hands of the House Leader, whatever he thinks best.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

2607

MR. ROBERTS: Do it under the total?

MR. MARSHALL: We can do it under the total on the understanding, Mr. Chairman, that when we come to the total the honourable Minister of Education, as he has indicated, will attempt to get it tonight if possible, if not, by tomorrow. When we come to the total it can be discussed, but its relevancy will be circumscribed to the area of the question itself. If that is understood.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the total is relatively wide-open of course, but on the understanding the minister will get the information, whether he gets it this night or tomorrow, it can be discussed under the total. It is a little more specific than normally a debate under the total would be, but on the understanding that the government side will allow us a little more latitude under total than normally the committee would have, we will gladly say "carried" on our side, for this bus transportation thing now.

MR. MARSHALL: Once we understand that the item whether to be discussed under the total or whether it be let stand, the item of transportation of school children in the debate will be limited to the answer given. Once we understand that now we have exhausted that particular subhead with the exception of this answer that the minister is going to furnish.

MR. ROBERTS: As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, that is so. We have exhausted 612-02 - 06 with the exception of comment arising out of...

MR. CARTER: As I understand it, the information the honourable Leader of the Opposition wants is the total number of pupils in each school board jurisdiction that are being bussed. Is that correct?

MR. ROBERTS: Either that or, (which ever is easier for the minister to get) the cost per pupil for each board. Because obviously, given the total number, and we do have the total cost, even our limited arithmetical abilities will lead us to a rough approximation of the per pupil cost. Holloway School grade II, whatever the lady's name was who attempted to inculcate that into me. But with the understanding that the only detailed comment on total, other than what is normally allowed

in respect of any item, will be with respect to these figures. Let us for heaven's sake carry it. Well, we are passing about \$1 million an hour, we are going to be here all year.

On motion, 612-02-06 carried.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the erection and equipment of schools, capital grants and operational grants, 612-02-02 are somewhat related in that this really represents a very large problem for school boards in that they had to come up with the revenue for such expenditures. Earlier this afternoon I asked the minister if in fact the operational grant was an appropriate place to bring up this whole business of school tax authorities and school taxation. The hon. the minister, Mr. Chairman, suggested that he would like to deal with that particular topic under the present subheading 612-02-08.

Now, Sir, having talked with some members of

MR. F. B. ROWE: quite a few of the school boards throughout the province, they are really desperately concerned about where the money is coming from for the erection and the equipping of schools and indeed the operations of these schools.

So Sir I think this is probably the appropriate time for the minister to try and get some indication of what this present administration intends doing with respect to the setting up of the school tax authorities and their general philosophy on school taxation. Now, Sir, if I may make a positive or constructive comment here, it may not be accepted but it is just a point that I would like to make, I understand that we have approximately eight school tax authorities now, Is that correct?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Eight school tax areas in the province. Now, Sir, each one of these authorities of course has to collect taxes and it is my understanding that the administrative costs of these school tax authorities represent close to ten percent of the revenue that they in fact collect.

Now Sir, what I would like to suggest is the setting up of some sort of a central authority that takes the full responsibility for the collection of school taxes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Not necessarily the setting up for the collection of school taxes all over the province but where they do in fact exist, there must be some way of centralizing the collection of school taxes, this is all I am suggesting. Now I do not know but quite conceivably this is the type of thing that is going to expand. I understand that the Avalon Integrated School Board and the Roman Catholic School Board in St. John's have already recommended that a school tax authority be set up in the St. John's Area.

So we can only assume from this, that the whole business of setting

MR. ROWE, F.B. up of school tax authorities will expand in the coming years. Now, Sir, if we are going to set up separate school tax authorities all over the province or if they are going to be set up under the Act -

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not know how relevant the honourable member is being, he is discussing school tax authorities and this item is the erection and equipping of schools itself.

MR. CARTER: If I may, Mr. Chairman, there does seem to be a conflict here but on the understanding that school taxes, school assessments and various sums raised for schools or these various taxes and assessments are in fact for capital works. That was why I suggested earlier that it be discussed under this subhead as opposed to the other one. I was trying to expedite matters.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Mr. Chairman, I was very careful to ask this afternoon, you know, where in fact I could discuss this particular topic. The minister indicated to me that this would be an appropriate topic subheading to discuss it under, for this I am now doing.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is obvious that if we are going to have expansion of the numbers of school tax authorities throughout the province, that to have separate collection agencies for these, each one of them costing approximately ten percent of the total revenue collected is an expenditure that we can certainly do without. So what I am suggesting, Sir, is that the Minister of Education give some consideration to, I do not know whether this is the answer or not, but I would like to ask if he has given any consideration to cutting down on the cost of collection of school taxes? That is point number one, Sir.

The second point that really disturbs me is the fact that we do have rich and poor areas of our province. Sir, there is no doubt in

MR. ROWE, F.B. my mind that there are some school boards or some school tax areas where there would be no problem whatsoever in collecting these taxes from the people within that area. Sir, there are others and obviously I am not going to name them, where school tax authorities would encounter extreme difficulty in collecting school taxes as in fact they have encountered difficulty in collecting school assessments or school boards have encountered difficulty in collecting school assessments.

So, Sir, here is another reason why I would suggest not only the need for centralization of the actual collection agencies itself but actual centralization of the whole collection system. So that really we do not have a situation where poor areas of the province or poor school board areas or tax areas are not able to collect the same amount of money as other tax areas.

So I would just like for the minister to comment on that, if he could?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, perhaps to expedite this discussion, since it is within the rules to get up as many times as it is felt necessary, if members would keep their comments reasonably short than I can answer each question individually or in blocks of two perhaps. This way we can deal with matter very expeditiously. You see the honourable member has raised quite a number of points that will take a fairly lengthy dissertation to deal with. He has raised one of the points, the whole business of school taxes raises so much material for debate that I could stay on my feet for a long time discussing it, but I will try and keep my remarks as short as possible.

The previous government, the previous administration promulgated the fiction that schooling would be free. They did not bother to define what free was too carefully but the suggestion was certainly made that schooling would be entirely free for all children in the province. Of course, they had to come up with the idea of the

MR. CARTER: assessment because they found that schooling, you know, there was not enough money for school boards. So they ended up saying you know, if a free education costs \$10.00 a month, how much would it be if you had to pay for it? So all sorts of anomalies arose but basically - just a moment if I might

MR. ROWE, F.B. I did not ask for an historical account or history of education in Newfoundland. I asked for an answer to two very specific questions and the minister is not relating to these two questions that I have asked.

MR. CARTER: Well I was leading up to it.

The point may well be -

MR. ROWE, F.B. Point of order on the grounds of irrelevancy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order, the honourable member can rise after the minister is finished and explain that his question is not being answered. However, it is no point of order to rise on and question it while the honourable minister is giving his explanation.

MR. CARTER: Sir, the point might - well I will deal with one of the earlier points that the honourable member raised. He said that there are some areas of the province more able to pay school taxes than others. But I think that a bit of reflection upon the fairly vast area that a school tax authority covers would indicate that in most cases, it is not in all cases, the school tax areas themselves encompass both rich and poor areas or better wealthier and less wealthy areas, so I doubt if on balance there is too much difference between various school tax authorities. One might suspect that a city like St. John's was a very well off city and yet the school boards in St. John's are probably having more difficulty making their ends meet than the school boards elsewhere.

However, there have been suggestions that it is much more efficient to collect school taxes by putting another point on the sales tax or putting two or three points, percentage points on the provincial share of the income tax. However, I might point out that already two

Mr. Carter,

of the seven percentage points of the S.S.A. are supposedly or were brought in for educational purposes. The precise dates I cannot recall at the moment. I think honourable members will agree upon reflection that at least two of the points were put in force for school use. Still there seems to be this need for local taxation, Admittedly it is somewhat inefficient. I agree with the honourable member that in some cases it can cost up to ten per cent and sometimes a little bit more to actually collect the school tax money. It has not helped, of course, for the previous administration to constantly say how free schooling is. It has not helped with the collection of taxes. There are certain school tax areas where it is very, very hard for - payment is slow because people feel that somehow or other there is a divergence between what the government say and what the government do. However, the answer probably lies in a provincial school tax authority, to co-ordinate the various types of taxation. The total amount to be gotten by school tax authority is very, very little in comparison - for instance one point on the S.S.A. brings us in \$8 million and the total amount I believe at present collected by school tax authorities all over the island is something under \$3 million. There is not a great deal to be had there. People are suggesting that here is a great wealth of untapped resources for education. It just is not so. You would have to raise school taxes to unheard and unbearable levels to bring in any substantial amounts of money for schools. It is not a source of money. It is not a great source of money. Its value probably rests in the fact that it impresses upon people the fact that education is not and cannot be entirely free rather than for the amount of money that one

Mr. Carter,

can collect by this method. However, I do not feel that I have answered all the honourable gentleman's questions. If he has further questions, I will be more than happy to try and deal with them.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, these were the only two questions that I had to ask. One was the possibility of inequality from one school tax board to another or authority to the other, in terms of what in fact they collect from the people within the area. Am I to understand that what you are suggesting is that we do have poor and rich areas or communities within the whole tax area, therefore, it balances itself out.

MR. CARTER: Yes, the areas of large -

MR. ROWE (F.B.): You are suggesting that there will be no inequalities nor inequities from one school tax area to another?

MR. CARTER: Less than one would think.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): This is what one would think.

MR. CARTER: Less than one would think. They are not that great, I would submit.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): But there is a difference. I will accept that and let it go for the time being, Mr. Chairman.

On motion 612-02-08 carried.

On motion total Subhead 612, carried.

On motion total Subhead 614, carried.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, 615-01, this is one area and I think it is probably the most important area of the whole Department of Education as far as education in the school itself is concerned. I will admit, whether it was under the previous administration or whether it will continue to be so under this administration, that this unfortunately was one of the weaker divisions of the Department of Education or one of the weakest

Mr. Rowe (F.B.).

divisions of the Department of Education - now this is no reflection on the gentlemen who are in that particular division. But, Sir, what I am suggesting is that we have never had and I do not feel we have it at this present time and that is enough curriculum and instructional experts within the Department of Education for the purpose of organizing and conducting workshops for the teachers who are in the field in our province. I am sure the two gentlemen on the other side, Sir, from Green Bay and Labrador West, in their experience in the field of education, saw very clearly this weakness in the Department of Education. Sir, I think one of the basic problems with this division is that we have people, curriculum experts and instruction, if you want to call them that, experts hired by school boards, for instance, in British Columbia, in Ontario, Alberta who get something like \$20,000 and \$25,000 a year. They are the curriculum directors within that school system and the same thing holds true for down in the States. Sir, it is very difficult to entice qualified curriculum directors, experts, assistant directors and everything else for this particular division. I really feel that this vote for salaries is one of the few places where I object to the small amount that is granted for salaries within a division of the Department of Education and Youth. So, Sir, I think that this is totally inadequate as are some of the sub-subheadings under this particular division. I would just like for the minister to comment on this particular aspect of the Department of Education. I will suggest that there is a great need for more qualified people in that particular division.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member's points are well taken. First of all I would like to point out the reason for the difference. I would like to point out the difference in last year's estimate and this year's estimate which is caused by the fact that there were eleven

Mr. Carter

vacancies existed there last year- they are gradually being filled at the present time. The point that the honourable member made is that these positions are very hard to fill and he is absolutely right. They are extremely hard to fill. I would suggest that this particular division would be much larger and much more accurate if these particular vacancies were not that hard to fill but they are almost impossible to fill, to get the sort of person (the honourable gentleman knows better than I do) that you require in these particular jobs. It is a very highly skilled, if you like, highly technical type of training that you need. All I can say is that we are limited largely by the number of people we can attract to this particular branch of the Department of Education. If we could get more, we would or we would certainly make a strenuous effort. That is the chief reason for the small size or apparently small size of this vote.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Chairman, if I could I would like to make a suggestion here. The minister is quite correct. It is extremely difficult to attract qualified people to the province. Unfortunately I do not want to sound too provincial or nationalistic but it might be an idea if we could attract or try to attract in some way more Newfoundlanders, who know the educational environment of our province, into situations like this. Perhaps the minister could give some consideration, if not this year certainly next, to the idea of establishing special grants or special bursaries or special fellowships or something or scholarships so that young, promising Newfoundland educators would probably take a year or two off from their school system and go out to the Mainland of Canada or go to one of the American universities where they have tremendous departments of education, of instruction and curriculum, within their faculties of education, and have young Newfoundlanders themselves educated, at least get their Master's Degree and certainly their Doctorate in this particular

Mr. Rowe (F.B.)

area and then bring them back to our own province and allow them to serve the provincial government in that way. I would submit, Sir, that probably if we got ten young, promising young Newfoundlanders in the field of education who are interested in curriculum and instruction and have them go down to some university, because we do not have doctorate programmes in our own university here, in this particular area, and train them for two years, it would be a very small cost indeed for the benefits that would be derived from having these people coming back to our province and

helping to articulate and correlate the curriculum in our province and set up work shops and what have you for the on-going education of our teachers.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable members point is well taken. I certainly concur with him on this particular subhead.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabour the point but I might suggest here that my honourable friend from St. Barbe North certainly has a point and I certainly give the Minister of Education, but I think another point should be made here. That is, probably the honourable member is too modest but I remember in the school from which I just resigned my position as principal, that the honourable member did quite a bit in helping to implement a side programme at the school in Wabush which was unlike any other in the province. I make this point Mr. Chairman, because I think the university can provide a lot of the expertise we look for here. A lot of the faculty in the educational faculty at the university certainly are providing quite a bit of expertise for the schools in the field. I would think that the gentleman employed at the same type of situation in the Department of Education would be more of the type that would coordinate a programme while the university would have much more leeway, much more time, much more funds and many more people at their disposal to look at this aspect of instruction. I am sure the honourable gentleman would agree with me.

Subhead 615 -02 - 04 carried.

Subhead 615 - 03 -01 carried.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, 615-03-02, there is a substantial increase in this item I would could the Minister explain the increase

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, \$150,000 of this increase is really a book entry. It does not involve a transfer of funds. It is a loan that was made to Atlantic Films many years ago, or it is a debt owed by

Atlantic Films to the Government, which is being forgiven upon the release or the giving up of a great deal of film that they have down there. If I might be permitted a moment or two, some of this film is extremely valuable. I doubt if you could see it for very much but, for instance, there, at the end of the first world war there was a victory parade that was captured on film. Although the film is rather jerky, still it is a priceless record of something like over fifty years ago. There is also some pre-world war 1 film there. How these particular films got into the hands of Atlantic Films, I am not able to say at the moment. But suffice it to say that it is a large quantity of extremely valuable and interesting film. We are more than delighted to be able to get control of it.

Total subhead 615-03-010 carried.

Subhead 616-02-01

MR.F.,ROWE: Mr. Chairman, 616-02-01, I was just wondering why the increase in travelling there. I realize the desperate need for expenditures in special education estimates but I was wondering if there was something new in the making or some workshop or something being conducted during the year to necessitate this increase in travelling.

MR.CARTER: This is due to the expanded facilities for this particular school for the mentally retarded, and the fact there will be more travelling done around the island in this connection. Of course it is only an estimate. It does seem like quite a jump from \$9,000. This is \$25,000, but I would submit it is money well spent.

MR.ROBERTS: Before it is carried, Your Honour, there is a very large increase from \$2500 to \$20,000. Specialized Schools - Handicapped. Could the minister tell us a little about what that covers?

MR.CARTER: This grant is to assist parents sending severely handicapped

children to special schools on the mainland when there are not equivalent educational services available here.

MR.ROBERTS: What kind of handicapped children -

MR.CARTER: This would be the type of handicapped that is trainable and yet severe. I am not able to produce a list - my familiarity with that type of -

MR.ROBERTS: What is the procedure, a note to the minister -

MR.NEARY: Mr. Chairman, before we carry this subhead, 616-2-06, got past me there. I was wondering what the government's policy is on the Halifax School for the Blind. This has been a target of controversy. Actually, I have to deal with it now under the total subhead but I am really talking about education and maintenance of blind children. As the committee knows, we send about thirty-five blind children over to Halifax every year. The school over there has been classified as a real fire trap. There is a move on foot in Nova Scotia and in New Brunswick I think and probably in Prince Edward Island, to try and get all the Atlantic Provinces to contribute to a school, probably somewhere in Nova Scotia, a new school. I do not think they plan to put it in Halifax, I think it was in Truro or Amherst somewhere they planned on building this new school. I was dealing with it when I was minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, because the vote came under that department. It has only been transferred this year.

I was all for building a new school somewhere in the Atlantic Provinces because it had been suggested that the blind children be educated down here at our School for the Deaf. But the experts will tell you, Mr. Chairman, deaf children and blind children do not mix together. So, the Atlantic Provinces are going to have to face the facts that a new school is necessary.

Now, I do not think it is feasible for each province to have its own school. So, I would like for the minister to indicate just what

June 19, 1972. Tape 835. Page 4.

is the position now on the Halifax School for the Blind. Are we going in with the other provinces or are we going to build our own?

MR. CARTER: Several things.

MR. CARTER: First, Mr. Chairman, the vote here includes \$3300 per pupil grant for pupils accommodated at the School for the Blind. This is 616-06. We have apparently thirty students in this school but next September the assessment is going to rise to \$5,000. They feel that they cannot manage on \$3,300 anymore and that will be \$150,000.

Now here is one case in point where the estimate is severely out of line with what we will actually have to pay. Of course this figure came in after this particular estimate was done up, so this will be one case where we will have to go to Treasury Board.

On the School for the Blind, last February I toured the school facilities in Halifax and I spent a day there and went through the entire school, it was a school day, I think it was a Monday and school was in session and I saw it at work.

It is true the building is old and the facilities somewhat behind the times. The land that the school occupies is right in the centre of downtown Halifax, opposite the Victoria General Hospital and it is extremely valuable and there were some suggestions that if the Blind School sold its land, they would realize more than enough money to relocate somewhere outside of Halifax with a magnificent school, very well appointed.

But the point is, Mr. Chairman, that if blind children are brought to a rural environment, they lose a great deal of auditory stimuli and especially among the younger children they are likely to deteriorate. It is felt by those who know, it is much wiser to treat blind children in an urban environment where their ears are constantly assaulted by a cacophony of noise if you like, but it is enough to keep their curiosity aroused. "What is this? What is that? What is the other?" Of course their instructor, or teacher, or whoever is accompanying them will try to tell them the best way he can. The other thing is that mercifully, many, many blind children can see, or can see something. It

is fortunate that very, very few people, or a very small percentage are completely and totally blind. There is a certain amount of sight that can be preserved and certainly worth saving, therefore, we are very, very lucky that the Halifax School for the Blind is located as close as it is to the Victoria General Hospital because many, many children go to the hospital once a week for treatment and it is not at all unusual for children to go there daily for treatment of such conditions as glaucoma and cataracts and for various other eye conditions that I am not able to describe medically.

The four Atlantic Provinces are more than happy to co-operate as much as possible, but it is felt that the present location and position in down-town Halifax is the best possible location for the School for the Blind and I must say I concur. Having examined all the other possibilities, I concur with the other Atlantic Ministers of Education. It is now suggested that what will be done will be gradual renovation and extension and repair of existing facilities. The piece of land that they are located on is certainly large enough for them to build another building entirely, another new building and still have lots of vacant land for whatever purposes they need it for.

So I can see a new School for the Blind being constructed. The present facilities being extended and the older facilities renovated. Structurally it is a very sound building, I think it is unfair to call it a fire trap. There are a great many exits and a great many stairs and there are a great many fire escapes, I think children could be got out reasonably swiftly.

However, I will admit that it is an old building.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: But it is an old building that leaves a lot to be desired and certainly no one could quarrel with the suggestion that it ought

MR. CARTER: to be replaced, entirely replaced, I agree with that, but bearing in mind the fact that it has a long tradition of nearly one hundred years in Halifax, and the people in Halifax are used to the blind children and are more than helpful.

There are quite a number of volunteer organizations that do a great deal of useful work and I think that the School for the Blind is in good hands. The present plans call for extensive renovation if not complete replacement and I think that we are on the right track. However I would agree that perhaps progress is not as swift as it should be.

On motion total subhead 616 carried.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): With regard to 617-01, Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the minister could indicate to the committee if there are any steps being taken to provide for the training of teachers for the deaf? I understand that there are approximately twenty teachers at that particular institution. They are extremely dedicated and capable teachers, Sir, but there still remains a great need for specialized training of teachers for the deaf.

Now of course there are no places that I am aware of in this province and I think there are only one or two centres in all of Canada that specialize in the training of teachers for the deaf and in most cases these teachers have to be sent to the United States for this specialized training. I understand that there is a definite need for further training or specialization of these teachers, although they are doing an extremely capable job under the circumstances at the present time. I was wondering if the minister could tell the committee whether in fact there are any specific plans for this purpose?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, as the member has indicated, the people who work out there at the Newfoundland School for the Deaf are extremely dedicated. At the moment we feel that the vacancies as they occur can be filled from applications but we are quite concerned that we might have to send local people away to be trained so that they will have a commitment, as it were, to Newfoundland.

There was some talk too of using people who are already severely deaf, as teachers. I must say, as there is with blind children, some teachers are quite blind or severely handicapped in that field. Fortunately I think it is on the right track but we do feel at the moment that because of the rapidly developing techniques in this area, that for the time being it might be wiser to fill these vacancies by advertisement. It may be better to fill vacancies as they exist by advertisement from various parts of the world, but we are not unaware of the tremendous value of sending local people away.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the Newfoundland School for the Deaf is located at Torbay. They are using the old R.C.A.F. buildings down at Torbay Airport and there has been some criticism about the actual physical condition of these buildings. This is another vote that came under my department when I was minister there. There has also been some criticism about the location of the Newfoundland School for the Deaf. Every year while I was minister, a proposal came up from my officials that the government should consider constructing or building a new School for the Deaf in the province. I am wondering if the government, if the minister could tell us if the government is contemplating building a new Provincial School for the Deaf in the foreseeable future?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, the outside condition of those buildings belies the fact that inside they are reasonably well appointed but there is no

MR. CARTER: question that they are of a temporary nature. These buildings were built during the war. They have been renovated several times, or at least a good many of the buildings have been renovated several times. I must say that the gym down there which also comes under the Department of Education, seems to be standing up fairly well and was fairly substantially built. However, I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that the School for the Deaf is of paramount concern to us and

and at the time the present facilities seem to be, I will not say adequate - better to use the word, sufficient. Still I agree with the honourable gentleman that they should be replaced.

Fortunately the people who are deaf they have standard, normal vision and I would view the provision of attractive surroundings as a very high priority for that type of school.

On motion, sub-head 617, carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, there is an error in the estimate here for salaries under the Denominational Education Committees. The amount instead of being \$260,800 should be \$160,800. I would therefore move that the amount of \$100,000 be deducted so that it will become \$160,800 and that the necessary correction be made in the total sub-head and also in the total at the end of the Department of Education. Well, later on in the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation we will find that there is an error the other way of exactly \$100,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: No, because there is an error later on of \$100,000 which balances it out otherwise we would love to do that.

On motion, amendment carried.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister, Sir, has saved me one of the two tasks, because we were curious and we did some research and we were even more curious. I wonder though if the minister could indicate to us the policy of the administration with respect to an item that has come before the House, Sir, and that is again in the news. I refer to the resolution passed by this House three or four years ago with respect to the entrenchment in the B.N.A. Act of the educational rights of one of the denominations in this province, the Pentecostal Assemblies. Just for the benefit of the committee and the minister, Mr. Chairman, the resolution came before the House and I believe received the unanimous support of every member in the House. Since

then it has been put down on the Order Paper at Ottawa because the resolution was sent by Mr. Soeaker, I guess, to the Government of Canada and after what seem to be very lengthy delays indeed it was placed upon the Order Paper of the House of Commons. It is there now and they have not proceeded with it at Ottawa. I wonder if the minister could indicate to us now tonight, as it seems to be the only place in the estimates where we can ask the question, the policy of the administration with respect to this. If the Premier were here I would ask but, of course, he is not here so I cannot.

Well, the Premier apparently is here. He may wish to deal with it because it is a matter of major policy but the minister may be in the position to speak. I would like to know the administration's policy. Briefly and in one sentence, Sir, do they intend to press Ottawa with the need to proceed with this matter?

MR. CARTER: All I can say in reply to that, Mr. Chairman, is that the level of co-operation between the denominations is so great that it is almost superfluous to look for the entrenchment of rights in the B.N.A. Act. I myself, from my own personal knowledge understand that it takes something like six weeks to get a Treasury Board Minute out of the Federal Government. So what it would take to get the B.N.A. Act amended strikes me that it would probably take a decade or so. However, I do not think that there is anything -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I have a very real reason for asking and the minister skating around it, Sir, will not meet the need. The point is this, do the present administration intend to proceed with this matter? Do they intend to press the Government of Canada - No, I am not asking the Finance Minister, let him go back to reading the want ads or whatever it is he is reading in the paper. Now the Premier is now coming into the committee, Mr. Chairman, and he may wish to say a word on it. All I want to know is the stand of the

administration with respect to this matter. I do not need a dissertation upon dealing with the Government of Canada as I agree it can be frustratingly long. But a very simple yes or no is all is needed. For the benefit of the Premier and if the Premier had been here earlier I would have addressed the question to him, do the government, the administration intend to proceed with the resolution passed by this House three or four years past on the Pentecostal Assemblies matter, the amendment of the B.N.A. Act?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, on that basically a great deal cannot be said. The Provincial Administration will carry forward with it and hope that the good graces of the Liberal Government in Ottawa will concur.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Premier. I wonder if he might tell me, the Premier was in Ottawa and had meetings last month and I am not asking to be privy to any information one way or the other but I wonder if he could say whether the administration have in fact pressed this upon the Government of Canada.

MR. MOORES: Upon asking the Government of Canada, Mr. Chairman, I understand that it is on the Order Paper.

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Chairman, with respect, the Premier has not answered the question. I know it is upon the Order Paper as it was upon the Order Paper a year past and has not yet come before the House of Commons. What I am asking the Premier and the Premier knows exactly what I am asking him, what I am asking the Premier is whether the administration have pressed the Government of Canada and I ask only, I ask not in any spirit of malice believe me, I ask because a number of the members at Ottawa who belong to the same party as does the present administration have brought the matter up and also I believe the Minister of Community and Social Development, following the sojourn to Ottawa in May, the first week in May, was on the radio

and in the newspapers with this. All I want to know is whether the administration, Sir, have pressed this. Have they made a statement to the Government of Canada, a clear and categorical statement, to the effect that as the administration of the province, confirmed in office by quite handsome majorities, they now would like the Government of Canada to go ahead with this matter immediately?

MR. MOORES: The answer, Mr. Chairman, is no. For the simple reason that the subject was brought up with the Federal Government. It is a subject that the Federal Government, because of the B.N.A. Act complications and a great many arrears, Mr. Trudeau, the Prime Minister, particularly I understand does not want to press for one single issue in the B.N.A. Act, before the B.N.A. Act is returned to Canada where it can be done here as has been requested. We have asked what the situation is at this present time, as have the six of the federal members in Ottawa, and there is only one, really only one federal member who can make a statement or is in a position to do what obviously should be done.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Premier and just so that I am clear and I want to be clear on the matter, he has said that the government of this province, the administration which he heads have not pressed. The Premier did say, "No, we have not pressed the Government of Canada to proceed with this matter." I do not want to misquote the Premier as it is an important point.

MR. MOORES: When I say we have not pressed the matter, Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of we have asked the Minister of Transport in Ottawa to do what he can about the matter. I understand he will do that.

MR. ROBERTS: I will comment on that at another time, another place. But, Mr. Chairman, we seem to not come to grips on it. The Premier tells us that the government have not pressed the Government of Canada to proceed with this but that he or a spokesman for the government has asked Mr. Jamieson, the Minister of Transport who sits for a Newfoundland constituency and indeed -

MR. ROBERTS: In common language, the Newfoundland representative in the federal cabinet to do what he can about the matter. I am not so sure those are not mutually contradictory but he that as it may, Sir, let me ask the question this way then. Does the present administration adopt this as a policy? Do they intend to proceed with it so far it lies within their power?

MR. CARTER: I think that I can answer this. Here again I have to do sort of a strange thing. I have to refer back to a subhead - 612-09 Grant in lieu of DREF, capital. This is \$536,000. We already treat the Pentecostal Assemblies as if their rights had been enshrined in the B.N.A. Act and we are more than prepared to recommend this. But as the Premier has pointed out, the present federal government apparently do not seem to be too anxious to petition the Parliament of Westminster for the very fact that they wish to bring the B.N.A. Act back to Canada.

So the honourable the Leader of the Opposition has raised a federal point that cannot be very well resolved by this Provincial House.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Chairman, we will see what the Government of Canada does or does not do or more precisely what the Parliament of Canada does or does not do. But let me come back to the minister because what he did was not strange, he did not answer the question. The subhead to which he referred is the carrying out of a provincial statute. The minister has no more option about that than does Your Honour has the option of following the Standing Rules or not, Your Honour, of course, would follow the Standing Rules. The minister would follow the statute or he would find himself in trouble.

Let me again ask the minister the question. Does the present administration support this policy of entrenching in the Constitution, and all I want is an answer, "aye" or "nay", of entrenching in the constitution the rights granted by statute, by a statute of this House

MR. ROBERTS: with the assent of His Honour The Governor; entrenching in the Constitution the educational rights granted to the Pentecostal Assemblies by that statute. That is all I want to know.

The Premier has said, you know, half "yes" and half "no" with respect to pressing Ottawa. But do the government, do they want to see this done. Do the present government want to see it done? That is really what I am asking.

MR. CARTER: It is an extraordinarily way to phrase a question, Mr. Chairman, because obviously we are already carrying out our responsibilities, towards this group, as if their rights were entrenched. We have no objection in the world to seeing them entrenched but I can state almost categorically that the federal government does not seem to be that keen to acquiesce to either our wishes or the wishes of our predecessors or perhaps the wishes of our successors. For the time being all we can do is our best and we are doing our best. We are recognizing them as a distinct group and giving them distinct privileges. I think that is at least part of what we can do.

MR. ROBERTS: You know, Mr. Chairman, this is almost - you know. it is like putting your fist into a bag of marshmallow to try and get an answer from the minister. But, Mr. Chairman, with all respect, what the estimates do is merely carry into force statutes enacted by this House, these twenty years past. I find it hardly surprising that even the minister, the honourable gentleman, I find it very surprising, you know, it is not surprising that he would even carry out a statutory direction. I do not know the name of the Act or the number of it. I think it was 1954. I am merely as amused as the Premier but perhaps for different reasons.

But, Mr. Chairman, would the minister or would anybody on the government side, there are enough of them over there, the honourable gentleman from Burgeo-LaPoile has been counting most assiduously. I congratulate him. He is doing a great job.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman does not need what? An abattoir. They are back at work at the abattoir.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman does not need an ABC card because really he could not use it.

But anyway, Mr. Chairman, to come back to the minister I was waiting for the gentleman for Green Bay to come alive. We had our doubts about him, especially after Thursday and Friday at Churchill.

But, Mr. Chairman, to come back to the minister -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No no no, only half the wit is needed for the honourable gentleman.

To come back, Mr. Chairman -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: To give half-wit, the honourable gentleman is indeed giving ones all.

MR. MOORES: Which one are you going to give?

MR. ROBERTS: Which one would the Premier like? He can have them both. He can have them both, he is surrounded by half-wits.

But, Mr. Chairman, to come back I am perfectly serious and fun is fun but the fact remains we still have not had from either the minister or the Premier a categorically "aye" or "nay". Is it the policy of this administration, and the minister may find this a strange question but I do not think it is strange on estimates to ask the ministry to indicate their policy with respect to items. Is it the policy of this administration to maintain this resolution, to proceed with it and to press it by all means within their power? The Government of Canada will or will not answer for themselves. Now if the Premier wants to say a word I will be delighted because he makes much more sense than does his colleague the minister.

MR. MOORES: Not necessarily, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to answer this, the question is, it is not absolute as such. The answer

MR. MOORES: basically is "no."

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MOORES: We intend to press the federal government to bring some rationale into the B.N.A. Act. It is the federal government's responsibility not the provincial government's responsibility. On the matter of the denominational education committees, the denominational education, I would hope that eventually and in the not too distant future, we can formulate a committee of all denominations to study the impact of denominational education vis-a-vis state education.

MR. ROBERTS: Well now, Mr. Chairman, we are getting somewhere and I think the Premier's statement might very well be a historic statement. I mean that not unkindly, I think it may very well be a very historic statement and the Premier might be surprised, I think as to the degree of support that might be encountered for such a move or maybe he will not be surprised. But, you know, he should not assume that it will not be. But it is a very important statement.

Now I just want to be clear, does this mean, the Premier began his statement by saying the answer to the question is "no." I am pressing it because I want to be clear because it is a matter of some - the resolution then is not being pressed by the administration here - of course, I will yield, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, as long as the denominational educational system is in operation in Newfoundland, as it is today, the government will press for all denominations to be recognized and this includes the Pentecostal Denomination to be recognized as are the others. If at such time a committee represented of all of the denominations bring in a different report or a recommendation that this House can discuss, then the subject will be for further discussion in the House, by the government.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Chairman, in that case I thank the Premier, I think it is now perfectly clear and let me say, my own party would

MR. ROBERTS: agree completely with what I understand to be the position of the administration, I think this goes beyond politics. As long as we have the denominational system in this province the Pentecostal Assemblies will have exactly the same rights entrenched in the same way as do the Roman Catholic or the Anglican or the United Church themselves or the other denominations.

But that the premier feels and I may say I feel this way too, that the time perhaps is come, to coin a phrase, when we might have a look at the denominational system voluntarily and without coercion and by consent. We have come along way in the past four or five years. If anybody had stood in this House. Mr. Chairman, ten years past, and said there would be a sub-head "Denominational Education Committee" nobody would have believed him. The man would have been howled down with derision. I think the Premier has made an important statement. And without any partisan politics, one way or the other I would welcome it and we are prepared to go along with it. I think it is a good move. So, whilst, Sir, I think we have our answer on the question of the Pentecostal amendment. the Government of Canada will have to speak for themselves, but I understand, now that the attitude of the administration has been made clear publicly, Then I understand that the Government of Canada may be willing to proceed a little more quickly than some people suspect. There may or may not be reasons why they have not proceeded up to this moment.

I thank the Premier. I know it is an important statement and, if I understood it clearly, despite the yapping of the people down there, Sir, I think it is an important statement and one which may very well, unlike most statements that all of us make in this House, may very well have some significance a number of years from now.

June 19, 1972

Tape 838 (night)

PK --6

On motion subhead 618-01 as amended carried.

On motion total for subhead 618-01 as amended carried.

MR. NIARY: Mr. Chairman, 620-04, if I could just ask the minister
a few questions on this heading,

Mr. Neary:

heading 620. Members may remember, prior to the October election, quite a controversy broke out in the province, over here at the College of Trades and Technology, over the fact that the students at the College of Trades and Technology do not have one residence. And if honourable members will remember, the former Premier went charging out of the meeting that was held in the gymnasium over at the College of Trades and Technology. However, later the administration at the time agreed that a residence for students at the College of Trades and Technology would be given top priority. I think this is right and proper, Mr. Chairman, because I think that we have had a tendency in this province to discriminate against vocational training school students and students in the College of Trades and Technology and students in the College of Fisheries, well maybe not so much the College of Fisheries because they have a dormitory down at Pleasantville, but they have been discriminated against, Sir, as compared to the facilities that are being provided for the university. You might say, Sir, that the students at the College of Trades and Technology and at the vocational schools are really second class citizens compared with the students at the university. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is about time that the department and the government decided to take the necessary steps in providing adequate accommodations for these students at the College of Trades and Technology. Now, Mr. Chairman, we also on a number of occasions discussed the possibility of establishing a polytech. institute in the city here. As a matter of fact the former administration had even gone as far as to select the site of the new polytech. I think we were going to put it up here at the top of the hill on the Ridge Road, overlooking the campus of Memorial University. I would like to know what the government's feeling is on this. Do they intend to go ahead with this polytech, or has it got the "X" of the Minister of Finance?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

Mr. Neary.

There are just two but I want to add - there are some other things I want to talk about. There are two very -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Go ahead, if you will answer -

MR. CARTER: Will the honourable gentlemen please describe to me what he means by a polytech?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable minister does not know what a polytech is -

MR. CARTER: What he means -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable minister does not know what a polytech is, then he is more incompetent than we thought he was. I would suggest, Sir, that if he does not know - if the honourable minister wants me to describe my version of a polytech -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: That is what the honourable chatter box from Bonavista South thinks.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I would suggest that the honourable member go back to Colorado, Mr. Chairman. However, the honourable minister knows what - Mr. Chairman, I do not want to waste the time of the House. The honourable minister knows what a polytech is. The honourable member knows.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if you want me to make a speech on polytech, institutes I would be very happy to do it. If the honourable and ignorant member would keep quiet, he might learn something. However, Sir, we were planning on building it up here on the Ridge Road or up in that hill up there. As a matter of fact, it was near where the honourable minister has his savory patch and we might have to expropriate the honourable minister's savory patch to build it there. So I would like to know if the government are going to proceed with the residence

Mr. Neary.

and with the institute. You know, Mr. Chairman, it always occurred to me and I do not know whether I am right or wrong that the College of Trades and Technology and the vocational training schools are more or less considered in the Department of Education as a non-wanted stepchild. They seem like they do not belong in the Department of Education. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is about time we got these institutions, the College of Trades and Technology and all the vocational schools out of the hands of the academics, got it out of the hands of the Department of Education and put it in either the Department of Labour or the new Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations that we decided to set up - my late and wonderful friend the late William Keough was dealing with when he died. He was in the process of setting up this new Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations. I think, Mr. Chairman that is really where the College of Trades and Technology and the vocational training schools rightly belong. I think that the academics, in my opinion, as far as vocational training is concerned, are completely out of touch with reality. I think myself, Sir, that it is about time that we brought our vocational training and our technical training more in line with the kind of a world that we are living in today. I think in a lot of cases people are being trained for the wrong skills. We are just pouring students of the assembly line with no hope of ever getting a job. I do not think there is sufficient research done to find out where the employment opportunities lie. I think we are going to have to do more research. I think also Sir, and I asked the hon. the Premier a question today about the hiring of the permanent, not the construction workers but the permanent work force at Churchill Falls. I asked the Minister of Economic Development a few days ago in this honourable House about the permanent staff and the permanent work force at the linerboard mill in Stephenville - I could probably ask the same question about the permanent staff of the oil refinery at Come-by-Chance.

Mr. Neary

The policy, Sir, of industrialists and employers in the past has been to bring in their top professional people from outside the province, their skilled workers, their technicians and so forth. Nine chances out of ten, they are brought in from outside the province. The industrialists who have done this, Sir, have run into all kinds of problems because the technicians that they brought in here, either cannot adapt themselves to the climatic conditions here or they do not understand the local psychology. They are here a short time and they become very disgruntled. The next thing you know they pack up and they leave and cause all kinds of problems for the employers and for the industries they are associated with.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that in the area of research this is one thing that the College of Trades and Technology and the vocational training people, in co-operation with Canada Manpower, should be doing. They should be researching the market and making sure that Newfoundlanders are trained well in advance for these jobs. Now this can either be done at the schools or the employer could bring skilled people in from outside the province on a temporary basis, train Newfoundlanders and then they leave and go back to their own homes.

I would say, Sir, right off hand that the majority of the top staff, supervisory staff at Churchill Falls are all non-Newfoundlanders. I doubt very much, Mr. Chairman, if there is a single Newfoundlander in the top supervisory staff on the permanent staff of Churchill Falls. I doubt if there is one in Stephenville. I have great doubts, Sir, about that. I doubt if there will be any at Come-by-Chance, unless we take the initiative ourselves and train Newfoundlanders for these jobs. We had an example recently, Sir, in Stephenville when the Minister of Economic Development and Minister of Finance confirmed that the linerboard people in Stephenville had to go outside the province to bring in pipe fitters. In my opinion, it is fantastic. It is incredible. You would hardly believe it. I could hardly believe my ears when I heard the minister making that statement

Mr. Neary.

on radio. We had to go outside the province to bring in pipe fitters, Sir, when we have in this province, Sir, twelve vocational schools and six more under construction, and a College of Trades and Technology and all kinds of millions of dollars being spent on training and retraining and upgrading. We had to go outside the province to bring in pipe fitters. That is poor planning, Mr. Chairman. In my opinion, it is darn poor planning. These jobs should have gone to Newfoundlanders. It is poor planning, Sir. It is poor planning on the part of the academics. That is why I say,

Sir, that these schools have to be taken out of the Department of Education and they have to be put, as far as I am concerned, in the new Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations. I am not trying to take the minister's empire away from him and build up the Minister of Labour's empire, but I think this is a very necessary step, Mr. Chairman.

I do not think I have to repeat the fact that has already been stated in this House over and over again in this session, but I do not think that I have to repeat it that our educational system, Sir, is geared up for the university and I think this is wrong because the College of Trades and Technology and the vocational training schools are equally as important as the university. Sir, I would submit, and hon. members on the government side of the House probably know this, that it is far easier, Sir, in a lot of cases, for a graduate of the College of Trades and Technology or of the vocational school to find a job than it is for a university graduate to find a job. Sir, I think this is the way it is going to be in the future. The trend is already established. I would like to hear the minister's comments on some of these points that I have raised. I think they are very important points. When we get down to vocation training, 621, then we can probably go into it in a little more detail.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for Bell Island has raised what I consider to be a very interesting philosophic point. I think he is attempting to differentiate between education and training and if you were to carry that argument to its ultimate conclusion, you would have to say that a doctor is a mere technician whereas presumably a lawyer is a highly educated person. Nevertheless, I think the distinction between education and training should be made and unfortunately in our school system that distinction seems to be made between the university and the

technical school or what could be classed as a polytechnic, if they were all lumped together. Supposing they were, I think it would probably be an unfortunate distinction made between them. They are both education. They both legitimately belong in a Department of Education and I think they legitimately belong in this Department of Education, because it is very hard to draw the line between so called education and training. I think that both are different sides almost of the same coin. In a very real sense it is a grafting of accumulated wisdom that occurs either when someone is educated or when someone is trained and I think that you cannot help but be educated when you are trained and trained when you are educated, I think it is a distinction that you can only make academically, if you like, It is not a real distinction and in fact I am constantly amazed at the heavy load of so called academic subjects that vocational students must take in order to properly understand their particular field of endeavour.

Another point, there are probably not enough workers trained in any one given field at any one given time. That is a very difficult question to decide because you have to grant workers or vocational applicants, you have to grant them freedom of choice. Some people may want to go in for electrical work, others may want to go in for mechanical and I think it is unfair, in fact I think it is wrong to influence them unduly into a field that they may not necessarily prefer. So I think that at the risk of sometimes having shortages of trained personnel in this particular field, you have to allow this freedom of choice. Since we are discussing the general heading of 620, I would like to lay the hon. gentleman's mind at ease, the subheads 620-09-08 which would not be voted in this, this is voted in another department as capital. This is \$150,000 for planning and preliminary plans for a residence for the College of Trades and Technology.

One could wish that the plans were further along and that

the residences were more imminent but certainly the need exists and the need is being recognized and at least something is being done about it. One could wish there was more being done about it, but at least something concrete is being done in this particular year. So with those few comments I will sit down.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with the minister's answer on the residence. He said \$150,000 was just to have the plans drawn up. If the plans are ready this year, Mr. Chairman, will construction then start this year or will we have to wait for the next fiscal year before construction actually gets underway?

MR. CARTER: Well we are talking about a pretty big facility so I think it would have to be voted.

MR. NEARY: It would have to what?

MR. CARTER: We are talking about a pretty big facility, a residence is not just another shack. It is a fairly hefty...

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: It is being worked on. That is all I can say. One could wish for a further advance but at least... surely we are not going to throw away \$150,000. We have no intention.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister did not answer the question of whether the government was going to proceed with a polytechnic.

MR. CARTER: A polytechnic, as I understand it, the idea would be to lump together all the vocational educational facilities in the province practically under one roof, which probably would be needless duplication at this point.

The vocational schools are spotted around the island strategically and I think they are fulfilling the present need although one could wish for more.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, another matter that has occurred to me. Graduation takes place pretty well around the same time every years, sometime say around the middle of June, graduation of the College of Trades and

Technology and all the vocational training schools takes place just around the same time, around June 15, or anywhere from June 10 to June 15, I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the minister and his officials would give any thought to spreading out the graduation, having the graduation three or four times a year, instead of having graduation once a year and pouring all these students on the labour market at one particular time. Would it not be better, Mr. Chairman, if you could have three graduations a year and have the schools operating continuously all year and instead of having all these students hitting the employment market in June, they could come out three times a year. Would the minister think about that?

MR. CARTER: I would like to comment on that. What the hon. member is describing at the moment as being the present system for graduating in May or June is what they call the lock-step method, whereas the type of method that the hon. member is suggesting is the continuous flow method and the continuous-flow method is now being experimented with in Stephenville and I think that there is a growing awareness that not only does this supply graduates at an even level all during the year but also it enables much greater use to be made of any one facility at times.

There are certain advantages in the lock-step method but we are mindful of it and we are trying it and we agree it is a good point.

On motion total subhead 620, carried.

MR. NEARY: With reference to 621-01, Mr. Chairman, before we carry this vote I wonder if the minister could inform the House

as to what stage now the, is it six new vocational schools or five, are they on schedule, will they open in September, what is the story on the new vocational schools?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, there are only three vocational schools that are going to open this September, Bonavista, Placentia and Springdale, the other two will open later on. But this is a carry over from the previous administration as a result of a very large injection of federal money. This I think one could argue quite satisfactorily that the level of vocational education in Newfoundland is on a very high level. One could only wish that schools were as numerous and as well equipped as the present vocational schools. One could say that there is a certain imbalance but it is an imbalance of one particular facility being almost as good as one could wish for, whereas the other lags far behind. I would hope that we can do equally well with the school facilities as has been accomplished so far with the vocational facilities.

On motion subhead 621 - 03-11 carried.

MR. NEARY: 621-03 Mr. Chairman, I presume the adult upgrading centre at Stephenville comes under this heading. Does it come under this heading? I think the minister indicated some time ago that he planned on decentralizing the adult upgrading programme in the province and that there would not be as many students in Stephenville as there was say in the past two or three years. Would the minister indicate to the House where the adult upgrading centres will be in the province? How many students will be at each centre?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, for the first part of the question, the change that the honourable member is referring to was the change from the lock-step method to the continuous slow method that resulted. This was initially a pilot project that was coming to completion. This resulted in some changes in staff levels.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure if I understand the minister. There will be an increase in students in the other adult upgrading centres throughout the province. I think there is one on Bell Island one in Carbonear, I do not know where the others are, but I think that is what I asked the minister, where will the upgrading centres be now? Will they still be in the same places? Will there be more students at these centres? Will there be a less number of students at Stephenville? Just what will be the situation by September coming?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, Bell Island, Carbonear, Stephenville will be

September but what I was saying about the change from the, remember the earlier question that we were discussing about the merits of continuous-flow as opposed to lock-step and this is the change that has occurred in Stephenville which I think the honourable member is referring to, that is the changes in staff levels. We do expect as a result of the pilot project that was conducted over there, to have rather more students in Stephenville using the existing facilities but otherwise there is very little change.

On motion, sub-heads 621, 622, 623, 641, 642, 664, carried.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, 668(02)(07), I notice there is a tremendous decrease here from the estimates for last year of an amount of \$1,100,500.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to hear these gentlemen on the other side butt in here because apparently they are quite happy with any decrease in sports facilities in their districts this year. Seeing that they are so happy with the decrease we on this side of the House will accept the full \$600,000 for the sports facilities for this year. This would be a wonderful thing. This would satisfy our needs on this side of the House.

Mr. Chairman, over the past three or four years the previous administration have been building up the sports facilities of the outlying areas of Newfoundland. They have not done a good job of it. They have not done as good as I would have liked to have seen them do but they have done something. Last year they did spend a tremendous amount, as the estimates show you. Well, whether there was an election or not it was certainly for a good cause.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South says that it was wasted in many cases. This is a very general

statement. I fail to see how he can say any sports facility in his district was wasted. Maybe he can come out with some examples for me by and by and show me just how these monies were wasted. I know in my district there was not a cent wasted.

Mr. Chairman, if the monies spent this year were spent as wisely as they were last year, then I would certainly be quite happy with the expenditures.

MR. CARTER: Would the honourable member permit me a comment. The honourable member for Bonavista North made the point that there is a considerable decrease in this particular vote. I would like to remind him that this is largely because there were a lot of capital works not only begun but also completed during the previous fiscal year and that in this fiscal year to carry out

the unfinished project, that is to bring them to completion plus to give certain ongoing five year projects one fifth of their total grant, (The grant was split into five equal payments) plus the small amount of discretionary money which is available for other new projects. This will effectively - well, will not absolutely complete the programme, the initial programme as envisages, but it will bring it pretty far along the road. There will always be something in this particular vote. It would be very hard to equal the tremendous level of activity that existed in the last fiscal year, precisely because the jobs were begun, participated in and completed that there is this enormous change in this vote. One might wish that it had been spread over more years so as to get a more even distribution of effort. This is the way it was done and this is the reason for the extraordinary difference.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister for his explanation but that still does not get back from the fact that there is a tremendous cut. I am quite sure, while the programme was carried out last year and it was certainly appreciated, at least by the communities in my district as I know they were appreciated by the communities in other districts, there are also many other communities both in my district and in other districts which need the facilities, which need the type of programme which was carried out last year, and I believe that this programme should be extended and should be increased if at all possible

Do I understand from the minister that this programme will eventually fade out and disappear?

MR. CARTER: No, no. I would like to reply to two or three things - one of the limiting factors for this type of programme is the ability of individual communities to be able to maintain the facilities that have been constructed. This \$1.7 million that was spent in the last fiscal year puts a fairly heavy strain on the various communities where these facilities were constructed merely to maintain them. Because, it is not just enough to supply a community with a facility,

it is also necessary that the community maintain it. Sometimes they are quite expensive to maintain, particularly playing fields and swimming pools and all sorts of sports facilities. They need. I would estimate, probably a tenth of their initial cost each year just to maintain, So that part of this vote will, be continued as a sort of a maintenance grant for sports facilities, if you like.

In the meantime, we recognize the need for sports facilities, in fact too long have sports facilities been neglected in Newfoundland. We are more than happy to continue this at whatever level we can. It would be very difficult to maintain the level, the artificially high level of the last fiscal year.

On motion, 668-02-07 carried.

On motion, total subhead 668, carried.

On motion, total subhead 670, carried.

On motion, Block Provision Canada Pension Plan, carried.

On motion, Block Provision Unemployment Insurance, carried.

MR. CROSBIE: I would like the committee to note that the total at the end now is changed from - it becomes \$127,963,300, reduced by \$100,000 - \$127,963,300.

MR. ROBERTS: Are you carrying the total as it was, Sir? Well we have done marvelous work tonight, our dollars per minute, Mr. Chairman, under your efficient, whatever it is, is going well. The minister has, as he undertook, supplied us with a total number of children bussed by each board and, perhaps I may make a comment or two on that because this table shows dramatically, Mr. Chairman, the cost of per pupil varies incredibly, significantly and that is the point that we have been trying to make and have made on the discussion of this transportation policy.

This information does show that the original statement by the minister, Mr. Chairman, is completely cockeyed and completely nonsensical. I have not had the opportunity as yet to look through each and equate it through. But I doubt if there is a board where the per pupil cost on the actual basis has to come to anything like one hundred dollars. There are some I suspect that would be less. There are others which would be much more. The Vineland Board with less than 1,000 students will have \$150,000, about \$150, I think, the minister told us earlier it was \$169 or \$170.

The St. John's Roman Catholic Board has 5839 students, we will call that 5900 for \$535,000, that is about \$90. per student. Again a considerable difference. The minister also mentioned the Straits of Belle Isle Board, the one in St. Barbe North, this list is not alphabetically, Mr. Chairman, so I have to keep looking back and forth through it. The Straits of Belle Isle, 871 students for \$93,000, which is a little over \$100 per student. The figure the minister gave us today was \$70. Why the discrepancy? Eight hundred and seventy-one students for an estimate this year of \$87,000, almost exactly the \$100 figure, an estimate next year of nearly \$94,000 which is about \$110 per student, in round figures. The figure the minister gave us today was \$60 or \$70, was it not? Why the apparent discrepancy?

MR. ROBERTS: Well we can go back to this at another time, another year. But the point I wanted to make and the minister's figures enabled us to make it, it is simply this, Sir, The original policy brought in by the minister was completely ill-founded, it was badly thought out, if it was thought out at all, The minister hopefully has now retreated from it and has gone back to a policy which takes into account the factors which are relevant. We do not know to what extent they are taken into account, the distance factor, the paved road factor and the existing contract factor, We know about the first, but we do not know about the other two.

All I want to say is that I have seldom seen a policy so ill conceived, All the information that we have been able to get from the minister, and to his credit he has given it to us on the third, fourth, fifth time of asking, all the information shows us quite clearly that the minister did not know what he was doing, and it is not a matter for debate again. That was the reason why we felt the minister was incompetent.

I submit that on the evidence that he has shown he has proven himself incompetent. Nothing personal, we have nothing against the minister, for all I know he may be a nice fellow. But the point is that I think this figure shows us again quite conclusively that he did not know what he was doing

did not take even the steps that an ordinary, reasonable and prudent man would take. I can only express the hope that if the Premier, when he shuffles the Cabinet this summer, as apparently he is going to, judging by the press, No, I do not know, The press tell me that. If the Premier in his wisdom confirms the Minister of Education in that portfolio, that when the minister thrusts himself before the committee next year he will give a little more thought to his policies. Next year he will have had seventeen months under his belt as minister and we will expect a great deal more from him next year than we did this. We have been relatively gentle with him this year because he is a beginner, a tyro, a novice and next year I hope he will come to the committee well armed, I am sure he will, with long-range plans, well thought out, integrated, consolidated and revised policies. I only hope they are better than the bus policy. His first effort was a diaster. Now he may want to say a word or two, if not let us carry the total and go on then we will do three more departments tonight.

On motion, total - Education and Youth, carried.

PUBLIC WORKS - 1X:

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we have very many comments at all on these. Indeed it should be quite possible to do them by the time Your Honour must leave the Chair. I have only one question. It is one that we all ask personally. The Minister of Public Works, I gather, is returning to good health but maybe the Premier could say a word or two. When is he going to come back? We miss him and dearly love to see him. My mother has asked me to say a special word on behalf of the honourable gentleman. She has fond memories of a one-day session. But seriously, how is the minister? I said not a one-night session, a one-day session. How is the minister coming along? I understand he is back to work on at least a part-time basis which I take it means his health is a little better. Maybe the Premier could say a word or

two on it.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, the minister is much, much better and will be returning, He is in his office now actually a half day and will be taking his seat in the House, on a full time basis, either the latter part of this week or the first part of next week and at that time will be available in his best form for the assault by his good friend opposite.

AN HON. MEMBER: So he will have a couple of months in the House in other words.

On motion, sub-heads 901, 902, carried.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, maybe the acting minister could tell us. The former minister once said that the reason for reduction in the vote was that they were going to put goats to work cropping the grass. The minister is asking for \$180,000 less. Does that mean more goats this year?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, it is the salaries for engineering, drafting, maintenance and inspection staff and it is the amount ask for by the officials in the department. That is all I can tell you.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister for his usual clear, illusive and detailed exposition. We will not make it like the cars for the constabulary. The minister has shown his usual grasp.

911(06):

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, obviously the government intend to acquire nothing in the park this year. Is that a matter of continuing policy or is that just one of the Finance Minister's tiger cat moments

for this year and hope the thing will be renewed again next year? But it is not on the priority list.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, maybe the minister should know or probably should know, is the property around the park still frozen, in which case none of the property is going to be purchased this year, perhaps for a year or two to come? It seems to me to be a little bit inequitable to some of the property owners involved. They hesitate to do any repairs to property and this sort of thing. I would like to hear a brief but fairly comprehensive statement on what the government intends to do this year and next year with regard to the freezing of the property, with regard to resale, the acquisition of the property and this sort of thing generally.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the hope of the government is next year to carry on with some of this expansion programme for the Pippy Park. One thing that has been very disappointing, very disappointing to the previous administration, I am sure will be to this, there has been no one forthcoming to pick up the challenge, to make finances available to carry out this great concept.

Mr. Chairman, it is not planned to unfreeze the land this year. I agree with the honourable member from St. Barbe South or White Bay South that if the policy is to postpone it indefinitely, then it would be inequitable to freeze any of the surrounding property that now constitutes the proposed Pippy Park. But the plan is next year to proceed and if so, it would be not too wise to lift the freeze at this time. I think most of the property has been acquired.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I know a certain number have, but just one minor question. If an individual sort of appeared before the minister and petitions, are exemptions to this freeze granted on a sort of house by house basis?

MR. HICKMAN: Either it is granted on a house by house basis or the

minister takes advantage of the fact that this is a token vote and tries to scabble around and find a few dollars to buy it.

MR.ROBERTS: A lot of people looking for that this year.

I have a question but it is a little down below, Sir, so we will wait.

On motion subhead 911 carried.

Subhead 912:

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could indicate there is nearly \$1 million on what amounts to public works types of buildings this year as opposed to the ones elsewhere. Are there any major projects in that? What are they up to this year? There must be a list there. 912-01 is it the net public works expenditure this year?

MR.HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, let me take them in order. Under Provincial Affairs, Historic Resources \$80,000, on which we are getting \$40,000 back from the Government of Canada. This is for the renovation of the ground floor of the Museum Building on Duckworth Street, which was formerly the Gosling Memorial Library. There is \$2,000 to be spent at the Arts & Culture Centre in Corner Brook. \$225,000 for renovations to Building No. 2, Torbay to provide additional accommodation for the School for the Deaf. \$150,000 for the College of Trades & Technology for planning of a new dormitory. Vocational Training for the completion of five new vocational training schools at Bonavista, Placentia, Springdale, Bay Verte and St. Anthony. These contracts are underway. I can give the committee a breakdown-
The

Mr. Hickman.

contract costs for the Springdale Vocational Training School is \$1,207,722 at a cost of \$23.85 per square foot which is not cheap; Baie Verte, \$1,269,000 at \$23.22 per square foot; St. Anthony, \$1,451,000 at a cost of \$31.63 a square foot.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: No, the St. Anthony one was \$ 1,451,354 - yes it is. It is 45,874 square feet. The others are from 50,050 and one is -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. Bonavista is \$1,227,000 at \$23.49 a square foot; Placentia \$1,187,000 at \$23.48 a square foot. Substantial payments have been made with respect to three: St. Anthony is \$17,163, so far.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Three will be open this year. This was given to the committee a few minutes ago: Placentia, Springdale and Bonavista. Baie Verte is behind and St. Anthony is way, way behind. They are on-going.

On motion 912-01, carried .

On motion total subhead 912, carried.

On motion total subhead 921, carried.

On motion Block Provision Canada Pension Plan, carried.

On motion Block Provision Unemployment Insurance, carried.

On motion total Heading IX - Public Works, carried.

On motion that the committee rise report having passed estimates of expenditure under the following headings: Heading VI, Education and Youth, items, 612-02-06 to Heading 670 inclusive with some amendment, to item 618-01 and also Heading IX, Public Works, all items and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

June 19, 1972

Tape no. 847

Page 2

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Tuesday at 3:00 P.M. and that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until Tuesday at 3:00 P.M.

2660