



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 16

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Health.

HON. DR. G. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): I wish to table, Mr. Speaker, the regulations under the Mental Health Act.

HON. H.R.V. EARLE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with section fifty-one, paragraph three of the Financial Administration Act, 1973 I detail below the guaranteed loans paid in part or in whole since the last sitting of the House. According to the act the report must be made within fifteen days after the opening of the next ensuing session. There are copies for the Opposition and for members of the press.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Any copies for us?

MR. EARLE: Oh, no. You do not need any.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador North.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy. In light of the fact that it has been published that a number of local business people from Newfoundland are looking for parcels of land for offshore servicing or development on the Labrador Coast, I wonder if the minister can tell the House what location they are looking for and if this has been made public in Labrador and if the people of Labrador in the area have been notified so they can get in on the action?

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

HON. L. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, that question should be more properly directed to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, I would think, in that as far as I know the only action that has taken place - I have only heard this indirectly - is that there has been application for a grant of crown lands. Industrial Development is also involved in this, I understand. I assume that any other resident

of this Province is entitled in the same manner to make application for a grant of crown land and will get the same consideration as anybody else would.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister inform the House what location the application was made for?

HON. W. DOODY (MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT): We had an application from a group of business people in St. John's here who have applied for or they have written us and asked if we would consider them in terms of having a supply base area in the Cartwright part of the Coast of Labrador. We wrote them back and told them that we would certainly consider their application when the time came for this sort of thing just as we would with any other group of citizens of the Province who would be interested in establishing it. But to the best of my knowledge that is the only application that has been received so far and it is

for the Cartwright area. That was your question was it not, not where the area was?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It was originated by them?

MR. DOODY: Oh, it was originated by them.

MR. WOODWARD: A further supplementary to the Minister of Industrial Development, Mr. Speaker: Are there any guidelines or rules set out whereby people can make application for land in the development of offshore minerals?

MR. DOODY: That is an excellent question, Sir, and the part of the response to this particular group was that we would not recognize them as being the sole applicant. Pending the approval by government of regulations controlling the establishment of supply bases anywhere in the Province of Newfoundland, we would recognize, of course, and look at all applications as they came in. But, until such time as we have the proper set of framework in which to build such regulations, we prefer to hold it in abeyance and we felt that it is far better that we hold off on this thing until the people on the Coast of Labrador who are most directly affected and then the population of the Province generally will have a chance to examine the whole thing. We are not going to pass out leases or grants or rights to particular areas or sectors of any part of the Province until such time as the regulations are framed and published and all of the people of the Province have an opportunity to examine them and participate in any benefits that may be derived.

MR. WOODWARD: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Maybe the minister can inform the House what time the regulations will be ready and at what time this government will be leasing land or property for that type of development?

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

HON. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if I could interject here. This is, first of all of course, going to depend upon how quickly the

services are needed by the oil industry and also how quickly government decides development should take place. This is the key reason why we are in the jurisdiction dispute with the Federal Government because we believe that the Provincial Government and not somebody in Ottawa should be deciding how fast developments take place.

Secondly, at the present time, as I understand it, the mechanism is available for controlling development through the ordinary crown lands procedure where parties must make application setting out the purpose for which they intend to have the land used, if it is in excess of so many acres, and this involves a discretion in government, in the minister responsible for the crown lands division and with a policy guideline that there shall be no large scale developments take place until government has had an opportunity to consult with the people along the Coast and whatever part of the Province the developments are likely to take place, particularly with respect to the environmental aspects and so on. That we are not really in a position where we cannot do anything now. What I am saying is that there is a discretion in the minister and before any decision is made with respect to any large scale project, it is my understanding and it is government policy, as I set out in the background paper - you might have seen my trip along the Coast of Labrador - that we intend to consult with the people along the Coast with respect to environmental problems and so on.

One question we are going to have to get into, for example, should it happen that there is a commercial discovery confirmed, and that is very likely, if a town is necessary in order to service the activity off the Coast, should this be incorporated into an existing community or communities or should it be a new town, a separate town. I submit from the little experience I have that the answer may not be the same if the activity is on the

South part of the Coast or if on the North part of the Coast. It may be that the people in Nain would just as soon not have an influx of outsiders into their community. They might prefer if activity is taking place along the North Coast, to have activity take place from a new centre as long as, of course, they see certain benefits to their own community, whether it be in the way of revenue or whatever. I am just throwing this out for the honourable member's consideration because this is one of the questions that I do not feel confident to answer at this stage. From the brief experience I have had along the Coast, it is one of the reasons I went up there to put out this sort of idea to get people thinking so that they can tell government just what way they would like to see things developed.

I think the most activity now is taking place out of Cartwright. As far as I can determine Cartwright is used to having outside developments with respect to the communications base they have their. Was it an American base up on the hill?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: International Telephone I think it is now, is it? Anyhow, what I am saying basically is that a community, all communities are not the same along the Coast of Labrador. There are some with fairly fragile social structures. You have your native communities. You have other communities that have had a fair amount of outside activity taking place with respect to the construction of communication centres and so on. And the sort of controls that are needed in one part of the coast are not going to be the sort needed in another part and here is where we are going to have to study it very carefully before we make decisions here that are going to affect the lives of the people on the coast.

MR. WOODWARD: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, the mere fact is that the last publication which was a couple of weeks ago identified Labrador Coast as a hot spot and they outlined the number of ships and the drilling and the activity that will be taking place there this year. In light of this I think a lot of the local businessmen are looking at maybe stepped up activity and would like to get in on the activity in the exploration stage and I see that this government has made no provisions for it other than the fact that -

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

MR. WOODWARD: Maybe one or two people enjoying it. Maybe the minister -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Member for Labrador North while he is leading up to his question is taking a considerable length of time in doing so.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the minister can inform the House, you know, what the local people can take advantage of in the exploration stage? That is the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: Well, Sir, as the Minister of Mines and Energy has indicated, it is not an area that we feel that we should, and I do not

mean a geographic area, I mean an economic and social area that we feel that we can rush into and just grab the ready cash that may be available there.

As the honourable Member for Labrador North knows, there is a life style and a tradition and a whole number of things that have to be considered before government makes arbitrary decisions, despite the fact that there may be some businessmen on the coast, some businessmen in that area who want to rush in and take advantage of the quick buck that may be available, and we do not blame them for that, Sir. That is their objective in life.

We feel it is our obligation to move a little bit more cautiously, to look particularly at the interests of the whole area and to make sure that we have adequate regulations and provisions to safeguard the life style, the economy, the social fabric of the area and make sure that we do everything that is necessary for the ultimate benefit of the whole area. And as the regulations are formulated, certainly they will be published and certainly the House of Assembly will be informed. And maybe the Minister of Mines and Energy would like to add to that, I am sure he will as he has a particular interest in the thing, not only from his departmental point of view but from an affection that he has acquired for that particular area.

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

MR. BARRY: One thing, Mr. Speaker, that I made clear in my dealings along the coast, and I have since sent out letters and background information to communities that we did not have an opportunity to visit, so that they will have the same information available to them, is that up to now we have had most of the activity concentrating on the South part of the coast, on the Grand Banks area, and this is why when the Offshore Petroleum Industrial Advisory Council where we have people from outside government in a position to advise government and also obtain information from government, that there was only one representative on that council from Labrador.

Now that the activity is moving North I think it is natural to assume that there should be greater representation from Labrador where the activity is taking place. This is the vehicle, I think, where a lot of this communication can take place, where a lot of the business opportunities can be made available, made known to people along the coast.

I think one thing has got to be made clear, is that to a great extent it has got to be a matter of individual initiative as well and individual enterprise, in that government is not in a position to say, oh, you know, there is this business here, there is that business there. The businessmen have to go out and find -

MR. WOODWARD: You do not have to tell me that.

MR. BARRY: Okay. Okay. Well then I am just wondering why you are asking the question, phrasing the question the way you did.

MR. WOODWARD: I am asking for clarification because there are a lot of people concerned right now.

MR. BARRY: Okay. Okay. So the honourable member knows then that individual initiative in enterprise is a great part of it. Our department is prepared, and the Department of Industrial Development I know as well, to make available any information, whether it be contacts with oil companies, whether it be information about what the companies are planning and so on, to any individuals in the Province, in Labrador or on the island who are interested in obtaining business from oil companies.

People should not get the impression that just because there is going to be oil industry activity in a particular area that all of a sudden it is a bonanza, you know, that the jobs and the business deals and the money is going to be flowing like water. It is

still going to be a business proposition and individuals have to be able to provide services, if this is the area they wanted to get involved in. They have to be able to provide the services that the companies require. But I will say that another suggestion that I made during my visit along the Coast of Labrador was that the time now has arrived where it may be that we should have a Labrador or coastal Labrador advisory council, not necessarily dealing only with the industrial aspects but with the social and environmental as well. This is currently under active consideration by government. We are not sure yet as to what extent the industrial advisory council will be taking over this responsibility or to what extent a new body will be necessary, representative of the coast. But I will say to the honourable member that I have invited people in the communities we visited and through letters, other communities, to let me know, and I will in turn let government know, what their views are as to how they would like to see their input organized. They have got to be some organization.

I think one way of doing it would be to set up an advisory council with representation along the coast of Labrador so that these people can both obtain information from government and make their views known to government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to ask a question of the Minister of Education. I think he is coming back in. I wonder if the honourable minister could tell us when his department will take positive steps to get the school children from the elementary school in Forteau back into the classroom after a month long absence?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman probably knows that there was a doctor, one of the Grenfell doctors, I believe, from St. Anthony, a Grenfell doctor in the area on Friday - was it Friday? No, a couple of days ago, I do not recall exactly which day - when

the department was endeavouring to get a report from him, we were not then able to get in touch with him. The superintendent for that area was due in St. John's today and was coming into the department to give us his firsthand assessment of the situation, whether he is in fact in town and whether he may well have spoken with officials of the department up to now, I do not know. I will check during the course of the afternoon.

The problem has been, and as the honourable gentleman knows because he spoke to me in my office about it a few days ago, has been in identifying what the cause of the problem is. That has been the problem, in identifying what the cause is. Various tests made did not indicate fumes from the furnace or from fuel. I have spoken with medical people as well, and unless they have now definitively identified the cause, but to my knowledge and up to the last time that I had spoken with them or with anyone in the department who was in touch with them, they have not identified precisely what the problem is. As I say there may be additional information because the superintendent for that school board was due in St. John's today, and there may be additional information which I could give you later this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: On that same line, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister - we agree that the problem is at this point unidentifiable and probably insoluble - are there any plans to get the children into other accommodations so that they can begin attending classes again?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this was one of the matters we were going to discuss as the possibility of alternate accommodations in, I believe there are a couple of community halls in the area, and the possibility of alternate accommodations there. Now the honourable gentleman said the problem 'unidentified' or 'unidentifiable: Certainly to my knowledge it has not been identified but it would be most strange if it were not identifiable. You know, that obviously is hard to accept. But, yes, we are looking to the possibility of using other areas in the community for the children in the school.

MR. MARTIN: I have a question for the, I think, the honourable the Premier since this question concerns or is of concern to a number of different departments. I would not want to address it to one department and get only a partial answer so I will address it to the honourable the Premier.

Would the Premier table before the House copies of the log of aircraft chartered from Labrador Airways by the Labrador Services Division last year between the months of June and September inclusive. The aircrafts in question, there are two, those bearing the registration numbers CFBTK and CFRJO?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that question could be placed on the Order Paper.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to ask leave to table all these regulations.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the Hon. Minister of Justice has leave to table those regulations? Agreed.

MR. HICKMAN: I can hardly read them out. The Condominium Regulations.

MR. SPEAKER: If it is not unanimously agreed then I am afraid the honourable minister does not have -

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: If I behave can I do it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: The Condominium Regulations, The Public Service Pension Regulations, The Security Amendment Regulations,

AN HON. MEMBER: Heavy stuff.

MR. HICKMAN: Heavy stuff. The Private Investigators and Security Guards Regulations - more security regulations - more security regulations - The Mechanics Lien Fees and Forms Amendment Regulations 1974, The Condominium Regulations, The Change of Name Regulations.

AN HON. MEMBER: Haw, haw!

MR. HICKMAN: Haw, haw!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: The Provincial Court Regulations, and more of the Private Investigator and Security Regulations, and more still of the same.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

605-03-02 is under consideration.

On motion 605-03-02 carried.

Shall 605-03-03 carry?

MR. M. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, the subhead is really transportation of school children. I would like to ask the minister in this case here, I think, that transportation in the Province does not only apply to bus transportation as the expenditure states here, or is

March 20, 1975

Tape 512 (Afternoon)

PK - 3

in the estimates for the sum of \$9,300,000.

There are locations throughout the Labrador section where we do not have high schools in most of the communities, and we have dormitory living for a large number of students.

MR. WOODWARD: The dormitory living for students is a very expensive one, although the federal government have been very generous in lots of respects to subsidization and towards room and board then the parents are no doubt saddled with some great expense as far as transportation is concerned.

The students have to come in in the beginning of school in September by aircraft into Goose Bay and then back to their communities for the Christmas and Easter holidays. While lots of cases that the federal government have been putting the bill through Labrador Services Division but in more cases the students or their parents are obligated to pay the travelling costs.

Maybe this only applies to that dormitory or that dormitory living for students along the Labrador Coast which not only involves the northern communities but some of the southern communities as well, is involved in here.

So when we think in terms of the large sums of money that we are spending to take a child a distance of over a mile to school on a daily basis and back again, I feel that we should give some consideration to children who have to travel long distances, even if it is only for a period, if they only have to travel two to three times a year.

In this respect I have had a lot of parents coming to me and at one time I was in a position to say yes, we will use the government aircraft in some respects to transport the children. But today it is not as personal as that because of the fact that a number of the people responsible for doing those favours are not around and they are removed from the scene.

So, Mr. Chairman, the minister can in his wisdom, when he looks at this type of Budget, study or make a survey of the needs, travelling by aircraft for students who are living in dormitories at Northwest River, students from the coastal community and maybe make

some provisions out of this vote, this \$9,300,000, so that those students can enjoy the benefits of transportation on a provincial level as well as the students who are bussed daily to their schools and taken back again. I would like to hear the minister's views on that.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, the point made by the honourable gentleman for Labrador North is certainly a very interesting one. I can say in all honesty that certainly during the two and a half years that I have been Minister of Education we have never had a request to that effect. Certainly I see the point he is making. This vote, he is quite right, is for the bus transportation on a daily basis for pupils living a mile or more throughout the Province, that is obviously Labrador and the Island part.

With respect to students in various Labrador communities who are going to Northwest River and living in dormitories -

MR. WOODWARD: Forty or fifty students.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Between forty and fifty students and on the whole that would be three round trips a year, I would think Christmas, Easter and then the beginning and the end of a school year, on the whole that would be three round trips a year, I truthfully say that we have never had a representation to that effect, apart obviously from the one the honourable gentleman made now, and I am sure he would not expect me to comment in detail on it. I will certainly undertake to have it looked into, to speak further with the honourable gentleman who no doubt has a very first hand knowledge of it and to discuss it with the school boards concerned. And certainly I think the only undertaking I could give now would be that I shall certainly have it thoroughly looked into.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, we have seen that the transportation of school children estimates has gone from \$8.2 million, rounding it off, to \$9.3 million this year, representing an increase I believe of about 13.7 per cent. Now, Sir, the only thing that I am concerned about here

is that over the years there has been a lot of controversy and trouble with respect to school bus transportation of children and a lot of this was attributed to the fact that there was some difficulty in actually getting a formula that would cover all the very deversified parts of the province. It was difficult getting a school bus formula that would work and meet the needs of the different conditions in the different parts of our province and I submit, Sir, that the school bus formula that presently is being used still has that weakness in it,

that particularly in the Northern regions the formula is such that the school boards simply do not get enough money for the purposes of transporting school children.

Now, I do not have the figures in front of me, but I have had conversations with members of various school boards in the Northern regions of the Province and, of course, in my own District of St. Barbe North, and that is one of the great problems facing the school boards today.

Sir, with growing, increasing inflation what is happening is that the increases in the school bus transportation vote is virtually being swallowed up by inflation, the increased costs of gas, the increased costs of oil and the increased labour costs when it comes to maintenance of these school buses. Sir, in this Province today we have many areas, I am afraid, where a lot is left to be desired with respect to the safety of the buses themselves, the mechanical safety of the buses. We have had a number of instances over the past year of buses going off the road and being involved in accidents that were directly attributable to the mechanical condition of the buses.

Sir, particularly in the Northern regions, I am told that many of the buses are completely inadequately heated and are not equipped with something that was brought up three or four years ago and that is a some sort of telecommunications or some sort of radio communications aboard these buses, similar to probably what you would find in taxi cabs in certain areas of our Province. But what we have in areas like the Northern Peninsula are great long distances to be covered by the school buses under very severe and hazardous winter conditions and these buses, as well as being mechanically, in some cases, in pretty poor condition, they are inadequately heated and they do not have a radio, a walkie-talkie or what have you in these buses so that they can maintain contact with some central area,

such as the highways depot there, in case they get into difficulty with seventy or eighty school children aboard.

Sir, I submit that, although there is an increase in this vote, that it is being swallowed up by inflation and the safety factor is something that has to be considered, the condition of the buses. A number of school boards have told me that they have less buses contracted this year than they had in previous years. I can give an example of the Straits of Bell Isle Integrated School Board, I think had to cut back on one bus and one bus now is out of operation or was out of operation a few weeks ago because of mechanical difficulties and these buses are simply not getting around to pick up the children and they are having to stand up and wait in sub-zero weather conditions for the bus that has picked up the elementary students, say, to come back and pick up the high school students or vice versa during the winter. Sir, there are very few new buses made available, or can be made available, to the school boards by the various contractors.

Now, Sir, the contractors are operating in a business like manner and they have to make a profit or they would not be into the school bus business. There is nothing wrong with a bus contractor trying to make a profit, but the problem is, Sir, I am afraid that it is being done at the expense of the school boards, one, and certainly the school children, most importantly, because as I mentioned, there are inadequate numbers of buses. The conditions of the buses are atrocious, in some cases, with respect to safety, heating and radio communications of some kind.

I would like for the minister to comment on that and to estimate, you know, how much he has calculated would, in fact, be eaten up by inflation and what the minister is prepared to do in terms of trying to make the school bus formula a little more

March 20, 1975.

Tape 514

RH - 3

flexible to meet the needs of the extreme areas of our Province. The typical example is the Northern Peninsula and north of Port Saunders or Port au Choix, I am sorry, where there is not one inch of pavement for the 150 miles or so to St. Anthony, not one inch of pavement, all

gravel road. Luckily this year, Sir, luckily, very luckily, this year they have had less snow than in any other previous year, but there is no guarantee that this is going to be so next year. But I would like to hear the minister indicate whether or not they are going to build any more flexibility into the school bus transportation formula or whether in fact there is a need to build more flexibility. This can be overcome strictly by negotiating with the school board and giving them extra and additional grants if required for school bus operation.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, before the minister answers, I would like to make one or two comments about this business of buses and school children, and I would like to hear the minister's views on one or two points in connection with it. What I would like to do is refer to an incident which occurred, I suppose, five or six years ago in which I was involved, and it involved school busing, and it raised some interesting points, or at least points that I thought at the time were interesting that was the time about five years ago, I believe, when a decision was made by the appropriate school board in Gambo or under which Gambo comes, that school children would be bused into Gander. Now I think some children were already being bused into Gander to the larger school. I think this involved children not in high school but younger in age. And the parents banded together and fought this proposal and subsequently were successful, as I recall, in having the plan to bus the children stopped. But it raised various interesting propositions.

The first proposition was that when you close up schools in a community, and when I am speaking of community now, perhaps 1,000 people, 2,000 people, that sort of size, when you do that, you are taking the teachers out of the community also. And these are, of course, in communities of that size the natural leaders, the people who play a very important part in the development of the community as a whole. I remember in that community at that time these people feeling very much

that they did not like the idea of their teachers being taken away. This was one of the important factors because it reduced, they felt, the effectiveness and the viability and the spirit of the community as a whole. That was one factor.

The other factor was, of course, the children themselves, in that because of having to be bused, in that case, thirty miles, it meant a very rigid schedule for them. They had to be on the road before 8:00 a.m., as I understand it and recall it. They would have to leave the school in Gander somewhere around 3:00 p.m. in order to be home at a reasonable time. So it meant that their day was very rigidly organized and a good part of it was spent on the bus, and that is to say nothing of the difficulties that might be involved in winter transportation. So that bearing these things in mind, and these things have been of concern to a lot of people in Newfoundland from time to time whose children have had to do this, I would be interested in hearing from the minister what the thoughts of the department and the Department of Education are on this subject, and whether, looking to the future, the department anticipates busing would be reduced or increased or will it stay at its present levels? Has the department given any thought to the viability and importance to small communities particularly of the school and the teachers as being part of the good development of the community? I have not heard much said about this in recent years, but I would be interested in, when the minister is talking about this matter generally, in hearing his views on the overall subject.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I will deal with the matters that were raised in the order in which they were raised. First, just a quick review of the bus policy from the point of view of cost sharing, just to put the matter in prospective. Some years ago, originally under the former administration, the position was, the cost sharing position was that government assumed seventy-five per cent of bus transportation for high school students and ninety per cent for elementary students and then that developed into ninety per cent for all students and then that developed into one hundred per cent for all students in, I believe, 1971, 1970-71 that developed into one hundred per cent for all students. And then later there was what my note calls the Carter formula - there was a formula which I will not go into, but it was based on so much per mile depending on the distance and a differential on paved or gravel road. That was in effect, I believe, for two years.

Last year we instituted the present formula and it is the same one which will be operative next year, except for the regular costs for bus transportation, ninety-five per cent is paid by the public Treasury through the Department of Education and five per cent by the school board.

I have to say that as a formula, I think it is the best we have had. It is the best we have had. Nor am I aware that there have been since last September while this has been in operation, that there have been any approaches or recommendations to the Department of Education to alter that formula. So, I think the ninety-five/five is quite acceptable to school boards. The vast majority of the amount is paid by the public Treasury and yet, obviously, there is still enough within the school board so that their involvement and commitment is there as well.

So, as to the overall formula, I think the ninety-five/five is fair and equitable and I can say that there have been no representations by school boards for a change since that formula

was instituted and that became operative last September. With respect to the buses, and the honourable gentleman from St. Barbe North referred to the safety of the buses and certainly all of us are very concerned about that, by law, four checks are required per year and to the best of my knowledge they are made and if any honourable gentlemen, you know, are aware certainly that that is not being - that that in any instances that is not - you know, anybody is subverting that or circumventing that, then certainly I would wish to know, but that there are four checks per school year, two of the drivers, two checks on the drivers and health examinations, two examinations of the drivers and two mechanical ones of the buses.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Either highways or garages authorized by them and on their behalf - either the Department of Highways officials or people authorized by them by motor vehicle inspection people.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate how many school bus contractors throughout the Province or approximately what percentage of school bus contractors would also own a garage that would be authorized by the Department of Highways to carry out that inspection? Are there any instances of that type of situation where obviously -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That, right, I am sorry, - that I would not know. I am not aware that there are very many but, you know, I do not know. That I do not know. If the honourable gentleman thinks that there is the possibility of abuse through that, then certainly it is something which could be looked into. I will look and see if it is a real problem and if so, one could think of a regulation that, you know, if there are such instances, then

that the check would be made other than by a garage owner who is also a bus owner.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, they also do some of the checks. So, in general, there are these four checks, two of the drivers and two of the buses. With respect to two-way radios, there was a requirement some years ago that buses have two way radios and at the request of the majority of the school boards it was no longer made a requirement. Now, it is optional, but if -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: But if in any region a school board wishes to have two way radio operation, that would also be ninety-five/five shared. So, the option is there and if in any areas because of geography or weather or whatever the case might be, a school board feels that there should be two way radios, then they could be installed and operative in the same cost sharing of ninety-five per cent of - in other words, the cost to the school board would only be five per cent.

Now with reference to the matters drawn to the Committee's attention by the honourable Member for St. John's South, this, of course, is a matter of real, you know, intrinsic to Newfoundland geography, I suppose, to a very large extent, to our patterns of settlement, to the fact that we have many communities, and many small communities, and that the pattern of settlement has been many small communities rather than a small number of larger communities.

And I think there is no doubt as well that certainly in the past there have been instances, if one wishes, of over-centralization, of over-centralization. It is a very, very real problem because like all problems there are two sides, there are perhaps twenty-two but there are two essential ones. And one is that when in a community a school is closed, they are no longer operative and people are bused to a school in another community, there is a sense of community loss, and more than a sense of community loss. You know, if there is not a school in a community, and if teachers are no longer living there then there is no doubt that there is loss to the organic day to day life of that community.

There is the other position as well, and that is while obviously a great number of people have done very well and have gotten excellent educations and excellent character formations in small schools without, perhaps, amenities one sees in larger schools, still I think there is a certain level, very difficult to identify with precision, a certain level beyond which it is not in the child's interest that he stay in such a - one would say, such a small school or a school which would be devoid of a number of things, whereby going seven, eight, or nine miles they would be there where there would be a larger number of teachers, where there would be the possibility of specialized instruction, where there would be more adequate library and resource material. So there are these at least two considerations.

I think that one could say that in general to transport below

Grade VII, which would be around twelve or thirteen-year-olds, to transport people below that grade level, that age level shall not be undertaken unless absolutely necessary. If there is no school or if it is impossible to get adequate facilities, if it is impossible or well nigh impossible to get qualified teachers or whatever the reasons might be - but certainly in the department's point of view, and I am quite sure that here - well I am sure that here I would also be speaking in the point of view of the school boards of the Province, the school board community.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, I think that is the case. But wherever possible we endeavour not to transport pupils below Grade VII, which we regard as sort of junior high school. I think that in general is the department's policy and the school boards' policy as well. But I cannot say that in no case does that happen, but wherever possible we avoid doing it.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, just one last question or observation from me on this particular vote, the transportation of school children. It is my observation, and the observation of many others, that many of our children in this Province going to school who are being bused from smaller communities into larger communities are being denied the right of the, you know, full education. They are in the school for the purely curricular or academic hours of that particular school. Now I realize that it is the school board policy, or it may be up to the contractor, the school bus contractor when these kids are bused away from school back home. But it has come to my attention in a great number of communities or places that the school buses do pick up the children immediately after the bell goes, and consequently - well let us take an example - I think this applies - you had

kids being bused into certain city schools here, say from Pouch Cove, as an example. Is that correct? Are kids being bused in from Pouch Cove?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes, I think so.

MR. F. ROWE: Right. That is just an example. These kids are picked up when the last bell goes for the end of the school day. Consequently, these students are being denied the opportunity to become involved in various, what we call, extracurricular activities, such as sports activities, any painting classes or science clubs and this kind of this.

Now, once again, I realize that it may be the policy of the school board, or there may be other factors that result in this kind of a situation. Have the minister and his department given any consideration to setting down some sort of a time, you know, for transporting these students back home rather than immediately after the bell goes.

Now, I realize that another problem is that some students would want to get back home. It may be even fifty, fifty. Fifty per cent of the students want to get back home to their communities whereas fifty per cent of the students may want to stay in that school to use the library facilities, the gymnasium facilities or any science club or any other kind of so called extracurricular activities they can get into. We have to look at education as more than the purely curricular and purely academic aspects of school overall activities. I realize it is a difficult problem, but are the minister and his department aware of this situation, number one, and have any steps been taken to try to resolve this particular problem that is a most difficult one, I understand?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There is no doubt validity in what the honourable gentleman says. I said earlier that certainly there should be no busing below Grade VII unless absolutely necessary. In general of course, I think one can apply the general rule, that unless the advantages outweigh the disadvantages, then I think that has to be the criterion essentially unless the educational advantages

outweigh the disadvantages. That has to be the criterion for centralization or busing or bringing people from a number of communities to one locality. That, I think, is the criterion that boards in the Department of Education endeavor to apply as fairly and as equitably as it can.

We are and do encourage boards not to view the end of the instruction period as the end of the school involvement period. It is not something that we can prescribe. I do not think it is something we should prescribe because obviously weather conditions, distances, particular needs in particular localities - of course in some areas there are quite active youth organizations, 4-h clubs, Allied Youth and other youth activities which fulfill a very real purpose.

Certainly the general premise put forward, that the full ends of education are not achieved just when the formal instruction period ends, there is no disputing that. We do everything and will continue to encourage boards to have a certain amount of flexibility there so that buses do not have to leave as a rule, necessarily or on a daily basis immediately when formal instruction is over.

On motion 605-03-03 and 03-04 carried.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 03-05 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Unless the honourable gentleman wishes to repeat the points he made or wishes me to repeat the ones I made. I think we spent quite some time, but I am certainly willing to do it again.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You do not want to go through that again, do you?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, I do not particularly want to. I think we have covered it, and even the honourable gentleman's colleague does not -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Pardon!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 03-06 carry?

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, you know, there are a number of points I do not think the minister has answered adequately concerning the 605-03-05, building and equipping schools, capital grants to the school boards.

Now, Sir, I would like to start off by saying - and I have to react to some comments made by the Minister of Fisheries, because we, and obviously the government, are completely aware of the problem facing the school boards of this Province, and I do not want to repeat myself, Sir, and I will not try to repeat myself - but we did make a positive and sensible suggestion to this committee as to what policy the government should have with regard to financing education in this province. Sir, we mentioned this whole business of a crown corporation, and the Minister of Fisheries, Sir, got up in excellent debating style, excellent wit, excellent satire -

AN HON. MEMBER : (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: - a good jovial style, Sir, and the style distracted from the main point altogether. Sir, the minister missed the point completely and that is the point that we were trying to make is that the only solution to resolving the financial state of the school boards in this province is to set up some method of long-term financing. The minister did not mention long-term financing at all.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: The minister played with crown corporations, played with crown corporations, and some of the things he said made sense. Of course, such a crown corporation does not produce revenue of its own, and it would require the guarantee of the provincial government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. ROWE: You do not have to be a genius to figure that out. We knew that. We did not need any minister of the crown to point that

detail out. But there are assets involved. Buildings are going to be built. But the main point, Mr. Chairman, is this, and let me repeat it, that in 1973 the Federation of School Boards in this Province said that they required \$132 million, starting in 1973, they required \$132 million up to the year 1980, From 1973 to 1980 the school boards required \$132 million in order to have some reasonable progress in new school construction in this Province. Now, Sir, what has the government offered the school boards of this Province, the Denominational Educational Authorities? The government has offered the school boards or the Denominational Educational Committees \$135 million from 1975-1976 to 1985. I believe it is, \$135 million from 1975-1976 up to 1985, with \$10 million last year and \$8 million the year before and \$8 million the year before and \$8 million the year before, \$10 million this year, \$11 million next year, \$12 million the following year, \$13 million the following year up to \$14 million, then \$15 million, \$15 million, \$15 million, \$15 million up to 1985.

Sir, the school boards are going to go bankrupt or they are going to have to cut back almost completely, halt, stop school construction in this Province.

Sir, it has already been publicly announced by the Chairman of the Federation of School Boards and the Executive Secretary, that they are going to have to slash their programmes for this coming year, slash their programmes for this coming year, slash their programmes.

Sir, we have had a very unfortunate fire out in, where was it? Harbour Grace or Bay Roberts -

AN HON. MEMBER: Bay Roberts.

MR. ROWE: Bay Roberts, we had a very unfortunate fire there that was not completely covered by insurance. We have had another unfortunate fire in St. Anthony that is going to cut into the capital budget this year, it has to. That alone may set back, these factors alone may set back the building programmes of the various Denominational Educational Authorities this year.

Sir, I repeat the government has not come up with a programme, a programme, in spite of this one announced in the new Budget. This ten year programme, boasting of an additional \$25 million that really does not come until years in the future, the government is plying loose with this \$25 million. It is leaving the impression that they are making \$25 million additional available to the school boards, as if it was going to drop right into the school boards this year. This is an additional \$25 million over a ten year period, and I repeat this because it is important, because that is a total of \$135 million over the next ten years, up to 1985, when the school boards in 1973 asked for \$132 million up to the year 1980. Of course, if you look at the value of the dollar that \$132 million back in 1973 is about equivalent \$135 million today. So the government has offered the Denominational Educational Committees and the school boards of this province exactly what they asked for in 1973 with one glaring problem, they have offered them what they asked for but they offered it to them over the next ten years instead of over the next five years. That is the difference.

So, Sir, the only results, the only possible results, there are only two results that you can have as a result of this new government policy or this new government commitment, that is school boards going bankrupt or curtailment, a moratorium, a complete halt to new, significant new school construction in this province within the foreseeable future. These are the only two alternatives, Sir, bankruptcy or a moratorium on new school construction.

Sir, the government's stated policy over the last couple of years has been that they will not concentrate funds on the building of new primary and elementary schools in this province. Sir, what kind of a statement is that, in view of the fact that the school boards are faced with the two alternatives that I have mentioned, bankruptcy or a moratorium on school construction.

I submit, Sir, that this honourable government, this PC administration should have gone after all the DREE funds that they could get for purposes of primary and elementary education and if they have been advised by experts in the field of education that DREE schools are too rich for our blood, they are too costly or expensive to maintain, there is an obvious solution to that, modify the specifications, modify the specifications for DREE schools. If this PC Administration does not think that we should have the same standards of schools that they got in other parts of Canada, if they think DREE schools are too good for Newfoundland but they are good enough for Ontario, these types of schools, good enough for certain parts of Nova Scotia and Alberta and British Columbia and Quebec,

these types of schools, the specifications of these DREE schools were similar to schools being built on the mainland. Do we not deserve as much as the rest of Canada? If we do not deserve, so be it, if this is the priority of the feeling of this administration. If we cannot afford, if we cannot afford to maintain such schools, probably we do not need a cooling system in our schools. We certainly need an exchange of air. There is nothing wrong with circulation of air in schools such as, you know, obviously for hygienic reasons. But, Sir, if DREE schools are too rich for our blood, for this Provincial Government, if they cannot afford it, if they cannot afford to maintain such schools, if they are too expensive to maintain, surely the reasonable alternative to solve the dilemma of the school boards in this Province is to renegotiate with DREE so that we can change the specifications of such schools so that we do not have fancy cooling systems for schools in the middle of Labrador, if that is the case, or fancy cooling systems for schools in the middle of the - up on the Northern Peninsula.

Sir, I submit that the only solution to the dilemma of the school boards in this Province was to take advantage of DREE funds for the purposes of school construction in this Province. Sir, the minister said from now on his administration will change its emphasis, its priorities from primary, elementary, secondary education as far as the use of DREE funds is concerned or federal funds, to the vocational and technical area of our Province. Sir, we all got the answer to this great change of emphasis.

I have already indicated in my preliminary remarks the percentage increase in emphasis with respect to expenditure in vocational technical education. The increase, the rate of increase, the percentage of increase of expenditure by this administration, Mr. Chairman, in the area of vocational and technical education is less than that of the previous term of office of the previous administration. This is the government that say that they are

putting more emphasis in the field of vocational and technical education. They are putting more emphasis in planning, Sir, and that is all. The minister has revealed to this committee that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs has yet to meet with his Federal counterparts to discuss plans for the building of vocational and technical wings on existing high schools.

Sir, there is nothing wrong with that. It is a good concept, the so-called comprehensive school concept, a good concept, Sir, but it is not action on the part of this administration. There has been no agreement with the Federal Government for funding this. This administration has yet to negotiate or even talk with Ottawa on this particular subject, and meanwhile, Sir,

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Am I correct or am I wrong? This administration has yet to -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: On the whole subject of financing the vocational and technical wings on schools. We were advised, the committee was advised by the Minister of Education the other day, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs or responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs is going to go to Ottawa, is going to go to Ottawa to discuss plans or to try to talk about an agreement or get an agreement with the Federal Government for the purpose of putting these wings on the schools.

Now, Sir, if that is their emphasis on vocational education, it is a good emphasis. It is a good emphasis if it was action, but it is not action. It is talk. Why, we could even have an election before the minister gets to Ottawa, Mr. Chairman.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Watch your language.

MR. ROWE: And there are great emphasis on the polytechnical institute. It has come to \$500,000 to commence planning. Now,

March 20, 1975.

Tape 521

RH - 3

Sir, if this administration is going to put a greater emphasis on a vocational and technical education, let them put a greater emphasis on it, but not at the expense of the primary and elementary schools in this Province when again this year we see only \$10 million made available for school construction, plus,

of course, the equalization bid of \$2 million.

Sir, the school boards of this Province want a system of long term financing. So let us not hear any ministers opposite get up and mock the system of a crown corporation. The crown corporation concept was put forward for one sole purpose, to commence a system of long term financing, so that the corporation, or the government or an agency of government could borrow so many hundreds of millions of dollars over a twenty year period so that the school boards of this Province can reasonably and sensibly plan a construction strategy for a ten or twenty year period instead of having to plan on a year to year basis - and then because of a fire, or then because they did not get what they expected to get, they got to go ahead and scrap everything altogether.

Now, Sir, we also put forth the idea that the government should do as is being done in other provinces and states of North America, that they should move towards the idea of centralized responsibility for financing primary and elementary and secondary education in this Province. This is the general movement throughout North America. Why, Sir? Because educational authorities are realizing that any system of local taxation for purposes of education or any systems or methods are regressive, and they are grossly unfair. And for the Minister of Social Services, Sir, to get up and compare a poll tax with a moose licence defies any neurons that anybody might have in their brains. Imagine, Sir, comparing a poll tax with a moose licence. A poll tax, Sir, and a property tax -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Maybe I have not been following the honourable member closely enough but the poll tax and the moose tax appear to have little relevancy to 605-03-05, building and equipping schools.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe the honourable member might -

MR. F. ROWE: If the Chairman would listen probably a little more carefully, Mr. Chairman, I am talking about this vote, building and equipping schools.

AN HON. MEMBER: And for that you need money.

MR. F. ROWE: And for that you need money. And the money comes from one of two sources - three sources; the federal government, the provincial government or from school boards through assessments or from school tax authorities.

AN HON. MEMBER: But not from moose licences.

MR. F. ROWE: I am now on the subject of the unfairness, the inequity, the regressive nature of school taxes and assessments. I am referring to a rebuttal, I am rebutting a rebuttal when the Minister of Social Services defended school taxes by saying, sure we have to buy a moose licence to kill a moose, we have to buy a car licence to -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: drive a car.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I believe that my interruption was timely, and I believe the honourable member has debated the subject of school tax under the first heading, the minister's office, 601. If we were to use the honourable member's reasoning on this subject the honourable member could discuss school tax on every topic, on every subhead. So consequently I suggest to the honourable member to get on with matters that are directly relevant to 605.

MR. F. ROWE: Is the Chairman saying I cannot talk about school taxation or assessments under the heading of school construction? Is that what the Chairman is saying?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F.B. ROWE:

You can talk about this as long as you want to, Mr. Chairman, and I intend to talk about it unless I am thrown out of the House, because I honestly think that this is the only relevant heading under which I can talk about financing education in this province. Am I going to talk about it under the School for the Deaf? Am I going to talk about it under supervision, special education, university, College of Fisheries? This is the only place I can talk about it. I am talking about it because I have put forward the idea before and there have been arguments on the other side that I am now rebutting. I think it is my right to continue to do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Now this matter has not been objected to by any of the honourable members to my left and apparently it is not their wish to do so. However, just so that the Chair has not "slept on its rights", I believe that the honourable member is irrelevant in getting into these larger arguments that could be more reasonably debated under the first heading, which he did at some length. But the Chair is not going to enforce the rule if, in fact, there is acquiescence that the honourable member can debate it. Should the subject of a ruling have to be made, I would be quite precise on it. There are many precedents for the type of debate that can be carried under subheads.

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

I am waiting for the Minister of Fisheries now to jump to his feet.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: We have submitted that a school tax and the assessment formula is regressive and unfair and, therefore, should be abolished. Now, Sir, the government stands on record as having said that they will

continue with school taxes and assessments in this province. They stand on record as having said that. They will not change the existing unfair, regressive system that we have for the sake of ten miserable million dollars, \$10 million, Sir. Surely, an administration that has a \$1 billion budget can take the responsibility for getting that additional \$10 million for purposes of education if their priorities were in the area of education so far as that is concerned. Because, Sir, as has been repeated in this House time and time again that even if the school taxes and the assessments were fair, even if they were fair, even if they were based on a person's ability to pay, we are not getting the full educational value for the dollars collected. We are not getting the full educational value for the dollars collected because in some instances, twenty-five per cent of the dollars collected go to the administrative costs of that school tax authority or the school board. Indirectly, it could be more than that through the court cases in Magistrates Court where a lot of parents are brought to pay up their school assessments, when they do not believe in paying them because of the conditions of the school in that particular area.

Now, Sir, I submit that any government - well, we have already submitted that this government can collect that money without increasing taxes. And it was suggested because of the change in the amount of revenue through four tax sources that I named that gave us \$211 million this year instead of \$199 million. And, Sir, if this government, as it has stated, has great faith in the economy and the generation of revenue in this province, they are saying that the money can come out of the general revenue of the Province, this additional four, five or six per cent. That is what they are saying. They have admitted it indirectly that they have such great faith in the economy of this Province that they are expecting increasing the increased revenues. They underestimated their revenues last year so consequently, Mr. Chairman, the money can come without increasing taxes.

There is another way that they can get the money, Sir, if they place their priorities in the proper area.

The \$221,000 that is going to be spent on redistribution for additional members, that money can be used for education instead of increasing the number of members in this House. Newfoundland and Labrador does not need additional seats, they need full-time politicians, that is what they need. That is what this Province needs full-time politicians, not fifty-one members.

AN HON. MEMBER: This is not relevant.

MR. F. ROWE: And the money - it is quite relevant - the money this \$221,000 can be used -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: I am not finished the list yet, Mr. Chairman. If the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing will listen and add up the figure he is going to get a bit of a jolt.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: The Premier's office, Sir, \$472,000 -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: this money can be used -

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order. These comments are quite irrelevant to the item under consideration, which is the construction and equipping of schools, and a tiresome repetition of votes on current account that does not need to be there, and the gentleman's opinion, has nothing to do with capital account on the construction and equipping of schools.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to the point of order.

I submit, Sir, that this is completely relevant because I am now putting forth areas from which the government can draw to spend money in the field of education, and thereby eliminate and abolish the school tax authorities in this Province. The minister the other night without being overruled gave his ideas of where the money would come from if school tax authorities were abolished. Now may I be

permitted to give my suggestions as to where the money can come from if we abolish the school tax authorities, and school assessments. Sir, if I am not permitted to give my suggestions as to where the money can come from if we eliminate school tax authorities and school assessments I submit that are two different rules being used for either side of the House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman is being quite irrelevant in his observations. The school tax authorities and what might be done or where money might be saved was discussed under general debate on the Department of Education. We are now into the specific heading here of building and equipping schools. We are now in the estimates. And the estimates is where the Opposition members are suppose to ask questions and get information, not have an address and reply debate or a budget debate on every item in the estimates. It is very clear, Mr. Chairman, that he should stick to the building and equipping of schools and stop this tedious listing of monies spent on current account that he says can be saved and spent to equip them.

MR. F. ROWE: Further to that point of order, Mr. Chairman. We are talking about, as correctly stated by the minister, about school construction, capital grant. I am completely relevant in talking about the sources of money for purposes of school construction.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. ROWE: I talked about federal monies, provincial monies, school board monies, and school tax authority monies.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. ROWE: We have talked about various types of taxation, provincial taxation. I am now putting forward where the money can come from to help to build very badly needed schools in this Province. The minister has given his suggestions, may I be permitted to give my suggestions where the money is coming from? Or I can ask individual questions, and that would certainly prolong it, Mr. Chairman, I can assure you if I start asking individual questions

instead of listing them off with some degree of continuity.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): The Minister of Fisheries' point is well taken. The honourable Member for St. Barbe North is not being relevant to the heading under discussion. By the same token if he were discussing the Executive Council of the Premier's office you would not be referring to education. So it is not relevant and out of order.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, Mr. Chairman, if we abolished school tax authorities, and I have given - you see the Minister of Fisheries does not understand the different stages of an argument or the different stages of debate. I have already pointed out in this honourable House

we can call it a difference of opinion if he wishes, and I am quite happy to debate it at any length he wishes according to the rules that Your Honour is enforcing, the rules of the House, is to get at the truth. I am not sure that we have got at the truth. The minister has done his level best to assist, and I am the first to say that, and it may be the committee can go no further on the point. But I reject with contempt and scorn the minister's suggestion that somehow I, by asking whether this administration have honoured a policy which they publicly say they have honoured, whether they have in fact honoured it, that I am somehow breeding religious strife. I have never -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, now the gentleman from St. John's Centre has chosen to enter. We will all be in it now. We will all have a great to do about it tonight and if that is what the Minister of Education and his colleagues and his brethren on the government ranks wish, and if it is in order, then, so be it. But let me just say, I reject it with all the contempt and the scorn that I can muster for any argument, not for the minister but for the argument itself.

The issue is a valid one and we can go no further on it because I think the minister has told us all that he knows and that is all any man can do, but I

gentleman -

MR. F. ROWE: There is no such thing as a point of disorder, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: A point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: Are you going to listen to a point of disorder.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Order, please!

I recognize the honourable gentleman from St. John's West.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman has now been speaking for -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The point of disorder is standing up there now.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, do not get so touchy. What a disposition!

Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman has now been speaking for three quarters of an hour. Does he want any of his questions answered? If he does, he should sit down and let the minister answer his questions. This is the estimates, the Committee of Supply. If the honourable gentleman wants to make speeches about where the money should come from, Mr. Chairman, and attack the government and say abolish the school taxes and the money can come from here and do not say this and that, that is the Budget Speech. The debate on the Budget Speech is going to come. The Address in Reply is going to come. This is a Committee on estimates.

Mr. Chairman, this Committee is supposed to consider what the government plans to spend its money on. The honourable gentleman should be asking how the \$10 million is going to be spent, so on and so forth, not getting on with all this tiresome, fatiguing, repetitious bunkum that he has been getting on with for the last three quarters of an hour.

MR. F. ROWE: To that point of order, Sir, there is no -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: There is no point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: You see, there is the contempt for the Committee, Sir. It is one big joke with the honourable Minister of Fisheries, one big

joke. When the honourable Minister of Fisheries can get away with something, fine and dandy, but when we attempt to do the exact, same thing as the honourable Minister of Fisheries, he gets up on points of disorder, of all things.

MR. CROSBIE: Get on with it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Go on home "John".

MR. F. ROWE: But to the point of order, Mr. Chairman, the so-called point of order, there is nothing to my knowledge in the Standing Orders that I am confined to asking questions of the Minister of Education when dealing with any vote or any estimates in this Committee. There is nothing that suggests that I am confined to asking questions only. I can make a speech. I can ask questions. I can insult the minister and be brought to order and I can insult the Chair and be brought to order, but there is nothing saying that I cannot talk, cannot debate, cannot rebut the Minister of Fisheries or the Minister of Social Services or any other minister who has spoken on this point.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: So, Mr. Chairman, I continue to suggest that if we take the expenses, the additional expenses to this Province because of the Election Act expenses and revising new lists which are going to come to \$205,000. Royal commission, \$246,000; publicity and investigation in the Department of Tourism, \$2.3 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dunphy): Order, please!

MR. ROWE: The Silver Anniversary, you will quickly get that \$10 million that you need, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dunphy): Order, please! The honourable member is persisting in being irrelevant. I would suggest that he would get to the topic at hand and if not, I will more than likely have to ask him to take his seat.

MR. ROWE: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I did not hear that last comment. I would like to hear it before I continue.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dunphy): I was cautioning the honourable member that he would become relevant to the topic which is 605-03-05 and if he persists in being irrelevant, I will have to ask him to take his seat.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what I got to do to try to convince people in this committee stage that it requires money to build schools. This is what I am talking about. Where can the money come from?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Where can the money come from, Sir? Sir, if the minister wishes to answer some of my questions, I will give the honourable minister an opportunity to do so. However, let it go on record, Mr. Chairman, that this administration is not prepared to set up a system of long term financing for the purposes of school construction in this Province. They have

given the school boards, the Denominational Educational Authorities exactly the amount that they asked for in 1973, approximately \$135 million. They have given it to them over a ten year period instead of what they asked for over a five year period. Let that go on record, Sir. This administration is not prepared to save the school boards, to continue with some semblance of new school construction in this Province by doing what all educational authorities have been asking for over the years, even during the Liberal years, Sir, and that is a system of long term financing.

This is the difference between this crowd over here, Sir, and that honourable crowd over there. We have stood up here and admitted our mistakes in the past and we have answered for them. We have changed policy with changing times and the same holds true for the school taxes. The Liberal administration set it up. This administration continued on with it. We have seen the inequities in it. The people of Newfoundland see it. The school boards, the school tax authorities, themselves, do not want it. Let that go on record, that this administration is against the abolition of school assessments and school tax authorities and will not take on the simple little job with their \$1 billion Budget. They are not willing to take on this additional small burden of \$10 million out of \$1 billion Budget and make the system more in line with what is going on in the other parts of Canada and the United States at this present time.

They are unwilling, Sir, to take the waste of money that I was trying to list out, that I cannot mention now because of the fact that I will be ruled out of order and asked to sit down, I cannot continue on with listing off the hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars of waste of this administration to George MacLean and silver anniversaries and everything else. I went

to the trouble, Sir, of going through the complete estimates, the complete estimates, from the first to the last page and meticulously went through them and added up every single, little one there and got it down on a list and I am not permitted to read out to this committee where the money can come from

to replace this regressive school tax authority and school assessments which is something that some poor dedicated people in this Province have been forced to set up to try to help out the school boards and the education of their children in various areas of this Province.

We have had examples, Sir, on that honourable side of the House, where they have said we are against school tax authorities and school assessments and school boards, giving the impression that we are against the people, the individuals on school tax authorities and the people who are assessing, the children and the parents in various parts of our Province.

We are all for the individuals, Sir, they are honestly trying their best to do something that the government itself should be doing. We are against this stupid, ridiculous concept, that has evolved into an educational, financial monster in this province, unfair, inequitable, regressive, not related to a person's ability to pay, cumbersome, inefficient, duplication of the minister's resources. I have said it so often, Sir, I thought it would penetrate somebody's grey matter on the other side.

Now, Sir, if this is the way this government wants to finance education in this Province, the people of this Province will speak when the times comes. Sir, the minister has been negligent in his leadership in terms of advancing a reasonable formula for financing education in this province and the minister should stand up and admit - the Minister of Fisheries says we are only saying it because it is popular. Now what is popularity, Mr. Speaker? Popularity means that if something is popular it must mean that the majority of the people in the Province are for it. Now what are we supposed to be doing in this committee or in this honourable House? Are we representing the majority of the people and protecting the minority or are we representing the minority and making believe we are protecting the majority.

Why, if the PC's were not popular, Sir, they would not have been elected.

MR. SIMMONS: That is not the reason.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is why they are going to be elected again.

MR. ROWE: And because they are unpopular is going to be the reason they are not going to be re-elected. Well let us not carry on with this foolishness about we are for it, because it is popular, we are for it because the majority of the people desire the abolition of school taxes and assessments in this Province. That is why we are for it? Why else would we be for it?

Now, I do not know whether the minister has mentioned, he did not answer some of the questions that were asked previously, I do not know whether he will answer some of the issues raised now. I asked the minister if he would indicate to this committee the allotment to the three denominations, you know, in lieu of this was because of -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: DREE equalization.

MR. ROWE: The equalization because of DREE grants made available in the year 1970-74 I believe is \$16 million over a five year period. I asked the minister two questions on that; number one, what is the formula that is being used for the allocation of funds to the three denominations, what are the three denominations involved -

AN HON. MEMBER: Two.

MR. ROWE: Three.

AN HON. MEMBER: There are only two.

MR. ROWE: No, it is three. It is three. That is the whole point. That is why I am asking the question. It is stated in the Throne Speech that it is three, and secondly, I ask the honourable minister if he would indicate what happened to the amendment that went to Ottawa or forwarded to Ottawa to, I think it had something to do with an amendment to term seventeen of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada with respect to what religions were, what is the word I am looking for, were not accepted, were acknowledged, that is not the word -

MR. SIMMONS: Were recognized.

MR. ROWE: - were recognized -

MR. SIMMONS: Under the BNA Act.

MR. ROWE: - under the BNA Act as religions or denominations for educational purposes, and of course I am referring here to the Pentecostal Assemblies. So I want to know what happened to that amendment, number one. Number two, what is their allocation under this \$16 million, or \$2.2 million this year for the equalization because of this DREE contribution made earlier.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (DUNPHY): Shall 60 -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, before this subhead passes, and before the minister answers some of the questions that my colleague wants. There are one or two points that I want to make on the subject of building and equipping schools. When the Budget Speech was delivered by the Minister of Finance, in the subsequent day or so after that, I did make some statements both here in the House and also publicly outside of the House that I felt that there was a fair amount of deception in various parts of the Budget Speech. Certainly of the areas relates to this very subhead. There is very real deception -

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Order, please!

The honourable member is referring, actually he is not referring, he is saying that the honourable Minister of Finance was practicing deception in the deliverance of the Budget. I am asking him to withdraw that statement.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that I had not suggested that the deception was deliberate. I am saying that there are items in the Budget Speech which are deceiving, for whatever reason they are deceiving, Mr. Chairman, is another question. I am not suggesting they are deliberate, and if I had said that I would withdraw it. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, to say something is deceiving, that it deceives, whether unintentionally or otherwise, is quite parliamentary. I know of no other way to say it, Mr. Chairman. It deceived a lot of people involved in school boards. And if I were allowed to pursue my point, I think I would certainly be able to make it. You may not agree with it but I think you would see that to some people the items I refer to are deceiving, they are misleading. Now whether deliberate is another matter, Mr. Chairman, altogether.

I was coming to the subhead under which we are, the matter of building and equipping schools, capital funds. I was saying here is one area where the impressions that the Budget left with the public and with that segment of the public, in particular, which is concerned

with school construction and funds for school construction. This is an area where the impression left was less than the correct one, less than honest, call it what you will.

The impression, Mr. Chairman, that was given, and I think the minister went out of his way to give, that there was a lot more money for the construction of schools this year. Now, Mr. Chairman, it all depends on who is doing the additions, and what you include in your additions. And if you look at this particular subhead it is quite clear, of course, that last year there was \$10 million for school construction. And this year there are \$10 million for school construction. And \$10 million against \$10 million, in my language, is the same thing. There is no increase. It was \$10 million last year and it is \$10 million this year. That is no increase.

Now where the Minister of Finance, and, I would think, the Minister of Education gets the information to back up the statement that there are all kinds of increases is because of the money that is in there under 06, which we will come to shortly I hope, Mr. Chairman, the money which is being used in lieu of DREE, and other funds there for school projects that are in the process of cluing up. But, Mr. Chairman, these are funds which are already committed, in terms of new dollars, in terms of new dollars being made available to the Denominational Educational Committee, it is \$10 million this year, like it was \$10 million last year.

And I just wanted, Mr. Chairman, to correct that misimpression that there is not more money. Now I realize under 06, the equalization grant in lieu of DREE, there are a couple of million dollars there for two of the denominations, as I understand it. Perhaps the minister will indicate that two of the denominations the Integrated Committee and the Pentecostal Committee are entitled to their proportioned share of this \$2.7 million because of the disproportions that were created at the time DREE funds were allocated to the various DREE schools which were constructed in the past few years. But that is quite a different matter, although it does make available to those two committees some additional funds.

But let the record show, Mr. Chairman, that in the main there has been no increase. No increase at all, not one iota, not one dollar, not one cent in the amount of funds available.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am no expert on school construction, I was involved in it to some degree. I have some knowledge as to how the cost of school construction has escalated over the past few years. I am told, and these figures are rough, but I am told that in the past three or four years the cost of school construction is just about double the cost of frame

construction for instance, wooden construction, if you like, frame construction has gone from about \$18 or \$19 a square foot three or four years ago, about four years ago, up to \$35 or \$37 depending on whose figures we use and that the more durable type of construction, the blocks and the mortar and the steel, that has climbed well over the \$40 mark per square foot.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we go back to when this present government or members of it were in Opposition, they took a stand, a stand which is pretty relevant, Mr. Chairman, to this \$10 million in this subhead we are talking about right now. The stand in 1970, four years ago, the stand of the present Minister of Justice, who then sat in Opposition, the stand of the present Minister of Fisheries, who is also now the Government House Leader, who then sat in Opposition, the stand as recorded here of the present Minister of Finance, who then sat in Opposition, the stand of those people, and I presume that these three were supported in their stand by the present Minister of Education, who was then in Opposition, by the present Member for St. John's East, who was then in Opposition, by the present Minister of Social Services, who was then in Opposition, all men who now are part of the decision making process of government, with the exception of the Member for St. John's East, who was part of the process until quite lately and we know what happened to him, the others, Mr. Chairman, are part of the decision making process of government, a government which says today that the most we can put into school construction is \$10 million, those same people, four short years ago, Mr. Chairman, four short years ago -

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I realize the contribution of the Hon. Minister of Social Services is somewhat limited but must he insist on whistling in the House when I am trying to make a point?

The stand, Mr. Chairman,

MR. MURPHY: Whistling in the dark.

MR. SIMMONS: You are whistling in the dark. The minister is whistling in the dark, Mr. Chairman. How dark he does not realize because his eyes are not open.

Mr. Chairman, four short years ago, -

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you. Thank you.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: I must say he - no, I will not say it. It is so near Sunday and I am trying to be charitable.

Mr. Chairman, four short years ago these same people, in Opposition, made such statements as these, Mr. Chairman, which you must agree, if you do not anticipate me, Sir, are very, very relevant to the subhead we are talking about right now. The spokesman for them, with a lot of interjections from the other members that I have just mentioned, fellows saying, a man, a man, so on and so forth, all the way through, but the spokesman is the the present Minister of Justice, then sitting over here in Opposition. I would just rather read the whole thing, Mr. Chairman. It was quite a long speech, but I think the crux of it is right here, Mr. Chairman, and I am reading from the verbatim report of May 4, 1970, actually almost five years ago.

The Minister of Justice says, the case for an immediate quadrupling, an immediate quadrupiling of expenditures on capital expenditures is watertight. He goes on to say, to hold the budgeted amount to the present \$4 million would be criminal. It was then \$4 million, Mr. Chairman. This government or the other government, I think, put it up to \$8 million and this government has managed to get it up to \$10 million. At that time in 1970, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Justice, as he is now, and will be I suppose until the next election, not after that for sure - he would like to be a judge, Mr. Chairman, but people got the idea -

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

MR. SIMMONS: - for that too.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dunphy): The honourable gentleman is not being relevant to the topic at hand at all. In reference to the Hon. Member for Fortune is something else.

AN HON. MEMBER: Burin.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dunphy): Burin.

I suggest that the Hon. Member for Hermitage will be relevant to the topic at hand, which is building and equipping schools.

MR. SIMMONS: The honourable Chairman is quite right, and

I certainly realize that in one moment there I did make a sentence about the minister wanting to be judge and so on, that was a little off the statement.

I get so used, Mr. Chairman, to people making cracks from the other side and I get the feeling we can get away with it too. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, to the subject and very relevant, very, very, very relevant, Mr. Chairman, very relevant, 1970, May 4th., the present Minister of Justice who was then in Opposition said that the case for quadrupling the amount was watertight. He held out a case for \$16 million in 1970, \$16 million in 1970, he figured it was a watertight proposal at that particular time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am pretty happy that he took that position in 1970, at that time I was involved directly in the school system and I was anxious to see the amounts of money for school construction increased. Indeed I was so anxious to see these amounts increased, where we could get enough money to build the schools that needed to be built, that I wrote an article on it, Mr. Chairman, an article in which I said something the same kind of thing the minister was saying when he was in Opposition, where I laid out the case in black and white and had it published as an editorial in a teachers' magazine, laid it out in black and white about how much money I felt we needed at that time.

Indeed the Minister of Justice who was then in Opposition, felt it was such a good idea, such a good article that I had written, that he stood up and read it word for word in this House, Mr. Chairman, and it was that article I was just quoting from then, which he had read because he felt at that time that we needed in 1970 at least \$16 million. Now here we are five years later with that member, that member in the Cabinet, the Minister of Finance who supported him on that occasion in the Cabinet, the Minister of Fisheries who supported him on that occasion in the Cabinet, the Minister of Social Services and the

Minister of Education, five of them at least, Mr. Chairman, come to mind.

Why now, Mr. Chairman, in 1975 are they unable to persuade Cabinet to put the kind of money in the Budget under this subhead that is needed if we are ever going to catch up in this Province even in terms of school facilities? Why, Mr. Chairman, is their tune so changed five years later? When they were in Opposition they were going to solve all the problems that they could. They were going to change the world overnight. They were going to put all kinds of money wherever you wanted it, just at the flick of a finger they were going to do it. They were going to have \$16 million back in 1970. And now five years later, they got her up to a measly \$10 million, at a time when the school boards say they would need close to \$200 million, \$200 million I am told to just replace those that are no longer functional or safe, replace schools that are presently firetraps, that are otherwise inadequate and provide the new and additional schools we need. They tell me that in round figures they are going to need \$200 million. What is the figure the government is -

MR. ROWE: \$264 if you are going to count the debt.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, the figure I have mentioned of \$200 million of course, Mr. Chairman, does not take into account servicing or retiring the debt, the capital debt these committees and boards have built up. Where the boards need \$200 million and I am talking in round figures, Mr. Chairman, it is \$170 million or \$180 million, depending on whose figures you use, but where the boards say they need in round figures \$200 million, almost immediately, well they could not spend it all in one year obviously, they could not find enough contractors or architects to do the work, but certainly in the next two, three, four years they could spend that amount of money.

Where they need in round figures \$200 million over the next couple of years to meet their immediate present needs, the government is going to give them \$135 million over the next eleven years.

Now, before we get through this schedule of payment to the committees they will be even that much further behind.

Mr. Chairman, I could not let the subhead pass without just addressing to this one because I find this subhead here particularly disappointing and I would have hoped that the minister would have been able to persuade his colleagues in Cabinet to put some more money in there. The Minister of Fisheries the other night waxed long and eloquent about what a persuasive fellow the Minister of Education was in Cabinet and how he was forever after the Premier to get more money for education.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I have difficulty believing the Minister of Fisheries on that because the evidence here, particularly insofar as school construction is concerned certainly contradicts what the Minister of Fisheries said. The evidence here suggests very clearly to me that the Minister of Education must be about the worst bargainer that is in the Cabinet. If he cannot do any better than this, Mr. Chairman, for his own department and for the needs of education insofar as school construction is concerned, then perhaps we need somebody else as Minister of Education who can put the case more effectively.

I would call upon the minister to correct the mis-
impression that the Minister of Fisheries left the other night and tell us, at least for his own sake, tell us that he did not persuade too hard, that he perhaps was out the day the Cabinet was making its decisions on education, give us some excuse to get himself off the hook. I cannot think for one minute, Mr. Chairman, that the minister with his known abilities for persuasion, did his best at the time this came before Cabinet. If he did, I would sincerely, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the amount here would not be ten. It would be more like eighteen

or twenty, more like the kind of figure that would, at least, get the D.E.C.'s off to some kind of a start, help them to begin to come to grips. All they are going to do with that amount, Mr. Chairman, is, well, I was going to say stand still, I suppose they will stand still. They will take care of the commitments they have at the moment to school boards, but I am told, Mr. Chairman, that with that \$10 million the boards will not be able to undertake any new construction beyond that which has committed at the present time.

I say that is very sad, and I say this government could and should do a lot better than that.

MR. ROWE: Absolutely right.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I thought for a moment I was in a time machine back to Tuesday, but knowing that honourable gentlemen opposite are not prone to repetition, I was not sure whether I was right or not, but I do believe that we did listen to these points of view previously and certainly it is not my intention to bore honourable members by repeating what I said. I intend to reply very briefly.

I would hope that Mr. Oates, I noticed is the gentleman who looks after the tape machine and I was wondering if we had unanimous consent of the House to instruct him to make a long playing record of honourable gentleman's, especially the speech on school taxes, so that the honourable gentleman would then be able to distribute that -

MR. ROWE: On a point of order!

MR. SIMMONS: New rules now, new rules.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: What is the point of order? What is the point of order?

MR. SIMMONS: The point of order is use the rules for both sides. That is the point of order.

MR. ROWE: Now, I was brought to order on a number of occasions,

Mr. Chairman, on the grounds of being irrelevant and I would submit that the minister is far from being relevant at the present time and that he be brought to order.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. I certainly withdraw it and will ask Mr. Dates not to make a long playing record of the gentleman's speech on school taxes, so that then he will not be able to send it out to his friends and we can hear it again in the House. So, please do not, please do not make a long playing record of that. Does that dispose of the point of order, Sir? I have retracted. I presume that disposes of the matter. Thank you.

MR. SIMMONS: Stop playing with the Chairman, boy. Stop playing with the Chairman.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now, now, now, now! Must have hit a sensitive note!

MR. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now, I would hope, now, that honourable gentlemen in the press and I presume - see if this is in order - will give very full coverage to the honourable gentleman's speech on school taxes and crown corporations because I believe he is perhaps dissatisfied with points made two or three hours a couple of days ago about school taxes and crown corporations that we would plead with honourable gentlemen to put it on the first page -

MR. ROWE: Thank you.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: And to have a supplement too. Have it in red to do whatever is required so that honourable gentlemen will know they have had good coverage on it and we will be able to -

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Now, look, if we are going to have rules in this House, they have got to apply -

March 20, 1975.

Tape 531

RH - 4

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: to both sides fairly.

MR. SIMMONS: They do not, though.

MR. ROWE: I tried to make a number of points this afternoon, exactly the same points as the Minister of Fisheries, and I was ruled out of order on the grounds of irrelevancy. The minister has not been relevant since he spoke, since he stood up

MR. ROWE: and we have asked a number of questions and we expect answers to them, not making a joke out of this committee, Sir.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw. I did not know that the honourable gentleman was so sensitive. I withdraw and I would certainly not request the press to do any such thing. Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SIMMONS: Playing with you "Alec" boy, playing with you.

MR. ROWE: What a joke. House of clowns.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Order, please! The honourable gentleman will be heard in silence.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, Sir. Mr. Chairman, I intend to be quite brief. To the best of my knowledge all of the points made by honourable gentlemen opposite were made previously. I gave the government's reply, other members of the government also made their contribution and whether to honourable gentlemen's satisfaction, obviously that is a different matter. I do not expect necessarily that they are going to accept everything I say nor do they expect that they are going to accept everything that I say or vice versa, however.

So very briefly, with respect, and it was stated that it is now government policy that there be no additional DREE schools, in the day school system that DREE not participate. Mr. Chairman, this is a federal-provincial programme, the federal government has made it quite clear that they do not intend to have further DREE agreements in the regular day school construction programme. They have made that very clear. I have stated it now. I am quite sure I said it before. I could take a half hour to say it but it is as clear as that, and that is it, full stop.

Now with respect to school taxes, I certainly do not intend to regurgitate what I said on Tuesday night. It would take a couple or so pages of Hansard. I related it to the development of municipal government here and all numbers of things and I have no intention, it was just less than forty-eight hours ago when this position was put forward, it will be appearing in Hansard and I have no intention of going through that again. Now there were a couple of specific points, on

specific information, which I am always glad to give, if I have it I will give it, if I do not I will undertake to get it as quickly as I can.

One was, I think I am correct here, one was asking for the general breakdown with respect to the distribution of this \$10 million, in other words the distribution of the population with respect to denominations. That is roughly for the Integrated, DEC and the denominations making that up. It comes to approximately fifty-eight per cent Integrated. This is the total breakdown for this capital vote, with respect to the percentages and the population. Integrated, fifty-eight; Roman Catholic, thirty-six; Pentacostal, five-point-five; and Seventh Day Adventist, one per cent; and under the category others.

Now the other question was, with leave of the House I will give the answer now, it is really two votes away, and that is the breakdown of the equalization under DREE, so with leave of the House I will give it now. That is under 03-06 - Equalization grant in lieu of DREE and that breaks down approximately for this year, this is \$16 million made available over five years, of which this is the first year. It breaks down this year to Integrated - \$2.3 million; Pentecostal - \$350,000; and Seventh Day Adventist - \$7,000; that again is, it is rough but it is certainly very, very approximate. It may not be exactly to the dollar or to the hundred. This has been agreed to by all denominations, this equalization -

MR. HICKMAN: With enthusiasm.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - formula, both with respect to the amount, the means of getting at the amount and the time period over which it is to be paid.

Now just, there is really just one other matter I am going to comment on and that is again the suggestion of the crown corporation and long term financing and this related to the request of the D.E.C's. put in, I believe, in 1973 where they asked for \$132 million from that period up to 1980.

Now actually under the ten year programme of the government, and with the additional \$25 million added in the commitment this year, the total is \$145 million over the ten year period in which \$10 million was spent last year. So there is a remaining \$135 million from this year on.

Now, a certain amount was made that it could appear deceptive or be wrong, the way the Budget Speech put this, but there is no way that I can see that whatsoever. I think it puts it very succinctly. I am going to read it. It is not that long a paragraph. I think it is on page thirteen of this document. It is the Newfoundland and Labrador Budget before you get to the estimates. It is school construction. It is relevant. I am just going to read it. It is very clear.

"The 1975-1976 estimates provide an amount of \$21,588,000 for school construction by the various school boards across the province." Now, this is a point I made in my opening remarks, that the amount for school construction for building schools comes under four subheads, and you add the four of them up. This one is \$10 million. The others have \$11.5 million between them, but the total is \$21.5 million. Of this amount, \$8.8 million is for the completion of school construction under the DREE programme, and \$2.7 million is for grants to the three denominations as part of a \$16 million five year programme to equalize the DREE grants given during the period 1970, 1974.

Now, a further \$10 million, that is what we are discussing now. It is to cover the ongoing commitment of government to denominational authorities whereby grants are made available to allow school boards to borrow their financing requirements. Last year's programme was increased by \$80 million for the ten year period, 1975 to 1985. It is government's intention to add a further \$25 million to last year's commitment as an interim measure to assessing all aspects of school construction.

Immediately when you turn over the page, the method by which government intends to extend the present guaranteed grants is outlined in table seven. You look at table seven and it could not be clearer that an additional of \$25 million is shown down there in the third column from the left. It shows that the first million comes in 1977, 1978 and it continues on until late 1984 and 1985. I am saying that that is put as straight forward as one can put it.

Just a final remark with respect to the long term financing. I mean, it is stated in the budget itself, and it is government's intention to add a further \$25 million to last year's commitment as an interim measure to assessing all aspects of school construction. As

a matter of fact, we received very recently, within the past ten days, a new submission from the D.E.C.'s with respect to school construction and what they regard as their needs. The total, that amounts there totals \$125 million. I think that is the amount, \$125 million. \$125 million - naturally the last one submitted was in 1973 and perhaps based on the information of 1972, and a fair number of schools have been built since then. That is the amount, \$125 million over the next five or five plus a few year period.

Nobody doubts at all the financial difficulty of school boards or municipalities or of provincial governments or of hospital boards or of practically any and all necessary and important agencies. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that this year we are, the government, will be required to raise \$203 million, will be required to borrow \$203 million. If we were to do as the honourable gentlemen opposite suggest, that is establish a crown corporation which could borrow on the government's guarantee, then we would have the corporation competing with the government. If, as our financial advisors tell us, and as the Minister of Finance on behalf of the government states, and if as the government collectively states, that \$203 million is the amount that we can and should properly borrow and that this can be done without jeopardy to our financial position, then the converse is obviously true, that anything in excess of that amount, would jeopardize the province's financial position.

It is really as stark as that. It is really as simple as that. All of the data and information and analysis that must go into arriving at that judgement, no doubt is very complex, but the final

statement of the government's judgment and fiscal policy is quite stark and quite simple and that is that that amount of \$203 million is the amount that we can properly borrow without jeopardizing the future development of the Province and jeopardizing the financial confidence and credibility and ability to pay the whole financial situation of the Province.

The final result of it all is as simple and as stark as that and to set up a crown corporation competing in the same market with the same money does not solve anything. If you are going to raise \$40 million or \$50 million through that, then that is \$40 million or \$50 million you raise here. So, you do not solve anything that way when the financial situation is such. If the financial situation were not such, then honourable gentlemen's arguments may well have been incorporated in the Budget itself, but the financial situation is something that honourable gentlemen oppose, nor I, can offer through aspirations and expressions of good hope or expressions of impending doom that, you know, school boards and everybody else is going up the sprout or this is happening and that is happening.

The financial facts are such and the amount voted under capital adds up, as I said, to the twenty-one point whatever it is million and this particular portion of that that we are voting on here is \$10 million and I would move that it be approved.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Well, I heard the honourable gentleman to my right first, although -

MR. SIMMONS: I will yield.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I just want to get up to make a normal, customary motion. I think at this stage of the time, that the question now be put. There are seventy-five hours of estimates. I am anxious, very anxious as a private member to

hear the estimates of every department and seventy-five hours is quite ample time for it, the estimates of every department considered by this committee. It would appear by the way that the Opposition is going that we are going to get into the same boat as last year and just get two or three departments heard.

I appeal to my friends on the opposite side, they have made their points on Tuesday, they have made it today on this. As I say, in the interests of, as I very much wish to see, all of the departments and all of the ministers' estimates be considered. As a member of the committee, I just appeal to them to be a little bit less repetitious and consequently, I make the motion that the question be put.

MR. SIMMONS: (First part inaudible) - fact, I yield to the member. Could I just make the observation which would have had the same result as the member's motion. I am simply going to say, Mr. Chairman, that what the minister has just gone through, the Minister of Education in the last few minutes, is a clear indication of how we are indeed. I agree perhaps not for the reason that the Member for St. John's East has suggested, but I certainly agree we are wasting our time here. We are wasting it as was demonstrated by the minister just a moment ago, that after putting some fairly legitimate questions to him, we got a long tirade from him about how we should give speeches and then he proceeded to regurgitate everything he had said the other night.

So, in the light of that, Mr. Chairman, you can call -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, in the light of that it is obvious we are not going to get any answers, so you can call the question on this head and you can call them on any other heads you want to, as far as I am concerned, because it is

pointless standing here asking questions if we are going to get that kind of regurgitation every time from the minister.

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I understand the gentleman from St. John's East -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Not necessarily, but I move that the question be now put. I would raise a point of order. I am not sure that motion is appropriate in committee. I think it is appropriate in the whole House when the House is meeting as a House, but in Committee of the Whole, I am not sure it is in order. I have not got a Beauchesne reference but perhaps if Your Honour would either - Your Honour may wish to make a decision now or Your Honour might prefer to let the matter stand for a couple of minutes while we have a look at the authorities, but I am pretty sure it is not permissible in committee.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order. I think everybody realizes the rules of the House, Supply and Committee, so the same rules apply. But all I wanted to do for the sake of peace, order, and good government, before I go out of my mind, is make the point that we are sitting here in the House listening to repetition after repetition when we could be validly using the time allotted. And if the Opposition were allotting its time properly and acting as an Opposition should, instead of showing that they are just as incapable in Opposition as they would be in government, we would be considering it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: So, I think the point is made and I would hope the question would be put and I would hope that the committee will be able to serve its purpose and be able to consider all of the estimates which is what was intended when you brought the estimates before the House.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe the honourable member's point is a debating point rather than a point of order. I refer to Standing Order 41 "A motion for the previous question is not admitted in a Committee of the Whole or any Select Committee of the House." I believe also that it is rather difficult to rule on this matter because we are in Committee of the Whole in which we have seventy-five hours. Now I suppose if honourable members are relevant they could spend all seventy-five hours on a subhead.

However, there are also rules with regards to relevancy which have on occasion been invoked. I am not prepared at this time to entertain the honourable member's motion although I think he has made his point.

Shall 605-03-05 carry?

On motion 605-03-05 carried.

On motion 605-04 through 606-02-03 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 607-01 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, 607-01 - I would like to indicate to the Committee the general work under that subhead that refers to the consultants in the Department of Education, employees, officials, professional people in the Department of Education who are available to various school boards throughout the province. We have them in areas of music, industrial arts, arts, social studies, science, math, starting last September metric conversion, of course, a quite important area due to the national policy of converting to metrics, English native education, also an appointment effective last September, French consultants, physical ed, and we have vacancies, and they are advertising for person in reading and in library science. That is what the general heading refers to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 607-01 carry?

On motion 607-01 carried.

On motion 607-02-01 through 607-02-03 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 607-02-04 carried.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: 04, Mr. Chairman, although not a large vote, is something which I think would be of some information here which would be of interest to honourable gentlemen. This area of curriculum

development is - much of it for workshops whereby these professional people and others in the department go out to various parts of the communities and have seminars and workshops with teachers, and also for a number of pilot projects. There are three here which, perhaps, four which would be of interest to honourable members; one in Red Bay, Labrador, which is a pilot project, a curriculum pilot project in the physical education area. And what we are endeavouring to find out and development is a kind of programme in physical education which would be particularly relevant and accessible in rural areas, and for small schools, and in communities where perhaps there is no gymnasium, and the recreation or athletic facilities that would exist in other areas would not in fact be - and it is geared around outdoor games and sports - and it is hoped that what develops from this project would be of interest and applicable to smaller rural schools throughout the province.

There was another kind of pilot project in the Port au Port area to study the kinds of adaptation of programmes to the needs of small schools as well. What we endeavor to do in this area is particularly to concentrate on the smaller schools and on the rural schools. In Mobile on the Southern Shore there is a pilot project with respect to the individualization of French instruction.

Basically what we endeavor to do here, and indeed in the deployment of professional people in general in the Department of Education, to make them the priority on their travel, on their accessibility on their time as for the smaller rural schools.

On motion 04 and 05 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 06 carried?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, since you are in the Chair, I am sure you would wish me to say a few words upon this. Actually this, the high school drama festival, this started last year as a twenty-fifth anniversary project. It is one which is continuing on a regular basis. We had the first one last year at Grand Falls. The second one this year is going to be at Stephenville in the district of Port au Port. I trust I am being relevant Mr. Chairman. The Chair will not mind if I give a few details. It is in early April. Approximately fifty schools have been involved in the various regional playoffs, and there are eleven taking part in the finals.

I think it is a very worth-while development. I was pleased to have attended last year's. I am hoping to be able to attend at least some of this years. But it is something of value for our schools and for the people in them.

On motion 06 and 03-01 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 02 carried?

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, this is 02, 03-02?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 03-02, yes.

MR. F. ROWE: Film Acquisition and Delivery - could the minister just indicate what all that is about? I am not asking for an itemized list, but is it tied in in any way with any other departments or any other agency or is it purely for the use in schools? Could the minister indicate

what is involved in this \$200,000 for film acquisition and delivery?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is essentially, and indeed totally, purchase of films, 16 millimeter, 18 millimeter, film scripts, instructional, educational film. The delivery, I am pretty sure that that means that it is being sent out to the various schools. This is actually a fairly extensive film library that the Department of Education has for - and these are available to schools throughout the province. That is in total what that is, the purchase of them and their distribution to the various school boards.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, let me take it up for a second. This might be and I think it is the appropriate head to ask whether the infamous payments to Mr. George McLean's company - were they paid out of this subhead.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: In this year's estimate, there is no money for any production by McLean Associates. Last year the \$12,000 was paid and it would, I am quite sure, have been out of this subhead. That was \$12,000 due on films made the previous year. The present fiscal year, at least the Auditor-General's report, points out, makes reference to three payments of \$4,000 each for three films that would have come out of this subhead, but there is no money provided here in the next fiscal year for that organization or any other making films.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether we are on the same wave length here or the same question, but I would like to ask the minister whether any of these films produced for television - I do not know whether they were video tapes or movie film, but in connection with advertising the government's forestry programme and the highway safety films that we saw, this sort of thing, is this included in any way under this particular vote, any of these type of films?

Mr. Ottenheimer.

The one with respect to the Department of Forestry, no. The ones that were, and this is in a previous year, were ones on ring netting - I have the notes here somewhere and I forget exactly what they were on, but I do have the notes here - but they were instructional. Actually, I tabled the answer to the question. There was a question on the Order Paper asked by the member for Bell Island on that, and I tabled the answer. The three which were referred to in the Auditor General's Report were three instructional ones. As a matter of fact, I have it right here now. One was the completion of a slide presentation for the Department of Tourism with respect to Historic Sites. The other one was for the College of Fisheries, Navigation, Marine Engineering and Electronics and was instructional film with respect to some officers training course. The other one was one on instructional film on Scottish ring net fishing.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the Auditor General, for the minister it is page nineteen in case he has not had it burned on his memory, the Auditor General had some quite harsh things to say about this particular expenditure, and I think it is only reasonable to conclude on the evidence he produces that his harsh comments were amply justified, and I think perhaps the minister might wish to consider the matter a little further because it casts very serious, not doubts as to impropriety, I am not suggesting that sort of thing, but certainly a very serious doubt upon the way in which the minister has administered the money which the Committee of the House and the people of this Province have entrusted to him. I wonder if, perhaps to begin with, the minister could tell the committee why it was proposed and in fact why the government did charge against the Department of Education this particular subhead, a ring net, a Scottish ring net slide presentation, which was for the use of the Department of Fisheries, an entirely different department which has its own head, the College of Fisheries, which has its own budget, I believe we will come to it further down, it is subhead 613 but has \$3.1 million, surely ample to provide \$4,000, and why a presentation for the Department of Tourism, which again has its own head, and has

its own sum of money voted to it, why work done for other departments was charged against this subhead? Now, Mr. Chairman, I view the matter very seriously, only partially because the infamous rip off artist, Mr. McLean, figures here but that is not my chief concern here, although I expect we will have a few words to say about that nefarious gentleman and his nefarious political activities, but what does concern me is that if this conduct - I realize that we are talking about a fiscal year that is passed - but what does concern me, and this is the subhead, is that if this conduct goes on it destroys the entire basis of parliamentary and this committee's control over the estimates. If the minister can gaily charge anything he wants, with some tenuous connection, against any subhead, then there is no longer any control by this committee over expenditures. It is in that connection in the first instance I raise the question, and I would ask the minister if he could address himself to that point?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, the essential reason that the government charged them to this subhead, in the previous fiscal year, was because these films were regarded as instructional films, as instructional materials, one relating to Historic Sites, one relating to officers' training, and one relating to ring net, Scottish ring fishing or some such thing. These were regarded as instructional or educational films and this seemed to be the logical subhead, the logical place in which to charge them. As I say, the total amount again last year was \$12,000. I was going over the Auditor General's opinions here, he has them under four, four little items, on page nineteen. He says that there should have been a written contract between the government and the company for the production of slide presentations. You know, that is his opinion. Then he says that the Department of Education should not have charged its appropriation with expenditure relating to these. As I say the reason we did so was that these were regarded as instructional or educational films.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is essentially it. There is the difference of opinion between or at least, I do not want to get into an expression of opinion on the Auditor General's opinion, that would be quite wrong. The Auditor General has expressed certain opinions in comment upon government's activity the previous fiscal year and all I can say is that the government regarded the production of these films as the production of instructional or educational films and was charged to that subhead.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the minister's explanation is facile but completely unacceptable because I suggest to him it is sheer unadulterated nonsense. The minister would have the committee believe, would have the committee believe, Mr. Chairman, that the reason why this \$12,000 was charged against a subhead, this particular subhead, was that somehow these materials related to the usual materials purchased out of the funds voted in this subhead. I suggest, Sir, that it is just not the fact. I would suggest, Sir, that the minister is trying to cover up what amounts to a very third class political rip-off.

Mr. Chairman, let us talk for just a second about the tourism film which was paid for. The Department of Tourism, its subhead 03-04, has voted \$100,000 a year and surely it is appropriate for the Department of - voted for films, that particular amount of \$100,000, \$90,000 was spent in the last fiscal year. Surely, if we are going to have a film on historic sites or a slide presentation, and I am all for it, all for that, it sounds great, it should be charged against the appropriate subheads. Now this is a most serious matter and the minister is deliberately refusing to answer the question. I think that comes perilously close to evading his responsibilities. He comes before the committee seeking supply and he asks for supply for certain purposes. Then he blithly stands up and says that the supply which was made available to him in the past was used for purposes other than the purposes for which it was authorized and the Auditor General fixed this up.

Now I do not care if it was Mr. George McLean or not, Mr. George McLean will have to answer before the appropriate tribunals in due course. That is not the concern here. The concern is that the minister apparently just feels, and the Auditor General, as the minister said, made some other comments, very serious ones, charging that the Financial Administration Act, the basic document, the basic legislation covering the expenditure of the funds voted by this committee, that that act was flouted and ignored. If the minister will not answer the question I am not going to repeat, and repeat and repeat but I would note that he had not answered the question and standing up simply and saying, oh we thought it was appropriate, I mean I have no doubt somebody thought it was appropriate, but the minister has not made any case in support of his conclusion.

Let me try another question then for the minister, What steps has he taken to ensure that this does not happen again? Have we any assurance? He tells us there is no money in this for film strips. I have not looked at the Hansard. He may or may not have been asked that question in the year past, Mr. Chairman, he may or may not have answered it and if so he may or may not have answered no, I do not know. But what assurance have we the minister - you know it is hard to separate it from Mr. McLean's companies, Sir. Mr. McLean is intimately associated with the administration, the most intimate possible fashion. He is intertwined. He has got the administration entangled. They are his captives. The minister blithely stands up and says, well you know, we did not have contracts, that is a matter of opinion. You know that is a change of tune. Then he blithely says, oh well it is only a matter of the Auditor General's opinion that the Financial Administration Act is flouted.

That is not good enough, Mr. Chairman, when the minister comes before the committee he has got to do better than that. So I again say to him, what assurances have we that this will not happen again? What assurances have we that the minister will not go on gaily ignoring the Financial Administration Act and asking the Department of Education to

March 20, 1975

Tape No. 538

NM - 3

issue vouchers. The minister is responsible. I know the Deputy Minister by law signs, or in his name the vouchers are signed, but the minister is responsible.

1701

We have nothing to do in this House with deputy ministers or officials, it is the minister who answers. It is the minister who is responsible. What assurance have we that this sort of conduct is not going on now? What assurance have we that Mr. McLean has not now decided to have a film made on Norwegian ring netting, if there is such a thing, and that next year when we come back the minister in his Uriah Heep fashion will get up and say, well, you know, it was a matter of opinion, we decided to charge a half million against it this year.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman can have no other assurance than the statements that I just made. That is the only assurance that he can have. The only assurance that he can have is that I said there is no appropriation, there is no money in there for the making of films by the government or anybody employed by the government this year. I am not aware that there is any other kind of assurance actually that he can have. Really I do not think there is.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I find the assurance unacceptable but, I mean it is all I can say.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well - no it would not be parliamentary to say - I will not say.

Let us come then, Mr. Chairman, to the delicate question of why no written contract existed. In fact the Auditor-General tells us that his auditors were informed orally, although he does not say by whom, but the minister is responsible, that no contract existed. Perhaps the minister could tell us of the circumstances - who ordered these films? Who ordered them? Why were they ordered? Where are they now? Are they being used? These are all relevant questions, and all very much to the point of this subhead.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, they were ordered by the government and, you know, what individual member of the government is not a matter that I would necessarily even recall. I could not, you know, truthfully

answer that.

MR. ROBERTS: Was it the minister?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: They were ordered by the government. Where they are now? One would be with the Department of Fisheries, one at the College of Fisheries, and one with the Department of Tourism. When I was assured that they had been delivered to these three localities then I certainly have not kept a watching brief on them. I mean, whether the one at the Department of Fisheries is now in the department office or if it is out in some part of the province being shown or where it is, I do not know. When they were delivered, and I had assurance that they met the requirements of whatever the various area of ring net fishing or whatever it is that they met this - and that they were in fact delivered to the agency, or the department suppose to receive them - and that was that. I mean that is over a year or so ago. I certainly have not kept a file on these journeys and use since, nor indeed would I suggest, you know, expected of me to do so.

MR. ROBERTS:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Just so that this matter does not become precedent to the - so that the Chair would not be able to intervene - I better call to his attention, this would appear to be a matter which would be more appropriate to discuss before the Public Accounts Committee. However the member has asked the question, and the minister has answered the question, attempted to answer the question. And the Chair only rises so that it would not be brought up in the future should the objections be made that this has become precedent. And also, at this time I would like to point out that normally at 5:30 on Thursdays this would be what is known as the late show. However, there were no questions today, and accordingly we are going on until 6:00 o'clock at which time we will adjourn until 8:00.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not quite sure, I am not sure I quite understood your ruling. It is not properly to debate the Auditor-General's Report before the Committee, and I

would not propose to do so. But surely it is appropriate to ask the minister about the disposition of funds relating to the subhead under discussion. I am referring to the Auditor-General's Report merely as a source of information. I am not attempting to debate the correctness or otherwise of the opinions advanced by the Auditor-General, that is a matter for the Committee. But the minister is - yes, the minister questioned the Auditor-General's opinion and soundness, but I do not propose to do that. There will be a Public Accounts Committee, and the matter will be gone into thoroughly and that is the time when we go into it. But I am concerned with the principle. Because here we have

the minister, and the minister's evasion of the question is becoming both obvious and deliberate. The minister who is blithely ignoring the House and ignoring the whole purpose of the estimates, charges whatever he ruddy well likes against a subhead. Now, these particular films obviously have - the only connection between these films and this subhead is that the word film appears in it. All the minister's torturous school boy debating, you know, should the pajama tops be worn outside or inside the pajama bottoms, does not take away from the fact that these films have no connection at all with the films envisaged by this subhead.

This subhead looks to the whole thing as instruction, the whole thing is instruction in the schools. Here we have one film that is made for the Department of Tourism and that is fine. The Department of Tourism spends \$90,000 or \$100,000 a year on films. We will talk about that when the time comes. It is a legitimate purpose. We have one being used by the College of Fisheries which is an entity onto itself. It gets \$2 million or \$3 million a year from the government to enable it to run its operations. It has a board appointed by the government under authority of legislation, but a board which is responsible for administering the affairs of the college.

We have another film which is going over to the Department of Fisheries, an entirely separate department. Now, that is not debating the Auditor-General's report as such, Mr. Chairman. What it is debating is a very serious state of affairs. The minister has not answered, he has not. He gives us assurance, and I accept it for exactly what it is worth, that there will be no money spent out of this subhead this year for the purpose of buying any more of these things.

He has not told us in any satisfactory way who ordered it. He just says the government. Well, I know the government did, but I want to know which minister authorized it. Did the minister himself do it or did the Premier make a deal with Mr. McLean and say, Mr. McLean we will give you a little money now, go off and make some films and when they come in we will bill them off. I am not even sure

the minister was the Minister of Education at the time this was done
but I mean he has to answer because he is the only Minister of
Education we have now, unfortunately.

The whole matter is just clouded and the minister is doing
nothing to dispel the cloud of suspicion. It is beginning to look as
if this was simply a political payoff. It is not a lot of money I
know. I mean, \$12,000 in a budget of \$800 million or \$900 million
is not necessarily a lot of money, but it is a lot of money in dollar
bills if it were piled up on the table before Your Honour right now,
\$12,000. It is also, Mr. Chairman, a very serious matter of principle,
because how many more of these things are buried in the estimates.
How many more little arrangements are buried whereby something comes
in, a bill comes in from somebody and is paid out of whatever subhead
happens to be, in a nomenclature sense, the same? Even the minister
with his tautological inexactitudes can claim that these were the
type of materials - I did not say terminological, but terminological,
Your Honour, I think you will agree on well established precedent, is
an appropriate parliamentary phrase, but I said tautological. Terminological
could apply to but it did not seem quite the right - one must be precise
with the minister because the minister has developed a defense. He
cannot use knowledge as a defense to questions so he has developed
a tactical defense which consists of throwing up a little smoke screen
with alleged precision.

However, that is not the point here. The point is that
the minister is attempting to confuse an issue which is a very important
issue, and the minister will not come to grips with the real question.
What assurances do we have that this sort of thing is not going ahead
again? How many other subheads? Now, the Auditor-General has found
one and that is terrific. But has the Auditor-General investigated
and looked at every expenditure in the minister's department? I doubt
it. The way the Auditor-General works is the same way as any auditor
works. He samples. He takes a few. He may have had some particular
and peculiar reason. Indeed if so he would be well advised because
anything connected with Mr. George McLean is both particular and peculiar

and well worthy of investigation.

So, I again ask the minister, who in the government ordered this? Did the minister himself do it? Was it his predecessor as minister? Somebody must have ordered it. I venture to suggest that it was not an official who came in and said, minister I would suggest, Sir, that we need - maybe it was. Do you think - the member for Hermitage has been involved in education - do you think it is credible that perhaps some teacher rang up the minister and said, Mr. Minister, I think we should have film on Scottish Ring netting?

And I think that it should - well George McLean could teach the minister things, and he has taught Newfoundland some things, but it has been a dear and an expensive lesson that some teacher or some official came in one day and waited upon the minister and said, minister, let us have a film on Scottish ring netting, and when we get it, we will send it over to the Department of Fisheries and let them use it. We will not charge them for it. The whole basis of allocating government expenditures will not apply in this case. But we will do it and the right man to do it, we do not need a contract, we do not need any of that nonsense about tenders, the right man is here in town, or his organization is here in town, just the perfect thing, and I would suggest minister that you get right on the phone or with respect you authorize me to get right on the telephone and ring up this organization and say we need a film on Scottish ring netting, would you be good enough please to do it? We will not bother about a contract. When it is done, send us in a bill, and if the bill is okay, we will pay it. If it is not okay, well then we will pay it anyway because orders will come down.

Now the minister is outside having, I assume, a cigarette, or either that he has gone to resign, and I do not think he has done that.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. ROBERTS: No.

He is having a cigarette. Well, you know, I do not want to go on repeating myself. I think I have made a point, at least, to the point where the minister, if he wants to leave his cigarette aside for a moment - his colleague, the Minister of Health should tell him that cigarette smoking is injurious to health, and I am speaking of the minister's physical health, not his political health, which is a different and far sadder subject indeed. I wonder if the minister would care to deal with some of the questions that I have raised now, and then we will have another little look at another aspect of it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I am certainly very glad that the honourable gentleman's solicitude for my health. I doubt if there is any more that I can say. I think I have answered the question. They were ordered by the government. They were charged to this subhead because these film strips, films, were regarded as instructional or educational films, and this is a subhead for educational films and that, I think, is essentially that.

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

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman from St. George's is being a little unruly. Maybe it is getting late in the week, the pressure is beginning to show on him.

The minister has declined to answer the question. I am very sorry about that. His answer will speak for itself. I will say what his answer means. His answer means that he did not order it but that it was ordered by some higher authority than he, that it was done for partisan, political reasons, that it represented an expenditure of public funds that was improper and possibly unlawful and that the minister cannot answer for it, he cannot defend it, so therefore he is attempting to obfuscate it and to confuse it. Will the minister, Mr. Chairman, stands indicted of having misspent public funds, misspent them in this particular way for this particular purpose? That is not necessarily the end of the world. But it is a very shoddy and a very improper course of affairs. I am surprised that the minister accepted it. I think it is very revealing of a great number of things, Your Honour, that the minister has chosen to accept this and that he cannot defend it, he cannot even put a good face on it in this committee. Because the truth is, Mr. Chairman, that this was done for partisan reasons and what happened was somebody, I know not whom; although I could take a pretty good guess, Your Honour, but somebody rang up the minister or his predecessor or whoever happened to be in office at the time, and

said, George needs a few bucks. We said we would give him a few bucks. George likes to make some films. He think he is a great film maker. He is going to make some films for you, and you find the subhead down there to charge them againt. That is why we have the curious spectacle of films for the Department of Fisheries being charged against this subhead while other films and film strips were charged to the Department of Fisheries. That is why we have the curious spectacle of films being charged against this subhead and used by the Department of Tourism when other films were charged against the Department of Tourism, including films done by Mr. McLean or by his organization. That is why we have the curious spectacle of the College of Fisheries having foisted upon them films that are made up by the minister's partisan, political friend. It is a very shoddy performance, and I am disappointed in the minister. I do not blame him for it. I think it was forced upon him, and he just had to accept. I am very sorry. I had hoped and expected indeed that he would stand up and say, well it was an error, it was done in mistake, it will not happen again, it was one of those things that should not have happened but in a big government, there are lots of things happening with busy people, things do go wrong once in a while and the province has not lost any money. We do have the film strips

but, you know, it really should not have been done that way. But this is just a symptom of what is going on, Mr. Chairman, on this particular subhead.

I venture to suggest that when the royal commission sits and investigates Mr. MacLean, it will find that several hundred thousand dollars have been funnelled to that estimable gentleman and his organization through means such as this. The minister now stands indicted by his own words of having been part and parcel of it. I think it is very shoddy. I do not know if I should ask the gentleman who - I am not sure if the Member for St. John's North was the Minister of Education at that time or not. I have not checked it out, but I do not want to include him in it. He left office and with it left the responsibility for it. The minister eagerly grasped the nettle of office and eagerly accepted the responsibility that went it.

Speaking of mental health, the gentleman from Burgeo is with us again, Sir. I do not know -

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the regulations affecting the honourable gentleman were tabled earlier today in his absence, the regulations affecting the Mental Health Act. I would suggest he have a look at them. I do not know if the former minister wishes to say a word on it. I would assume and indeed, quite readily believe that he would not be part of any such nefarious plot, but the minister stands indicted, a very shoddy -

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, am I going to be subjected to this harrassment by the ignorant gentleman from Burgeo.

MR. EVANS: You asked for it. You asked for it. - - -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Order, please! Order, please! Now, one

honourable gentleman should not provoke another honourable gentleman into making unparliamentary remarks or remarks that are disruptive. Now, both honourable gentlemen have been rather abusive and insulting each to the other. I would suggest to both honourable gentlemen that they deal with the estimates. The Chair will not be called upon to rule on such poor behaviour.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I was provoked by the gentleman from Burgeo, I regret it and I, of course, apologize.

As I was saying, the minister, I think the view of any fair minded and responsible person stands indicted and convicted on his own evidence of a very shoddy and reprehensible state of affairs. All I want to say, at least at this point, is that I am surprised. I really had expected better of the minister. I thought he had the moral and political courage to do better than that when the crunch came, but I think it is obvious he did not.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say just a couple of additional words there. The honourable Leader of the Opposition has stated that I stand indicted and convicted of - I am not quite sure what -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Reprehensible conduct.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Reprehensible conduct and I do not wish to debate that point. I just wish to state my strong, personal objection to such a statement.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to prolong this particular debate on this point, but shall I say I object to the minister's strong, personal objection. The fact remains, Sir, that on - I began this line of questioning in the hope that he would indicate that he had no part of this, that it is just one of those things which happen, but I repeat what I said. The

minister has been convicted by his own words of shoddy and reprehensible conduct. I do not suggest anything unlawful or illegal, but I would say that - and personally I am very disappointed - I had expected better from the minister when the crunch came. I think the very least it shows is a complete lack of any desire to do the right and proper thing. I regret that. I had genuinely expected better from the minister.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

On motion, 607-03-02 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Shall 607-03-03 carry?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could indicate why this is down \$11,000 over the revised estimate for last year? Are we going to have fewer school broadcasts? Are they going to be cheaper per broadcast or what?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, this is basically for script writing for school broadcasts which are broadcast by the CBC. I understand that the CBC is now making more of a contribution. So, they are making more of a contribution for the writing and purchases of the scripts.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could tell us what the going rate per script is and how the people who write the script are selected? Particularly, does Mr. George McLean or any of agents write any scripts?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, certainly Mr. McLean is not writing any. These are all teachers, specialists in their subjects. On the rate per script I would have to check and let the honourable gentleman know, hopefully later this evening.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable gentleman. I will look forward to getting some answer there. I find last year this subhead had a different name on it, it is now called School Broadcasts and it has shown the expenditure was \$60,000. Last year it was called Radio Script Preparation, etc., marvellous words, Sir, and it showed a forecast expenditure of \$19,000 and a revised the year before of \$18,000. Now that means the actual expenditure, Your Honour, was three times that forecast. That is a most unusual mis-estimate, I wonder if the minister could explain why?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I believe, Mr. Chairman, and this again I would have to check, I believe that the CBC paid a large amount percentage of script writing and then did not, and then it did not either pay any or very much, but they are now paying some. But again I would have to check that. With respect to the change in title, I do not know if there is any significance to that except that this is briefer and a bit more descriptive, a bit more accurate.

MR. ROBERTS: (05) Would the minister, Mr. Chairman, perhaps it is nearly six, perhaps he could enlighten us between now and six on exactly what is happening in the audio visual centre.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, basically what is done there is a production of audio visual programmes, mostly in the area of film scripts and the recording of radio broadcasts, of school radio broadcasts, a certain amount of that recording is done there, so there is the recording of school radio broadcasts and the production of film strips. It has also been used as a demonstration centre for teachers

in audio visual techniques and that essentially is its worth.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman used the magic word film strips -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: These are not produced by any outside -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that was going to be my question to him and not only that, has Mr. McLean, I would not call an outside person, indeed, Sir, Mr. McLean is so far into this government and into the people of Newfoundland that he cannot be called an outsider by any stretch of even the minister's overheated imagination and I wonder if perhaps he could tell us whether or not Mr. McLean or any of his agents or associates or companies, you know I could go through a whole rubric worthy of a first year law student, such as a first year law student on the point, but I wonder if the minister could answer that, I also wonder if he could tell us why, after having been at the level of \$35,000 for two years, we suddenly get a one-third jump in round figures to \$46,000, why has it gone up this year and not last year, and the year before.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, all the film strips produced there are done by the Department of Education employees. There has been no work done by other than employees, contractual or non-contractual.

MR. ROBERTS: Why are the costs going up?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: An additional technician is going to be employed.

MR. ROBERTS: Is that Mr. McLean?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No. No. This will be a regular Civil Service appointment, unless of course he applies to the Civil Service Commission or the Public Service Commission, which he probably would not.

MR. ROBERTS: Is it six o'clock already, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 03-05 carry?

MR. ROBERTS: It is six o'clock and Your Honour has to leave the Chair and that would be a matter of infinite regret but we can have another crack at it at eight o'clock. There are one or two points I would like to raise on that subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It now being six o'clock, I do leave the Chair until eight o'clock this evening.

March 20, 1975

Tape 544 (night)

IR-1

The Committee resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Chairman in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

607-03-05.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, on that particular vote which is up \$11,000 from last year. Actually before we adjourned at supper time I said that I thought that the increase there was due to an extra employee. That is not correct. Of course, he would not be there if in fact there was. That is for the purchase of approximately \$11,000 worth of equipment which is recording equipment which is purchased by Supply in the regular way - tenders being called, etc. - because at this center the production of the radio programmes which are played on CBC takes place.

So, essentially what it is is one master recorder which is estimated at \$2,700, one recorder editor, \$3,200, one re-verb unit, \$2,000, two control room speakers, \$500, master record equipment for presentation with interlock control, \$2,000. That adds up to \$10,400. Also I undertook to inform the committee of the three or four radio scripts and it is \$75.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 03-05 carry?

MR. F. ROWE: No, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, would the minister indicate to the committee were number one, this audio visual center is? Is it here in this building. There used to be an audio visual center in this building. Is it down in Pleasantville? Or is it down in Atlantic Films? I believe there is a possibility of some space down there or is it a combination of all three.

Secondly, as the minister mentioned if they are making their own films down in the audio visual center and film strips and slide presentations, why is it necessary to award a contract to a company for slide presentation costing \$12,000? Could the minister indicate, specifically, what slide presentations or film strips or movie films are being made or plan to be made this year in the audio visual center and which ones have been made during the past year?

The minister did mention the fact that one of the purposes and functions of the audio visual center was to make such film strips and slides and presumably movie film.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, apart from the recording of school broadcasts, which is a recording, all that is made are film strips, not films, not movies. It is film strips. They are made in curricular areas. You know, in science and math, most of them. I would not have in my head nor would I have access right now to a list of the particular strips that they have for distribution to the various schools. You know, there would be some in chemistry, some in physics, some in math. There are some in social studies. But a specific list of them I would not have. I could undertake to get it, but that would have to be for tomorrow. I repeat it is film strips, not films, not movies, not 16 or 18 or 36 or whatever they are millimeters. They are just film strips totally of a curricular nature, mostly in science. Some in social sciences.

MR. F. ROWE: They have been made definitely over the past year, is that correct?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Pardon!

MR. F. ROWE: The minister is saying to the committee that film strips have been made over the past year.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right.

MR. F. ROWE: And is it contemplated that more film strips will be made by the Department of Education personnel in the audio visual center this coming year?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, that some will be made, yes.

I suppose I ought to emphasize again that eighty per cent of their work, if one could put a percentage on it - is in producing and recording school broadcasts. But, as I say, roughly twenty per cent of their work would be in preparing film strips of a curricular nature.

MR. F. ROWE: You know, I asked the question, Mr. Chairman, because it was the minister who did say that, you know, films were being made at the Audio Visual Centre -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: They were only film strips though.

MR. F. ROWE: I wanted assurance they are in fact being made, and naturally enough the minister still has not answered the question as to why it was necessary to go outside of the Audio Visual Centre to get a film made that was assigned to a vote in the Department of Education, namely that \$12,000 contract that was awarded without tenders.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, this particular centre is not equipped to make films as such. There is a big difference between film strips than there is in films. This centre is not equipped to make those.

MR. F. ROWE: That was a film slide presentation, that \$12,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Junphy) Shall 03-05 carry?

On motion 607-03-05 carried.

On motion 608-01 through 608-02-04 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Shall 608-02-05 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Committee here, this is naturally a very important area, the education and maintenance of blind children, and approximately thirty-five Newfoundland children are attending the School for the Blind at Halifax, and this is for travel and any educational costs involved. They are accompanied up and down by people from the Department of Education. And as honourable members probably know they have no direct cost to themselves or to their families.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Shall 05 carry?

On motion 608-02-05 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Shall 06 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: 06 - I just want to point out that this is for the assistance of children usually with a multi handicap where only a very specialized institution can be of help. Actually in the last year we had two children at Amherst, in Nova Scotia, and one at Oakville,

in the U.S.

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

We have in the gallery, and I would like to welcome these people, a delegation from Goose Bay-Happy Valley, Mayor Jim Kelland, Councillor Brian Neville, the Reverend Francis Buckle, Dr. Keith Dyson, and the Town Administrator, Bill Spruin . I welcome these folks to the gallery.

Shall 06 carry?

On motion 608-02-06 carried.

On motion 608-02-07 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 08 carry?

MR. F. ROWE: The minister was probably going to answer the question. There is a substantial increase in that particular vote. Could the minister indicate the reason, please?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is a centre for learning disabilities. And the Department of Education makes a contribution to the university, because the department and the university have a joint or a partnership function there. This is an endeavour to diagnose various learning disabilities, and then to advise teachers and parents of the best programme, indeed the best school or the best location for that child. This is a service which up until last September, September past, was to a very large extent, but not exclusively, certainly to an extremely large extent centered in St. John's only. But now people from the centre are available in different parts of the province. The increase is also partially related to the fact that the department itself will have two or three people involved in this diagnostic and counselling service starting certainly no later than next September, and hopefully before it, and they will be located in the Torbay area near the School for the Deaf. It is not directly part of the School for the Deaf. It would be of assistance obviously there but it is in a broader context. But our increased participation in that, and of course, some of the vote there comes from the university as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 08 carry? Carried.

Shall 02-09 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to honourable gentlemen that this is a new subhead, assistance to school boards for the development of programmes for handicapped children. There is a vote there of \$100,000. As some honourable members are no doubt aware, it is generally agreed among enlightened educators that handicapped children are best served and educated and helped, when possible, in their community or in their own environment. It is obvious, too, that some handicaps or disabilities are of such a nature that it is absolutely essential to have a highly specialized staff and highly specialized facilities and, you know, there are times when this has to be done on a centralized basis, you know, either in St. John's or in some cases in some other part of the Atlantic Provinces, and in some very fortunately rare cases, indeed, only other parts of Canada or in the United States as the one person I referred to, one student who is at Oakville. But this is a new vote, and it is the beginning of our endeavour to have the education of the handicapped as far as possible in their own locality or environment, and we shall be meeting with some school boards and working out with them programmes for the education of the handicapped. As I say, in instances of, you know, extreme disability or of a multiple disability, this is not possible, but there are areas of disability where it is. And this will be our first year in endeavouring to work jointly with school boards and obviously it cannot, in its first year, be with all, there will have to be some selected ones, and it will be done on a year's basis so that it can be reviewed before made province-wide. But that is essentially what it is.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman,

MR. M. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, if I may make a few brief remarks in this respect, Mr. Chairman, and leaving out 609, for the deaf, but when we think in terms of handicapped children, I have been having

some correspondence with the Minister of Health concerning a number of requests that I have had over the last couple of years about handicapped children and particularly when we deal with deaf children in the Labrador area. I am sure at the time the Minister of Health was not quite aware if he was responsible for education in this respect or if the Department of Education should have the responsibility. I see this vote of \$25,000, which I welcome, but then again, there is another problem which, when you not only live in rural Newfoundland but when you live in isolated areas like Labrador - and I understand that the Minister of Health is now making a register of all handicapped children in the province and hopefully to complete this register in a very short time. We have over the years experienced, not only hardships, but some great difficulties in respect to children taken away from their parents at a very early age and then for a long period of time being separated from their family.

I have had some mothers in the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area and in some cases the coastal areas where the children have to be taken away from their parents and sent down to St. John's for special training and education. Now in this particular case the children are taken away in early September and are kept away from their parents up until the following June. The economic barrier because of the high cost of transportation, the parents cannot afford to come to visit with the children while they are in an institute or in a home or attending a specialized school. We felt that maybe

as a result of the register that the Minister of Health was compiling, that it may be necessary to, possibly, set up a center school in some area in Labrador. I have had some correspondence with Dr. Paddon of the Grenfell Mission on this as well, on setting up a school either in the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area or into the North West River area by accumulating or bringing together all the handicapped children, the deaf or the blind and people who can be treated under the school system, into that particular centre rather than having the parents to be separated for long periods of time. There is possibly no end if a child is deaf and it has to be taken outside of Labrador, we discover over the years that they become totally separated from the family because they are removed for such a long period of time.

I had hoped that if they were into an area where they could be visited periodically by relatives, the same as the Goose Bay area, even the coastal areas are not that far removed. We have a great liaison or communication with the Goose Bay area. There are people travelling to and fro from the North as well as the South into Goose Bay. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that maybe a facility would be more accessible in the Goose Bay-Happy Valley or North West River area than it would be in St. John's unless there is extreme disability and maybe you would have to move them out to a specialized institute.

I would like to hear the minister's remarks in this respect. There is correspondence on it. I had a good letter, a very good sympathetic letter from the Minister of Health. He is preparing a register. I will be very pleased to see the number of children who have disabilities or are deaf or of one handicap or another - maybe the minister should think in terms of if this can be fitted into the school system under the Department of Education, I am sure that the parents throughout the, especially the Labrador area, would greatly appreciate having their children close by and have this type of training. Maybe it is time that we should look into this situation.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, actually it is just not precisely what the honourable gentleman referred to, that we are making an important

start at, not a total start in terms of certain disabilities, but in terms of certainly deaf students and others. Now, the register which is being compiled by an intergovernmental department - health education, and social services is involved as well - is approximately seventy per cent completed. Of course, this will allow us to know in what specific areas there are sufficient numbers. I am not using numbers in a kind of callous sense. It is not a question of numbers, but obviously for certain facilities and sufficient teachers in specialized knowledge. It has to be in areas where we can get people into some center.

It is precisely that. As the honourable gentleman said, as well, with a severe handicap this may not be possible, but for people with a light or moderate handicap, then certainly as much as can be done in their own environment by their own school board, then the better. This is what in fact we are endeavouring to do. The register, I have said, is about seventy per cent complete. In this entire area there is pretty close co-operation with health, the Department of Health and the Department of Social Services. We are hoping more and more for a sharing of personnel, for example, social workers. Frequently, one hears from school boards of their need for social workers. We are hoping to work out a system whereby the professional social workers of the department could be available to schools for the kind of social counselling that might be necessary, and also psychologists, speech therapists who may be on staff of the Department of Health. We are working out ways for sharing of these people so they do not have to be duplicated by a few departments and their services can be best utilized.

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

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister is to be commended for this new vote under special education and I think one of the points that I was going to mention has been mentioned by my colleague from Labrador North. Sir, I would like to comment on this briefly by saying, you know, that this could be a very radical departure from what we have seen in Newfoundland education in the past twenty-five years. This could be a very radical departure and a great move towards integrating the handicapped children of our Province, integrating them in with the normal school population, for the want of a better expression, in our Province and make them feel a more integral part of our society today. I think it is a move in the right direction.

But, Sir, on the other hand, it could be just a token effort and this is what I am trying to find out what exactly it is to be. We have a \$100,000 vote here for development of programmes for handicapped children. Now, what I would like the minister to clarify basically is this, okay development of programmes, who are the programmes to be developed for? Is it the mentally or the physically or a combination thereof, mentally or physically handicapped children? Is there going to be an attempt by the school boards, for instance, to try to integrate deaf children or blind children or partially blind or partially deaf, integrate them with the average school population to the Province. If so this is a great departure and I would submit a move in the right direction but it is going to be a vast undertaking.

Or is it just the mentally handicapped, say the, again for the want of a better expression, the backward student. You know the type of student for whom we had opportunity classes and have opportunity classes in our schools. You know, what is the magnitude of this planned programme and will there be centres? Is it the government's intention to set up centres in communities so that we will not have the situation that my colleague from Labrador North described of children being separated from their parents for long periods of time, or is it the government's intention to have these programmes within the existing school themselves?

Now I have probably asked too many questions at one time on this, but if the minister could clarify that situation and if he misses a couple of points I will be quite happy to repeat a couple of the questions.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, this programme is not designed as a supplement to the special education programmes which are throughout the Province, nor essentially for what professional people call trainable retardates. There are nine schools in the Province operating in that area, at St. John's, Bay Roberts, Gander, Baie Verte, Grand Falls, Deer Lake, Stephenville, Corner Brook.

It is essentially geared to work in conjunction with school boards and it will be the school boards and the department which will be working out the programmes, in the area of the visually impaired but not the blind. The hard of hearing, and perhaps some in the area of total deafness and students with emotional problems and also in the area of autistic children -

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Not that we are aware of, and, of course, when the registry of handicapped people is completed we do have a class for four autistic children being conducted in St. John's but it would appear that there are very few in the Province. We are not aware of any

others, and indeed if there are any then they should be drawn to our attention. But it is essentially in those areas of emotional difficulties, visual impairment and hard of hearing, too deaf.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: This year we are hoping that we will be working in the Central Newfoundland area and in the Labrador area. Whether in this first year we can go further than that and, as I said, because it is a departure, it is something new. And we have to work out the details with the school boards. There have been preliminary discussions but the overall purpose of it is to endeavour to have programmes whereby school boards can themselves look after the needs of the partially or moderately handicapped in those areas. So it will certainly be in Central Newfoundland and hopefully in Labrador. It could be in other areas, but it would be difficult to say at this period because one would have to enter into quite some thorough discussions with school boards. Some would be equipped. Some might feel that it might be a couple of years or a few years before they would wish to get involved in the programme. So, you know, it will depend upon the finalization of discussions now going on.

MR. F. ROWE: This is assistance to the school boards and presumably specialists working with the school boards will be involved in developing these programmes this year. You know, the point I am trying to get at is, will programmes be put into action this year? Or will just the planning take place this year?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, no. It is our intention that the programmes would start the coming year, in September. It will be with the personnel of the school boards and also personnel at the Centre for Learning Disabilities and people in the Department of Education, in the Division of Special Education, who have had during the years quite some experience in education of the handicapped. These people will be available to the various school boards.

MR. F. ROWE: Have their affiliation, I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dunphy): The Hon. Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: While we are on this subject, the minister just referred to the registration of handicapped persons. I wonder if the minister would care to indicate just how all embracing this is? Who it includes in terms of age groups, in particular? What is the cut-off point in terms of this registration? Also could he indicate just how it is coming along and what point it would be completed and so on?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I believe the Minister of Health wishes, because to a large extent its medical terminology, probably, so I will ask the Minister of Health -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dunphy): The Hon. Minister of Health.

DR. ROWE: The cut-off period for the registry is all people born after January 1, 1953. This is because of the difference of records prior to that time but also of the fact that it is not going to be closed at that date but they will be trying to include all people from that date and such others as will be notified to the committee studying it who were born prior to that date. Essentially the register will date from January 1, 1953.

MR. SIMMONS: A comment I meant to make - I thank the Minister of Health. I am glad to hear that it does go back that far because it is embracing people up to twenty-two years of age essentially, and I am rather glad to hear that. I would just like to add my word of commendation to that of my colleague from St. Barbe North, I am particularly delighted to see this new subhead here. I believe it will fill a very real need, and I certainly wish the minister and his officials much success in implementing the new programme.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dunphy): Shall 09 carry?

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, I did not hear you call the total of 608, and I do not know if we call the totals or not, but there is one question I wanted that really has no place to be asked except it is relevant, if I may ask it?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dunphy): Go ahead.

March 20, 1975

Tape no. 549

Page 3 - mw

MR. ROBERTS: On the capital, there is nothing provided and last year there was \$150,000 spent. That is 608-09-02, okay.

MR. ROBERTS: My question is that last year we spent according to the estimate here, the information here, \$150,000. But the budget request last year, the estimated request as approved in the comparable subhead, it had a different name, it was \$550,000, and that is an under expenditure of \$400,000 on capital expenditure on the heading. I wonder if the minister could tell us what happened?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, the explanation for that is, that the lease that the Department of Education had with the Retarded Children's Society ran out sometime last June, and we were negotiating with the society for the purchase of the building -

MR. ROBERTS: This is the one on Patrick's Street, or which building is it?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No.

AN HON. MEMBER: On Pennywell Road.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: On Pennywell Road.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, okay.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: And the department have been negotiating for the purchase of that building, and negotiations did not come to -

MR. ROBERTS: And there is no thought now of purchasing the building?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No. What we have done, we have made fairly extensive renovations at some buildings which located the former Sanatorium, and they are now being used for that school. That is where the classes are now. That is what the capital expenditure was.

MR. ROBERTS: What happened to the Pennywell Road building? What have they done to it?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is being used by the society for its own programmes, I believe, for adult clients.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Shall 09 carry?

On motion 09 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Shall 609-01 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I would be pleased to give a resume of work at the School for the Deaf.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER : Right. These honouable gentlemen are -

MR. ROBERTS: It is a marvelous institution.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, it is. It is an excellent place. But I will say a few words on it anyway. There are approximately 130 students, 100 of them - it is residential as well as day school - 100 of them are boarders from different parts of the province, thirty from around the St. John's area. There was recently a fairly major renovation there. And as members might recall there was a fire sometime late last Summer which delayed the opening of an area to be used for pre-vocational work. That is now opened. Actually no longer than two weeks ago I had the pleasure of spending a few hours there myself. And certainly it is an excellent institution. There are twenty-four teachers, and quite a number of additional workers, seventy-nine actually, because of the fact it is a residential school for the vast majority of the pupils there.

MR. F. ROWE: I have a couple of brief questions here - one, just one observation on salaries, under that general heading. It seems to me that last year or sometime recently we heard from some parents who voiced some concern over the possibility of fire in that particular school. And we were wondering if the minister could indicate to the committee whether or not there is a house lady or some other personnel on duty overnight in that particular institution in case of a fire in the School for the Deaf, Mr. Chairman?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are people on duty on a twenty-four hour basis, and every care and precaution is taken.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, has there been any thought given to relocating that school? I recall a couple of years ago, and as we did not have an opportunity to get into those estimates last year, you know, it is two years or more since we have been able to get any information worthwhile, there was some thought, I believe, a couple of years ago to relocating that school from the present site?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: About two years ago some people were saying that the location was not suitable, and they related it to the proximity to the airport, actually. Now on a regular basis there are audiological tests made. These are available to the Minister of Health and to myself. They have never showed that there would be any ill effects because of its location. There is also some comment with respect to safety because it was near an airport. There again, I think, the fears are understandable, really. But there would be dozens of schools in the province on flight paths, you know, at Gander, at Stephenville, and at St. John's. But certainly within the past two years there seems to be very excellent relationship. There is a parent-teachers association, or parents of deaf children, and of teachers at the school, and an official of the department meet on a regular basis. And to the best of my knowledge those apprehensions have been alleviated. There have been some

improvements at the school during the past year or two.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: There have been some renovations, have there?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, there is quite a major expansion which was due to be completed in September, which was only completed a few weeks ago, which is a pre-vocational area and quite a major expansion. Now, I would say that improvements in the programme, improvements in the physical facilities and improvements, I think, in the relationship between the teachers and parents as well.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, there is one other point that I forgot to raise under this general heading and that is the fact that, the safety factor for the children in that particular school. Recently, I do not know how recently, but in driving out to that general area there a few weeks ago, I did notice that there was a snowmobile outlet adjacent to or next door to the School for the Deaf. There is a very high volume of traffic going back and forth there, presumably buying the snowmobiles and it has been brought to my attention by a number of people that snowmobiles are running around, not necessarily on the property of the School for the Deaf but the snowmobiles are being operated in that general vicinity as a result of the fact that this snowmobile outlet is there. Of course, we have these children going back and forth, I understand, to the recreation centre there in that part of the airport. I am just wondering, you know, about the safety factor when we look at this situation.

Now, I am the first one to admit that these children have to go out into society and they have to live with all the dangers that people who have a complete hearing have to live with. They are not to be over-protected in any way whatsoever. This could do them more harm than good, but they are in that school, in a training programme, in an

educational programme and presumably they are in the process of learning to live with society and go out into society. They are not totally prepared to go into society or they would not be in the school to start off with.

Sir, I was wondering if the minister could indicate whether he has received any complaints from anybody or whether this matter has been brought to his attention before and if he could, in fact, look into the situation? There are those who say, I will repeat it, that these students have to be subjected to some of the hazards of normal life. They cannot be over-protected, but I am concerned over the fact that they are still in a preparatory programme, that they have not been fully trained or educated, whichever expression you wish to use, to cope with the normal hazards of society. I think this may be a danger factor out there, that I would wish the minister and his departmental officials to look into.

I do not want to pursue it too strongly because I do not want to alarm any parents of children who are going to that particular school or be accused of being an alarmist and I certainly do not want to worry the parents who have children going to that school, but I was wondering if the minister would undertake to look into the situation and at some future stage indicate probably to the honourable House, instead at the committee stage, you know, what his department thinks of the situation and if there is a danger factor there, what the department intends to do about it?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, actually I have not had complaints with respect to that. There are, of course, large signs up at the approach warning motorists to drive carefully and the students are escorted whenever they leave the building.

They are always escorted by members of the staff. I was not aware that people were driving snowmobiles in the area. Certainly they should not. If in fact they are, they should not be. I will certainly draw that to the attention of the minister responsible.

Certainly every possible care is taken and the children are escorted at all times. With respect to the snowmobiles, I will certainly draw that to the attention of my colleague, because that is certainly not prepared to be an area where snowmobiles should be going around.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes. I would like to make one thing clear, Mr. Chairman. It has been reported to me that snowmobiles were being used in the area. I had not witnessed it myself. When it was brought to my attention, I drove out there to see what was going on. I would appreciate it if the minister could look into it.

On motion 609-01 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Shall 02-01 carried?

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, there is a dramatic jump, I believe, in that travelling vote. Where are we, 09-01? The revised estimate for 1974-1975 is \$5,000 and the estimate for last year, 1974-1975 was \$1,000. This is an increase of 500 per cent. I was wondering if the minister could indicate the reason for that increase.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I believe the increase there is that the previous year we had at least a couple of teachers who were taking some additional professional training, at least to the date.

MR. F. ROWE: I am talking about the increase.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Pardon?

MR. F. ROWE: Last year's estimate was \$1,000.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Wait now. Perhaps we are not on the same heading.

MR. F. ROWE: That is 609-02-01.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right.

MR. F. ROWE: Last year's estimate was \$1,000. The revised estimate for last year was \$5,000. Why that increase? Am I reading this right or wrong?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I understand that last year a number of teachers and professional people at the School for the Deaf did a fair bit of travelling to school boards in various areas helping in a diagnostic way. This would now be done more appropriately either through one or both other areas, and one, the Center for Learning Disabilities where there will be people on hand both of the department and of the university and also hopefully through the new programme that we spoke about a few minutes ago with respect to facilitating school boards to offer programmes for the handicapped. So, some of these diagnostic services should be out in the area, and people there rather than people from the School for the Deaf going around from board to board.

On motion 609-02-01 to 09 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Shall 609-03 carried?

MR. F. ROWE: Again, Mr. Chairman, a dramatic increase over 1974-1975 estimates. When we looked at the revised, we see \$145,000 whereas \$110,000 was committed for last year. I wonder if the minister could explain the increase in the revised estimates, of course, as well as the increase in the estimates for 1975-1976?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, basically in the increase when they revised over the estimate and the amount this year related to that, that is the equipping of the new pre-vocational wing where they are working on certain crafts and domestic science and in various pre-vocational areas.

MR. ROBERTS: (610) Mr. Chairman, I only have really one question on this subhead which is the, as I understand it, is the, well the note pretty well explains it, this is the money that is given by the government to the DEC's under the, the Minister of Justice knows exactly what the question is going to be, he is smiling, well I am going to ask it again and I hope to get an answer, In 1970 or 1971 Your Honour, the House of Assembly unanimously passed a resolution. The Minister of Education at that time was a member of the House, the Minister of Justice was, but unanimously passed a resolution -

MR. HICKMAN: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I thought it was 1970 or 1971, Mr. Chairman, but I have not checked it. It was during the Thirty-Fourth General Assembly -

MR. HICKMAN: I think it was 1968.

MR. ROBERTS: It may have been and I would think the date is essentially for the purposes of my question at least, irrelevant. The resolution, I do not know if Your Honour has sat up nights reading the back resolutions of the House, but the resolution in so many words asked the Government of Canada to amend the British North America Act insofar as it affected us, to add to the officially recognized denominations for the purposes of education, the name of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland.

Now Your Honour, I am sure, is familiar with the constitutional position and I do not need to go into it at any length at all, Suffice it to say that under the constitution of this Province, there are I believe seven denominations recognized for the purposes of education - the Roman Catholic, the Anglican, the United Church, the Salvation Army, the Seventh Day Adventist, the Presbyterian, I may have miscounted but there are -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No. No. No, that is the point. But I may have dropped - the Seventh Day Adventist are recognized, indeed they operate some schools in the Province. The Presbyterians do not operate schools by their choice. The three major Protestant denominations, the Salvation Army, the Anglican and the United Church have chosen to come together.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, that is a special section in the Education Act. It is also in the Election Act, I can assure Your Honour, And, of course, the Roman Catholic.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, he is just jealous because I won Bide Arm 114 to nothing.

AN HON. MEMBER: You won?

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one denomination that is not recongized in the constitution and that is the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland and I think there is essentially a very good reason for that, When the Terms of Union were drawn up in 1948 and 1949, the Pentecostal Assemblies were a very small group numerically. I do not know if they operated any schools at that time or not but they were not included in the Terms of Union for that one reason.

Shortly after Confederation the House unanimously enacted a Statute Law which had the effect of making the Pentecostal Assemblies a recognized denomination, They have been so treated in every respect since that. You know in every way this administration and their predecessors have treated the Pentecostal Assemblies as being a denomination recognized under law. But there does remain that constitutional anomaly. In theory it would be most unlikely and certainly most unwise, but in theory the House of Assembly tomorrow by majority could repeal that statute and take away from the Pentecostal Assemblies their rights under the educational system.

It has been a matter of some concern. I do not think it is a matter of practical concern. I do not think conceivably that any administration in this Province would sponsor such a bill, nor do I think it in the least bit likely that any House of Assembly would pass such a bill. But it is possible. Accordingly in 1968, I will bow to the Minister of Justice, but in any event at some point during the Thirty-Fourth General Assembly of Newfoundland, and this is the Thirty-Sixth, the government brought before the House and the House unanimously adopted a

March 20, 1975

Tape No. 553

NM - 3

resolution asking the Government of Canada to amend the BNA Act.

Nothing of any consequence has happened since that time. The

resolution in due course was forwarded to Ottawa. Considerable correspondence ensued back and forth. I believe the correspondence was tabled. Indeed, I believe it was tabled during the Smallwood Administration's tenure of office, before we left office. The federal position at that time was bound up with their hope to bring to Canada, not to repatriate the constitution, because we have never had it Canada, but to patriate the constitution, to bring to Canada the power that we do not now have in Canada, to amend our own constitution. We do not have it. We do not have in Canada the power to amend the British North America Act, which is the constitution of this country.

In any event, those efforts culminated in failure in June of 1971 at the conference in Victoria where it was not possible to get agreement among the eleven governments, the ten provinces and Ottawa, with respect to the formula to be followed with amending. As far as I know, from that time to this, there has been no real effort made by any public authority in Canada, the government at Ottawa or the government of any province, to revive the constitutional amendment question. I think for the time being it is as dead as a dodo. There is no thought being put into it or no effort being put into it by any political figure. There are more pressing questions.

The question I have for the minister is what have this administration done? The Premier during the March, 1972 election campaign made a statement in Corner Brook - now I do not have it in front of me but it could be obtained if necessary - made a statement to the press to the effect that the Government of Newfoundland, of which he was then Premier, intended to press that case in Ottawa. The constitutional process amendment had come to naught. If it were to be amended at all, it would have to be in England, at the Westminster Parliament which, of course, would accommodate us. It is an anachronism. I am sure the attitude of the United Kingdom Parliament is that if we could figure out from Canada how we should go about amending

the B.N.A. Act they would be only too happy to pass the law in England to allow us to amend our own constitution. So I ask the minister what has been done? First of all, let me ask what is the position of the administration? But, I think, I know what that is. What I do not know is the second question. Exactly what the present administration have done? Now the Minister of Justice is sort of asking me a question but -

MR. HICKMAN: Do all provinces have to consent to an amendment?

MR. ROBERTS: The minister, I do not know if Hansard has picked it up, Your Honour, but the Minister of Justice said, do all the provinces have to consent to an amendment? I do not claim to be a constitutional expert, but I have limited expertise and so I will bow to anybody with greater expertise on it in the House. But my understanding of the process is that where a matter affects one province only, it is a matter only for that province. I think the most recent amendment to the constitution was in 1964, when it was made possible for the Government of Canada to give survivorship and disability benefits under the Canada Pension Plan, Under the property and the civil rights clause that was held to be a matter of for the provinces. The provinces severally did consent, and eventually Westminster changed the law.

MR. HICKMAN: I have a recollection that the Province of Quebec said that they were not going to consent to any more amendments.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I have no recollection one way or the other. I mean the minister may very well have more recollections than I do on the point and, you know, whatever the facts are, they are. But my understanding of the constitution is that a matter that affects only one province, and this affects only this Province, is a matter between this Province, the Government at Ottawa, and the Government at Westminster or the Parliament at Westminster. In any event perhaps the minister could tell us exactly what the administration have done on this matter?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, with respect to basically two questions put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, the position of the administration, first of all, of course, the position of the administration is clear. We respect fully the rights, educational and all rights, of the Pentecostal people of the Province, and I think that is quite clear. Their rights are in Statute in the Province. I think that is quite clear. Their rights are in Statute in the Province and indeed in practice and in custom, and I do not think -

MR. ROBERTS: There is no suggestion to the custom.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, right, I understand that. Then the Leader of the Opposition asked what the administration have done. Mr. Chairman, to the best of my knowledge, there is nothing we can do because the action to be taken is one of amending the Canadian Constitution which action has to be taken by the federal government. Some honourable members who are now on this side voted for it, and indeed I did. When it was passed in the House, it was passed unanimously. I recall having supported that resolution. It was passed unanimously. The question now is for the federal government to amend the Canadian Constitution, presumably in one of two ways, one, by going to Westminster or two, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said, by patriating the constitution. They have not to date done either, and presumably cannot amend their constitution unless they go one route or the other. So essentially

it is a question for the Federal Government to act upon that resolution when they have found a way which they deem, I suppose, acceptable for amendment of the constitution. I could say, as well, that during my two and a half years as Minister of Education, I am not aware, and search my memory to assure that I am accurate here, but I can quite truly say that I am not aware of any misapprehension or doubt or, well, misapprehension, doubt, on the part of the religious and educational leaders of the Pentecostal community with whom I have been in touch. It has never been transmitted to me that they are in any way apprehensive or uneasy or unhappy or dismayed with respect to this matter. They recognize that in statute and in practice and in custom this administration's full recognition of their rights. This has not been made an issue, the matter of that resolution by any of the religious or educational leaders of the Pentecostal Assemblies with whom I have been in touch during the past approximately two and a half years.

Essentially, it is up to, when it comes to a question of amending the constitution, it is up to the Federal Government to amend its constitution and presumable in one of two ways, either through Westminster which they may be reluctant to do, they may not, or by patriating the constitution.

MR. A. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, if I may. I was in the House when this motion was passed unanimously. My last recollection is and the honourable Leader of the Opposition has said that the Premier did mention it, but the last recollection I had was a question on the Order Paper in Ottawa by John Lundrigan, I do not know if anybody recalls this, on this matter, you know -

MR. ROBERTS: Did he get an answer?

MR. MURPHY: And the time was - would it be Mitchell Sharp at that time said he would have to go to the United Kingdom for a bit - Actually, this sticks in my memory because it did come up

in the House here at that time and I think it is just a matter of everybody saying no one can do it, but it might be something that could be pursued possibly at this time by someone.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister of Social Services. I must, because I do not recall the matter in Ottawa. Mr. Lundrigan, who was briefly a member of Parliament at Ottawa and was very active while he was there, and I do not know if he got an answer or not. But my concern is really not with Ottawa. If it were clearly to be established that Ottawa has fallen down on this matter, then Ottawa would have to answer for their action or their lack of action.

MR. MURPHY: (First part inaudible) everybody says we cannot do it but someone else can. - -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I think it is common ground that the people who must act are Ottawa. I mean the minister and I do not agree on a great number of things but I think we can agree on that, that it is only the Government of Canada that may approach the Government of the United Kingdom, only the Parliament of Canada may require the Government of Canada to approach the United Kingdom to ask if they would enact the necessary legislation. But the Minister of Education was skating on thin ice and he avoided one or two of the weak spots, so I have again got to ask him to come back and to deal with the issue.

The Smallwood administration forwarded the resolution to Ottawa. Now, I do not know whether it was forwarded over the covering letter of the then Speaker, Mr. Clarke, or whether it was forwarded over a letter from the Premier. I mean, I just do not know and it does not really matter for the purposes of this discussion. Again, the fact remains the resolution was sent to Ottawa. Ottawa's position at that time was that we do not want to take any action because we are trying to patriate

our constitution and when we get it in Canada then we will consider the amendment question and deal with it.

That process collapsed in the late spring or early summer of 1971 and as Your Honour will recall it, about that time there were certain festivities in Newfoundland culminating in the elections of October 28 and March 24. Gosh! It is just about three years. How quickly time does go. How quickly it goes. It may well be the best three years of the Minister of Industrial Development's life. It may very well be. It shows he is part of the small and endangered minority. But, Mr. Chairman, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do not be nasty.

MR. ROBERTS: I am being very pleasant to the honourable gentleman, by agreeing it has been the best years of his life. If it only could it

be said that the best things in life are free, then the minister and I would be on even better ground. Now, Mr. Chairman, the point the minister has not dealt with. I want to know what this administration have done. It is not enough for the Minister of Education to say, as he did, that there is nothing more we can do. I want to ask him whether this administration, members of whom while in the House, as the honourable gentleman from St. John's Center just reminded us, and as the minister himself and I suppose the gentleman from St. John's West if he was - I am not sure what side he was or what he was in between at that point - the member from Burin, all of us who were in the House at that point, five or six of us, Sir, who survived. The political careers of Newfoundland these days tend to be very short lived. They are only about seven or eight of us, Your Honour, who date back to 1966 or prior to that. Those were the days.

I want to know what the present administration have done. I want to know whether they have pressed Ottawa. I want to know what the Premier or any spokesman of the administration has said to Ottawa because, Your Honour, I have asked one or two people in Ottawa why nothing has happened, you know, where it stands, essentially the question that Mr. Lundrigan - you know, I do not know what words Mr. Lundrigan - but essentially that question. I want to know whether the Government of Newfoundland have pressed the matter. Would the Minister of Education or the Minister of Fisheries or anybody speaking for the government answer the question?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, there is no mystery about this situation. The honourable gentleman should not get himself into a spasm trying to infer that somehow the government is not pressing the matter or the government is against the Pentecostal Denomination and does not want their rights recognized. The situation - and he has already explained himself, there is no mystery about it - The Government of Canada has extreme reluctance, in fact, they do not want to ask the Parliament of the United Kingdom to pass another amendment to the Canadian constitution. It is as simple as that. They do not want to. They

are not going to unless a tremendous fuss is kicked up. They do not want any more amendments passed by the United Kingdom Parliament in London, to the B.N.A. Act because they feel it should be done here in Canada. Therefore this request for an amendment to the B.N.A. Act has been put on the back burner at Ottawa by the Liberal Government of Ottawa. It is there remaining on the back burner until eventually Canada gets around to bringing in some sensible way to amend its own constitution. No amount of fuss or pressure from this province is going to change that.

Or perhaps if the honourable gentleman wants to he can write the leader of his party in Ottawa, Mr. Trudeau, and say that he wants this matter dealt with or proceeded with and does not care whether the United Kingdom Parliament is asked to amend or not. This House unanimously passed a resolution that the Terms of Union be amended. It was sent to Ottawa. It is still in Ottawa. It is languishing in Ottawa. It is going to continue languishing there, as far as I know, unless honourable gentlemen want to make this a great public issue and want the Canadian Parliament to proceed and not wait any longer.

There is nothing can be ascribed to this government in any way, dilatorious to this government, about that matter. The Canadian Government, it is their policy to try to have the Canadian constitution amended only in Canada, and they do not want to ask the United Kingdom Parliament to amend it. It is just as simple as that. The honourable gentleman when he is in Ottawa at any time, can ask the Prime Minister or ask Mr. Jamieson, our federal representative, what Ottawa's position is. I presume that they will confirm it. That is the position.

Have we written week after week, month after month, asking them to proceed? No, we understand their position. We understand. They know the Province of Newfoundland has asked for the constitution to be amended by all parties in the House. That request is still at

Ottawa. They know that that is still our position. They have, and I think naturally, a great reluctance for the Dominion of Canada or the Nation of Canada to have to go asking the Parliament of the United Kingdom to amend the constitution. Now, constitution reform has not been a great issue, Mr. Chairman, in Canada in the last two or three years when the attempts to resolve the question expired. There have been other more pressing problems in energy and otherwise. There have not been new constitutional meetings. There may very well be this year.

So, that is the position. Do not let the honourable gentleman infer that there is some plot on this side of the House to sabotage this resolution that the House passed. There is no plot. There is no devious plotting. We are not out to get the Pentecostal Denomination. They are not out to get us. I do remember a time when they disagreed with the election of the party that is now in power at Ottawa. I do not think that has anything to do with it at all. Or at least, that was alleged in 1968. So, the

resolution is there. And if the honourable gentleman wants to write, as Leader of the Opposition, to his own party leader in Ottawa I am sure he will get an official response. And he will certainly find that we have not - if the honourable gentleman is inferring have we requested the Government of Canada not to proceed? That is not right. It is not correct. It is not true. It is completely false. There is not an iota of truth in it. So that is the position. And if Canada had the machinery to amend its own constitution that amendment would be passed presumably two or three years ago.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Fisheries for all of his sarcasm, and obviously knowing he has a weak case or maybe he does not know, maybe he has not been told, maybe the Premier has said things -

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I am not going to say.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not suggesting anything, I am trying to get an answer to a question, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Fisheries has not answered the question, nor did the Minister of Education. I will ask it again. Have this administration made any written, and I will come back to oral, any written communication to the Government of Canada since they took office in January 1972 with respect to the question of that resolution? Any written communication? Now I do not care whether who asks - I do not care how sarcastic the Minister of Fisheries wants to get. Obviously he knows he is on thin ice. Well let him answer that question.

MR. CROSBIE: If I ask permission, Mr. Chairman, has the Leader of the Opposition in writing, requested the Government of Canada at Ottawa to proceed with this amendment in the last three years? Has the honourable gentleman opposite sent any letters? Has he made verbal representation, oral representations? Frankly, at the moment we do not know whether the Province has or not, we will have to check and see. Three years have gone by since then. But it would be

interesting to know. Has the Hon. Leader of the Opposition sent any written representation? Has the Hon. Leader of the Opposition written the government making representations for the government to write the Government of Canada at Ottawa? Has he made any verbal representations to the government here in the Province to see whether the government will write Ottawa? I mean, what a lot of nonsense!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a few words on this. I do not know if there is much that can be added on this matter. The point has been made that that resolution was unanimously passed by all parties. The point has been made that the Pentecostal people in this Province enjoyed it, have never doubted it, nor in any conversations, and I am fairly frequently with certain of their educational leaders, and in communication as well with some of their religious leaders - there has never been an iota of doubt, or apprehension on their part that I am aware of, I can only speak of what I am aware - that I am aware of. During the approximately two and a half years that I have been Minister of Education I have never to my memory been requested by those religious or educational leaders to, you know, write a letter to the appropriate federal minister, because I am sure they understand exactly what the position is, what the position is in the Province whereby statute and custom, and in every manner their rights are as fully recognized, and as fully exercised as everybody else's. I think that is quite true. They are fully recognized, and fully exercised as anybody else's. I think obviously they know that the putting into effect of the request of that resolution is exclusively a matter for the federal government, exclusively a matter for them to do either through Westminster or in some other way, through what the Leader of the Opposition calls it, patriating the constitution, but that is exclusively the prerogative of the federal government.

I would suggest that the Leader of the Opposition is endeavouring to create an issue where there is no issue. Because to my knowledge there is no doubt or misapprehension or uneasiness with respect to the recognition and exercise of rights of the Penetcostal people on

March 20, 1975

Tape 557 (Night)

PK - 3

their part whatsoever. I am not aware of any misapprehension or any fear or any doubt in that respect. I would think that if there were such misapprehension I would be aware of it, that it would have been communicated to me by their educators with whom we are in touch, or by their religious leaders, and this has not been done.

So, really, Mr. Chairman, I mean, is the Leader of the Opposition suggesting, I suppose suggesting that we should send a letter

to the federal government asking them to expedite the implementation of this resolution? If that is what he is requesting, then that is understandable. All I can say, and I think I am repeating myself here, is that I have not - I am not aware that the administration has been - I have not been asked by the representatives of the Pentecostal Community of the Province to write the federal government. I think the reason - I do not know, I cannot give reasons for what other people do or do not do - but I would presume the reason is that the Pentecostal Community recognizes fully that their rights are fully exercised and guaranteed by the practice of the government, by the Statutes of the Province, by custom and by honour, and that there is no danger, no jeopardy, no misapprehension. They fully realize that.

They realize as well that the question of amending the constitution is totally outside the jurisdiction and competence of the Province. I presume that this is why they have never made such a request. If they had, then certainly I would have acted upon it. If they do, then I would be pleased to act upon it. They have not to my knowledge. I can only presume the reason they have not is that they are fully assured and comfortable in the recognition and protection and exercise of their rights without any distinction whatsoever between the Pentecostal people and people making up the religions of the Integrated and Roman Catholic and Seven Day Adventist and others, that they have no misapprehension on that ground and that they fully realize that it is totally within the competence of the Federal Government and not of this Province.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, all of the honeyed words and deliberate attempts at obfuscation by both honourable gentlemen, really are just that. Both honourable gentlemen seem to wish to raise the specter that somehow Pentecostal Assemblies are afraid for their rights. Well, I have not heard any suggestion made by anybody on this side or by anybody in the Pentecostal Assemblies or anybody anywhere on that. Honourable gentlemen seem to feel that that somehow answers the point I am raising. It does not.

The fact remains that this administration, Sir, have made no written communication to Ottawa at all in support of this. I want to know whether they have made any oral communication in support of it or against it. I want to know why the Government of Canada have not proceeded and I want to know whether the fact that they have not proceeded in any way results from any communication from the Government of Newfoundland. I realize the Minister of Education has not always been the Minister of Education nor will he always be. He may not be aware of it. Even the all-knowing, the omnipotent, the omniscient, the honourable member for St. John's West, may not know or he may know. I do not know.

Let me again say there is no written, no formal written or informal written, to my knowledge, communication from this government. I venture to suggest that the reason the Minister of Fisheries is being sarcastic is he is trying to defend a weak case. He knows full well that no communication has been sent, no written communication has been sent. I think all the files and records - and this question has been asked in this House at least once each year during the estimates on the Education Department. The first year we asked the Premier, in one of his more memorable mumbles, announced we were going to have a committee set up, Your Honour, to review the whole denominational system. If anybody remembers, it took the mandarins about six months, and the Minister of Justice got up and supported that concept. The minister may not have opened his mouth, but he made some noises which got recorded in Hansard. Whether or not he opened his mouth I do not know, but a number of honourable gentlemen - I believe the Minister of Education who was not then minister, but he might recall the incident.

I am sure that we are not allowed to recognize that there might be an official present, but I am sure any officials who might be present would very well remember the incident. It took about six months to find a way to climb down without making the Premier appear to be the fool he was in that incident. Oh, it was quite, quite fun. That is why the Minister of Fisheries is being so sarcastic now.

March 20, 1975

Tape 558 (night)

IB-3

That is why he is giving us an example of his venom and his vitriol and his virulence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: It is not relevant, Your Honour?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Maybe it is because I have not been jumping up and down as much as it is usual in committee; however, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition's reference to the Premier as a fool in any way unparliamentary, uncomplimentary, it is abusive and insulting and surely the honourable member can express himself in the terms that are parliamentary.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank Your Honour, and if it is unparliamentary, I will withdraw it. That does not make it any less accurate but that is not a question for this House. It was a foolish thing he said. I think that that is parliamentary. It was a very foolish statement, very foolish. I do not think it was a considered statement at all, but it was made, and it is in the Hansard. It is a record. But what concerns me is that there was no written communication, and I make that statement. I do not have access to the files here or at Ottawa on this point. I am quite sure that they can search all the files they have in Confederation Building, Sir, and all the files they have in Ottawa, and there has been no communication in writing from any member or spokesman for this administration since January, 1972.

Now the Premier said publicly, he did not say it in the House, and I wish he were here, but I understand he is off trying to placate a delegation from Labrador North, who have essentially the same end in view as the delegation did from Grand Falls the other day -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry? Some honourable gentleman said something?

I wish the Premier were here because I suspect he could speak with more personal knowledge than the Minister of Fisheries can or the Minister of Education.

I want to know whether this government have communicated to Ottawa a desire not to proceed, an unwillingness to proceed with this amendment. I want to know whether that is the reason why Ottawa

has not pressed the matter? I am the first to agree that Ottawa has not pressed the matter. I do not know why. I am trying to find out why.

MR. MURPHY: The honourable minister did not say -

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. MURPHY: The honourable minister did not say there was any correspondence.

MR. ROBERTS: No. I thank the gentleman from St. John's Centre, but his colleague did not say that there was no correspondence. His colleague said that he did not recall any, that he had not checked the matter.

MR. MURPHY: Two-and-one-half years.

MR. ROBERTS: I agree with him that there has been no correspondence.

MR. MURPHY: Right, right.

MR. ROBERTS: That is a fact.

What we have here, Your Honour, is not just a question of the rights of the Pentecostal Assemblies, as important as they are, but there has been no suggestion that their rights are being affected, not until the Minister of Education and the Minister of Fisheries tried to get off a weak wicket, a sticky wicket, a sticky wicket wicket. Who is the fellow on CJON who got the silver dollar for tongue twisters?

AN HON. MEMBER: John Nolan.

MR. ROBERTS: No, that is dancing dollars, dancing dollars.

But, Your Honour, the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Education are dragging this question in because they hope to confuse the issue. That is not the issue. The issue is whether this administration have said to Ottawa, do not proceed, it is our wish as an administration that you do not proceed and that in itself -

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor. Would the honourable -
Mr. Chairman, I have the floor -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. Is the honourable gentleman to have the floor all evening with this base canard?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman -

MR. CROSBIE: Or does he want these questions answered?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor. If the Minister of Fisheries is not willing to observe the rules, may I ask, as Your Honour always does, Your Honour to take the appropriate action?

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

The honourable member is conversant with rule 51 (b), which deals with irrelevance or needless repetition. The honourable member has asked this question a number of times, and has had it answered a number of times, and that is a rule that can be invoked. So -

MR. ROBERTS: With respect, Your Honour, I have not had any answer at all to the question that I have just put. The minister calls it a base canard. Well, when his turn comes, if he wishes to stand and say that, well and good. I have not had an answer to the question, and I would say to the minister that I know the answer to the question. He may or may not, but I would like an answer preferably from the Minister of Education. After all, he is the minister responsible or is he like all the others over there, that he has to have his keeper come and keep him? I say to the Minister of Education, since no written communication has been made, and that was the question I did not get answered until the gentleman from St. John's Centre was kind enough to come to my aid and rescue my poor, beleaguered self, since there has been no written communication -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I want to know whether this government have communicated orally, verbally in words, their wish that the matter not go ahead. What concerns me about that are two things. First of all, whether it was done and if so, you know, I would not agree with it. I voted for that resolution.

But secondly, if it were done, it was low and it is underhanded and sneaky, because the Premier himself publicly committed this administration in Corner Brook to that position, and there has been no motion brought before this House to change that resolution which still stands as the expressed sense of the Legislature, the House of Assembly of Newfoundland. Now the Minister of Fisheries may call it a base canard, if he wishes. He can get up and treat us to one of his pyrotechnical performances, fuelled by venom, fuelled by malevolence, fuelled as only the Minister of Fisheries can in full flight. He may not know the answer. But I say to him I do know the answer to the question, Unfortunately not being a minister I am not in the position to give it. But I do know the answer to the question.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry the Member for Burgeo I hope would not - was the gentleman for Burgeo who was interjecting?

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I just want to be sure, one tends to confuse these noises from time to time.

But I would hope the Minister of Education would now deal with that question. And I do not put it forward as a base canard, I put it forward quite seriously, and in the hope that I shall get a frank and full and honest and a complete answer which we have not had yet.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, to the best of my knowledge I have answered the questions put by the Leader of the Opposition. His first one was with respect to any written request on behalf - by myself or by the government? - and as I said, no. Then he is now asking is there any oral one? I certainly have not made any oral representation. I am not aware of oral representation - the same reason with respect to oral representation, as with respect to written representation, and that is, as I understand it and in my contact with the Pentecostal people again I say they are fully at ease with respect to the recognition of their rights. In any conversation with me there has been no representation, no request

for a written or an oral communication to the federal government -

MR. ROBERTS: That is not the question, I repeat.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The question the honourable gentleman asked me was basically twofold, to put two together. One, was there a written representation by the government? And two, was there an oral representation by the government with respect to the implementation of that resolution, a constitutional implementation -

MR. ROBERTS: I did not ask if anybody had asked for one or no.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, but I mean, well I answered the honourable gentleman, I am not restricted, Sir, to yes or no.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: And it is fair enough to speak hopefully relevantly, and I think this is relevant on the matter in general. I think I have made the answer as totally specific, and that is, there has been no written request by myself or by this government. There has been no oral representation by myself, and to the best of my knowledge by this government, and that to my knowledge. The reason that I put forward well I have already put it forward, and that is, I am not aware of any misrepresentation on the part of the Pentecostal people, at least those with whom I am in touch, and they are the educational leaders, and there is the representatives of the religious leaders - they may well coincide - I am not aware of any misapprehension on their part. They are fully aware that the implementation of that resolution by a constitutional amendment is totally in the hands of Ottawa.

I will just add, and add briefly, I am not suggesting that this is a purpose or a motive, I am not suggesting that, but, I think, it could be an effect of the persistence in this manner, it could be in effect of attempting - no not attempting, that implies motive - it could be an effective creating of religious differences in an age when, you know, there is more and more co-operation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down boy!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Why should I sit down just because the honourable gentleman - I do not have to

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: the honourable Member for Hermitage to tell me when to sit down. Now, now, now take it easy. Take it easy now. I made it very clear when I said what I said, and I said very clearly, and I can repeat it, that the effect of persistence in this manner could be to suggest or cause denominational differences where there are none.

AN HON. MEMBER: Cowardly ...

MR. OTTENHEIMER: What is cowardly about it? Listen to the honourable gentleman. Does the honourable gentleman think I have to put over any material I am going to say to be censored by himself? Well there is nothing cowardly about it. Nor am I imputing any motives or anything whatsoever. I am giving my opinion of what the effect could be, and surely I am entitled to do that. And if the honourable gentleman

has a different opinion of what the effect could be, then he is obliged to give his.

MR. ROBERTS. : Not as irresponsible as yours.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Oh, not as irresponsible? No? Well that is obviously a matter of opinion as well. But the effect could be, you know, to suggest that there is some hostility between this administration and, you know, any religious group, or to cause misapprehension when there is none, to my knowledge there is none, this could be the effect, and I really ask the honourable gentleman, you know, to what purpose is the persistence, to what purpose, when it is clear that in practice, in day to day practice during this administration's term of office and indeed during the former administration's term of office and no doubt, as far, in my judgment, in any administration's term of office, the rights of Pentecostal people are equally recognized as the rights of everybody else. And not only that, but to my knowledge there is no misapprehension on their part that that is not the case and will not continue to be the case. So I really feel that I have to say that, you know, the effect of this persistence is almost to suggest that that is not the case, you know, that there is none.

MR. ROBERTS: The effect of that suggests that the administration have been dishonest.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is -

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

I think it is time for the Chair to interject.

Some honourable gentlemen who do not have the floor appeared to be getting a little carried away there a few minutes ago, and I feared for something a little more serious than words across the floor. I suggest to honourable members that if they do not talk to one another, that nothing of this type will happen and will not come close to it. Other honourable gentlemen who have had the right to speak, to speak at length, have the right to speak again. The minister has been asked a question. He is attempting to answer it, and has the right to answer it, and he is being perfectly relevant in his answers.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, actually, you know, there is really, as far as I can see, nothing further to be said. Specific answers have been given. I have put forward the facts of the data that not to me and not to any member of the administration that I am aware of, has there been a request from the spokesman for the Pentecostal people for us to make representation in writing or an oral one to the federal government. I have put forward the reasons I think that this has been the case because, first of all, there is no misapprehension on their part and they are fully aware of this administration's recognition of their rights, and also the realization that this is totally a federal government matter.

I went on to the great chagrin of one hon. gentleman to say that, in my opinion, the effect of the continuation of this is to suggest that things are not like I have described them, you know, that there is not a full exercise of rights or that the exercise of their rights are in jeopardy, and this is not the case. But to persist? Obviously, the honourable gentleman has the total parliamentary right to persist as many hours as he wishes. I am not suggesting the contrary of that either. All I am saying is that, in my opinion, the effect of this persistence is to suggest that things are not, as I said, that there is not the full enjoyment and exercise of their rights, and that there is not the recognition on the part of the pentecostal people that their rights, by this administration, in any sense of the administration, are as well protected as are anybody else's, and that essentially is the case. I think it would be quite improper to suggest otherwise.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I think

the minister is contemptible but, you know, if he wants to say so

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Let me, first of all, thank the minister for the first part of his interjection in his speech where he did answer the question finally and I appreciate that. As I heard him, he said that there had been no written communication. Well, that is common ground and I think I have his words exactly. I jotted them down on my little sketch pad here. He said to his knowledge - he used the words, "to my knowledge," well, there have been no oral communications. I accept that without any reservation. I have no hesitation at all in saying that the minister has unburdened himself to the committee of all that he knows on the matter. Having said that, I would ask him if he would undertake to check with the Premier on that.

It is too bad the Premier is not in the committee, but he is elsewhere about some public matters, and if he would have a word with the Premier because the Premier, the minister will concede, might have made such a commitment or a representation orally and nottold the minister. After all, the minister at that point may not have been the Minister of Education. The minister came into office in his portfolio, I do not whether it was third or the seventeenth Cabinet shuffle, but I mean he did not begin his current bout in government as the Minister of Education, an honourable gentleman preceded him briefly and somewhat tempestuously

So, all I would say to the minister is would he undertake to have a word with - and I think probably the Minister of Fisheries might be in the same position. He might not be aware of what may have been said.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I mean it does not matter whether they hold the vote over or not in that sense. The vote is just an opportunity to discuss the issue.

Now, as for the second part of the minister's comments, I am somewhat surprised that he would stoop quite that low. I might have expected it from the Minister of Fisheries who is an expert at this sort of thing. I did not expect it from the minister.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, he can either keep this on the rails or when I get a chance to speak, Sir, I will do my part. Now, it is up, either - Mr. Chairman, either the rules are going to be observed in this committee or if the honourable gentleman opposite wants to get on with this kind of thing, then we will certainly respond in time. So, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): The Minister of Fisheries beat me to my feet. The Leader of the Opposition is quite at depth and clever at the art of insult and does it in many ways. The motives or whatever he said to the minister -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Order, please! Order, please! He was abusive and insulting to the Minister of Fisheries. Now, this is not unprecedented in this House or in the committee, to be abusive and insulting. However, it will - abuse and insult leads to more abuse and insult which leads to complete disorder, chaos and many other nasty things.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much your ruling and shall try my best to take it to heart and to act upon it. Now, as I was saying, I had not expected such a course of action, of words, from the Minister of Education. The effect of my questions -

we can call it a difference of opinion if he wishes, and I am quite happy to debate it at any length he wishes according to the rules that Your Honour is enforcing, the rules of the House, is to get at the truth. I am not sure that we have got at the truth. The minister has done his level best to assist, and I am the first to say that, and it may be the committee can go no further on the point. But I reject with contempt and scorn the minister's suggestion that somehow I, by asking whether this administration have honoured a policy which they publicly say they have honoured, whether they have in fact honoured it, that I am somehow breeding religious strife. I have never -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, now the gentleman from St. John's Centre has chosen to enter. We will all be in it now. We will all have a great to do about it tonight and if that is what the Minister of Education and his colleagues and his brethren on the government ranks wish, and if it is in order, then, so be it. But let me just say, I reject it with all the contempt and the scorn that I can muster for any argument, not for the minister but for the argument itself.

The issue is a valid one and we can go no further on it because I think the minister has told us all that he knows and that is all any man can do, but I

say that there is great reason to say that this administration - and I speak not of the minister nor for that matter do I speak of the Minister of Fisheries who to my knowledge had no hand in this matter, no affair, no dealing, no involvement - have not been honest with the people of Newfoundland. They have not done what they said they would do, or if Your Honour would wish, they have done those things which they ought not to have done, and they have not done those things which they ought to have done.

I realize that the Minister of Education has said all that he can, and maybe the Minister of Fisheries will be tempted to add a few words of judicious counsel to the matter. I would welcome that. Here is the Premier and he can now - now here is the man - good. Now, let me address my question to the Premier now. The discussion in the committee - for the Premier's benefit, it it is in order, Mr. Chairman - it has been about the question of this resolution about the amendment to the British North America Act. Well, the Premier is not listening to me. There is no point in my talking to him. Well, there is obviously no point in my saying it to the Premier.

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

Honourable gentlemen both to my left and right on occasion interject remarks. However, I must direct a particular comment to the member for Hermitage. I need no direction. The Chair needs no direction in the keeping of order and the pointing of fingers at offending members. It needs no direction of that type.

If the honourable member has a point, the honourable member, any honourable member, can rise in his place on a point of order, but the Chair will not be pointed at or have things pointed out to it.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it is ignorant, Sir, or perhaps it is an annoyance that my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, is not accorded the same privilege of speaking in silence as members on the other side have been accorded tonight. That upsets me, and I am sorry for pointing but it does annoy me to hear the Yahoo from Burgeo continually interjecting when my colleague is trying to make

some sensible points.

MR. EVANS: He never made one yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The honourable member has had his say on a so called point of order. His remarks give rise to disorder in the committee to refer to an honourable member of this House as a Yahoo. It is a very abusive and insulting term to call any honourable member such a name. I suggest the honourable member might look at the definition of it. It is quite -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, for the sake of parliamentary niceties, I withdraw the term. It is accurate but not too parliamentary, I understand.

MR. ROBERTS: May I -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We really must get a dictionary and look it up. Does it not come from Gulliver's Travels? However, Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with Your Honour. Your Honour is becoming a bit of an expert on keeping order of one sort or another. There has rarely been a Chairman, I would suggest, who has presided over as tumultuous a debate as Your Honour has had on occasion in this chamber. I think it is a tribute to Your Honour that Your Honour has presided over these tumultuous debates with such calm and judiciousness.

Now, as I was saying, the Premier, he may have been briefed by his colleague and soul mate, the Minister of Fisheries. The question is about the Pentecostal constitutional position. For the Premier's benefit on page thirty-four, 610, grants and D.E.C.'s. The question is this. The Minister of Education has told us that there is no written communication to the Government of Canada one way or another with respect to the resolution adopted by the House in the Thirty-fourth General Assembly. The Minister of Education has told us to his personal knowledge, all of which he can speak, there has been no oral communication. The Minister of Fisheries has not been heard from on the point, but presumably if he had anything to say, he

would have said it or he may yet say it. I would ask the Premier whether he has made any communication to any member of the Government of Canada or to the Prime Minister or minister or for that matter any representative of the Government of Canada with respect to this question of amending the British North America Act in this sense.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak on this at any great length. I think I will have a few words because we have had an hour now of the honourable Leader of the Opposition proceeding in a way - since I am not trying to stir anything up, I will just call it in the way that I would call it despicable if I - he has been absolutely despicable, absolutely despicable. If the Leader of the Opposition has some -

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

We are adding somewhat to the list Your Honour has in Beauchesne. We really should have sort of a Stagg on unparliamentary expressions but let us have a ruling on this word because if the Minister of Fisheries wishes to use it, and if it is in order, and more power to him but I would like to be able to use it, I would like to have that—really what we want almost is an unparliamentary expression of the day. If the government were advertising in "The Daily News" instead of the little morning smile, whatever it is, we could have the unparliamentary expression of the day. But is despicable in order? If so, we will all use it.

MR. CROSBIE: I will withdraw it, Mr. Chairman, so you will not

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well I withdraw it categorically, and then the Chairman cannot make a ruling, you see.

MR. CHAIRMAN Order, please! In the event of a withdrawal I presume the ruling then becomes hypothetical. And for that I thank the honourable minister. I believe the honourable minister's comment was - it was despicable referring to a statement that is quite different to an honourable member as being despicable or otherwise.

MR. ROBERTS: I take it is in order then. I play the game whatever way Your Honour wants ...

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can get back

AN HON. MEMBER: No ruling has been made.

MR. CROSBIE: to my point.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: We have been treated to an insidious spectacle. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is wanting, apparently, to start some kind of a story throughout the Province that the government or someone in the government has asked or requested the Government of Canada not to proceed with an amendment to the constitution to the Terms of Union in connection with the Pentecostal denomination. This is the impression he wants to give. And he hints in his remarks, in a way

that can only be described as not cricket, and diabolically inspired and certainly carefully premeditated and with malice aforethought, in his remarks he intimates and hints that the guilty party - who the poor Minister of Education does not know about and the Minister of Fisheries does not know about - but the guilty party is apparently the Premier. We have heard mutterings about the Premier.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Just a minute now, I am having my say, and the Premier will have his if he wants to have his say. And I have a right to speak in this Committee. I have been listening to this now for an hour or an hour and a half. That the Premier apparently - we connect from these disjointed remarks that he hopes the press gets the point of, and that the Premier apparently is suppose to have made some verbal request of the Government of Canada or someone in the Government of Canada, unidentified, that the matter not be proceeded with. He wants the implication to get out around the Island, particularly to the Pentecostal denomination, that the Premier apparently, or someone in the government, has asked the Government of Canada not to proceed with this amendment to the constitution. Well that, Mr. Chairman, is not correct. And it is not true.

And we would like to know, we would like to know, if that is what the honourable gentleman is saying, that he has been told by somebody in the Government of Canada, by someone in the Government of Canada, in his same political party, if someone in the Government of Canada has told him that someone in the Government of Newfoundland has officially requested on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland that the amendment be not proceeded with - we would like to know who is that party in the Government of Canada, so that the matter can be dealt with properly and so we will who has told the Leader of the Opposition, if indeed anyone has told him that the Premier or someone in this government asked that the matter not be proceeded with, so that the truth can come out.

Now the honourable gentleman should therefore enlighten the Committee who is his informant in the Government of Canada. And if he had informant, who said this in the Government of Canada. We surely have a right to know his name. And if that informant told him and gave him this information confidentially, sort of buddy to buddy at some political meeting, well surely it is a breach of confidentiality if that occurred for the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to be using it publicly in this House, in the way he has, to give to give the impression. Now this Committee is entitled to know. Who, if in fact, if the Leader of the Opposition has been told by someone in the Government of Canada - who in the Government of Canada told him this? And what exactly did that person in the Government of Canada say? And then when the Premier or whoever the party is here, who is supposed to have said this, has identified to him who it was he was suppose to have said this to or it is alleged he said it to and when? Then our Premier can deal with it. But I do not think that our Premier should in anyway deal with this kind of suggestion or this kind of invidious remark, and then the insulting suggestion that the Minister of Education or somebody here should ask the Premier about this and report to the Committee, when the Premier is in the House, and has been for the last three years, and the Leader of the Opposition can ask his question if it is properly framed any day during those three years or he can ask it tomorrow. Let him frame his question. It has been

reported to me, Mr. Chairman, you know, would the Premier confirm that on the (blank) day of (blank) 19(blank) in a conversation with the honourable (blank-blank) of the Government of Canada, he said and requested that honourable gentlemen ask the Government of Canada not to proceed with an amendment to the constitution requested by the House of Assembly of Newfoundland. Would the Premier then comment on that?

That is the way to do it. Give us who is alleged to have said it because we want to know that. We are entitled to know. Has someone in the Government of Canada told the Leader of the Opposition something that is not true? We are entitled to know that. That is what we want to know - not all these hints and so on and so forth.

Now the Government of Canada to my knowledge, all I know of it, Mr. Chairman, has not proceeded with that amendment because they do not want to go to England to do it.

HON. F.B. MOORES (Premier): Go to Westminster.

MR. CROSBIE: Or go to Westminster to do it. And no one as far as I know on this side of the House has requested that they not proceed with it. So instead of this cowardly and sneaky and pernicious procedure that the Leader of the Opposition is getting on with, let him lay his cards on the table. Whom does the information come from? If in fact he has been given that information, whom does it come from and what did the person say? Let the Leader of the Opposition come and put it right on the old table and we will deal with it.

On motion Head 610, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 611-04 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, on 611-04 dealing with the College of Trades and Technology, what I will endeavour to do is to give an overview of the work at the college during the past year. I imagine honourable members are actually quite familiar with it so I will just make a general review.

Essentially one can distinguish between three areas of students there. The pre-employment students, and these are people essentially in the trades, for example, masonry and brick-laying, automotive mechanics, plumbing, carpentry, sheet-metal work etc. There are approximately 663 students in that category of whom approximately forty per cent would be manpower and sixty per cent provincial students. That is the one category of pre-employment students. These are obviously conveniences, these categories. The other is diploma students and these are in either two or three-year diploma courses. About eighty-five per cent would be in two-year courses. These would be in areas like pharmacy, x-ray, technology, lab-technology, business administration, electronic technology, forestry technology etc. As honourable members probably know, all of these are provincial students.

Then there are the apprentices who go there. At any one time there would be approximately 200 or let me say at most times there would be approximately 200. These are six to eight week courses. They are all Manpower students and the College would serve between 1,500 and 1,600 a year because they are in on a short basis. That essentially makes up the student body. The pre-employment ones are there for nine months, the post-secondary mostly for two years and some for three years and then in the apprenticeship area, 200 at any one time but there are quite a number of intakes and there will be between 1,500 and 1,600 per year.

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

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to point out the fact that over the last three years we have been continually bringing to the attention of this administration, and in one case by way of a private member's resolution, the serious situation that exists at the College of Trades and Technology with respect to accommodations, that is accommodations in the courses themselves. I am not talking about residences or anything like that. But it is my understanding that the College of Trades and Technology is bursting at the seams and I think when we were dealing with the private member's resolution we had statistics indicating that only one in ten students applying could actually be enrolled in certain courses at the College of Trades and Technology and there was a very, very serious situation with respect to the numbers of people wishing to get into that particular College and the number of students who could be accommodated in the College of Trades and Technology.

Now, Sir, that same situation still exists today, and as I have pointed out previously, on, I believe, last Tuesday evening, the rate of increase in expenditure by this administration at this stage in this administration's history, as far as its first term is concerned, its rate of increase in expenditure has been thirty-seven per cent in - now this is vocational and technical expenditures - as compared to an increase of one hundred and thirty-three per cent in the previous Liberal term. Now, Sir, I feel compelled to bring this to the attention of the committee because it is this administration that has said that it intends to place greater emphasis on technical and vocational education. Presumably that includes the College of Trades and Technology.

Now, Sir, it is a sad commentary when we look back and see that the administration's, the present administration's great re-emphasis and increased emphasis in this particular area, and we are referring specifically to the College of Trades and Technology, has been in words only and not in deeds. It has not been reflected in either of the estimates brought down over the past four years. This so-called great emphasis, and increased emphasis on technical education has been in words only. It has not been reflected in

action, nor deeds, nor in votes passed through this committee in terms of grants-in-aid to the College of Trades and Technology. And, Sir, I can only assume that the only way that the government can weasle or rationalize or try to explain its way out of this dilemma, having promised and stated something but having not acted, is to make a further commitment and/or promise and that is for a polytechnical institute in this Province.

I think, Sir, the effect of this promise of a polytechnical institute, now I am relating this to the College of Trades and Technology, the effect of this promise of a new polytechnical institute with a vote this year of \$500,000 to commence planning, the only effect that that will have is delaying expansion in the existing College of Trades and Technology, badly needed expansion, or for that matter in any other field of vocational or technical education. Now, Sir, I think this has to be pointed out. I do not know if there is a solution to it. It is going to take a number of years. I do not know if the minister can even attempt to predict or forecast when the new polytechnical institute or the three main areas thereof will be opened. If we are to judge by the length of time it took to set up a Regional College on the West Coast, it is going to be many, many, many, many years before we see a replacement for the so-called College of Trades and Technology.

First emphasis, if the minister could just pay particular attention to this kind of a question, the first stage, I understand, is going to be the Fisheries College. Is that correct? The first stage of the polytechnical institute is going to be the Fisheries College?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: (Inaudible)

MR. F.B. ROWE: Yes, okay, which presumably will take up the courses, replace the courses being presently taught at the College of Trades and Technology.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: (Inaudible)

MR. F.B. ROWE: The first stage is basically the -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right.

MR. F.B. ROWE: - a new Fisheries College. There are three aspects
of the -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right.

MR. F.B. ROWE: - of the polytechnical institute.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right. Right.

MR. F.B. ROWE: The Fisheries College,

although it would include some courses not now given at the Fisheries College which would be given at the present College of Trades and Technology.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, a simpler way of putting it, Mr. Chairman, is when will total replacement in the polytechnical institute take place, when will the total replacement take place for the College of Trades and Technology. I would submit sometime in the distant future. Certainly not in the immediate future because we still have to get the plans and designs and we are still a long ways from start of construction.

The point that I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that this grand pronouncement and/or announcement or promise of a polytechnical institute, however desirable to have a polytechnical institute in this province, however desirable, if the government is not prepared to pour more money into the College of Trades and Technology, we will have hundreds and thousands of students denied an opportunity to get a trades or technological education during the period in which this polytechnical institute is under construction.

I think that is something that the government is answerable for, and have to explain because it is this administration that promised the great new thrust in vocational and technical and trades education.

The second point that I would ask - I would like the minister to reflect on that briefly because the only stop-gap, the only - what is the expression I am looking for - the only interim measure that I have heard of from the honourable minister while waiting for the construction and the opening of the new polytechnical institute, the only interim measure that I have heard from this administration is a planned talk, negotiation between the minister responsible for intergovernmental Affairs and the federal authorities in setting up vocational wings. These are only planned negotiations. They are not even plans, but planned negotiations for plans and for, hopefully and desirably, construction afterwards.

So, I would like the minister to indicate what his administration

is going to do to fulfill its promised increased emphasis on trades and technological education and what it intends to do to accommodate the hundreds and thousands of students who are trying to get into that particular college at the present time.

The second point I would like the minister to indicate to the committee, Sir, or the second question, is what exactly is the status of this promised residence? We have all witnessed the infamous or famous demonstration down in the lobby of the Confederation Building when the students were justifiably very upset because of the fact that there was nothing in the budget for a new residence on or off campus for the students at the College of Trades and Technology, Sir. They were upset for one simple reason. They demonstrated for one simple reason.

I am not advocating civil disobedience or demonstrations that get out of hand or what the Minister of Finance called a sign of immaturity. I am not advocating what the Minister of Fisheries advocated a number of years ago when he suggested civil disobedience if you could not get your own way.

Sir, those students were justifiably extremely upset over the fact that a written commitment by the Minister of Education in a letter of November of last year sent

to presumably the President of the Students Union at the College of Trades and Technology, a letter in which it was stated emphatically by the Minister of Education that a new residence would commence construction in the Spring of this year.

Now I understand that the minister and the Premier and the Minister of Finance have met with the students and things have cooled down somewhat since that demonstration, but I am not quite clear nor am I sure that the people of Newfoundland or the students at the College of Trades and Technology may be quite clear, but I think it is incumbent upon the minister to indicate to this committee, and hopefully this information would get out to the young Newfoundlanders in both the Island portion of our Province and on the Mainland, in Labrador, would have some idea of what in fact is the true commitment of this government respecting a residence for the College of Trades and Technology.

Now, Sir, I can, you know, become a little political but I would not dare do that, Sir, I would not want to upset the Minister of Social Services, but I would like for the Minister of Education just to review very briefly, to indicate to the committee precisely what his administration is going to do during this period, from this point until the time when the polytechnical institution will be opening its doors to the students of Newfoundland, what his administration, the administration, is planning to do to accommodate the many, many, many students who are still trying to get into the College of Trades and Technology. Because it is my understanding that that college will then be converted into a vocational school for this area. However many extensions you can put on that College of Trades and Technology to serve its present purpose, I would submit that any extensions could be well used by any vocational school that would be serving an area of approximately 100,000 people. So I would like for him to answer that question, and secondly, of course, to clarify the situation and reiterate the government's commitment with respect to the residence. Now, the minister may get up and say, well a new residence will be built along with the polytechnical institute, That is too vague of an answer, that is too fuzzy of an answer, Mr. -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: No, you did not.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes.

MR. F. ROWE: No, you did not.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, yes, ask your honourable colleagues.

MR. F. ROWE: No, no, no.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Totally.

MR. F. ROWE: No.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Totally.

MR. F. ROWE: No. There are quite a few questions the Hon. Minister of Education did not answer on Tuesday, Sir. He answered many questions but not to the satisfaction of the committee, Sir. Undoubtedly, the Minister of Social Services is happy.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: I am suggesting, Sir, that unless the minister can, you know, pinpoint a date -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Now if I happened to be out of the Chambers at the particular time, when the minister nailed down a specific date for the start of construction of the residence and the date of completion, I apologize for not having gone up and listened to the tapes while I was out of the House at that particular time.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: What is the poor, old Minister of Fisheries, Sir, - make no wonder some people refer to him as a cod jowl.

AN HON. MEMBER: Pick up your hoe and plough a row.

MR. F. ROWE: If he wants me to pick up my hoe and plough a row, I can tell him what to do with his portfolio, Sir.

Now did the Minister of Education, in the exchange, manage to get the two basic questions?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes. The ten minutes is up.

MR. F. ROWE: Okay, fine and dandy.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman,

with respect to the residence, I will answer that first and I must insist that, however I am willing to do it again, that I did in my opening statement on Tuesday in quite some detail, outline that. However, I am willing to do it again. I will not, of course, say what date it is going to start or what date it is going to end -

MR. ROWE: Well, you might as well just stop right there.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Because the honourable gentleman knows darn well that it is impossible for anybody to give a specific date of starting and a specific date of ending.

MR. ROWE: You gave us the specific date -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now, now, if the honourable gentleman wants to hear the answer he will have to learn to keep his ears open or, well, his mouth - It is difficult to have both open at the same time unless one is suffering from a bad cold.

However, with respect to the residence, as I said in the opening statements when we started the estimates of the Department of Education Tuesday and I stated at that time that the government had met with students at the College of Trades and Technology and we had listened to their request that there be some residence facilities at the present college, what is now called the College of Trades and Technology, with special reference for the apprenticeship and vocational students who will continue to be there even when the polytech is totally completed, and that we in the Department of Education made our own checks with respect to numbers and a continuing need for such facilities. I stated that we had agreed to build residence facilities for approximately 250, adjoining the present College of Trades and Technology, bearing especially in mind the needs of the apprenticeship students who would be going there on a continuing basis and from a very broad area, as a matter of fact, in some apprenticeship areas, from practically all over the Province.

I stated as well that it was the government's intention to commence as soon as possible and that I would envision, it would be this summer - there are a couple of matters to be finalized, one, the actual property. There are essentially two possibilities there, one, Gooseberry Lane and, two land now adjoining the College of Trades and, however, there is some that is privately owned. If that were the option, then there be necessity to acquire it.

So, with that respect, we have also had a preliminary discussion with CMHC and, obviously, we do not know yet whether they will participate, and if they do, and under terms suitable, that would be excellent. If not, obviously, there will have to be tendering and with these tenders, usually, there is six weeks notice before tenders close. So there are the essential considerations and as I said on Tuesday that we would do this as soon as possible and we would certainly hope that this would be done this summer. That is fairly clear, and I did, in fact, say the same thing on Tuesday, but perhaps the honourable gentleman was not listening or taking notes on some of the matters.

MR. ROWE: No, I heard all that but I -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right. Now, with respect -

MR. ROWE: Could I just ask one sub question, if I may?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right, right.

MR. ROWE: This summer -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes.

MR. ROWE: Now, what exactly is going to happen - I am sorry, Mr. Chairman - What exactly is going to happen this summer, the acquisition of the land or are we going to commence construction?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: We hope to commence construction this summer. We hope to. We plan to. We will do our best to, but I certainly

cannot and would not, you know, swear on a Bible or swear on anything, you know, the date it is going to commence, but it is our intention to commence construction this summer. That is our intention. We will do everything reasonable to achieve that and reasonably confident we will, but beyond that, certainly there is nothing further I can say. I would certainly think that the honourable gentleman opposite knows that as well. He knows that.

Now, the other point he made was what - or question he asked, or point he made, was the need for more space to accommodate more vocational-technical students. Within the estimates of the College of Trades and Technology, further down under the capital vote - there is a capital vote there of \$500,000 - it is the government's intention that renovations be made in certain buildings or areas of what was formally the sanitorium, whereby the College will be able to serve an additional 300 full time students next year. Let me repeat that because it is quite an important point, that there

is money provided for certain renovations whereby in certain courses an additional 300 students will be able to be served by the College of Trades in certain buildings, formerly the Sanatorium, and also, I will give the details when we get to the vocational schools, there is a capital vote there of \$1.2 million and this will allow approximately \$500,000 for an extension of the Placentia Vocational School, \$500,000 for an extension of the Placentia Vocational School, not bad for a government doing nothing, in vocational or technical education. There is \$488,000 for an extension at Burin District Vocational School, and a smaller amount for the completion of an extension at Gander. There is an amount for the planning of an extension -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: This is planning. The honourable gentleman might get up and say this government likes to plan and plan and plan.

MR. F. ROWE: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, just in case I get in the same area of debate as the honourable minister, he is now talking about vocational schools, we are discussing 611-04, grants-in-aid to the College of Trades and Technology, I submit that he is completely irrelevant and out of order.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: May I speak to the point of order?

MR. F. ROWE: However, I am quite willing for the minister to go into these particular areas as long as we on this side are accorded the same latitude in our debate. It is either one thing or the other.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Chairman, merely to that point of order, and that is that I was answering a question which the honourable gentleman asked, which seemed to include the vocational area as well, but certainly I think it is much better that we wait until we get to vocational schools so I will not persist there.

MR. F. ROWE: You know, it does not matter to me just so long as -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It does keep it clearer if we take them item by item. So I think what we should do is insist on this relevance and both practice it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must say coming from the honourable member it is refreshing.

MR. F. ROWE: Now that is quite insulting, Mr. Chairman, if you do not mind my saying so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: When a neutral, non-partisan Chairman of this committee gets up and insinuates that it is refreshing to hear such a statement coming from another member of this side of the House.-

AN HON. MEMBER: Shocking! Despicable!

MR. F. ROWE: - it is nothing but insulting and it is an example -

AN HON. MEMBER: Retract!

MR. F. ROWE: - of the kind of thing that caused my honourable colleague to get kicked out of the House the other day.

AN HON. MEMBER: Retract!

MR. F. ROWE: I do not think anybody in this House should just stand for it, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: I was hoping I would not have to get up and say that, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. F. ROWE: I was provoked into doing it. It was nothing but an insult and it indicates nothing but partisanship.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The honourable member has had his say, and granted, the phrase with which I opened my remarks may have been unkindly, and for

that I apologize to the honourable member. However, his remarks were somewhat intemperate, and I choose to ignore them and - well I apologize to the honourable member. However, probably that is the last apology. His point of order was well taken in that he was asking for relevance, and the honourable minister has indicated that he will be relevant from now on, and I presume all other honourable members will be relevant as well.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to set the record straight and correct a few of the things which the Hon. Member for St. Barbe North, in the statements he made, particularly with reference to the polytechnical institute. I recall very vividly that it was 1966, just about this time of the year that the former Premier and myself drove up around Oxen Pond with the person who is now the Leader of the Opposition in the car and examined the site for the polytechnical institute. At that time, the word polytech had not been thought of or used. After examining that area up there, adjacent to the university, we came back and the late Phil Henley, who was the Deputy Minister of Education at the time, I mentioned this to him when I got back to the office and he said, yes, it is a good idea, we should call it a polytech. That afternoon in the House of Assembly I spoke to the Premier and said, a good name for this thing would be a polytechnical institute and right away he made an announcement, in 1966, that we were going to have a polytechnical institute. That is the first time the word was ever thought of or used in this House. But periodically, from then until I left the government -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. EARLE: I left that government in 1969 but periodically between then, after I had long since been Minister of Education, the term was used frequently, and it invariably promised that this was going to be done. Now that was five years before we came into power and there was nothing done on that except talk.

The government has been in for just about three years, and at least we have now said that we are going to have the plans drawn and will proceed with construction. After three years in office we are going to produce the plans for such a complex and are going to build it, which nine years ago that particular institution was promised and on the drawing -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: Nine years ago.

Now as far as the residences are concerned the honourable member made reference to the fact that I had met with the students of the school over there. Frankly, I did not meet with them. And I would not meet with them until they offered an apology for their very rude and unbecoming behaviour, not to me, so much, as the Minister of Finance but to the guests of this House. I thought it was quite outrageous and an insult to this House of the behaviour the other day, and until an apology was made I would not meet with them. I can recognize and feel sympathy towards their cause because I know they felt very let down. But there is a way to do things properly, and it is time that young people, in fact all people in this Province learned that there is a right way to do things and a wrong way to do things. And rude and ungentlemanly and ignorant demonstrations are not the way to get the things you are looking for. But if you approach government in a proper way, sit down and talk to them, then we, of course, will be prepared to talk to them. And I am glad that the thing seems to have gotten back on the tracks now and that people are talking sensibly. But most certainly, the kind of thing that we witnessed the other day, I hope we will never witness again because that is not the way for any student body or any group in Newfoundland to get things done.

MR. F. ROWE: In replying to the honourable Minister of Finance, Mr. Chairman, he says there is a right and wrong way to do a thing. I could not agree with him more, Sir. And I would submit that one of the wrong ways of doing things is to write a letter to students

promising them something in November for the Spring, and then breaking that promise, and then turning around and having the gall to accuse the students for their behaviour down in the lobby of this building. I submit that it was this administration that did the wrong thing in that case and not the students, Sir.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Two wrongs do not make a right, "Fred", you know.

Do not be talking such foolishness.

MR. F. ROWE: I am not submitting, Mr. Chairman, that two wrongs make a right but if people are going to start pontificating -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: - on what is right and what is wrong, the same rules should apply to government as it does to the students of this Province.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Chairman, on that particular point. I think the public of the Province are entitled to know on matters of that nature, you know, of where the honourable gentleman stands. Because surely if the taxpayers of this Province - if we put public funds into education and we own and staff building of that nature and the same thing happened at Memorial University - does the spokesman for the Opposition, the critic on education, does he agree with the occupations of these premises by students like what happened at Memorial University, and what happened over at the Trades College? That is the question here. Do they agree, unequivocally, do they agree that were students do not get what they want - do not smile - that is the issue here - it is just simply quite plain - does the Opposition feel that any group of public servants be they policemen, or firemen, or teachers or anyone, that they take over public property, that they occupy? Do they agree with that? Because that is the question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. F. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: And everybody feels in a democratic country that they

have a right to manifest their objections and make it known to the authorities. But does any group in the Province - any group, the people in this building who are working do they have a right to say to the company you are not allowed in that building, which is what happened in that Trade School?

Now the question I am asking the honourable gentleman is, does he agree that they are entitled to occupy these buildings?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. AYLWARD: The question is not whether that letter - that is not the issue -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: That is not the issue whether the honourable gentleman wrote the letter. But does he agree that they should occupy those buildings?

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the students of the College of Trades and Technology have the same right to bar members of this Assembly or any of their guests from the gymnasium of the College of Trades and Technology as a symbolic action of their reaction to a broken promise, they have the same right to bar this crowd or any other crowd from the gymnasium of this building as this government has the right to bar the doors to the fishermen -

AN HON. MEMBER: They have more.

MR. F. ROWE: when they came into St. John's and left them out in the cold -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. ROWE: and locked them out of the Confederation Building during one of their demonstrations.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. ROWE: This is what these students have the same right to do.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: More right. More right.

MR. F. ROWE: If the honourable member from Placentia East is trying to get me to stand up and condone criminal activity or destruction of property or anything of that nature, I would not even be so foolish as to try to answer the question. I just -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, if I can finish my remarks. Nobody in a democratic society, Mr. Chairman, can object to peaceful demonstrations that neither cause bodily injury nor destruction to property. There was neither destruction of property nor bodily injury incurred. The students were simply peacefully demonstrating.

I would ask the member for Placentia East whether he is against that.

MR. AYLWARD: No -

MR. F. ROWE: I would submit that the students - I know the member for Placentia East is simply trying to trap me into saying that I condone violence, or something foolish like that. I will say this and I will repeat it, the students of the College of Trades and Technology had the same right to bar us from a cocktail party as this government -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: More. More. More.

MR. F. ROWE: -and probably more right, justifiably more right than the government had to bar the fishermen from the Burin Peninsula out in the cold from the lobby of the Confederation Building a few months ago.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, may I respond to that because that is one of the most irresponsible statements, in my opinion, that has ever been made in this House. The simple fact of the matter is that the -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: The simple fact is that the College of Trades and Technology, which is owned by the Government of Newfoundland, administered by the Board of Governors, cannot be taken over by students or anyone else,

and anyone who is coming in for any lawful purpose cannot be barred from that building. There is no point putting the adjective peaceful on it because it has nothing to do with it. The simple fact is, Mr. Chairman, that we have an obligation as members of this House, I have an obligation as Minister of Justice, to see to it that people of this province are allowed to go about their lawful business without interruption by anyone, but anyone.

Mr. Chairman, may I say I was not in the province when this happened, but I have read about it. I commend the position that allegedly was taken by the honourable the member for Twillingate when I am told - if he did not say it, so be it, but if he did say it and I am told that he said that no one, but no one, no responsible person in government, should ever give in to that kind of pressure. If that is his philosophy then he stands out in his own party, and he stands out as a kind of representative and a kind of member that we should have in this House. I just simply want to make it very, very clear so that there can be no misunderstanding, that there are many ways for the people of this province, for pressure groups, for minority groups, to let government know, be it the provincial government or the Government of Canada or a municipal government, as to what they feel they are entitled to receive. If they do not receive it, they have a very effective means of dealing with it through the ballot box, but they are not going to deal with it through breaches of law and order. This is a very simple statement.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, just one last comment. It is unfortunate that this red herring had to be dragged into it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: I was asked a question, for Heaven's sake. The honourable member for Placentia East asked a question and I had at least enough courage to answer it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: It is too bad the -

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

Honourable gentlemen to my left may wish to participate in this debate, although it may or may not be irrelevant. It is dealing with the College of Trades and Technology and I suppose it is relevant although I have not been asked to adjudicate upon that.

The honourable member for St. Barbe North has the right to be heard in silence and certainly the matter has been the cause of some serious debate. I would think that he should be given the opportunity to air his remarks with silence from members to his left.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to,

MR. F.B. ROWE: you know, like to simply restate that I nor any of my colleagues condone violence.

AN HON. MEMBER: Was there any violence?

MR. F.B. ROWE: There was certainly no violence, there was a symbolic act and I would submit, Sir, that it would have been much better if the Member for Placentia East had to direct the question to the Minister of Fisheries, who several years ago advocated civil disobedience in this Province unless they got their own way.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. F.B. ROWE: Now, let the honourable member put that question to the honourable the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: I was not going to speak in this debate, Mr. Chairman, because as you know I am reluctant to speak in this House unless it is absolutely necessary. The honourable gentleman just made a statement which I cannot allow to go unchallenged. Several years ago, he said, I advocated civil disobedience. Now let us get that in context. I never did advocate it as he says it, but on a certain occasion, Mr. Chairman, in October of 1971, a vast majority of the people of this Province voted the government then in office out of power. I think it was that the political system was gerrymandered and of course the number of seats did not reflect the percentage of the popular vote, and they clung on with their fingernails and they clung on with their toenails from October until January.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I am talking about civil disobedience. I will show you how relevant I am now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will let the honourable member show his relevance but he will have to do it fairly quickly.

MR. CROSBIE: All right. While that government was clinging to office, and attempting to do things which should not be done in those circumstances, and while they were refusing to leave office and trying every stratagem and deception they could to stay in office, I said that the people of this province, if they did not

obey the constitutional conventions, should certainly consider civil disobedience, because the government in power was no longer entitled to be there. It had been voted out of office and would not accept the verdict of the electorate.

I would do that again and I certainly believe in that. And if it were necessary I would have gone to jail to get that bunch out after they had been defeated by the electorate overwhelmingly. Now how does this relate to what the honourable gentleman has been asked? When there is a speck of trouble, Mr. Chairman, in this Province at all, whether it is vocational school students, technical college students, whether it is on the roads somewhere the women are putting up a picket line, wherever there is any trouble, a strike, if there is a strike anywhere, if there is a spot of trouble and bother anywhere in this Province, wherever there has been in the last three years a spot of trouble, the honourable gentlemen opposite, their noses start to twitch like rodents in heat. Their noses start to twitch and they try to add to that trouble. They are so delighted, they are so pleased that there is a spot of trouble going on -

MR. F.B. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think we are really very irrelevant at this stage of the game, and if the minister is allowed to continue in this vein I would certainly like to reply to every single comment that he has made -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no. (Remainder inaudible)

MR. F.B. ROWE: Either one of two things, Sir. I simply ask it now, either the minister be ruled out of order on the grounds of irrelevancy or I be given the opportunity to reply to the statements that he is making at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

While debate on the College of Trades and Technology has ranged far and wide, and we have touched virtually every subject that could have been touched, and as that appears to have been the

wish of the committee, both honourable members to my left and honourable members to my right, and to stop a locomotive of that type when it has gathered this kind of momentum is rather difficult and the honourable members are now asking the Chairman to do that.

I can only say that the honourable the Minister of Fisheries did bring his remarks into relevance to some extent and further expansion on them, I suppose, would be irrelevant. Since honourable members have now revoked the latitude that each had given the other, the Chair will now begin to enforce relevancy to the letter.

MR. CROSBIE: Well now, to get back into the Technical College, right back to the Technical College and the recent demonstration. Mr. Chairman, there is a world of difference between a group of students or a group of whoever they are making their complaint known or making their grievance known, and

a group of students or a group of people, whoever they are, physically stopping other people going about their lawful business proceeding into the Technical College, the auditorium, at a reception tendered by the Minister of Finance after his Budget Speech. Honourable gentlemen opposite call it a cocktail party. Well, that is supposed to be, you know, an insult. That is supposed to show that this government is a government that is having cocktail parties every day and it is time students stopped this riotous outburst of cocktail parties.

Now, there are two a year, Mr. Chairman, one the Speaker has, and one the Minister of Finance after the Budget. Now, if they had demonstrated or had carried placards and did not obstruct people going into that reception, fine. They had some placards there. They indicated their displeasure with what they were displeased about, number one, but for a group of students or anyone else to physically block the public auditorium in that building, stop the members of the government and the Opposition and their guests from entering into that room to a reception, that is behaviour that is not excusable. It is certainly not lawful and certainly should not be applauded and for the honourable Member for St. Barbe North to indicate that it has his approval because there was no violence -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ALYWARD: Yes, he did. Yes, he did. Yes, he did.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, because the member said he does not condone violence but he condones everything else but violence. Well, I mean, by violence, I suppose, somebody punching you in the face. He does not condone that. If the students had punched the Minister of Education in the face, then the honourable gentleman would not condone that, But the students blocking the Minister of Education and the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Industrial Development

and their guests and so on from the auditorium physically and pushing them out when they went in to try to get them to leave, that is violence. If anybody puts their finger on you that is violence. For him to condone that, a pretty low, it indicates a pretty low standard. I am shocked and surprised the honourable gentleman would condone that. You know, if we are going to condone that, then you will not have any government in this Province at all. It is the same on the picket line. You are entitled to carry a sign and ask people to respect your picket line and inform them you are on strike but you are not entitled to stop them from going in and out if they chose to ignore your signs. It is exactly the same in the Technical College or anywhere else.

Now, the honourable gentleman has put himself squarely on the record. He condones all kinds of illegal activities as long as nobody gets punched, kicked or assaulted while this is going on. Now, the only reason no one was punched, kicked or assaulted was because the ministers who went in and were pushed out did not resist. But if one of them had gotten really angry, then there could have been considerable violence. The honourable gentleman apparently condones that kind of activity. Well, we do not, and I certainly know that I do not and people can make their point without that kind of obnoxious and unnecessary behaviour.

But, the Member for Placentia East has done a valuable service because the Member for St. Barbe North has shown what their philosophy is. Anything that embarrasses the government, no matter what it leads to, is all right with the Opposition.

MR. ROWE: With respect to - I will be very short because I would like to get back on, you know, matters pertaining strictly to the College of Trades and Technology, But I would like to just point out that this is an interpretation that the Minister of

Fisheries has placed on my philosophy and it is certainly not my -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: It is not my philosophy -

MR. ALYWARD: No, Mr. Chairman, I mean as an elected Member of the House of Assembly. The public should know what he said.

MR. ROWE: Is this a point of order? Mr. Chairman, is this a point of order?

MR. ALYWARD: Yes, a point of order.

MR. ROWE: Okay, then say so.

MR. ALYWARD: The point of order is, what is your - would you

MR. SIMMONS: That is not a point of order. Learn the rules. Learn the rules.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ALYWARD: Would you please, once and for all, make your position clear?

MR. SIMMONS: Learn the rules.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, are you going to - I am trying to indicate -

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

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: - Lo and behold!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Well, the point of order is really the only rule of order that any honourable member needs to learn when he comes in the House because it supercedes all others. I suggest that the point made by the honourable member was not a point of order, but it is the device that is customarily used when a person wants to make a statement. The honourable the Member for St. Barbe North has the floor.

MR. ROWE: I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I will not sit here in this committee and have the honourable the Minister of Finance put words into my mouth. It is as simple as that.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible..

March 20, 1975.

Tape 574

RH - 4

MR. ROWE: If the gentlemen on the other side, Mr. Chairman, would just allow me to be heard, I might be able to make my point. Now, with this constant babbling from the other side, it is quite conceivable that one could become flustered enough over on this side to say exactly what they want to hear me say.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Say it!

MR. ROWE: Now, why do they not just clam up for a few moments and let me say what I wish to say.

MR. SIMMONS: He is back. He is back. Look.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You said it. You said it.

MR. ROWE: Now, I will

not have the honourable Minister of -

MR. HICKMAN: You made a charge when you said it.

MR. F. ROWE: I will not have the honourable Minister of Fisheries nor any other member of this committee, Sir, stand up and put words in my mouth. It is as simple as that. I have not advocated everything that is illegal except violence. I have never heard of anything so ridiculous in my life, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Shut up. Shut up. Shut up.

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: So, let that one rest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I would suspect that some honourable members to my left would want to reply to that remark. That remark is irrelevant, and maybe honourable members could debate it in some other forum.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave this subhead, I think

that the member for Placentia East in particular and others who have spoken on the other side have managed to blow this whole thing all out of proportion. If we go back to the original exchange between the Minister of Finance, and then responded to by my colleague, I believe the real perspective that needs to be restored on this point is that as my colleague said and I completely agree with him on this point, that what the students did at the College of Trades on Budget Day was certainly no more illegal than what the government of this province did when the fishermen came here to demonstrate. They were locked out of a public building. They were barred. They were barred in the same sense that I understand the Minister of Finance was barred.

So, if we are going to hear all kinds of comments about how wrong the action of the students was at the College of Trades, let us put it in perspective, Mr. Chairman, and let the records show that for their example they had the Government of Newfoundland who did the self same thing just a few weeks previous when the fishermen came here on a demonstration and tried to enter their own building and were prevented from doing so. They is illegal in every sense. If the students are at all blamable in this, the government must share part of the blame for setting the example a few weeks previous.

MR. AYLWARD: It is really astounding to hear this other honourable gentleman from Hermitage arise and enunciate really the same proposition and that is in effect, no matter what way they put it, they can dress it up in whatever language they like, but they agree wholeheartedly with the occupation of these premises by those students. What that means in effect is that if any of the public servants of the province who choose to occupy a building anywhere in the province supposing the Premier and the Minister of Health or any minister of the crown decides tomorrow that he wants to visit one of the public institutions in the province, and they decide that they have a beef with the government, there is a letter on file that someone promised to do something at a certain time and it is not done, so they are not going to allow entry into that building. I think the honourable gentleman from Twillingate

should really be applauded because what he stands for is law and order.

It is shocking for the press to record tomorrow that two elected members of the House of Assembly in Newfoundland stood up in their places and said they agreed, they have just as much right.

They are inviting rebellion in every public building in this province. Supposing tomorrow,

Mr. Chairman, that the public servants decide that they just do not like the wage offer or what is happening in Treasury Board, they had a letter that they were supposed to get this much money or that much money, Confederation Building should be closed down -

MR. F. ROWE: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: There are no points of order.

MR. F. ROWE: There is a point of order. I have been completely, and my colleague from Hermitage has been completely misquoted. The member for Placentia East said -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, can the point of order be heard. He said that two honourable members on this side of the House have now gone on record in inviting rebellion in this province. I ask the Chair to direct the honourable member to retract that statement because it was not said and neither was it suggested. He is blowing it out of all proportion, Mr. Chairman.

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

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is not a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe we have here a disagreement between two members. Both honourable members have said a lot. I must say the Chair does not have the powers of complete recall. I do not think that either honourable member has slandered the other. What one honourable member may understand from another honourable member's remarks, may not in fact be what the honourable member meant.

MR. SIMMONS: Sir, I would suggest to the committee that we have probably exhausted this subject, and if they would recall -

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Chairman, with respect, I do not think any other issue of such importance of magnitude will ever come before a committee again because law and order is at stake here. I do not think that we will ever be asked to vote on any question as important as this one that is presently before this committee. The question is simply this -

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I will not stand here and be painted as a person advocating illicit actions in the province.

MR. AYLWARD: He is painted, Mr. Chairman, whether he likes it or not. He has come down on the side of those students who occupied that building.

MR. F. ROWE: I ask the Chair to adjourn this committee and get the tapes down here and find out exactly what the honourable member said. He said that two members on this side of the House have invited rebellion in this province.

MR. AYLWARD: Exactly.

MR. F. ROWE: It was not stated, Sir, and I ask for adjournment of this committee -

MR. AYLWARD: What I said, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat -

MR. F. ROWE: I ask the member to retract his statement.

MR. AYLWARD: - statements of the nature and type made are inviting rebellion.

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

I am not sure how serious the honourable members wish the Chair to take this subject because at times the honourable members smile at one another, and the debate is somewhat light, and then it becomes fairly serious.

The Chair is not going to adjourn to hear the tapes. I doubt if it would be conclusive in any event. I will have to rely on my memory and my thoughts at the time the remarks were made or allegedly made. I believe that debate on the advisability or the conduct of students of the College of Trades and Technology is technically speaking irrelevant to this subhead. I rule in that way. Further debate on it will be ruled out of order.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect, I would just like to say this so that the honourable gentlemen opposite can understand quite clearly what I said. What I said was this, statements of the type and nature made by these gentlemen are inviting rebellion, and it is a shame -

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order -

MR. AYLWARD: _ and it is a shame that two elected members of the House of Assembly -

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, on this point of order -

MR. AYLWARD: - would say this during a debate.

MR. ROWE: The ruling has been made. The ruling has made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Now, the honourable member for Placentia East has risen in his place pretty well in direct defiance of the Chair's ruling. As I stated before, the honourable member's interpretation of what other honourable member's said, is a question of opinion. I certainly did not see anything in the honourable member's remarks that would indicate anything of that type.

However, if honourable members wish to get the tapes themselves and debate it in some other forum tomorrow or at some later date, then of course they can do so. Honourable members have other avenues of approaching this problem, but the basic one relevant to this subhead -

MR. AYLWARD: I accept the ruling of the Chair. I sincerely hope that other opportunities will be provided during this session to debate at large this very, very important issue.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, now before this item carries, the member for Placentia East has made some fairly controversial statements and some pretty irresponsible charges. I believe I, as one of the members involved, should have an opportunity to reply to them,

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, it was I think the later Judge Higgins who used to say, he used to tell a nice story about the lawyer who only listened to one side of the story so he could more easily make up his mind. We now know who that lawyer is, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Placentia East.

Mr. Chairman, the kind of thing he has gone on with, the diatribe, the nonsense that I have heard tonight about, what was it, inviting rebellion, he must have, Mr. Chairman, during one of his many absences from the House, read that phrase and decided to try it tonight somehow, Mr. Chairman.

MR. AYLWARD: Debate it, I will gladly debate it but if you are going to enforce your ruling well then I will accept it but certainly if the honourable gentleman is allowed to debate -

MR. SIMMONS: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that -

MR. AYLWARD: The point of order is, Mr. Chairman, that you have already ruled that all further debate on it is out of order and I accepted your ruling.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, to the point of order, I rose and asked the Chair for its indulgence to reply to the points that have been made by the Member for Placentia East. I think I have that right as a Member of the House. Or does he have some kind of licence to stand up here and heap all kinds of abuse without our having the opportunity to reply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! Now it would be a circuitous argument that the honourable member is proposing because if one honourable member is allowed to make -

AN HON. MEMBER: Call it eleven o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish I could. If one honourable member is allowed to reply, and of course then the other honourable member is allowed to reply and then the other honourable member is allowed to reply and we have the circle which would only be interrupted by eleven o'clock.

If the honourable member feels that this is a question of privilege, he can raise it at the first possible opportunity, which

is now, or which has already passed in this case, or when the Speaker is in the Chair, then maybe that is the proper procedure if the honourable member feels that it is a matter of such importance. However, it is not for the Chair to instruct honourable members in how to do certain things. It is the Chairman's responsibility to attempt to keep order and this has been relatively unsuccessfully for the past half hour or so.

I would suggest to honourable members if we could move on from 611-04 which has been thrashed about fairly well then we might get onto some other matters that are relevant and honourable members would have ample opportunity to make other comments.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, without responding to the members I would very much like to - to you point if I just might get some clarification. I would like to check the tapes, Mr. Chairman, and I cannot do that immediately so is it understood that my bringing up the matter with privilege can be done tomorrow because I do need to hear the tapes first to see what the member said exactly.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we have noted the honourable gentleman apparently has some objection, if he wants to check the tapes he can check the tapes and bring it up tomorrow or we do not care he can bring it up Monday, whenever he likes he can bring it up. As long as it is within the next couple of days, be reasonable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! On that particular point, the consent of the House Leader to my left is, well it is interesting but irrelevant. That would be a matter for the Chair to consider at the appropriate time. However, this whole argument, this whole last ten minutes of speaking to points of order has basically been hypothetical, all of which is out of order and it has been a device used by the Chair to occupy as much time as possible so that honourable members may cool off.

MR. ROBERTS: Well let us call it eleven o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that we might get on -

MR. SIMMONS: Perhaps my question was misunderstood, I understood, Mr. Chairman, to say something to the effect that the time for the matter of privilege was now passed and I was not being hypothetical. I was looking for some direction as to whether the Chair in effect said that I could not raise the matter having heard the tapes say tomorrow. I understood the Government House Leader to say that it was quite okay with him and I wanted to know if -

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I wanted to know if it was in keeping with the Chairman's ruling a minute ago.

MR. STAGG: It was hypothetical.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, it is not hypothetical.

I asked Mr. Chairman did he rule just now that the matter of privilege on this nonsense here that has been raised by the irresponsible member for Placentia East, did he rule that it could not be brought up as a matter of privilege or not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Maybe the Chair has not made itself clear to the honourable member. Certainly the Chair has acted as a buffer between honourable members, which is about as good as could be done under the circumstances.

The Chair does not give instruction to honourable members. The Chair may on occasion make gratuitous comments, but the Chair is protected in effect by one of the rules that hypothetical questions do not have to be answered.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted in some way - I think I have done it in the last minute or so - to record my objection to the fact that the Chair allowed the member unlimited time to heap abuse on us and did not permit us time to reply. That upsets me. At the right time I shall introduce the matter of privilege as soon as I can get the tapes to verify what went on. It is disgusting what has happened here tonight. We never got a chance to reply to what that Yahoo said.

MR. AYLWARD: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. You heard what this honourable gentleman said. I ask you here and now to ask him to withdraw that unequivocally.

MR. SIMMONS: I withdraw that.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

On motion 611-04 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 611-07 carried?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could indicate exactly -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: If the gentleman from St. John's Center would control himself, I realize it is a struggle for him.

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise. We will

come back to this tomorrow if the honourable does not -

MR. ROBERTS: I did not not even yield the floor to the honourable gentleman.

MR. CROSBIE: That is what I was going to say.

MR. ROBERTS: Since I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to yield to the honourable gentleman. Is Your Honour trying to say something?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe the Chair has the floor.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, well, hear! Hear!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is attempting to head off what appears to be a rather violent exchange - order please! - between the Minister of Social Services and the member for Hermitage. Now, you two honourable gentlemen may wish to carry on a conversation, a violent heated debate among yourselves out in the corridor. However, in this chamber the floor and the right to speak is reserved to the gentleman who happens to have it, who was the honourable the Leader of the Opposition. That is the point the Chair is wishing to make. So, the Chair recognizes the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the House Leader on the other side wants to call it a day as it were, since we are only five minutes short of automatic adjournment anyway, you know, let us rise, the committee, if that is what he intends to do and His Honour can come in and do whatever His Honour does when His Honour comes in when the Committee has raised at five to eleven at night.

MR. CROSBIE: I move, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

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

and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. EARLE: May I have permission of the House. I have with me two reports which were not in my possession early today. They were supposed to be presented at the same time I presented the earlier one, namely, the Report of the Liquor Licensing Regulations for 1974 and the Financial Administration Act requires that all temporary loans be registered within fifteen days. May I present these to the House?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, March 21, at eleven o'clock in the forenoon and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion that the House at its rising do now adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, March 21, at eleven of the clock.