



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 53

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1976

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present two petitions from my district of Lewisporte. One comes from the town of Birchy Bay. The other comes from the town of Campbellton. Both are signed by several hundred residents of both communities. They are both in connection with the electric rate, the electrical rates in the Province. They are opposed to, as we all are, to further increases in the electrical rates in the Province. Commenting on those petitions, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say one thing. I was going to bring it up when the estimates of the Minister of Mines and Energy's department were being discussed, but I did not at that particular occasion. I would like to bring it up now. That is that I think the people of Newfoundland should be told in the best possible way, in the best forecast possible just how far the electrical rates are going to go. I think it has become practically obvious during the last few weeks and months that we are not going to see any decrease in electrical rates in the Province. I think it has also become obvious that further increases will probably come into effect during the next year or two, or next couple of years and so on. So I think it is probably important that some attempt be made by the government, be made by the Minister of Mines and Energy to let the people know just how far and how bad and how severe electrical rates are going to become during the next few years so that people can plan accordingly. It has been suggested here in the House in the last few weeks that there are few wood stoves, for instance, being used anymore and that people are getting away from that kind of thing. Well I disagree. In my district this year there are hundreds of wood stoves that have been installed by people who are aware of the kinds of increases that we are going to see in the field of electricity and in oil in the next few years.

Now I think that people should be forewarned if electrical rates

MR. WHITE:

and oil increases are going to go, as we here in the House suspect that they will, and they should be told to prepare for the worst. One particular individual in my district has come up with a scheme, Mr. Speaker, whereby he has a combination oil and wood stove. When the temperature reaches a certain level the oil cuts in, and then when he fills up his furnace full of wood and as long as the wood is burning the oil does not take effect. But as soon as the temperature decreases as a result of the wood being burned out, then the oil cuts in. So it is a fantastic system that he has got going. More and more people are putting wood stoves in their basements. The heat consequently keeps the electrical rates down. So I think that some attempt should be made to warn the people of Newfoundland about electrical rates during the next few years so that they can guard themselves accordingly.

I would like to have those petitions tabled and presented to the department to which they relate.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Industrial Relations.

HON. F. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act." (Bill No. 47)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

HON. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act For The Avoidance Of Uncertainty Concerning Certain Judgments Issuing Out Of The Supreme Court Of Newfoundland", (Bill No. 46); and on behalf of my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Finance, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Corporation Act." (Bill No. 49)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. J. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Acquisition Of Rights To Minerals In The Province", (Bill No. 50); and a bill, "An Act Respecting The Acquisition Of Rights To Quarry Materials Within The Province", (Bill No. 51); and a bill, "An Act To Amend The Mining And Mineral Rights Tax Act." (Bill No. 52)

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: My question is for the Minister of Education. As all hon. members are aware, teachers have been granted a system of sabbatical leave this year, and the numbers of teachers to get that sabbatical leave is at the discretion of the minister. I wonder if the minister is in a position to inform the House how many teachers will get sabbatical leave this year and probably where they come from, not their communities, but whether they are from the Island part of the Province or Labrador?

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

MR. HOUSE: I would presume, Mr. Speaker, that he is referring to the recent announcement I made this year, I am talking about this current year.

MR. LUSH: This current year.

MR. HOUSE: This current year.

Well there are two this current year. I named them in a statement here the other day, and one was Wilfred Rumbolt, and the other is Monica Moriarity. She is from -

MR. PECKFORD: St. Mary's Bay, I believe.

MR. HOUSE: St. Mary's Bay? Possibly, I am not sure of that. And Mr. Rumbolt is from the Labrador Coast.

The collective agreement gives the teachers control of the selection of these people, and there is a committee set up from the NTA, Department of Education, and the Federation of School Boards, two members of each. They set up their own guidelines for the selection and what they would look for, the criteria. And first of all they selected those teachers who have given a fair amount of service, number one, and who still have not obtained an undergraduate degree. They selected these teachers. And it came down to twelve people. They took a lot of things into consideration. The opportunity that people had for upgrading, for instance, were they near centres where university courses were being offered. And then, of course, they selected from the

Mr. House:

twelve people, and probably these twelve had a lot in common. But the only thing they did from there on in, of course, was made the selection and most of the committee agreed with the two that were given the selection. My interference in it, if you could call it an interference, was just announcing the two people that the committee had selected.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have a supplementary?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No!

MR. LUSH: I realize that the minister probably by virtue of his statement was not all that involved in it, but I am just wondering if the minister can provide the House with, briefly or table it, whatever the situation might be, the kinds of guidelines that were used or what the criteria were? And I ask this for a specific reason. So probably the minister could comment on it. Or let us say he mentioned the guidelines. How was the

criteria received, or how was it obtained by the Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: I can attempt, Mr. Speaker, to get the guidelines. But as I understand it, the Committee was set up representing the three bodies I mentioned, and they determined their guidelines. They determined their own guidelines from there. Bearing in mind, of course, that was in the collective agreement. I think that is the way it would be done.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has a supplementary.

MR. LUSH: I would like for the minister to be able to provide the House with the guidelines and how it was that the criteria were obtained, because I know of one particular person who applied, and he was asked simply to give his name and social insurance number.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: I think there were better guidelines than that, but I will attempt to get it for the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. the member for Twillingate and then the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Government House Leader, the Minister without Portfolio, if it is the intention of the government, who, of course, have the - except on Wednesdays - sole right to call the order of business of the House, to have the Speech from the Throne debated? Two hon. members have so far, I believe, spoken in that debate on a speech that was brought down five months ago; and to call also the debate on the Budget Speech, and I believe that on that I do not think anyone except the minister has yet said a word; and the resolution on Come By Chance, on which only the minister who introduce the resolution and the Leader of the Opposition, in part, have so far spoken. The three great, major debates of this session, is it the intention of the government to call them or are they going to wait until all other business is done, which would be the most extraordinary and unusual and unprecedented occurrence in parliamentary history, I think? Are we going to have these debates?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have these debates.

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

MR. ROBERTS: A question for the Minister of Mines and Energy.

Would he tell the House, Sir, whether the government are giving consideration to the alleged offer, and I say 'alleged' because I rely only on press reports, by the Government of Quebec to purchase 7,500 square miles of Labrador either in their own name or through Quebec-Hydro?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

HON. J. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members know, it is pretty hard not to know, I had a meeting with the Minister of Natural Resources yesterday in Quebec City, with the Hon. Jean Cournoyer, and the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the suggestion we have made to the Government of Quebec and Quebec-Hydro that the Government of Newfoundland would like to have available in the Upper Churchill project an additional 600 megawatts of power in addition to the amount that CFLCo has the right to recall under the power contract, which amounts to 300 megawatts. Now the 300 megawatts that CFLCo already has the right to recall, some of that has been recalled and is needed for use in Labrador. In fact about 100 megawatts is needed for use in Labrador by the Iron Ore Company and other customers in Labrador. That leaves 200 megawatts from the amount that CFLCo has the right to recall. And the Province has asked for an additional 600 megawatts to be made available in 1982 at the same price as is provided for in the contract between CFLCo and Quebec-Hydro. That matter was discussed with Premier Bourassa and Mr. Cournoyer about a month ago. And this meeting was a follow-up meeting at which Mr. Cournoyer was to suggest alternatives to our suggestion. The meeting was held yesterday.

In the meantime, as hon. gentlemen know, Mr. Cournoyer has made several statements that have ruffled the waters of the whole situation, uninvited, but asked by the press. I met with him yesterday to discuss whatever other suggestions the Government of Quebec had. And naturally, Mr. Speaker, these are hardly

Mr. J. Crosbie:

matters in which, while negotiations are going on, one does not disclose them until they are concluded. In any event at the end of that meeting it was agreed, because he had brought up the boundary question, that I was certainly going to tell the press that we had repudiated any boundary suggestions, and that presumably he would refer to it himself, and there would be no other discussion. We would not tell the press anything else that we had discussed. There are no decisions being reached, it was only information to communicate back to our government, this government here by me.

In the meantime after the press conference I restricted myself to what had been agreed. Then Mr. Cournoyer went on to suggest several other things that had been discussed, or suggested by him. So I will discuss what he has discussed in public. At that meeting, the meeting opened up with Mr. Cournoyer suggesting that if the Government of Quebec made 600 additional megawatts available from the Upper Churchill, that these boundaries should be adjusted. He had already brought the question up. So that was given tremendously short shift because, as I told him, as he already knew, and I assume he was just raising this for his own political reasons, that the Government of Newfoundland and no person in Newfoundland would contemplate for one second any adjustment in the boundary -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: - or any change in the boundary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: So I was not going to discuss that further and if that is what he wanted to discuss of course this would be a very short meeting. So then he dropped that, of course, he accepted our position as he must. He has no choice but to accept it. He then went on to suggest, and I am mentioning this because he has mentioned this publicly, and, you know, it is an extraordinary way to try to conduct any negotiation. It makes it very difficult if not impossible.



MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Cournoyer suggested this, then went on to other alternatives that he wanted to discuss in return for this alleged concession of our having 600 megawatts from the Upper Churchill, in excess of

MR. CROSBIE:

QPLCo's right to recall a certain amount of power. He suggested that Quebec - whether he is talking for his government or not, I can only assume that he is - that Quebec would like to have the right to purchase the land involved in the watersheds of the five rivers that originate in Labrador and then go through Labrador into the Gulf of St. Lawrence, that they would want to purchase this land. The area of the land involved would be somewhere from 7,000 to 10,000 square miles, but of course they would be subject to the sovereignty of the Province of Newfoundland and would have nothing to do with the boundaries. But they would purchase the land and own it so that they could develop the hydro power on these rivers if they wished to in the future.

I told him that in my view no government of Newfoundland would agree to sell any land to Quebec-Hydro or to the Province of Quebec, and certainly not any -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: But naturally I was not there to make decisions, but however I was there to report back to my own cabinet, the Premier's cabinet, which I did this morning and the cabinet has confirmed and I can now confirm that what I told Mr. Cournoyer yesterday is the exact position. The government of Newfoundland is not prepared to sell one square inch of land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: I did say that we would be prepared to discuss the question of their developing those rivers which originate in Newfoundland but where the dam sites would have to be down in the Province of Quebec. We would be prepared to discuss development of those rivers either on a joint basis or discuss possible leasing of water rights or rights to flood or some arrangement like that if that was necessary and if some sensible arrangement could be arrived at which would be to our mutual advantage and if we also obtain what we are looking for with respect to additional power from the Upper

MR. CPOSBIE:

Churchill. Then that and other matters were discussed.

Of course among the matters discussed was the price of power. If they consent that we should recapture another 600 megawatts at what price should this be at? As I have told the House we have suggested that the price should be the same price as Quebec-Hydro is paying. Mr. Cournoyer has suggested that the price should be the replacement cost of the power to Quebec or to Newfoundland in 1982, which would make it very costly indeed. I have told them that that is not acceptable to us and we would not agree to pay such a price. Other matters were discussed. I am mentioning these two things because he has already mentioned them publicly. And we had a discussion for about an hour and a quarter on matters generally along those lines and concerning hydro in Newfoundland and Labrador and Quebec.

So I cannot describe the rest of what was discussed except to say naturally no decisions have been reached. That is where the matter lies. The government of Newfoundland has made no decision on any of these points. The whole situation will have to be carefully reassessed and I do not doubt but that the Premier will be discussing this with Premier Bourassa in due course and before much further time has gone.

But just let me make it quite clear that it is abundantly clear - and this is a false issue anyway - that the government of Newfoundland has no intention of any adjustment in the boundary supposing we all starve to death. Suppose we lost the lights in the whole Province we would not agree to give anything up in connection with the Newfoundland and Labrador boundary. I also made it clear what has been confirmed by the cabinet today - I was not there to make decisions on my own, naturally - that the government is not prepared to consider or discuss the sale of any land to Quebec-Hydro or to Quebec inside Newfoundland and Labrador. I have made it quite clear that the price he is suggesting for any recalled block of power is certainly not a price that we are going to agree to or anything close to it. There the matter rests until it is discussed at a higher level, I guess, between the Premier and Premier Bourassa.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the hon. minister. I cannot help but regret that it is too bad we have to do this in Question Period, because if ever there was a subject that this House should debate it is this, and it cannot be debated at Question Period. Indeed we are restricted to asking questions which by nature must be brief, whereas the minister, of course, quite properly has the right to expound at some length. But it is too bad, because it means we cannot really debate it. However, I shall raise the matter. I will give notice and ask to have it raised under Standing Order 32, I believe it is, this afternoon. At least we will have five minutes each on it.

Mr. Speaker, the supplementary would be quite simple: Where do we go from here with particular reference to when do we get some decision? I ask that because, of course, the House was told before Christmas in the debate, which we were allowed to have, that, you know, we were risking \$55 million, I believe it was, on the project this year, on a gamble that we would be able to make an accommodation with Quebec. It now seems as if the chance for that gamble paying off are narrowing down, although the matter may not be resolved, and I hope it is not. But the question is really where do we go from here? I regret only that I can only ask a question as I am not allowed to make a statement. Indeed perhaps we could, by agreement, have a motion to adjourn the House and debate that for a couple of hours this afternoon. It would be more important than what we will probably end up doing. But in any event I have asked the question and let us see what the government's response will be.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, well with respect to any suggestion of an emergency debate, there is hardly an emergency to debate.

MR. ROBERTS: There is an urgency of debate.

MR. CROSBIE: That can be argued later, I am answering the hon. gentleman's question, if that was part of it. With respect to the rest of the question, the government, of course, is now and will be for the next week or two weeks, however long it takes, reassessing our position to decide exactly what alternatives we will pursue. There are a number of alternatives. We will also have to decide in the next couple of weeks whether we continue on with the transmission line and the tunnel during this year, or whether we would postpone it for the rest of this year while the steps that we are going to take are decided and carried out. There has been no decision made on that naturally. You cannot make decisions until we have ascertained what the final position of the Province of Quebec is, and that will certainly have to be ascertained in the next several weeks. So the government will be reviewing the whole situation in detail. Doubtless the Premier will be meeting with Mr. Bourassa. The government will then make a decision as to the course we are going to pursue. The government will then inform the House of Assembly what the position is. If hon. gentlemen want to debate it, we would be more than delighted to have a debate on it, and so ample opportunity will occur for a debate. But at the moment there has naturally been no decision made.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. member for LaPoile, then the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to sort of draw the hon. Premier into this matter, if I could, Sir. As the head of the administration the hon. Premier will be the one who will be heading up the delegation to meet with Mr. Bourassa. I wonder if the Premier would care to make a statement to the House on just what attitude, what position, he will be taking when he is meeting with Mr. Bourassa? Will be it a tough, hard-nosed position and point out, as Mr. Cournoyer did, that Newfoundland does not intend to budge

Mr. Neary.

one fraction of an inch on discussing the boundaries? I would like to hear that from the Premier and not from one of his underlings, the Minister of Mines and Energy who has shifted his ground so often?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, without the added remarks it is fine, but the Minister of Mines and Energy has stated the government's position very clearly here this afternoon. But there are just a few things I think that if it is for the edification of the member or for the House, it should be clarified. First of all, that before any decision is made regarding power from Labrador and how it is going to be dealt with, the House will be discussing it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before a decision is taken?

PREMIER MOORES: Before the decision is taken, of course.

Because what is said here I think it is of such major importance to this Province that I think it is absolutely critical that -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow me?

Does this mean that the House would debate it before the decision is taken by the government, or does he mean that the government would take a decision subject to the confirmation of the House? Which is it?

PREMIER MOORES: Before any agreement is signed with Quebec.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not signed but made, made but not signed, signed if the House approves, which is it? This is terribly important.

PREMIER MOORES: It will be fully discussed in the House to make sure that everyone is on side. And hopefully what we will decide as a government will be on side with the House.

MR. NEARY: Before the government -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before it is final?

PREMIER MOORES: Before we commit ourselves to any third party it will be discussed here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman will allow me. The normal practice is for a government to deal with a government or deal with a corporation or with an individual and come to a tentative agreement subject to debate and confirmation by the House. Is that what the hon. gentleman means?

PREMIER MOORES: What I am saying is that there will be government to government negotiations as there are now, Mr. Speaker, and after those negotiations have come to the stage where a possible agreement can be signed it will be fully debated here in the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before it is signed?

PREMIER MOORES: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Before the government is committed?

PREMIER MOORES: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Committed subject to approval of government?

PREMIER MOORES: Yes. Sir, with due respect on the semantics, there are a few other things I would like to say. The Minister of Mines and Energy has already stated that not one square inch of Labrador will be sold nor will the boundary be changed. That is a fact.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: If the power from Labrador is developed it will be developed for the benefit of the people of this Province in Labrador and on the Island part of the Province and not for the benefit of any other province but primarily for ourselves. That in itself is in the Canadian interest.

I would also like to say that hopefully a final position should be established as far as this government is concerned, because negotiations of this sort can go on and on and on. Within the next two to three weeks, at the outside - I will be seeing Premier Bourassa next week in Ottawa - in three weeks hopefully we will be in a position to state what Newfoundland is prepared to negotiate (full stop). As opposed to carrying on and on and on by months and by years and with the sort of thing we have seen this last month. We will have our final position established. We will have contacted the federal

DELETED MOOPES:

government to see if there are pipelines that can go inter-provincial, why transmission and energy cannot go inter-provincial, as opposed to having a broker, the only broker on your boundary.

We will talking about - and I allow most people agree - about the contract as it is. **There** has been no contract in recent years that has been for sixty-five years with no reopener, and see what can or cannot be done. Sir I hope it does not get to this stage, but there are a lot of things that the government can do which cannot be discussed at this time, even including suggesting to the Olympic Commission that they get enough candles to hold their event.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Mines and Energy whether there was any discussion between him and the Quebec minister of the idea of a joint development of the water power that can be developed from rivers originating in our Labrador but flowing into Quebec, and requiring either what Quebec is asking, that they get the 7,500 miles of territory, or lease it or buy it or some kind of joint effort. In other words is there any discussion or thought in the government that the development of that power might be a joint thing by both provinces as indeed at the moment the development of the Upper Churchill is a joint thing between the two provinces, because the two provinces own Churchill Falls, the Upper Churchill? Is the same idea in the government's mind perhaps with regard to those rivers originating in Labrador but flowing through Quebec and emptying into the North Shore, emptying into the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, this government has always been prepared to consider joint development of those rivers if it is in the interests of both provinces to do that. That has been discussed in general terms. But as I said here a few minutes ago, what Mr. Cournoyer suggested yesterday was not any joint development of these rivers, but that Quebec should purchase the land or be granted the land and



MR. CROSBIE:

develop it themselves.

MR. ROBERTS: There is no difference between that and changing the boundaries, is there?

MR. CROSBIE: Well they would be subject to our sovereignty so called.

MR. ROBERTS: If the constitution calls for it.

MR. CROSBIE: So, Mr. Speaker, we are willing to discuss that kind of development but it has not been discussed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They know that?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, they have been told that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They know that a joint development is feasible, that the government would consider it?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, that is right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry. The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to come back to an aspect of what the minister said in answering the initial question when he made reference to Mr. Cournoyer and Mr. Cournoyer's having made some public statements apparently contrary to a mutual agreement that the two ministers had undertaken. I am wondering, in view of this, if the minister would indicate to the House what he feels the problem may be. Was it a strict case of the Quebec minister having gone out and done something contrary to the mutual agreement, or was there a language problem? What, for instance, was the language of discussion at the conference? Was the minister dealing through a translator or was one of the ministers dealing through a translator?

The larger question really which I am wanting to ask here is is the minister, Mr. Cournoyer, speaking for the government of Quebec in the opinion of our minister or is he in some way spouting off some rather personal opinions which may or may not represent the consensus of the government of Quebec on the matter?

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to speculate as to why Mr. Cournoyer does the things he does or acts as he does. But it was specifically agreed that we would say nothing about our conversation except, since I knew he was going to say the boundary had been discussed, I said I was certainly going to say that it had been repudiated, but that we would not discuss the alternatives. Now why he went on to discuss other things I do not know. As to whether he is speaking for the Government of Quebec, I can only assume that, because a month ago Premier Bourassa -

MR. NEARY: If he is the minister you must assume that.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, you must assume that, in the first place, the speaks for the government, and because it had been agreed by Premier Bourassa and our own Premier that they will come back with their positions at a meeting as soon as it could be agreed on, so therefore I presume that this is Mr. -

MR. NEARY: That is typical.

MR. CROSBIE: - I do not want to interrupt the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I can only assume that this is and must be the position of the Government of Quebec. And now as to why Mr. Cournoyer wants to discuss these patent matters publicly in this manner I do not know.

MR. SPEAKER: I will recognize the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir for a supplementary and then the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. SIMMONS: Would the minister first of all indicate the language of the discussion at the meeting, was it French or English?

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the language of our discussion was English since I am not fluent in French. I did meet a chap who said, - we were asking directions and he said, "You go to the left." And I said, "You mean allez gauche." And he then came back at me with a rapid fire of French speech and I had to pretend to understand, and I got lost.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is something like you would do.

MR. CROSBIE: So they were conducted in English, but Mr. Cournoyer understands English very well, he is quite fluent and he had three

Mr. Crosbie:

officials with him, and I had three officials all of whom understand English, Mr. Wally Reid, Mr. Dave Mercer of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, and Mr. Steve Millan of the Department of Mines and Energy so I mean it is clearly understood.

MR. SIMMONS: And now for my supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I said that I would recognize the hon. member for LaPoile after since it is getting close to the end of the Question Period.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have not put my supplement yet.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame!

MR. NEARY: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Premier. Now that Bronfmans have taken over Trizec would the hon. Premier indicate to the House if the government now is in the process, or if there are any negotiations going on with Trizec or the Bronfmans to enter into an agreement to rent office space in the downtown proposed office building?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the proposal is no more or less swallowable now than it was then.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to the Minister of Mines and Energy on a supplementary to what I said, as soon as the meeting is over between the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. My supplementary really, would the minister feel that if the future discussions were taking place with the head of the Quebec Government rather than the Minister, Mr. Cournoyer, that we could expect different results than he is obviously having with the Minister, Mr. Cournoyer?

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, that is a difficult question to answer.

I think it would be wrong to say whether you are optimistic or pessimistic about any discussions. But it is often true, however, that after the ministers have met and taken certain positions, then the Premiers get together, and being the elder statesmen that they are,

Mr. Crosbie:

they come to some arrangement. That could be true in this case. I know in our own case here we have got a real statesman. And that it may be that Mr. Bourassa would be as statesmanlike as our own Premier. So it is still -

MR. NEARY: You have got a real charmer in this Premier.

I do not know what they have in Quebec.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, he is not as charming as our hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I should point out that this will be the last question and answer.

MR. NEARY: So far this session I have put 137 questions, written questions, on the Order Paper and I have only gotten twenty-six answers.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised.

MR. NEARY: Would the Premier -

MR. CROSBIE: This is not a question, this is a speech. The hon. gentleman is telling the House how many questions he has put on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: No I am asking the Premier when I can expect to -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - get the answers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! When a point of order comes up even if the answer seems self-evident presumably it is not supposed to be left dangling. The hon. minister is quite correct in saying that the preamble must be as brief as possible and not give information. However the hon. gentleman has not finished the sentence to my recollection, so I would have no way of knowing whether he was attempting to give unnecessary information or a preamble.

MR. NEARY: Well I am asking the Premier when I can expect to get an answer to 111 questions out of 137 that I placed on the Order

Mr. Neary:

Paper so far this session, when the other 111 questions will be answered?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the questions will be answered immediately upon the information being found out and being able to passed on.

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling Orders of the Day, and if I am right in presuming that I will not be given notice of any further questions pursuant to the Standing Order with respect to the five o'clock procedure, and the only reason I say that is in case the House is going into Committee not to have interrupt it at five o'clock, and I presume I am right there because nobody has indicated to the contrary, then I could inform hon. members now of the matters to be debated at five-thirty.

I have been given notice of four - and of course the Standing Order and the time available only will allow for three to be actually debated, not for notice for only three, but for three to be actually debated. I received two from the same hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition and I have consulted with him as to which of the two he would prefer since only one of them could be debated, and he has indicated his wish and that is the one which will be selected.

The three matters are: The first one of which notice was given me on April 9 by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has to deal with matters arising out of his question to the Minister of Mines and Energy but in the absence from the House of the Minister of Justice, with respect to the hon. member's question with respect to the Provincial Companies Act and the permissive aspect of it whereby lawyers' secretaries' names may be used in the registration of companies. That is the first matter.

The second matter, notice of which was given me on April 13 by the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. P. Moores), deals with a question he asked of the hon. Minister of Education with respect to the policy for upgrading or manpower training at the Carbonear District Vocational School.

The third matter of which I was given notice today is one from the hon. Leader of the Opposition arising from a question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy and deals with the recent negotiations with the Quebec minister with respect to Labrador. So those are the three matters which will be debated in that order at five-thirty.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 40)

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act Respecting Queen's Counsel and Precedence At The Bar," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 41)

On motion of the hon. Minister of Finance, a bill, "An Act To Authorize The Province To Undertake, Organize And Manage Lottery Schemes," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 42).

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

COMMITTEE:

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

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Chairman, I intend on this point to be very brief this afternoon and I am looking forward to hearing some of the minister's responses to matters which have been raised. I would like just to re-enforce some things I said earlier about the particular need for programmes for the physically handicapped. I exclude from those comments persons who are blind and who are deaf because, as I believe we are all aware, adequate programmes exist here in St. John's in the case of the deaf student, in Halifax in case of the blind student.

I am thinking of the physically handicapped otherwise, other than the two categories I have just excluded. And I feel very strongly that we ought to address ourselves to some kind of institutional care programme for these people, a programme which would have two obvious prongs to it, the provision of nursing care, because these persons not being mobile themselves, having to depend either on a wheel chair or on the assistance of another individual to move from one place to another, these people have other related problems such as the problems related to toilet, the problems related to dressing and very often that kind of thing, and in many cases the nature of the disease which in the first place created the handicapped, the handicap, I should say, these diseases require some extent of regular administration of drugs, for example, various kinds of dressings and that kind of thing. And for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, the provision of nursing



MR. SIMONS: care would have to be one prong of any such program. Right now that nursing service is being provided by the parent or by some member of the immediate family or certainly at the expense of the family. Very few families have the funds, the wherewithal, the resources financially to pay outside nursing help and so what is happening in most cases is they are providing it rather inadequately themselves.

I say, Mr. Chairman, 'inadequately' not to criticize what is but to plead the cause a little further because these parents, while good parents as is witnessed by their compassion for these people over the years and their continuing care of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! I would like to point out to hon. members that the noise level of informal conversation is driving somewhat so if they would allow the hon. member for Turgeo - Bay d'Espoir to have the floor in relative silence, please.

MR. MURPHY: I do not know if there is anything wrong with the sound but it is very difficult to hear.

MR. SIMONS: Yes, my mike is apparently on, the light is on at any rate.

MR. MURPHY: It does not seem to be carrying, you know.

MR. SIMONS: Yes. All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to continue briefly, I was speaking in particular - can the minister hear?

MR. MURPHY: It is better now.

MR. SIMONS: I was speaking in particular of

Mr. Simmons:

the way in which those parents have looked after or provided nursing care over the years without really being particularly qualified to do so. I am not at all being critical of what they have done. But I am wanting to plead the cause that proper nursing care be made available. That is one prong of the programme.

The second prong would be what is pertinent to the estimates under debate right now, the educational prong. I pointed out in an earlier participation in this Committee that I had at hand examples in one community in my district where there were five children, belonging to three families, who have never attended school although a test had shown that they are in terms of intelligent quotients and so on are quite normal people, and indeed the reason why they have never gone to school is that they could not get their physically. All five of them had been confined to cribs for their entire lives which range age-wise from nine to sixteen years. And, as I say, the only reason that they have not gone to school is because they could not physically get there.

Now if we could visualize an institution, or I would advocate two or three smaller institutions rather than have one large one say here in the city, I could see perhaps one here in the city or somewhere on the Avalon to serve the immediate area, and the large population numbers which you have here. I could see one in Central Newfoundland somewhere to embrace the area, say, from Bonavista Bay in the East to White Bay or Green Bay in the West to Hermitage Bay in the South to embrace -

MR. MURPHY: The hon. member would prefer to bring them to Grand Falls and board them in there rather than -

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, yes. Well again, you know, it would be politically smart to be saying you should put one in Bay d'Espoir, and one in Hermitage, and one in Harbour Breton, and one in Burgeo and that kind of thing. But I believe this issue is one that we should be looking at more in terms of how the need can best be met. You know, in

Mr. Simmons:

Bay d'Espoir, in the road system directly connected into Bay d'Espoir, let us talk about St. Alban's and Bay d'Espoir, the Connaigre Peninsula, Hermitage and so on and so forth as far East as the road system goes there, Pool's Cove, you are only talking 12,000 population altogether. And, you know, the law of averages says you are probably talking twelve or fifteen people of the type that I have described. And it just would defeat the whole purpose if we began advocating one of these in every one of our districts.

What I would like to see is the minister and his colleague, the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation, look at the problem I have raised from a realistic standpoint and say, well if we cannot put thirty or forty of these around the Province there is no need. It might be good politics, but it would be a sheer waste of money. But could we put one in the Avalon somewhere? Could we have one in the Grand Falls-Gander area somewhere, which would include obviously provision for people from my area Bay d'Espoir, and then could we put one in the Corner Brook-Stephenville area which would take in, in my own case, people from Burgeo, Ramea and then Port aux Basques and perhaps the Great Northern Peninsula too for that matter. These are just thoughts.

But the overall point that needs to be made is that I believe at relatively small costs we could provide two or three relatively small institutions which whose function would be educational, one, and two, nursing care for those people. I would further suggest, Mr. Chairman, and this is all very much off the top of my head and would, obviously, such an undertaking of this would require a fair amount of study and research first, but I would further suggest that a consideration for this kind of undertaking would be the proximity of good hospitals, and when I say 'good' I am not implying the others are bad, but I am suggesting 'good' in the sense of adequate to cater to most of the requirements of those particular people.

Mr. Simmons:

Now the Gander-Grand Falls area, of course, have regional hospital systems, as do the Corner Brook-Stephenville area, as do the St. John's area. Hence another good reason for looking at those particular three areas for a nursing-educational institution for the particular group of people I have been describing. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is one of the most pressing needs that we face in this Province at this time. I believe it is a sad commentary on, not only governments, but on all of us as a community. It is a sad commentary that while we have organizations, volunteer organizations, we have government agencies, we have agencies of all kinds that address themselves literally to every kind of problem we have, and legitimately so, but I am thinking in particular of the eye clinic that was down here in front of the Building some weeks ago. We have a mechanism now for diagnosing possible eye problems, you know, almost before they occur or when they are in their earlier stages. We have all kinds of fund raisings for many worthwhile causes, I am thinking of Red Cross and C.N.I.E.

MR. SIMMONS:

and various others. I am not citing these to be critical. I am saying they are all very worth-while causes and it is a good commentary on the direction of our concern that we have these mechanisms and these organization and these collection agencies. But, Mr. Chairman, the one -  
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: Is not this poetic justice!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why I have to compete with meetings in the House every time I try to get on my feet -

MR. NEARY: You are so dull, and boring and long-winded -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the people who parade their dignity for this House or their concern for this House should at least show their concern for the dignity of the House by keeping quiet once in a while. I am fed up with trying to speak over two or three fellows having private conversations which are very loud conversations. I wish Mr. Chairman would rule on that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The issue has come up very recently in this regard and I would ask hon. members to pay due regard to it.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind Your Honour of the Standing Rules of this House concerning repetition and tedious debate and ask Your Honour to enforce that rule too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I have listened with due attention to the hon. member's remarks and I did not detect any undue repetition or irrelevance.

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I was saying I believe it is a sad commentary - and I say this for those who are interested, Mr. Chairman. I realize that some people may have no concern in something as undramatic as physically handicapped people who have no access to educational facilities. I recognize that possibility Mr. Chairman. But for those of us in this Committee who have some

MR. SIMMONS:

concern about something that undramatic, not very vote getting, Mr. Chairman, I agree, but my plea is for us to stop being dazzled by the dramatic and the character assassination type of approach in this Committee and get down to brass tactics as compassionate human beings.

MR. NEARY: What about the letter concerning the man in Rural Development? Is that character assassination?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I shall deal with that matter which has been raised by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). It was not character assassination. But, Mr. Chairman, let us in the name of goodness for once try and treat a compassionate matter with some compassion instead of the old stage acting that I am sick and tired of from certain people in this Committee, sick and tired of it. If you are not acting, if you are not hurling character assassination type things at people, you are not doing anything any good. Well that is not my attitude of how this Committee should operate, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to make a plea if it is possible without having interruptions from some people whose minds would force them to dwell on the more dramatic but less helpful, if I could have some co-operation from these people I would like just to make a plea -

MR. NEARY: With or without a band?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, it is not worth a response.

MR. DOODY: The band.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I say to the Minister of Finance, whom I am glad to see back in the House again, for him-how could you deny him a band at any time at all. At any time he wants to rent my hand he can have it free of charge.

MR. DOODY: The story of my life.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I guess this is not the time to plead the cause for the physically handicapped -

AN HON. MEMBER: Talk about music schools and that stuff.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes. A music school for one member and bands for that same member. Perhaps I should be making a plea, Mr. Chairman, for the not so well off in other ways than physically for other members, or one other member. Mr. Chairman, I would nevertheless like just to reiterate this point before sitting down,

MR. SIMMONS: that we give some very deep consideration to the matter that I have raised insofar as the physically handicapped people are concerned. I would like to see some initiatives taken. I do not expect the minister to stand up and say they are going to start it tomorrow morning, but I would like to see some preliminary work being done.

For instance, can anybody tell us, do we have up-to-date statistics at this moment as to how many people we are really talking about in this category? I am particularly mentioning the school age group - the five to sixteen, say - how many are in this category who could attend either a regular school programme if they could physically get there, or two, could attend a special education or TMR class if they could physically get there? How many are in those two groups of individuals that I have talked about? I would like to know that and I would like to know - and again I know the minister cannot answer this off the top of his head, but I would like him to undertake to get some answers for us if he could - how much would be required if we talked about one, or two, or three such institutions?

Now, Mr. Chairman, before I got the series of interruptions a few moments ago I was on to the other factors that I think are important to the case at hand. I believe, for instance, these institutions ought to be close to large well-equipped hospitals such as we have in Corner Brook, St. John's, Grand Falls, Gander and so on, because of the particular need that these types of people would have. I believe also it might be worth considering to have these institutions located either in proximity to or as an actual part of a regular school. Because there is another set of needs here that need to be accentuated, that we should not beyond what is possible under these situations, under the circumstances we are talking of, we should not seek to isolate those people any further from the mainstream of society, and from the mainstream of the educational process. I could visualize, for example, Mr. Chairman, that we could just by the provision of dormitory facilities



MR. SIMMONS: - and it is not quite that simple - but dormitory facilities and related facilities such as the dining room and the nursing clinic and some special care rooms that might be needed here, but I could visualize that with the provision of certain minimal facilities attached directly to an education complex, an existing education complex, you might be able to provide the type of care and programme I am talking about that would require the very active indulgence and co-operation of a school board. But I do not believe that would be difficult to get under the circumstances we have been talking about.

Mr. Chairman,

(Extraneous noise.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I do not particularly want people to stand up in this Committee and talk about austerity as it relates to this particular suggestion of mine. I am aware of austerity. I am aware of restraint and that kind of thing. But perhaps in a year when we cannot do great things financially, perhaps this is the year to take up the challenge that I have been talking about and look around and say, "What can we do without a lot of money?" Let me throw out one or two suggestions, Mr. Chairman. The government is talking about closing down some hospital beds. While I will not get into the wisdom of doing that - I have some views on it, and we will say them at the appropriate time - but if there are to be some surplus facilities around as a result of the government's closure of hospital beds, is it possible - I do not know, I am asking it off the top of my head - is it possible that some of these facilities, rather than be allowed to lie dormant, could be adapted to suit the need that I have outlined in the last few minutes? That is one possibility.

Or, Mr. Chairman - I wish the Minister of Tourism were in the House at this moment because I believe it is under his department the subject of Heritage Village comes. Is that correct?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: It is, yes. I understand - and this is quite unofficial and quite informal - but I understand that when the matter of a Twenty-Fifth Anniversary gift from the Government of Canada to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador was first discussed that there were two possible proposals as to the form that gift should take. One of these was the Heritage Village concept. I understand the other related to the very subject I am talking about,

MR. SIMMONS: The matter of providing some institution for handicapped people.

MR. CROSBIE: The federal government will assist them.

MR. SIMMONS: The Minister of Mines and Energy says the federal government will assist them. I see. Do I understand from the minister's comment that this government made representation along those lines?

MR. CROSBIE: No. No. You see there were a number of possibilities discussed, you know, and this is what the federal government came up with a suggestion -

MR. SIMMONS: The Heritage Village. Yes I see. The Minister of Mines, for the record, indicates that it was the federal government that came up with the Heritage Village as the proposal for the form the gift should take.

MR. DOODY: I was pushing for a marina.

MR. SIMMONS: I do not blame the Minister of Finance for pushing for Marina Holyrood. I think he has got his hands full with the marina he is going to have out there, but that is another story.

Mr. Chairman, at any rate I want to ask the question of the Committee and of the ministers directly involved in the subject I am raising, I want to ask whether the Heritage Village concept, as exciting as it is in many ways, might not be reviewed. I think we are talking \$1 million, are we?

MR. CROSBIE: More than that.

MR. SIMMONS: The original figure was \$1 million was it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, I mean. Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: Several million is expected to be used for these tourist information centres and \$1 million towards the Heritage Village. But the Heritage Village may cost \$10 million, \$12 million, \$14 million.

MR. SIMMONS: The million is the federal government's undertaking?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! It has been brought to my attention that grade ten and eleven students from St. Michael's Pentecostal High

MR. CHAIRMAN: in Arnold's Cove, with teachers in charge Mr. Harvey Jackman and Mr. Baxter Wareham are in the gallery to my left and I am sure hon. members would like to give them a warm greeting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me say in passing that I am certainly delighted to see students from Arnold's Cove with Mr. Jackman and his colleague Mr. Wareham here in the House. As a former teacher it is always good to see this participation in the House by students. I hope it will prove educational for them. It is good to see them.

Mr. Chairman, I was talking about the possible diversion of the funds which have been made available or would be under certain circumstances made available from the federal government for this Heritage Village. I am just wondering out loud if perhaps it is not the time to see if this money could not be better spent and meet a much more humanitarian need if that money were diverted to the cause that I have outlined, the cause of providing educational and nursing care institutions for the physically handicapped student, a student who is unable to get to the regular school because of the extremity of his physical handicap. I do not know whether that is a possibility but it obviously requires some further negotiation with the federal government. I would be very, very surprised if the Government of Canada turned thumbs down on such a proposal if the government of this Province were strongly in favour of it.

I am much in favour of Heritage Villages, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see one in this Province. I have seen one or two in other parts of Canada, one in Alberta, I believe, I have had the privilege of looking at closely and it is an exciting concept, there is no question about that. But I believe we are talking here, Mr. Chairman, when we talk about the scarce dollars which we have at hand, I believe we are talking here really about what we would like to have on the one

MR. SIMMONS: hand, and what we should have on the other hand. If you ask me I believe we should have a more adequate way of taking care of the physically handicapped student before we get into what is essentially the luxury of a Heritage Village.

Mr. Chairman, for the record I just repeat I am much in favour of Heritage Villages, I just happen to be even more in favour of doing something concrete for the physically handicapped student.

I mentioned just now in introducing the Heritage Village comments that it was my understanding, but notwithstanding what the Minister of Mines has told the Committee, I got my information from a federal source some months ago, or actually a year and a half ago and it was my understanding that the federal people were mulling over these two possibilities, among others. So it is certainly worth checking out.

Mr. Chairman, whatever the route we should go in terms of finding the money to pay the bill I believe it is

MR. SIMMONS:

very important that the appropriate ministers, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Rehabilitation, take this plea of mine - and I am not the only one who is concerned about it, I recognize - but take this plea on behalf of the physically handicapped person under very immediate advisement because it is one that has been neglected far, far too long, and I do not think we can go on any longer neglecting it.

Mr. Chairman, two other brief points I would like to make before sitting down which are unrelated to the matter of the handicapped child, the handicapped person generally. I have some very strong feelings about the use of the school facilities in a community context. A lot has been said about this over the years. The minister himself has been, as I was, a superintendent of education for some years and he is aware, as I am, that there are many and varying views of this subject and that there are a lot of problems associated with making school facilities available to the community. There are all kinds of arguments against making the school available.

But let me say, Mr. Chairman, that as an educator for a number of years I was never able to see, never able to comprehend for one fraction of a second why it was that we had some of the best equipped buildings in the community, often the best equipped, often the only equipped in the community from a recreation standpoint, for example, from an educational standpoint. I am thinking of the educational technology, the overhead projectors and the film projectors and that kind of thing. I have never been able to understand for one fraction of a second why these buildings had to be locked up at three-thirty in the afternoon. I could never see it. I am a taxpayer, too. I raise this subject now particularly because I happened to have been in the community recently where the old order does not change, where there is still, either because of the whims of the principal concerned or the teacher concerned or the school board concerned, there is still a lock-her-up-at-four-o'clock attitude about the whole thing. That way we save wax on the floors, we save light, we save a lot of things.

MR. MURPHY: Does the hon. member mean the recreation parts of it or the other part, the whole works?

MR. SIMMONS: Well, the Minister of Provincial Affairs asked me whether I mean just the recreation wing. No, I am really talking about the whole complex. Let us say it this way; if a community need can be met by having that building open, why should it be closed? I can tell you examples, and I do not want to be petty about this but I just tell them to dramatize the outdated thinking on this subject, I can you of cases where the Women's Institute in a given community is using very substandard facilities to hold its meetings. In one case I am thinking of there is a womens group meeting in what is in every sense of the term a fire hazard. Why? Because the building about 300 feet down the road is not available to them because there are no janitorial arrangements for after four o'clock. While the ten or twelve room school sits there nicely locked up available only to vandals, the women sit up the road almost risking their lives. These women are the mothers of the youngsters who go to that school. Who are we protecting, and from whom?

I can recognize that the administrator who is concerned about running a tight ship finds it easier to turn the key at four o'clock than he does to have to come back the next morning and find perhaps an ash tray full of cigarette butts or find a bit of paper on the floor. I can find that it goes against the grain for that administrator. It just might hurt his sense of routine. I say, you know, "To heck with his sense of routine." I have seen too many facilities, particularly schools, run for the convenience of the administrator. It is time-and I am not talking about the majority, Mr. Chairman. My comments of a moment ago should never be interpreted as being critical of the school administrator generally. The school administrator is like the clergyman and the teacher and the doctor and the politician. There are some good ones and some bad ones. The only thing that keeps us going in the school situation is that we have a whole lot more good ones than we do bad ones.

April 29, 1976

Tape 2279

IB-3

MR. SIMMONS:

But we do have some people either sitting on school boards or responsible for the administration of schools who have this very narrow attitude, as I call it, a very narrow attitude about the availability of school facilities to the community. I say make



MR. SIMMONS:

it available to the women's institute, make it available to the boy scouts or the girl guides. They are only students under another label, students in another uniform. If they are being educated in the Boy Scouts rather than in the grade six classroom what is the sin about them meeting in the school building, because they happen to be called the scout troop today instead of the grade seven class or whatever? Make it available to the community badminton club. They are the older brothers of the students. They were last year's students in the same school - or to the parents of the students. Make it available to a local group to organize basketball for adults or floor hockey. So we beat the school up ten years before it would have been beat up. That is fair. I would rather see a school beat up through use than rot through misuse or nonuse. We are all taxpayers. We are all paying the bill. I am not advocating that we open the thing up in the sense that people go in and be reckless about it. I am not talking about that. Any community recreation programme, any adult education programme as any school programme will use or abuse the facilities depending on the management, depending on the administration. Of course it has got to be done according to the rules. But the escapist approach is to say, "Let us not do it, let us lock it up at four o'clock and then we will know it will be there tomorrow morning."

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we were living in one of the oil rich nations of the Mid-East where they have more money than they know what to do with these days, we could afford to have an eight to four building and then another four to twelve building. But in Newfoundland where we have scarce resources, can you think of anything as crazy as absolutely cock-eyed, ridiculous?

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on.

MR. SIMMONS: We have an eight to four building and an after four building. The eight to four building is a beautiful DREE school or a beautiful designed school costing \$1 million, \$2 million, \$3 million. That is their eight to four building. And the four to twelve building where the Women's Institute meets and freezes to death or subjects themselves to a health hazard or a fire hazard is the old condemned school that is renovated or is a condemned fire

MR. SIMMONS:

hall or the Scout hall that is no longer good for the Scouts. That is what it is.

MR. MURPHY: Why are they against opening the schools to community groups?

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Chairman, very often - the question of the Minister of Provincial Affairs - the objections are, in fairness of the people who raises objections, the objections are strongly felt by those who object. It is not a matter of them feeling they are being petty about it. They have strong objections. They do not want the school programmes to be interfered with and that I can see. I have seen situations, I have seen situations where the community use has been abused. I have seen - I would not name communities - but I have walked into a classroom, not my own or not in my own school, but I have walked into classrooms during the period when I was with the N.T.A., for example, and you could not believe what some adults will do when they are wearing another hat. It is amazing. I say that again, wearing another hat; because I have seen parents who would be very, very disgusted if their youngster, first of all, smoked; but secondly, took a cigarette butt and scrunched it into the floor with your toe. But I have seen that same fellow who is tonight wearing another hat - he is a member of the ex-club - it is all right for him to do it in the classroom because he is not there as the parent or he is not there as the teacher, he is not there as the student. That is the kind of problem you can run into, the problem of attitude, that it is okay tonight because I am wearing another hat. You have that problem too. But I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the way around that is not to lock the door but to place some conditions on the availability of the facility.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was involved for a number of years in the community of Springdale. Springdale, in terms of the use of facilities, community use of school facilities, is just wide open, absolutely wide open. The principal of the school, whom I talked to in the last few weeks on the phone, told me that the only night that the school was not booked on a regular basis was Sunday night. Very often it got booked then for various reasons. But he had a schedule in front of him where the school was booked six nights a week

MR. SIMMONS:

for various reasons, university extension courses, art courses, various community education undertakings, that kind of thing. I believe the answer without selling the people short, the people who advocated, without selling them short, I think the answer is to instead of just saying, "Let us close the door," the answer is, "How can we open the door and still protect the facility." That question has not been asked in a lot of communities.

Mr. Simmons:

Now again I do not know what the department can do, I do not know what the minister can do except in terms of undertaking to change attitudes. That is about all that can be done, I suppose. But it brings me to the other point that I want to raise before sitting down. It is a point that has concerned me as an educator for a good many years, and it is the old question of, who speaks for education? Here we are spending \$250 million on education in this Province, that is what the Province is spending directly. Now if you were to total up the amounts that boards are spending, you know, which is raising through School Tax Authorities, for example, if you were to total up the amounts that youngsters are spending directly on school programmes of various sorts, their input into basketball uniforms, and that kind of thing; if you were to total up the whole cost of the Newfoundland community of education, you would be talking something far in excess of \$250 million I can assure you. Because what we are considering here is only taxpayers' direct input into it. There are many indirect inputs financially as well.

I am delighted to see my good friend, Reverend Bellemy in the galleries today, and he is quite aware I am sure of what I am saying here now in terms of the overall financial input into education. Reverend Bellemy, as the Committee well knows, works with the School Board Federation for the Province.

Mr. Chairman, taking that great big figure which is much, much in excess of \$250 million I am sure, I believe we have to ask ourselves all over again, who does speak for education? Is it the N.T.A.? Is it the School Board Federation? Is it the D.E.C.? Is it the Department of Education? Is it the University? I believe in rhyming off those various institutions, I believe I have really pointed to the problem. That is the problem really. There is no other discipline, there is no other area of concern, be it health area of social concern be it health, for example, or recreation, for example, or religion, the church, for example. There is no other area of social concern where we are so fragmented as in education.

Mr. Simmons:

When you hear the President of the N.T.A. on the air he is talking about some matters of very legitimate concern to his immediate group, the teacher-welfare issues, salary issues, teacher-pupil ratio. He is talking about matters affecting educational programme from the educator's standpoint. When you hear a spokesman for the School Board Federation on the air, he is inevitably talking about the very legitimate need for additional funding, among other things. When you hear the D.E.C. spokesman on the air he is espousing very legitimately the need for more capital funding for school construction. And so it goes, Mr. Chairman, When you hear the President of the University on, he is lamenting the cut backs in funding as it affects the University. But I believe you get the drift of what I am saying, Mr. Chairman.

Everybody in education, and I am not standing out criticizing, I am standing in being a recipient of part of the criticism because I was there too. We are all in education, it seems, so busy doing our own thing that nobody in the overall is speaking for education, Now perhaps it is because it cannot be done, I do not know. I thought about it for a long time, and perhaps it cannot be done. Perhaps it can be done, perhaps that is a weakness we have to live with. But why do I raise the question?

I raise it, Mr. Chairman, because in the absence of somebody speaking, in the overall, speaking for education, here is what is happening. It is popular to downgrade the finance need in education. The most popular thing you can do in any forum in this country, any platform you get on, if you cloak it in the right language, in one audience you would cloak it in the language of the school tax burden, and you will get an applause in that audience.

MR. SIMMONS:

go into another one and you will choose another theme. But whatever the theme, whatever the language cloak may be, you can get public support for downgrading the financial of education. I say we have come in 1976 to a very serious situation when the one mechanism we have evolved as a society, the one mechanism more than any other, namely, the formal education structure, the one mechanism that can be, not only our economic but our social salvation in the long-term - well let me put it less dramatically - without that mechanism there is no salvation, economically or socially. The one mechanism that we have evolved as a society for really meeting the economic and social needs, we are downgrading as a people, we are talking out of both sides of our mouths. As parents we are demanding the most in quality education and as taxpayers we are getting all worked up because it is popular to be worked up on the subject somehow, all worked up to say that we cannot afford it.

Mr. Chairman, I say that we can afford it. I say it another way, we cannot afford not to afford it. I have heard all kinds of allusions including some in this Committee about people who are raving on about the shocking cost of education. I am proud to live in a country, Mr. Chairman, that places so much emphasis on education.

MR. MURPHY: Is the hon. member speaking from an individual point of view now or from the government's point of view?

MR. SIMMONS: For the Minister of Provincial Affairs, in the context of what I just said, I am talking about government's involvement in education. I am saying that I am proud - I am not at all criticizing the \$250 million, I am not at all criticizing the fact that the government is laying out a quarter of its total budget on education - I am saying that it is too bad it cannot be more. I recognize the restraints. Only when I talk money do I get any interest from the Minister of Finance. Well, something touches his heart.

MR. DOODY: I am giving up any hope for education now.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance of course does not really say what is on his mind when he makes a statement like that. He is one of the fellows in cabinet we can really depend on to go to bat for education. I am sure of that.

MR. DOODY: What about my old Burgeo host?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know about that. The minister has given up hope for him. We have not given up hope for him, Mr. Chairman. We recognize that where he sits this days there is a reason for hope but he is a smart man and as the song goes, "While the light holds out to burn, the vilest sinner may return." He is far from the vilest, Mr. Chairman. But we are looking for a good Minister of Finance.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that somebody begin speaking for education in the total context. If I could have before me today the various disciplines within education that I have mentioned, if I could have before me the DEC and the School Board Federation and the NTA and the PTAs around this Province and the Department of Education and the university, if somehow I could speak to all these at once, I think the essential message that I would want to get through to them for the sake of education, for the sake of the future of elementary and secondary education in this Province, the essential message would be that if you are really concerned - and that is not meant to imply that they are not concerned, I know they are. I have worked closely with those groups - but I would say to them as a preamble, if you are really concerned the best way to manifest your concern in this matter is to start speaking out on the larger issues, start doing the education job that has to be done on the parent when he is wearing his other hat, his taxpayer hat, start doing the education job on that taxpayer, that as popular as it may seem to be on the surface to downgrade education expenditures, in the name of the future of education let us,

MR. SMITH:

all of us, School Board Federation, NTA, university, let us all in addition to mouthing our immediate and legitimate concerns - more funds for operating schools, more funds for building schools, more funds for teacher welfare in addition to mouthing those very legitimate concerns, let us also address ourselves to the larger education issues, to the P<sup>er</sup> side of education, to getting across to the public, to Mr. Taxpayer that what we are on here is not a spending binge in education but the most worth-while investment we can possible make if we are concerned about the direction in which we are going socially as a society, and economically as a people.

There is nobody,



MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman - I do not know if I make myself clear - at the moment there is nobody who really speaks in the latter context for education. Without being critical to the Minister of Education, let us reflect, let him reflect, we will not discuss the instances though I have taken note of the press releases - let him reflect on the last two, three, five, I have no number in mind, let him reflect on the last ten pronouncements he has made, the last ten pronouncements he has made at school openings or before the television cameras, I ask him, and it is not of soul bearing session here, but I ask him to ask himself was he really speaking for education as a whole or was he really trying to mount today's crisis? That is too often the temptation in education, to get so immediately concerned with your own immediate crisis - get some more money to build a school, get some more money to run a school, get some more money to run some buses, get some more money to pay some teachers some more - so immediately concerned with these. If you have been in education, Mr. Chairman, you can understand how they can be pretty occupying. But the danger is that we get so - and not only the danger, but the reality is that we all get so preoccupied with the immediate problem, as big as it is, that we are allowing the larger issue to go unresolved, we are allowing the larger concern to almost as it were go down the drain. I am disturbed as I read the weekly magazines, the Times and the Newsweeks and the MacLeans and the other magazines and the articles in them, I am concerned about this mounting consensus as it were for bad-mouthing education. It seems the thing to do these days.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have to remind the hon. member that in somewhat less than a minute, forty five minutes will have elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes. Well, Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to go that long. If I could be permitted just a sentence? I believe I have made the point I want to make. I believe we all, taxpayer, legislator, teacher, parent, all of us, in whatever hats we wear should be particularly concerned about the last issue I raised, about educating the taxpayer. If we do not take some initiatives to see education in a more positive light we are going to forfeit what is a very real opportunity to affect the socially, educationally, economic future of all of us as a society. If we forfeit it once it is going to be very difficult, if not impossible, to retrieve it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, as a non-academic, as a non-teacher in this House, Sir, but as the father of four young children who are attending school, I believe that I have a few views and a few observations to make with regard to the education estimates that may be of some help and some benefit to the Committee. I am delighted, Sir, that the students from Arnolds Cove are seated in the gallery at a time that I have chosen to make my few remarks because I might, Mr. Chairman, just taking a look at these students, I would say probably they are about grade ten or eleven, who are probably just getting about ready to go out into the world to figure out what their future is going to be, whether they are going to attend the College of Trades and Technology, whether they are going to go to the vocational schools and get a trade, whether they are going to attend the university or whether they are going to go to the College of Fisheries and Technology or maybe go straight from high school and try to look for a job with just merely grade eleven. So, Mr. Chairman, that brings me to my first point, first point in my remarks and it is this, Sir: Sitting back as a non-academic and non-teacher and just looking at the whole education system in total,

I cannot help but wonder, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the advances that we have made in education in this Province with a quarter of the budget now devoted to education, with the wonderful university that we have built in this Province, the wonderful College of Trades and Technology that we have, the high schools we have, the DREE schools, the great advances that we have made in training teachers and so forth, but taking a look now, Sir, I am beginning to wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we are getting the best value for our educational dollar and if we are headed in the right direction. The hon. gentleman who just took his seat asked the question - tried to answer it himself - asked the question, who speaks for education in this Province? He implied that

Mr. Neary:

the DEC and the Boards of Education, the University president, and so forth, speak for education. He kind of left the question up in the air, who speaks for education?

Well I do not know who speaks for education in this Province, Mr. Chairman, but I know who should be speaking for education, and that is the parents. Under the United Nations Constitution Bill of Human Rights and under the Canadian Bill of Human Rights it is the parents who decide the kind of education that their children will receive. Now gentlemen who are involved, and who have been so close to the educational system may say that the parents are apathetic, complacent, not interested, are prepared to sit back and leave the decisions up to the bureaucrats, and leave the decisions up to the boards, and when they have elections to elect boards you can hardly get enough people to come out to elect the people who are elected to the boards, because not all members of boards are elected, some are appointed by the various denominations, some are elected. But I think if you just look back over the history of the number of people who are interested enough to come out and vote for those who are elected, that you will find that it must be very, very discouraging indeed, which would lead one to believe that the parents are very, very disinterested, lackadaisical, complacent, apathetic about the kind of education that their children should receive. It is the parents who should be speaking for -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Can we not have the right to listen to one person and not a half a dozen outside, only one person at a time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I ask the constable to ensure that silence is kept in the public ways.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that looking back over the history of this whole procedure of electing boards and so forth that it has not worked out too well. Maybe because the various school boards

Mr. Neary:

and the denominations have not done the PR work, they have not motivated the parents to the extent that they should have. Maybe it is the fault of the parents, they are too apathetic and too disinterested and could not care less about the kind of education that their children are getting.

But I am a parent myself, Sir, who has four children in school who is very, very concerned about the kind of education that his children is receiving. And I am very concerned about the future of my four children who are in school. And therefore sometimes I sit back and ask myself a number of what I consider to be a number of important questions. What do these children have ahead? What plans are being made to ensure these graduates, these students, these graduates of our high school and of our post-secondary education institutions, what guarantee do they have that we are giving them the right counselling and the right advice so that they will be able to go out into this world and earn a living for themselves?

Mr. Neary.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that although we have made rapid strides in the field of education in this Province, that we have nice, big, huge, great, modern buildings, and we have buses taking children back and forth to school, and we have teachers who are highly trained, and highly educated, I would submit to Your Honour that we are at the crossroads, that we have reached the stage, reached the time when we now have to sit back and examine our whole education system, and ask ourselves if we are doing justice to the system, if we can ensure the graduates of our high schools and of our post-secondary educational system that we are giving them the best training and the best advice and the best counselling that we can give them, that we are headed in the right direction so that that will be able to go out in this world and earn themselves a living.

My hon. friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) scoffed the other day at a point that I made in this hon. House on a number of occasions whereby I implied that we have a large number of graduates of our university who have B.A.'s, B.Sc.'s, who have various other degrees, Bachelor of Science degrees and so forth, who cannot find jobs. They have spent four and five years at Memorial University, and have graduated with a piece of paper, with a certificate, as I heard some educator say on television one night about the Regional College in Corner Brook, "You will get another certificate." Well, that certificate and fifty cents will get you across on the ferry to Bell Island. It will not get you a job.

In the 1960's the trend was the whole population of Norther America was brainwashed into thinking that if you got a university education you were guaranteed to get a job. And so everybody wanted to get into the university. Everybody wanted to get a university degree, and in this Province we made sure, the former Premier and the former administration made sure that even the son and the daughter of a lowly fisherman or a truck driver or an office worker or a labourer could get a university education through bursaries, free tuition, and even get paid while you were attending the university. And so the

Mr. Neary.

enrollment at the univesity started to skyrocket, and today it is on the decline. Has anybody ever stopped to ask themselves why? I heard the reason given a year or so ago when the government cut back on student aid. I heard the argument from the old-line Liberal spokesman on education that this was the reason for the decrease in the enrollment- and I cannot swallow that, Sir. I cannot fathom that at all - the reason for the decrease in the enrollment was the fact that the students themselves began to realize that there was no future in the training, no future in the courses, that there was no future in the certificates that they were getting from Memorial University, the bit of paper that they could hang on their wall. It could not ensure these students that they were going to get a job. They had gone over and spent four or five years, brainwashed into thinking you had to get a university education. And unless you were taking medicine or engineering, or unless you were doing social welfare at the time, something where there was a demand for that kind of trained person, you were doomed. And my hon. friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) said that we had not reached the stage in Newfoundland where this has happened. Well, Sir, I know myself of graduates of Memorial University who have their B.A., and their B.Sc. who are taxi driving today. I know a couple who are working as bartenders.

MR. HOUSE: Does it hurt them to have a degree?

MR. DOODY: It does not help them when they apply for welfare.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend asked me if it would hurt them? No, it does not hurt them, except that they have wasted four or five years of their lives. Maybe it helped them to broaden their education, possibly

MR. NEAPY:

that may be a sort of an added attraction.

MR. R. MOORES: It makes him a dignified taxi driver.

MR. NEAPY: Well maybe it does. It makes them educated taxi drivers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A man is not finished because he is a taxi driver. He could still become Premier.

MR. NEAPY: Well, maybe he could become Premier. But, Sir, the point is this, that that is all irrelevant. They got their degree. They spent four or five years working hard at it, hoping that when they came out they could get a job in the profession for which they were trained, and they were disillusioned. That is the point that I am making. My hon. friend here can verify this. My hon. friend is a graduate of Memorial University, and I am sure that he has a lot of colleagues and friends and members who were in his **Student Union** over there who got their degrees, worked hard at it, hoped to get a good job, posh office, and are now out working at something completely remote from what they were trained for.

I know one of my hon. gentleman's buddies who just got a job the other day as a statistician, I think it was, and that is not what he was trained for. But the training does not do him any harm, I agree. But I am sure that if they had their time back that they would not have spent four or five or six years over at Memorial University getting a degree unless they were sure they would have gotten a job. And in a lot of cases, Mr. Chairman, they have come out of the university and then have had to go to vocational school or the College of Trades and Technology.

MR. DOODY: They are in debt when they come out.

MR. NEAPY: They are right up to their ears in debt when they come out. My hon. friend is so right. I know one gentleman who is in debt for \$20,000 who has to now go to the College of Trades to try to get a trade to go out and earn a living and help him pay off his debt.

MP. NEAPY:

I am not coming down like a ton of bricks on the system, Sir, but I think it is about time that we sat back and took a good hard look at our educational system. The other provinces are thinking about doing it. Some have already done it. Down in the United States - I believe I quoted from this article in Time Magazine, in the March edition of Time Magazine where it says, "Jobs, slim pickings for the class of '76". This is in the United States so rich and so wealthy. Just listen to this, "Unemployment among new humanities, B.A.'s, is running at about fifteen per cent rate, higher than the fourteen point four per cent registered by labourers". Just imagine Sir! Those who have B.A.'s, there are more, the percentage rate of those with B.A.'s is higher for being unemployed than those of labourers. "Most, probably unrelated to their majors, will earn average starting salaries of \$825 a month. That is less than any other graduates will make. Accountants, for example, can expect about \$1,000 a month," and so forth. "Many education graduates are no better off."

"Theresa Borden, twenty-three, who despite her accreditation to teach high school is distributing lunch trays in a Seattle hospital. "It is very depressing", says she." And the hon. former Premier just reminded me that it is not time wasted. Well, here is a young lady in the United States by the name of Theresa Borden, twenty-three who despite her accreditation to teach in high school is now distributing lunch trays. But she says it is very discouraging and very depressing.

MP. SMALLWOOD: But her life is not over yet.

MP. NEAPY: Her life is not over yet, Sir, no, but she has spent four or five or six years of her life getting this degree. "It is very depressing", says she, "to find out that you are not qualified after five years of training."

MP. SMALLWOOD: She is qualified but she cannot find a job.

MR. MURPHY: She would get more an hour if she were teaching.

MP. NEAPY: Maybe, Mr. Chairman. I will come to why I am bringing these things up in a minute. "Only specialists in such fields as bilingual



MR. NEAPY:

Spanish, English teaching or musical instrument instruction in elementary schools have much hope for employment, with the sometimes exception of biologists and economists."

"Ph.D's - just listen to this, - doctors - Ph.D's are in dire straits. Academic hiring is nearly dormant. One California psychologist claims to have mailed off 800 resumes

MR. NEARY:

over five years and the uncertain P and D climate discourages employment of science doctors."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman yield a moment? Does he not realize that this economic depression to which he is referring, to which the clipping refers in the United States and which can be duplicated in so many other countries in the world now and for the past year or two, and perhaps for the next year or two, this very thing has happened a number of times before! People were out selling apples on the streets of New York in the great depression, and there are depressions. That is no argument against people qualifying themselves for when the opportunities do come, surely.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. the former Premier seems to be very, very sensitive about the point that I am trying to make, and I know that the university was the hon. the member's baby and he built it up and he hates to hear anybody criticize it. I am not trying to tear it down, Sir. I am merely trying to impress upon the Committee the need for us now at this point in time to get our priorities straight. We are spending \$5 million over here at the College of Trades and Technology where they are turning away four out of five applicants. Four out of five are being turned away, the doors are closed to these students. We are spending \$5 million, and we are spending \$40 million on a university where the enrollment is decreasing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. member be patient once again? I asked the university and I asked the Fisheries College and I asked the College of Trades and Technology, all three of them, and I asked the trade schools to give me the figures of the numbers of students who had gone through them and where were they now. I was absolutely amazed and of course delighted to discover that overwhelmingly they are all in good jobs, overwhelmingly -

MR. NEARY: In the university?

MR. SMALLWOOD: - in Newfoundland today.

MR. NEARY: Where is this?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mostly in Newfoundland but some have gone out of the Province, but mainly they are still here working in good jobs now in spite of the depression.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Chairman, I cannot accept the fact that the high rate of unemployment amongst university graduates in the United States is due to the depression. It is due to the changing times, Sir, and we have refused to change with these times. That is the reason, Sir. We are living in an electronic age.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is a lot of truth in that.

MR. NEAPY: We are living in an age of where they are sending people to the moon. We are living in a computer age. If you want to go over at Memorial University, and you have the time, or any other university, and you have the time to punch in three or four or five years to get a piece of paper that is useless to you, well, more power to you. It broadens your outlook in life. But I submit to this Committee that that is not what the average Newfoundland student or Canadian student wants. They want -

MR. DOODY: You are talking about a hobby.

MR. NEAPY: That is a hobby. If you can afford that, if you are the son or daughter of a wealthy Newfoundlander and you can go down there and become a professional student and get two or three pieces of paper to put on the wall of your bedroom, the more power to you. It will broaden your outlook on life but it will not earn you a living. That is why, Sir, I say to this Committee that these students who are sitting in the galleries today should be very, very, very, very careful indeed about their futures and about the decision that they are going to take probably in the next few months or in the next year or so of what they are going to do with their lives in the future.

Mind you, Mr. Chairman, I am not condemning outright the courses, all the courses, that are being given at Memorial University. There are some good courses being given there. There are some good courses being given whereby I think you could, probably, when you graduate find a job. But you can count them on one hand. Has anybody ever taken the trouble to go over the list of courses that are given at that university? The hon. minister probably has.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. minister and I have had a few minor discussions over a cup of coffee about this very same matter and I have to give the minister due credit that he is concerned about it. I told the minister on more than one occasion since the hon. gentleman became Minister of Education that if he wants to make his mark in this Province that the minister would do well now at this particular point in time - this is not a condemnation of the people who are involved in education, it is a recommendation - that the minister would do well to set up an impartial, independent commission to take a look at our whole educational system, to see if we are headed in the right direction and if we are getting the best value for our educational dollar.

There would be nothing wrong with that, Sir. I do not think it should be done by somebody within the system. I think it should be somebody who is completely independent and disassociated with the system. I say that as a parent, because I am very concerned about the direction that our educational system is headed in. The minister would do well even if he only did it in the post-secondary part of our educational system. I think it should go right on down to Kindergarten right all the way up through to university. We do not have one thing to lose.

And we have had a commission. I know the argument. I have heard the argument before. Oh, we have had a commission. Well okay. Well and good, I would say. We had the Warren Royal Commission. Bravo! Good for them! How long ago was it? Was it twelve or fourteen years ago?

AN HON. MEMBER: Eight.

MR. NEARY: Eight years ago? Ten years ago? Eight years ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ten.

MR. NEARY: Ten years ago. The Warren Royal Commission may have been good at that time. If we had followed all the recommendations of the Warren Royal Commission it would break the public treasury of this Province. But it did create a level of bureaucracy, several levels

MR. NEARY:

of bureaucracy, that I think are unnecessary. I do not recommend that we do away with them at this moment, but I certainly think, Sir, that it is about time. We have had a royal commission on everything else in this Province. You name it and we have had a royal commission on it. Is it not important enough now that we are spending one quarter of the public treasury on education that we should just pause for a moment and have an independent enquiry, an independent commission to take a look at the system to see if we are headed in the right direction and we are getting the best value for our money?

Mr. Chairman, the teachers, the academics who have spoken so far in this debate, have talked mainly about our elementary school system and about our high school system. But, Sir, I do not know if the Committee realizes it or not, but the College of Trades and Technology, the university, the College of Fisheries, and I believe the School for the Deaf and several other institutions all come under the minister's department. They made no reference whatsoever to the post-secondary education part of the minister's estimates. They just brushed over the elementary and high school part of the minister's estimates and tried to leave the impression, well, the education people are not getting enough money to run the system, not enough money. Well, maybe they are not. I realize they have their problems the same as everybody else. But the general public, Sir, are getting kind of fed up with pumping more and more money into our educational system when they are not seeing the results that they would like to see.

Let us take, for example, the College of Fisheries, Navigation and whatever else it is called.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Marine Engineering.

MR. NEARY: Marine Engineering and so forth, which was a concept developed by my colleague, the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), the former Premier of this Province, which was

MR. NEARY:

supposed to be, when it was properly developed, one of the finest institutions in the world, not in North America, but in the world.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And it is right now.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. member says it is right now. Well, I say it is not right now. I tell the hon. -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes it is.

MR. NEARY: I am not talking about the staff. I am not talking about the kind of training you can get there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right.

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, I will say this - and the hon. member made a statement there a few moments ago that he was amazed that all the graduates of all our post secondary education system had such wonderful jobs.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not all, no.

MR. NEARY: Not all, but a good many, the hon. member said.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Overwhelming majority.

MR. NEARY: Well, I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, and I may take this on during the Summer as a project to try to justify my \$1000 office grant that I got, I may take this on as a project because it might help the fisheries in this Province - I would like to research the students who have gone through the College of Fisheries -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. NEARY: - and who have graduated -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right.

MR. NEARY: - and who have gone out into the world -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right.

MR. NEARY: - who have been upgraded and trained to see if they are working at the trade for which they were trained at that College of Fisheries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right, right, right.

MR. NEARY: I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the vast majority, the vast majority are working at things that are completely unrelated.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know right now how many students who have been trained in boat building at that College are now out engaged in the profession of boat building. I would like to know, Sir, how many students who have been trained in mending nets that are now out mending nets and so on and so on and so on. I could go all the way down the line. I would submit to Your Honour that the College of Fisheries was probably a good place to go to punch in the Winter, to punch in a few weeks, to punch in a few months because you were getting paid by Canada Manpower. It is a lot better than welfare. I would submit, Sir, that that institution, that should be and could be one of the finest institutions of its kind in the world, is on the downgrade, if anything. It should be on the upgrade. It is not doing the job that it should be doing for the fishery in this Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Could be right.

MR. W. CARTER: Will the hon. member explain what the institution should be doing?

MR. HICKMAN: Will he wait to see what it is doing?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, I will explain to the minister what it should be doing. It should be teaching Newfoundlanders how to diversify the produce of the sea through smokers, through canneries. It should be doing research of all kinds. It should be out in the field establishing and helping the fishermen and the fishery to get established in these kinds of industry. That is the only salvation for the fishing industry. We cannot stick to the traditional cod block. The minister may stand up in a few minutes and say, "oh, well, we are teaching all these kind of things and know exactly what the answer is going to be." But, Sir, what I want to know is this: how many smokers and how many canneries and how many this and how many that do we have in Newfoundland today as a result of the several millions of dollars that we put into the Fishery College every year? How many do we have? There is where you can judge your success.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that the fault of the College?

MR. NEARY: It is, Sir, - well, I do not know. Maybe it is the fault of the follow-up of the College.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right, all right.

MR. NEARY: But there is certainly a weakness. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee do not think - I am trying to offer some positive constructive criticism of the whole system. I am not condemning the whole thing forthright. I suppose I have to repeat it over and over again for the sake of those who may think that I am being negative, that our educational system in this Province have made rapid strides since Confederation, rapid strides. We have done excellent. We have done wonderful in training our teachers. We have put up beautiful buildings. We have nice gymnasiums. We have all kinds of electronic equipment. Wonderful, good, great! But I hope the Committee is aware that we also have DREF schools where you have musical instruments that were paid for by the taxpayers of Newfoundland and of Canada that are not used because they cannot get music teachers. You have other schools that have music teachers and do not have any instruments. I would assume that the minister is aware of that kind of a situation. You cannot borrow the instruments from the DREF school because they say under



Mr. Neary.

the contract, under the agreement, we are not allowed to give them to you. I remember one night, Mr. Chairman, I attended a PTA meeting. We were trying to raise funds to buy the instruments for the band in the school. And I nearly fell off my chair when I was told by people in the know at that meeting that in at least two schools in Newfoundland, two DREE schools, where apparently they grabbed everything they could when they had the chance. They took the Cadillac type of school even through they knew at the time they could not use the facilities, but probably I will give them the benefit of the doubt and say, they were looking ahead to the future. We were trying to raise a few dollars to buy instruments for the band. And there were two schools in Newfoundland that had the finest equipment, and the finest set of instruments, I suppose, in Canada that were not used because they could not get a music teacher. But the school I attended the meeting at, where I attended the PTA meeting, was told that they could not borrow these instruments, because it was against the DREE agreement. This is the kind of thing! Maybe I am not making myself clear to the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: You are!

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I will tell you that is a fact.

And I sold tickets to try to raise enough money to buy the instruments.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. member is correct, is that not the fault of DREE for insisting on that clause in the agreement?

MR. NEARY: I am not convinced, Sir. I put the questions, I cross-examined the gentleman who made these statements, and I am not convinced that it is the fault of DREE. I am not convinced at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, does not the hon. member realize that all he has to do is ask a question, and have the clause tabled in the House here? The agreement is in possession of the government. They signed it with DREE. Ask them if there is such a clause in it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member says, "Why do I not ask a question?" I have got 137 questions on the Order Paper right now, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have almost double that.

MR. NEARY: I have 137 questions on the Order Paper. I have gotten the answers - this is since last November - and I have gotten the answers so far to twenty-six, which is less than eighteen per cent.

MR. MURPHY: Are you writing a book?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not writing a book, but I have got some pretty good questions on the Order Paper and so, therefore, I am not going to waste my time any more writing questions and putting them on the Order Paper when the government refuses to supply the answers.

But, Mr. Chairman, getting back to our post-secondary educational system again for a moment. Sir, I do not know if members have taken a look at the estimates, but here we have a situation where the College of Trades and Technology this year will get \$5 million, I believe it is. The College of Trades and Technology will get \$5.5 million, and they are turning away four out of five students. They cannot take them in. It is blocked to the doors. They have no room for them. They are being turned away. And Memorial University's budget this year is \$40,267,000, almost \$40.5 million. Now, Sir, I ask the Committee to look at this situation objectively and positively. Here you have a situation where the enrollment at Memorial University is dropping. I do not know why it is dropping. They did a little research over there a few years ago and they kind of half blamed it on the government, and gave the government a backhanded Flick for cutting the student aid. The enrollment is dropping. The demand for vocational training and technical training is increasing, and yet the amount of money spent on technical training and vocational training has stagnated. It is frozen. And the university estimates are going up. Now does that make any sense? Or am I so stupid,

Mr. Neary.

am I so uneducated, just barely scraped through Grade XI that I do not understand? Do I not hear right when I hear all the students who talk to me and who come to see me, who recently - I wished I had the paper, I do not have it with me - who recently did an article in the newspaper - I showed it to the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) - did an article in the newspaper over at the College of Trades and Technology pointing out all the weaknesses in the system?

Mr. Neary:

Do I not hear right when these students tell me these things, when some of my colleague's friends and students presently attending Memorial University are completely frustrated, and when I picked up the paper this morning and find that 8,000 students are going to be unemployed this year, I mean, am I dreaming all of this? And yet in certain fields and in certain industries there is a demand. I know the minister's department does some research on job opportunities, on the labour market. But we are churning out, Sir, we are mass producing B.As. and B.Sc.s. and what have you, who will never find a job. The job opportunities are not there. It would be far better, Sir, if the students were told when they get up around Grade VIII, IX, X or XI, if they were told that, look, here is where the opportunities are; get into computerization, get into electronics, get into this, get into aeronautics, get into medical science, get into nursing, get into this, here is where the job opportunities are; and not just try to brainwash our students into thinking that if they get any kind of a piece of paper from Memorial University that they are going to get a job. They are beginning to realize that, and now they know the difference, and that is why the enrollment is starting to drop at Memorial University, and I think the Minister of Education will have to agree with that. And that is why they are clamouring and begging and clawing and scraping at the doors of the vocational schools and the College of Trades and Technology to try and get in, to get a trade where they know they can get a job. And yet we went ahead with that foolish plan of spending \$11 million in building a regional college out in Corner Brook just to fulfill a political promise, and all it is is a glorified upgrading school! The minister says, "Oh, you could take a two year course there." We could have accomplished the same thing in this Province, Sir, by putting Grade XII into our high schools instead of spending \$12 million building that regional college out in Corner Brook that is nothing more than a glorified upgrading school, where you go in

Mr. Neary:

if you do not qualify for nursing, or you cannot qualify to get into Memorial University, or you cannot qualify for this trade or that trade, you go out there and you do a refresher course in Mathematics or English or whatever you failed in Grade XI. You could have done the same thing in Grade XII. Why are we not thinking about putting Grade XII into the high schools? I am trying to make an argument, Sir, I am not condemning those who run the educational system. God bless them, they have done a good job up to now. But I am trying to make an argument for pausing for a moment. And if the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), the former Premier will remember, and I am not divulging Cabinet secrets, that I on at least three occasions when I served in the former Premier's Cabinet raised the matter of our post-secondary education system and begged and pleaded with my colleagues at that time, because I could see the need then, I could see the trend setting in, and I begged them at that time to do an independent, impartial study of our whole post-secondary educational system. And I finally convinced the hon. Premier, I had an awful job convincing some others of my colleagues, but I finally convinced the Premier of that day and he said, "All right! We will do it, if we can find a man to do it!"

MR. DOODY: Is that why he started the medical school?

MR. NEARY: No, that is not when the medical school started, Sir. If we could find a man, it is a problem to find the right kind of person, I agree, to do that kind of a study. And I am not talking about a long-drawn-out two or three year royal commission study. I am sure that if you could get the right kind of a man, independent, impartial, he could do it in six months and tell us. All I want to do is to be reassured for the sake of my children and all the other children of this Province that we are headed in the right direction. I believe as a parent I have that right to know that. Maybe I have not got the right. I do not know. Maybe the Mandarins and the bureaucrats think they have the right to tell me as a parent what kind of an education my children should get.

April 20, 1976

Tape 2231'

FK - 3

Mr. Neary:

I am concerned, for instance, about the fact that the member for Terra Nova was quoted in a report sometime ago made in

The Evening Telegram

Mr. Neary.

about the number of functional illiterates that we have in this Province. And the member said - not the member - but whatever board made the statement, of which the hon. member was a member said, "It is about time we got back to the three R's, reading and writing and arithmetic." Well here is an article that appeared in the Evening Telegram, April 27 which said, "Old-fashion teaching is the best." This is over in London, England. "Most pupils, especially bright ones do much better at reading, writing and arithmetic with old-fashioned teaching than with progressive methods says a research project published on Monday." Then they go on to talk about the research project. And it says, "Teachers were classified in seven categories ranging from extremely traditional to extremely progressive. Progressiveness was characterized by informality, freedom of choice for the pupil, less emphasis on tests and a blurring of divisions between subjects. Testing 101 pupils aged ten to twelve and one-half years at the beginning and the end of the school year, the researchers found that in reading age formally taught pupils gained on their progressively taught counterparts by three to four months a year. In mathematics, pupils in formal classrooms were four to five months ahead. And in english the gap was three to four months in the difference."

Mr. Chairman, I think it is about time, from all the reports that I have seen over the last few years, that we considered going back to the old system of teaching children how to read and write and a little bit of english. The hon. minister made a statement in the House the other day that startled me. I was, I suppose, semi-aware that we had a tremendous number of functional illiterates in this Province. But the minister threw out a figure the other day - what was it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Eighty thousand.

MR. NEARY: - Eighty thousand! Eighty thousand!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I wish to inform the hon. member that his time has expired.

MR. NEARY: Well, I thank the hon. Chairman. I will probably come back to a few other points later on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I have never failed to listen with enormous interest to anything said in this Chamber by the hon. member who just exhausted his forty-five minutes. I hope he will come back before the debate finishes. I am sure he has other things to say. I agree and disagree with virtually everything he said here today. I agree with the statements, but I disagree with the inferences he hopes we **will draw**, or I **think he intends** us to draw, from what he has said.

Now I am ashamed of some of the things I did while I was Premier of this Province. I am ashamed of the short-sighted things I did and the blunders I committed. What kind of a man would I be if I were not ashamed of my complete record in twenty-three years? Surely I made mistakes and blunders, and I am ashamed of them. But I am at the same time proud of some of the things I was instrumental in doing, or with which I was associated in the doing, and one of them is education. There was no university, **there** were no trade schools, **it** was under my administration that all seventeen of the trade schools we have in Newfoundland were put there. There has not been one since I went out. It was under my administration the Technical College was put there, and it was enlarged again under my administration. It was under my administration that the College of Fisheries, Navigation, Deep-Sea Engineering and Marine Electronics was put there, and it is now in the world the best college of its kind, except only for those in Japan and those in the Soviet Union. But there is



MR. SMALLWOOD:

nothing in North American, Central America or South America or Europe that can compare with our great College of Fisheries. I was associated with the creation of those things. I am proud of it. I saw the total government expenditure on education go from \$3 million a year to what it is now, a quarter of a billion, two hundred and forty odd, \$250 millions. The Committee may remember that it happened to be I as Premier who called that famous education conference that was held over a period, I think, of a couple or three days in the Arts and Culture Centre theatre in which, with great graphic charts, six, eight, ten feet high so that the entire audience could read the figures, I showed the growth of expenditure, the growth of school attendance, the growth of grade eleven exams, the growth of successful examinations in grade eleven, and the growth of expenditure. Not only that, those graphs carried it forward to this year and next year and the year after next, and I think for the next ten years showing that we were headed on the basis of the expenditures as they were then and had been from Confederation, showing that we were headed into utter and absolute financial disaster. I think we have gone a little faster than the forecast showed. I think we have reached today an expenditure, overall expenditure by the government on education in all forms, we have now today, this year, reached a figure which that forecast fixed for a couple or three years from now.

MR. DOODY: That is because of the inflationary conditions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is a certain amount of inflation, a considerable amount of inflation. The inflation accounts for a substantial portion of that increase. But we must not exaggerate that. We have not had 100 per cent inflation. We have not had fifty per cent inflation. We have not had twenty-five per cent inflation. We have had maybe ten or twelve or fifteen per cent in the last year or two.

Now one thing the hon. member, who is in my view one of the most brilliant minded, one of the most alert minded, one of the quickest minded members of this House, but one thing he forgot -

MR. LAMBRICAN: You never always said that. You said he had a great heart.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said he had an educated heart, and he has that. But I have since learned, since then I have learned that he has also got a very, very fine mind. And his brother -

MR. DOODY: But he was not quick.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I said he was not a genius. And I would not say that he is a genius. I would say that the number of geniuses in this Chamber is a very limited number, a very limited figure. I doubt if there are more than three or four. That is a very high average in any deliberative Assembly. We have had three depressions in this Province since Confederation. We had a depression within a year of our becoming a Province. It was the post-Korean War depression which swept across Canada. The Committee may remember our W.R.A., Work Relief Administration, W.R.A., in which we spent millions of dollars to create jobs, government jobs rather than just handouts, dole. All over the Province we put people to work. This was to take up at least some of the slack there was in the economic situation at that time. Today we

MR. SMALLWOOD:

are in the third depression that Newfoundland has known since she became a Province. This will pass, I hope. I am not absolutely certain of that. I am not an optimist about the economic and social future of Canada, the United States and Europe and a large part of the world. I am by no means hopeful - I am hopeful - but by no means optimistic or certain of a good future. The system under which we live may truly contain within it the seeds of its own destruction. It may be incurable. I do not know. I hope not. I fear that it may well be incurable. However, that would be in the long run. That would not be in the immediate run.

The likelihood is that there will be some recovery from the present economic depression of North America and Europe. That is a very serious depression. What do you do, Mr. Chairman? Because we have had three depressions and may have three more, do you close your schools? Do you close your trade schools? Do you close your **Fisheries College**? Do you close your **College of Technology**? Do you close your university? If you see, and if you bemoan, and if it hurts you in the heart to see clever, ambitious young men and women of Newfoundland coming, so many of them out of poor homes and poor families, coming in such enormous numbers and proportions from little coves and harbours and hamlets stretching around the Coast of Labrador and the Coast of Newfoundland, when you see them come out of the trade schools and the **Fisheries College** and the **Technical College** and the university and finding more difficulty this year and last year than they had for some years before, difficulty to find jobs, that is hurtful, that is not nice, **but** because it is so you do not close your schools or your colleges or your technical institutions, **you** keep them going!

I remember when I turned the sod for the **Technical College** down here just to the East of us. There was a huge crowd there and it was broadcast and it was televised. I remember well addressing myself to something that someone had said to me. I said to the audience, 'A friend of mine said to me, 'In God's name Premier, why this insanity,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

spending \$7 million to build this great college of technology. Why this madness?' To which I had replied, 'Why do you call it madness?' His answer was that there is no way that the thousands of young men and women who will go through that college will find jobs, no way. My answer was this, "That may possibly be so. That is possibly so. Not necessarily so but possibly that is the case." But they are young Newfoundlanders, they are Newfoundlanders and if they cannot get jobs in Newfoundland for which this college will train and equip them, if they cannot get jobs in Newfoundland they will get jobs somewhere else." Now I said, "If they cannot get jobs in Newfoundland and there is no college of technology and they do not get the training that that college will give, they will still leave Newfoundland for the jobs they cannot find here. I would rather see them go out of Newfoundland educated and trained to take jobs than to go up and go on the relief rolls in Ontario or to become day labourers or hour labourers digging holes in the streets of Toronto."

Well, years later I was invited down to the same college where they had an enormous enrollment. We had enlarged the college. We built some big wooden additions to it, and I was invited there to speak and I repeated this story that I just told the Committee here and I said, "But what is the answer? How many who have gone through this college have been forced to leave Newfoundland to get the jobs that the college train them to fill?" And I gave

Mr. Smallwood.

the figure, and it was an astonishing figure. I repeat what I told my hon. friend here from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), my former cabinet colleague, what I told him on his feet - he was kind enough to let me do so - I repeat it now. For some writing that I am doing I asked the College of Technology, and I asked the College of Fisheries to give me - and I asked other education institutions - to give me the figures of their enrollment from the beginning. How many had they had enrolled? And what was the story? What was the outcome? What had happened to those students? I was astounded and, of course, delighted beyond the power to describe to learn that overwhelmingly those students were in jobs and good jobs and at jobs which they had been trained in the Fisheries College or the College of Technology to do, to fill. But, Sir, there is something else that must be said. Every word that my hon. friend said here today under the heading of Education he ought to have reserved for the debate on Industrial Development. We have a minister in this Province today who has two portfolios. He is the Minister of Rural Development. Well, we have had a debate on that here in the House. It went a little hot and heavy. There was one aspect of it that was not nice, and I still do not think it is nice, but we disposed of that, and under the rules of the House we are not allowed to raise that again in this session. We can do it next session. I think we might take a little crack at it in the debate on the Address in Reply or in the debate on the budget. We may touch on it. However, the other portfolio the hon. minister has is that of Industrial Development, and every word that my hon. friend said in his speech today could just as well, in fact better, be said in that debate.

Because what is to be said against the failures of the university and the failures of the seventeen trade schools, every one of which he and I and my other colleagues in the Liberal Cabinet put here, because there is no trade school in Newfoundland today that we did not put there - there has not been a new one built. Maybe there is no

Mr. Smallwood.

need for another one, I do not know. Maybe there is not enough money to go around now to do it. Maybe it is because Uncle Ottawa, which at that time under the administration, I may say, to be fair about it, of the Right Honourable John Diefenbaker, the dear friend and comrade and colleague and leader of my hon. friend the Minister of Rural Development and of Industrial Development, under his Prime Ministership Canada was very generous, and Newfoundland was very ambitious and so we built seventeen trade schools with great financial assistance from Ottawa, which assistance is not presently forthcoming which may be why the present administration have not, in going on five years, added to the number of trade schools.

Sir, we built the university, and seventeen trade schools, and the Technical College and the College of Fisheries. But there were three great things to be done in Newfoundland. It was not enough to do one of them. It was certainly not enough to do two of them. There had to be three. Now let me tell the Committee what I mean by that. There is nothing mysterious about it, no secret at all. For Newfoundland to hold its population, to prevent a terrible out-migration of our people by their going to seek the jobs they could not get here in Newfoundland - and thanks be to God almost, almost I say, I do not mean it literally, I could almost say thanks be to God this depression goes right across Canada to British Columbia, because if we had in Newfoundland in the past two years the depression we have had, and they did not have it in the rest of Canada, our population today would be 150,000 or 200,000 fewer than it is. But you go from the frying pan into the fire now. You go off from St. John's or Gander or Corner Brook or Placentia or Grand Bank or Carbonear to Toronto, and you are going from the frying pan truly into the fire.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

In Newfoundland there were three things to do if we were going to be a successful Province, One was a vastly enlarged, a vastly improved system of education. I am not talking philosophy now. I am talking about having more teachers, having more buildings, having more classrooms, having higher quality teachers, giving them more training, giving them more pay, and generally building a great education edifice. But, Sir, if we had done that and only that, what would have happened? They would have gone. We would have lost them, Newfoundland would have lost them, They would have gone to Ontario, to Nova Scotia, to New Brunswick, to New York, they would have gone to British Columbia, to Alberta, they would have to have gone. We would have lost them because we would have been educating our young men and women and not providing jobs for them.

So the second thing that had to be done was to provide jobs - economic development, industrial development, fishery development, mining development, forestry development, rural development, everything and anything that would create jobs, that had to be done or all your education would only have been a case of our bleeding ourselves white to pay the cost of educating young men and women to go off and build up Ontario, to go off and build up other parts of Canada, and we were just too poor to do that. We are still too poor to educate thousands of young men and women just to go off and build up other parts of Canada. I would venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that if the cost of educating and clothing and feeding a young man up to the age of, let us say, twenty-one could be ascertained, if the cost to the parents of clothing and feeding that youngster, that child and then that young man up to the age of twenty-one, if the cost to the government of providing schools and teachers and facilities so that he could get a decent education, put all of that together at the age of twenty-one, every young Newfoundlander, male and female, at the age of twenty-one has cost this Province, some of it coming directly out of the public treasury and some of it out of the private pockets of the parents, has cost this Province not less than \$30,000, every

Mr. Smallwood:

single individual student in Newfoundland is costing at least \$30,000.

Now if you were to divide \$250 million, what is the precise figure this year in the budget? is it \$250 million?

MR. HOUSE: \$264 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$264 million. If you were to divide the \$264 million into the population of the Province I do not know how much a head that comes to, perhaps the minister has done it. Maybe he can tell me how much a head education is costing the government, the public chest, how much a head of our population? It is a substantial amount. But that is only in one year.

MR. HOUSE: About \$500.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How much?

MR. HOUSE: About \$500.

MR. SMALLWOOD: About \$500. That is only for one year, this year, and that is only what the government directly spends on education. And then you add to that what the parents spend and all that together is just for one year. And you take twelve or fifteen years say, twelve years, now it has not been that much every year, the amount that it is this year, it was less last year, it was less the year before, and the year before, and the year before, its an amounting figure. But I would say that not less than \$30,000 is the cost to the parents and the public chest of every student in Newfoundland reaching the age of twenty-one. Now can this Province afford, can we afford to produce students, manpower, brains, energy, ambition for Ontario? Can we afford that here in Newfoundland? We cannot afford it. We have not got that kind of money. And we are going to be less and less able to afford it as the months and the years pass because we are not at the limit yet. If it is \$264 million this year, now what was it the year just past?

MR. HOUSE: \$244 million.





Mr. Smallwood.

for everything under the sun. That was the total amount we spent, \$30 million. Soon you will be spending ten times that on education alone. Soon you will be spending \$300 million. Now what is the third thing you had to do? You had to provide education facilities and opportunities and put a drive behind it. Make it popular, make it respected, make it even loved so that every mother in Newfoundland would get a fierce ambition, fierce, that her children, whatever might be the case with other families, her children were going to get every chance in this world to get a good education. You had to inculcate that feeling. You had to develop a fierce ambition, first in the parents, and that would rub off on to the children until you would have tens and scores of thousands of young men and women flocking to the schools, flocking to the trade schools, flocking to the Fisheries College, flocking to the Technological College and flocking to the university. That was the first.

The other one was economic development, because what is the use of educating them and training them at enormous expense only to help build up Ontario and thirdly you had something else to do. After all, you know, a smart young fellow could come out of the university at twenty-one or twenty-two or twenty-three or twenty-four, he could come out of the university and say, "Well, it is pretty good so far, pretty good. I have done all right. We got a nice university, and I have done all right, and at the same time I can get a job here now. But what kind of a Province is it? Yes, I got an education, I have got a training. Yes, I can get a job, but a job where? At what? In what kind of Province?" So, therefore, the third need was there. You had to make an attractive Province. You had to make an exciting Province. You had to make a Province that young people coming out of school, full of vim and ginger and energy and ambition, that they would like a Province that would attract them, a Province that they would not be ashamed of, a Province that would be

MR. SMALLWOOD: very attractive and exciting for them. Now what did that mean? That meant you had to have electricity all over. What else did it mean? You had to have water and sewerage all over. What else did it mean? You had to have roads all over. What else? It meant that you had to have paving all over. What else? It meant that you had to clear the snow off in Winter. What else? You had to build parks. What else? You had to put all kinds of attractions into the Province so that the three working together, good education, lots of jobs with good pay, and then a pleasant and attractive and healthy and wholesome Province to live in, with good hospitals, with good doctors, with good dentists, with good optometrists, with good opticians, with good nurses, with good roads, with good water and sewerage, with good electricity, with good municipal government, with good parks, with skiing and snowballing and ski-dooing and everything under the sun that you must have today to keep our people here.

You might not have to have it so much if you did not have radio, if you had never had television. If the people in Newfoundland grew up in the last twenty-five or thirty years as they had in the previous twenty, thirty, forty, fifty years, you might not need so attractive a Province. Then, Mr. Chairman, it might be quite feasible for a girl to go through Memorial University and get her Bachelor of Education, Bachelor of Science in Education and take a job in a small outport then perhaps; and then perhaps a girl might train as a nurse and be happy, be satisfied to go down and practice her profession in some little backward, out of the way, remote and isolated place, if there had not been radio, if there had not been television, if they had not learned of what kind of a world they were living in, if they did not know as they came so well to know what kind of a continent they were living in, and what kind of a country they now belonged to. So the competition that Newfoundland had to meet was the competition of Ontario and British Columbia and Alberta, the competition of the United States. We had to compete with those places to give our students an attractive place in which to live.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Now if we have fallen down on one of them - it is an exciting place now. After all, the roads have been built and they are still being built. They have been paved. We are still paving them, at fierce and at frightening cost because there are so many things. If, Mr. Chairman, we read - and God forbid! - if we read tomorrow morning that the Minister of Finance has gone out in some shed with an old sheet or a piece of rope or something and has made an end to the budget debate that is coming up, if he just put an end to it all, we could be sorry that so genial and affable and honourable a member and an hon. minister had decided to put an end to it, but we should not be too surprised; because if you talk in this present debate of \$264 million for education, and that and that only and nothing else, just education alone, \$264 million, up \$20 million from last year, and then you come to roads and then you come to health. We have not come to health yet. Then you come to all the other great departments of state, and you find that we are going to, the government in the budget they have brought down and which we are going to be debating, if ever the government have the nerve to call the debate -

MR. DOODY: If we ever get time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, that is up to the government. The government got interim supply through. That is two months money. The government could have spent the next month debating the Address in Reply, and the budget, and the Come By Chance resolution, that could have been done in that month, and then start this debate now. Oh, no! They will not call the debate on the Speech From the Throne, they will not call the debate on the budget, they will not call the debate on Come By Chance until the people of Newfoundland are so completely fed up with this House that even the reporters will not come here! And if they do they will only go asleep and they will not report anything that is said here except a charge of murder or rape or some awful offense or some awful crime. It will be in one ear and out the other. They will be so dull and despondent about sitting here and listening to

MR. SMALLWOOD:

some of the appalling stuff that we do here from time to time that there will be no publicity.

Now I would say that that is smart politics, very smart politics. I would not do a thing like that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh no!

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, never. I did not in twenty-three years. Maybe I would but I did not. When it was my task and my duty and my right to call the order of business, which it is the government's right to do, and normally that is set by the Premier, often he leaves it to the government House Leader to do it, you decide when the debate is to be held, on this or that or the other. The government had decided -

MR. DOODY: You used to do most of the debating yourself.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The word 'you' can only be addressed to Mr. Chairman or Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOODY: The hon. gentleman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman, what?

MR. DOODY: Did most of the debating himself.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did a lot of the debating because I loved debate. Usually I had something worth-while saying. Look at the Hansard. Look at the reports of my speeches and learn a lot. There is a lot to be learned from those speeches.

MR. MURPHY: Oh modesty, where art thou?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is true, a very modest person. Because if I wanted to prove my immodesty, the opportunities! No man in this House has had the opportunities to be so immodest as I could be. The opportunity has been there to be very, very immodest.

So my hon. friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for whom I have tremendous respect, that man I believe - that hon. gentleman, I should say - works harder perhaps than any other hon. member of this House. I believe he works harder than any hon. minister. I believe he works more hours every day and more days every week than any other person in this House. He is a tremendous worker. He does his work. He does

MR. SMALLWOOD:

his research. He does his homework. If there is a competitor it would be the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy who is, as I happen to know, a prodigious worker. Whatever else he is, he is a tremendous worker. There is no doubt about that. And in the country of the blind, the one-eyed man is king. If you have a government that are not fallen head over heels in love with hard work and industriousness, if you have one man who has and loves it, he will be the king and that is the saying. Now apply the saying. Does it turn out to be true in this case? I leave it to hon. members across to make up their own minds on that.

I am not saying that some of the young tribe, the young turks that are now in the cabinet, in Municipal Affairs and Housing, Fisheries,

Mr. Smallwood.

Transportation and Communications. I heard a good one about the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Who is the hon. minister's office next to his? What is the next office to the office of the Minister of Transportation and Communications? What minister is that?

MR. DOODY: Public Works.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Public Works. That is it. The hon. Minister of Public Works called in his secretary and said, "What is that terrible loud noise coming from the next office there?" And his secretary, Sir, said, "That is the Minister of Transportation and Communications talking to people in Bonavista." "Well," he said, "Why does he not use the telephone?" It is because he has a powerful voice, but he really ought to use the telephone. And when he gets into a genial conversation, as he sometimes does with the hon. Leader of the Opposition, he should maybe use wireless or perhaps something, some kind of a silencer on his voice.

I am not joking when I say I commiserate with the Minister of Finance. I am not joking. I am far from joking. And I am not joking when I say that I commiserate with the people of Newfoundland.

MR. DOODY: The reports of my death are grossly exaggerated.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

We are headed, I fear, into real trouble, this government, the public chest, this House, and this people, this Province. Our increase in education - have I got the figure right, as the minister has stepped out for a moment? - is \$264 million now the government are asking for, and last year it was \$247 million. So it is \$20 million or more of an increase this year. Now that is very typical of the overall picture. The budget last year was \$1 billion, an incredible, an unbelievable amount. One thousand million was last year's budget. And this year's budget - because we are living in rough times, hard times, and the belt is being pulled in by the government - this year's budget is \$1.25 billion. It is \$250,000,000 in one year.

Mr. Smallwood.

Mr. Chairman, please do not be alarmed.

I am not going into the debate on the budget, although I would like to. If I felt confident that the government will really have the courage to call that debate! The House Leader for the Government said in a one word reply to me today, "Yes," they are going to have that debate. That will be about July, say? No?

MR. DOODY: Before that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is the paper that appeared the day after the budget was delivered by my hon. friend, and it had as it deserved to have, a full page headline right across the page, "Taxes Boosted In. Hold-The-Line Budget." Here was a budget that the day before announced an increase of \$250 million over the preceding year. One billion last year, \$1.25 billion this year, an increase of \$ 250 million. So that is why the Minister of Education is to be congratulated that he got his - I will not say claws - but he got his grasp, his firm grasp on some of that \$250 million. He got \$20-odd million of it for his Department of Education. And I have no doubt that other departments managed to successfully and adroitly to get a share of that \$250 million as by way of increases in their votes. I do not know how successful the Minister of Fisheries was but one thing I am sure of, that whatever the Minister of Fisheries had - we will find out more about when that debate comes up - he will make good use of. He will make excellent use. He will put it to the very best possible advantage, because if there is one hon. member on that side of the House, if there is only one, he is that one. I do not think he is the only one, but if he is the only one on that side of the House who is full of ambition and absolute determination -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am talking about the Minister of Fisheries. If



MR. SMALLWOOD:

there is only one hon. minister on that side of the House who is absolutely determined to be a successful minister and make a great success of his job, that minister is the Minister of Fisheries.

But then I could say that -

MR. W. CARTER: Keep it quiet!

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not hear that.

MR. W. CARTER: I was not going to talk about it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, I think whatever he does that is the way it will be .

I have asked myself again and again should I get up in the debate on the estimates and say in every instance, "Too much! Too much! The government are asking us for too much," because I do not believe it is too much. I do not believe the Minister of Education is asking for too much. I do not believe the Minister of Fisheries, the Minister of Health, the Minister of Highways, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I do not think they are asking for too much.

MR. DOODY: The hon. minister has not got enough to keep the increase of cost of school operations -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not saying that they are asking for too much in the sense that they do not need it. In the sense that they need it, they are not asking for too much. But they are asking in the aggregate for too much. They are asking for at least a quarter of a billion dollars too much, too rich for our blood, Newfoundland cannot afford that quarter of a billion! That quarter of a billion may be the straw, a big hefty straw it is, that will break the camel's back. Because if the government do go out or try to raise all the money they are talking of raising in this current financial year, \$275 millions, if they are going to go out this year and raise or try to raise \$275 million, they may or may not succeed. But if they succeed, I prophesy it will be the last dollar they will raise, because the money lenders will take notice there is no doubt of that.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

So I am in a very unhappy position, Mr. Chairman. In one part of my mind I would like to denounce the amount of each individual minister is asking for.

MR. DOODY: On what grounds?

MR. SMALLWOOD: On the grounds that we cannot afford it.

MR. DOODY: The Treasury Board examined it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Treasury Board - I am talking about me, myself, now. I am not a member of the Treasury Board at present. I think I was President of it once, I am not sure. I think I was. Anyway I am just speaking of my own feeling, and my own feeling is that it goes against the grain to argue against these increases, these steep, these quite fantastic increases the government are asking for, in the aggregate a quarter of a billion, and at the same time it goes against the grain to vote against these amounts or to talk against them. Now what will I do? Will I be cowardly and absent myself every time the vote is taken? So that I could say in a cowardly kind of way later on, oh I did not vote for it. I did not vote for it. I am not cowardly. There is nothing cowardly about me. There never was, and I hope there never will be. And not being cowardly I either have to be a man or a hen have I not?

MR. DOODY: A man or a mouse.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A man or a mouse, is that what they say? I have to vote for this quarter of a billion increase in the spending of the government in one year.

I led an administration, Mr. Chairman, in this Province and in the first ten years, now I am speaking from memory, it may be twelve or fourteen or fifteen years, it may be only nine or ten years, but certainly in the first ten years the amount that was spent each year for those ten years all added up it did not come to the amount of the increase in this one year. The increase is a quarter of a billion dollars, but that was a hold-the-line.

Now what in God's name what would they have called it if the budget had called for \$1 billion expenditure this year, the

Mr. Smallwood:

same as last year's, what would they call that? They would call it miserable penurying. They would call it, "The government has introduced a wretched economy budget!" The lot, you know. A quarter of a billion up, and its a hold-the-line budget. Hold what line? What do they mean by hold?

MR. SMALLWOOD:

And what do they mean by line, hold-the-line? An increase of \$250 million. You know you go back to your house and your wife says, "Well, you know, I have just gone over the accounts for the year and, you know, what the groceries and the household expenses cost for the year? It cost \$4,500." You gasp. You say, "It actually costs that, \$4,500?" "Yes", she says, "but we are going to change now. We are going to hold the line, and next year it is only going to be \$7,000 or \$6,000 holding the line". What would you do to your wife? What would you say to your wife if you were greeted with that? What should the Newfoundland people say to their managers, the managers of the economy, the government? What should the people of Newfoundland say to the managers of their economy, the Newfoundland economy? What should they say to the government? "Last year you had a billion dollar budget, \$1,000,000,000. Now you are coming in with a hold-the-line budget, \$1,250,000,000, a hold-the-line budget!" What should the people say to that?

I am in despair. I am terribly downhearted and depressed about the prospects of our dear Province, your Province, my Province, the Province of all of us. We are in serious trouble, serious, serious trouble. There are at least one, two, three, four, five, there are at least five hon. members sitting to Your Honour's left, on the government side of the House, there are at least five who are just as vividly, just as keenly aware as I am of the truth of what I have just said. They too know what an utterly desperate condition it is.

Now I am sorry that the Minister of Education should be the occasion of my being a Jeremiah while it is education that is being talked on, because I would fight to the last breath for ever more and more for education. Although, Mr. Chairman, I am tempted to say something that perhaps I ought not to say, but it is what I think. Should a man say what he thinks even if it is unpopular, even if it could be quoted against him and used against him?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Could I remind the hon. member that one minute is coming up

MR. CHAIRMAN:

to the expiration of the forty-five minutes?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Your Honour, I get one minute?

MR. CHAIRMAN: One minute.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One minute. That is enough for me to say what I want to say. What I want to say is that I see a remarkable thing happening in our modern world. I see the strength and the influence of religion declining, becoming diluted and education taking its place. It is the great modern superstition of our age that education has become the new religion. I do not think that it is or can be enduringly successful - remember the two words 'enduringly successful' - as a substitute for deep religious faith and religious worship. But it is becoming successful, but I do not think it can endure.

I suppose every one of the 7,000 teachers will despise me for saying that, and perhaps the minister will despise me for saying it, but it comes from my heart and I think that we are overdoing it. Not merely in the beautiful great buildings we have been putting up but in almost all other ways in our great programme of education. I am as guilty as anyone in this chamber, perhaps more guilty than any other hon. member, for the tremendous drive and the tremendous cost of education.

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

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I rise, of course, because I did not allude to all the points that I wanted to make the last time that I spoke to the 701, the minister's salary, plus the fact that I found out since the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) spoke that I have been too long talking to teachers. I think that I have got to get rid of some of my educational jargon because I made precisely the same points that he was making. I just want to elucidate on some of these, and to go a little further into some of the points that I did not mention when I last spoke. The hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned that I had said that we were not reaching the stage in this Province when we were turning out graduates that could not find jobs. Number one, I think I pointed out, and all hon. members will recall, that I pointed out the importance in education of establishing aims and objectives. In doing this I said that there was a danger of two things in this Province, of over educating and under educating. If we were to put vast sums of money into post secondary institutions such as the Trades and Technology School and in the Fisheries, we would find the same things happening, of course, that are happening in the United States where the hon. member referred to people with degrees not being able to get jobs. This is the point I was trying to make, that we have got to be very, very careful that we do not under educate our people and that we do not over educate our people. I would suggest still - and the hon. member is not here, and that is unfortunate - but I would suggest that many of the graduates that are walking around in the United States without jobs - I am reluctant to say this, but I am forced to - I would think many of the graduates walking around have degrees of very little value. I would expect some of these degrees or even doctors of canoeing or skiing because you can get all sorts of degrees, and I think this is what we have got to watch in this Province, that we provide an education whereby the people are educated in terms of the kinds of skills that we are going to need.

I can recall back ten years ago, first when the trade schools got going, that many people were being educated, were taking courses in welding.

MR. LISSIT:

The market became glutted with welders. I would expect the same thing is happening today in other trades with electricians and this sort of thing. But I still maintain that we have not reached that system whereby we have graduates walking around doing nothing. If we do, it is again related to the fact, to two things, that we have got to look at our aims and objectives, we have got to establish new directions for education so that people are being trained in those areas in which their skills are going to be needed. This is a very important issue and something that we have to do. It relates back to the schools with guidance. There are people going into wrong types of programmes. But that is not to condemn the educational system. People need more training. I notice the kinds of things that the hon. member mentioned, people with B.A.s. We know that a Bachelor of Arts degree does not qualify a man to get any particular kind of a job today. It is a very general degree. It is just education for the sake of education. If a person wants to do it that is fine. But we have to counsel people. We have to give them guidance, tell what this kind of a degree will give them. Because a person goes to university and graduates, in my explanation, that is no reason why the person should be given a job. I think some people expect because they have gone to university that the world owes them a living. That is not the case. But I say it relates back to establishing our aims and our objectives, making sure that people are being trained in the skills that will be needed and giving them lots of counselling and guidance in our high schools, which I think is sadly lacking.

This is point I was trying to make. The other night actually I was trying to do three or four things. Number one - and I am aware of the restraints and the austerity programme, but I was trying to do two things - one, I was trying to point out the great need by government to put a greater priority on education. I was pointing out the need for more money, that the money now spent on education is inadequate to meet our present needs and that the amounts now spent on education are not at all as astronomical

April 29, 1976.

Tape 2302

RH - 3

MR. LUSH:

as they appear. When we look at the proportion that the educational expenditures are taking out of the total provincial budget, and when viewed in terms of the real spending value of a dollar, when we look at it



Mr. Lush.

in these terms we will find out that the money spent on education is not so astronomical as it would first appear.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few points that I did make the other night, but it is not repetition. It is repetition to try and prove a few points that I want to make here today. I have said, Mr. Chairman, that the problems faced by education in this Province are great, and it is a necessity for the government to put a greater emphasis on education if our people are to have the educational opportunities that they deserve and if they are to have the same equal educational opportunity extended to other Canadians in this country. And I pointed out some of the conditions which existed in education to cause us concern, some conditions which should cause the government to be concerned about education in this Province. And I will just run down through them. I mentioned the high drop-out rate. I mentioned the inadequate school buildings, the narrow curriculum in many of our high schools, the few specialists in our schools, and I think I have made that point, the necessity for guidance counsellors earlier, helping people to take the right trades and professions. And vast sums of money are required to help the so-called disadvantaged children, particularly those who have experienced the long history of deprivation in rural areas, large numbers of handicapped who have little opportunity to acquire a good education, something which is their right. There is a large student-teacher ratio, and I just want to comment on this again that I mentioned, I think, the ill-effect that this could have on our educational system with respect to quality education with children. A teacher working with large numbers of students cannot possibly do an adequate job and presently our student-teacher ratio is far too high.

But last night listening to the NTA president it would also appear that this is going to have an adverse effect on graduate teachers coming out of the university. And this is certainly

Mr. Lush.

a sad situation if this should be the case. He did not give any specific numbers, but at one point it was referred to that probably as many as 200 people coming out of the university next year may not be able to get jobs in teaching, and this could be very, very serious.

But I think, Mr. Chairman, that these conditions emphatically point out the magnitude of the task with which this Province is faced if our people are to have equal educational opportunity. It is quite clear that if we believe in the maximum development of our people, the government is going to have to place more emphasis on education. This means that the government is going to have to spend more money on education. And I raise the question again: How can the provincial government provide even more funds for education? One suggestion, of course, is to have education assigned a higher priority in provincial spending.

A look at the expenditures across Canada will confirm that Newfoundland is spending considerably less than most other provincial governments on education. Mr. Chairman, the very fact that we are a have-not Province is reason enough to compel us to be spending more money on the development of our people, and not less. And the comparison of educational expenditures in elementary and secondary schools reveals less spending on education in just about every kind of statistic you can find. And I just want to refer to a couple of tables, for example. Here is one that I am quoting here which shows the total expenditures on elementary and secondary education related to total spending on formal education, and it goes from 72 per cent with a projection actually up to 76 per cent or 77 per cent. And in Newfoundland on the elementary and secondary education, in 1971-1972 that the total of the education budget allocated to the elementary and secondary education was 60 per cent as compared

Mr. Lush.

to Prince Edward Island which was 60.8 per cent; to New Brunswick it was 69.8 per cent; to Quebec it was 70.1 per cent; to Ontario it was 63.5 per cent; to Manitoba 67.5 per cent; to Saskatchewan 68 per cent; to Alberta 62 per cent; to British Columbia 66.4 per cent. The average for Canada was 65.5 per cent, and we were down to 60 per cent.

MR. LUSH:

I will take another one, 1974-1975. That year the amount of money, the total expenditures on elementary and secondary education was 59.3 per cent of the total monies; in PEI, again 61.8 per cent; in New Brunswick 67.4 per cent; Quebec 65.7 per cent; Ontario 64.1 per cent, and so on it goes up. On the Canadian average that year was 64.8 per cent of money spent on elementary and secondary education, and we spent 59 per cent. The projection, and I have not worked it out for 1966-1967 to find out how accurate indeed it is, but the projection -

MR. R. MOORES: Fifty-nine per cent of what?

MR. LUSH: Pardon?

MR. R. MOORES: Fifty-nine per cent of what?

MR. LUSH: Of the total monies in education, all right, out of the \$264 this year, for example, all right. So we have been talking about 60 per cent and less on secondary and elementary education, when indeed the national average is just about in every case 65 per cent. It is 65 per cent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What moral should we draw from that comparison?

MR. LUSH: It shows that we are spending considerably less money on education. And looking at the conditions that are existing, then we should be spending more. This is what it points out. When I have listed the conditions which are existing right now with inadequate schools and narrow curriculum -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. member permit? As I understand it, what he is saying is, I believe, the percentage showing how much of the grand total amount spent on education is spent on one particular aspect of education. And in reply to my question - what moral do we draw from that? - his moral is, not that we should spend a higher percentage of the whole on that aspect, but that we should spend more for all. Why? So that we can spend a higher proportion or will the proportion remain the same for those grades of education?

MR. LUSH: Yes. The point is I am just showing one area in education where we are spending far less than indeed other provinces

Mr. Lush:

are spending. And I pointed out -

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, that does not show that. The figure the hon. gentleman quoted -

MR. LUSH: Sure it does.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - does not show any such thing as that.

MR. LUSH: Again I will show you out of the total - first of all our total budget is less.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh yes, the total budget not just -

MR. LUSH: Oh yes, it is the total budget -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I understood the hon. member to mean of the total amount spent in a year for education certain percentages were spent in the different provinces that he quoted. But what he is talking about these percentages are the percentages of the whole grand total budget for everybody?

MR. LUSH: No, no, no!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well then -

MR. ROWE: The education budget.

MR. LUSH: The education budget.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. All right that is what I understood at first,

MR. LUSH: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: and now I understand it again. But would the hon. gentleman draw the moral?

MR. LUSH: Yes. I have illustrated, what I am getting at, I have illustrated -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You are on the education budget only now.

MR. LUSH: Pardon?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. LUSH: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. Just the education budget.

MR. LUSH: That is right.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is argumentative.

MR. LUSH: No, no, no. The education budget. So first of all

Mr. Lush:

I am pointing out that we do not spend not as great a proportion of our educational budget on secondary and elementary education -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. LUSH: - as they do in other parts of Canada, all right?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right. Now under what moral?

MR. LUSH: The moral is that because we are not doing this that we are not giving the kind of education that we should be giving our children, we are not offering the kinds of facilities that they are offering other parts of Canada, consequently our students do not have the same equal educational opportunity as children in other parts of Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Again would the hon. member permit? He is very patient and generous to allow me to interpret him like this, but I am immensely interested. If we are spending a smaller proportion of our total education vote on that kind of education than the other provinces, then by the same token we are spending more than the other provinces on the other aspects of education, are we not?

MR. LUSH: No. No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But we must be.

MR. LUSH: Because our total budget -

AN HON. MEMBER: In percentage.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. I mean percentage I am talking about.

MR. LUSH: Yes in percentage, possibly in percentage.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that bad?

MR. LUSH: It is not bad. But all I am asking - the total point of this argument is that we should be spending more on education, and what I am saying here is just pointing out one area where we are spending less.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, the hon. member means spending a higher percentage on that.

MR. LUSH: Right. That is right. But the point I

MR. LUSH:

also want to make, if I can get to it, is to point out how our total budget in education is also less.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ah, ha! That is another thing.

MR. LUSH: All right. This is what I want to get on to. I am just doing one aspect here.

MR. HOUSE: If the hon. member would allow I would like to ask him a question, a point of observation. I am interested in that statistic he is using for the simple reason that I have been trying to garner some statistics and I am not sure that we are doing the same thing in each province. Now last night I sat down and I looked at the education budget in total, and I came to the conclusion that we are spending over seventy per cent of our budget on primary and elementary education and special education. Now you will see our vote is \$174 million but we have got to assess so much of the Department of Education as being expended in elementary and primary education. We have got to assess so much of a lot of other factors, scholarships that we give out. That is elementary and primary education and secondary education. So you can take the total budget as \$200 million if you assess it that way. Now I do not know how the other provinces do it and that is why I am a little bit afraid of using comparative statistics.

MR. LUSH: Well, you know, if that is the case then we will have to point out to Statistics Canada that we are not doing it properly here in Newfoundland. But anyway - pardon?

MR. MURPHY: Compared to the minister's setting it, what percentage is the hon. member -

MR. LUSH: This one was 60.1 for this one for this year. But that was a projection. All right? That was simply a projection of what they thought it might be.

There is another one to look at and this is the total expenditure on elementary and secondary education per capita. This is what it is costing us per person. And in 1971 in Newfoundland it

M. LUSH:

was \$177, and in Prince Edward Island, the people were spending \$180, in Nova Scotia, \$183, New Brunswick, \$191, upwards to \$268. Again the Canadian average there was \$250. We were spending \$177.

I will take us down to another one, 1974-1975.

The amount that we were spending per capita on elementary and secondary education was \$235, whereas in Prince Edward Island it was \$277, and the Canadian average that year, for 1974-1975, was \$306 per capita and we were spending \$235. So, you know, this points out to me the lack of financial effort at this particular time when compared to other Canadian provinces.

Again I want to point out that I think that the public does not get the right impression when we tell them that the budget was \$264 million for education. That sounds like an astronomical figure, staggering. But the point is that the proportion of money spent on education out of the total budget has remained the same in Newfoundland for the past fifteen years, with probably a percentage point change. As a matter of fact it was going down from 1971 until 1974, I think. It was going down and then at 1974 it came up a little bit. But I do not think it has ever gotten over, the total budget had never been much more than one-quarter in education. It has never been more than one quarter. I have not worked out the percentage. I find the figure too big. I tried to work it out with the billion what it is this year, but it is less than a quarter this year, close around that area.

So the point is that the amount of money spent in education, even though the figure goes up and up, and so do the figures in everything else, but it has remained the same, The amount of money that we spend on secondary and elementary education, the percentage, the proportion, it has remained the same over the past fifteen years. I am wondering if that is not a formula. If we say, you know, that the budget has to be within the twenty-three per cent, has to be twenty-two per cent of the total for education,



MR. LUSH: the same thing with the elementary and the secondary, it has remained the same, with a change of two percentage points maybe from 57 per cent to 59 per cent. That is the way it has been. That is one point about trying to look at what is spent on education realistically. Of course the other point is the one that I tried to mention here the other night when we talked about the ever increasing cost of education, is to try and isolate what factors cause the increase in education. And I mentioned that up to 70 per cent of the cost in education was related to school hire enrollment, teachers' salaries and inflation. So the real increase in education was not apparent, really, from looking at the figures. You had to look at the various factors within it. So the real increase was not apparent.

The other thing is that when we look at the real value of the dollar, we find out that the money that we are getting really is not that much in education. It is not something to be frightened about, it is not something to be startled about, when we look at the real spending value of the dollar. As a matter of fact, I think all across Canada in the last - I do not know where the percentages were compiled, whether it was over a two or three year period, but certainly over a one year period - looking at the real increase, it was something .3 per cent all across Canada. That is looking at the real dollar value.

So I think when we look at these factors we can see that the spending in education is not that astronomical and all I am doing or what I have tried to do on those two occasions - I have spoken is to try to impress upon the government the necessity for making sure in education that we know where we are going, that because of the problems that we now face in education in order to give every student in this Province, every person, equal educational opportunity, that we are going to have to assign education

MR. LUSH: a higher priority within the government and this is going to mean more money. And it is not a case of asking for more money for the sake of wanting more money, we need it. Education is important and we have got so many needs that we have got to look into providing more money for education.

I just wanted to comment on a few other things before cluing up, and I do not want to dwell long on this because the hon. member of Hermitage, I think, alluded to this and that was the use of schools. And I just want to point out how strongly, or that I feel rather strongly about this as well, that we have got schools around this Province, the best buildings in the community, with the best facilities, and they are only being used in the regular school day. With all the organizations around wanting to use these I think it is terrible that these people cannot get in to use these facilities, even with professional groups. They cannot use the schools without paying exorbitant rents.

I was president of a professional group for the past three years, the International Reading Association, and we paid as high as \$65 for rent for a school on a weekend, for a Saturday when teachers were supposed to be off we came back to do something in the way of professional development, to -

MR. PECKFORD: To use the place you had to pay the rent?

MR. LUSH: Yes. Right. And you pay \$65. This year I am told that the organization was hit for a much higher fee, something over \$100, for professional people to use their own facility. So it is a terrible indictment on our system that we have got these buildings around and that we cannot use them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the Auditor General's Report and there are a couple of things there that I would like to bring to the attention of the minister and have his comments or explanations for. The first thing that the Auditor General comments upon is the improper charges to certain subdivisions. In his Report he talks about operational grants. He talks about how

Mr. Lush.

two figures, one in the amount of \$3,000 and one to the tune of \$13,000, just about \$14,000, were charged to the subdivision relating to an accounting study into the financial condition of two schools. But the Auditor General points out that these funds, of course, as voted by the Legislature should have been allocated within the regulations enacted under the authority of the Schools Act. Maybe the minister would explain this. But the one that I find most offensive, the one that I find most disagreement with, is the one that he labelled as expenditure without appropriation. And in this one he is talking about services to school boards, grants, transportation of school children. It includes amounts of over \$100,000 in total which relate to the transportation costs for handicapped children, and the amounts involved were paid to sundry persons and companies rather than directly to school boards. And he notes there that these payments were made without written contracts between the suppliers and the government. He further points out that no public tenders were invited for the contracts, no public tenders for this amount of money for these services. He says that these payments were not processed through the supervisor of transportation, these payments were not grants to school boards, and supplier cards for the various suppliers receiving these payments were not adequately maintained.

Then he goes on to say that a similar charge of \$1,750 was processed through subdivision 603-03-05, scholarships and bursaries relating to that, and again handicapped children.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise immediately before 5:30 P.M. so that we can get the Late Show in before 6:00 P.M. So if the hon. member would like to continue his remarks afterwards, I would move that the Committee rise at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole has reported that they have considered the matters to them referred, have made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion Committee ordered to sit again presently.

It being 5:30 P.M., we now proceed to the procedure as outlined in the Standing Order, and the first matter for consideration is on the subject matter of lawyers being able to use the names of their secretaries when filing share lists and on registration, I call upon the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of grave concern to the people of this Province, Sir, that when companies are formed that there is a loophole big enough in the Companies Act to drive a bulldozer through whereby the company, when it is registered under the act, down in the Registry of Companies office downstairs, that the real owners of that company, of any company that is formed, do not have to be shown on the share list. And in most cases, Sir, the share list is filed in the name of the law firm, or the secretaries who work for the law firm are shown on the share list as being the owners of these companies. This is a matter that concerns the people of this Province, Sir, because the people's government, the administration, are doing business with some of these companies, and the people do not know who the real owners of these companies are. I have met one or two lawyers recently, Mr. Speaker, who are refusing now to register a company with the name of the law firm or the individual lawyers or the secretaries of the law firm on the share list.

MR. NEAPY:

One or two lawyers are beginning to realize how immoral and unethical this practice has been. The lawyers give the excuse, Sir, that in the past they have had to do this because of lack of communication, that the owners of the companies have been scattered all over Newfoundland, or all over Canada, or all over North America. I say, Sir, to that argument that it is balderdash! Today, with the communications and the transportation system that we have, you can have the owners of the companies right on the spot to sign the documents in a matter of hours.

Mr. Chairman, I contend that this government should set the example by refusing to deal with companies who are registered in the registry office where the real owners of the companies are not shown. I can give the House, Sir, three examples of companies that this government is doing business with at the present time, that up to a week ago, when I last checked the registry office, had not filed their share list of the real owners of these companies. How do we know but the ministers do not own these companies?

One company is a company called COMANEC - Construction, Management and Economics Ltd - that the minister is dealing with, the Minister of Public Works. Sir the share list for that company has not been filed. It is overdue. And we do not know who the real owners of that company are. Then there is a company called Stephenville Development Corporation. The share list is filed in the name of three secretaries for a law firm in Corner Brook doing business with this government. It took over recently the buildings out in Stephenville and going to renovate the buildings, and we do not know who the owners of the company are.

Then there is Amalgamated Salvage Metal that is getting this dollar from the license fees for collecting car wrecks around Newfoundland. We do not know who the owners of that company are at this moment. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time that this practice was put to an end and that the government should set the good example by refusing

MR. MEADY:

to do business with companies. Well, how do they know? They may be dealing with the Mafia! Refuse to do business with these companies where the real owners are not registered in the registry of companies office.

The argument, Sir, that it is hard to get the owners together, that argument is now obsolete and outdated. Mr. Speaker, I put the question to the Minister of Justice some time ago, and he told me that the Companies Act was going to be amended to plug that loophole, and then the Minister of Mines and Energy last week contradicted the Minister of Justice by telling me that the government had no intention of amending the Companies Act, that there was nothing wrong with it, that this practice was perfectly normal and perfectly legal. Well I claim, Sir, that it is wide open for abuse and misuse, and it has been misused and is being abused and it is time that it was put to a stop. I hope that when the minister rises to answer my allegations, if you can put it that way, and my accusations that he will tell this House that the government intends to plug this loophole in the Companies Act and update the Companies Act so that never again will the lawyers and the law firms and the secretaries be filed down in the registry office as owners of these companies.

It is really frustrating, Mr. Speaker, for a fellow like myself, who does a lot of research in connection with the goings on in this Province, to go down and not to be able to find out who the real owners of these companies are that are doing business with the government and doing business in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. BICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the comments made by the hon. gentleman for LaPelle (Mr. Meady) fall into two categories, as I see it. One, he suggests that the Companies Act of Newfoundland should be amended to compel any persons so incorporating or whenever a company is incorporated that the incorporators be the true shareholders of the company.

MR. MEADY: Right.

MR. HICKMAN: Now we have been doing a fair amount of work on the Companies Act with a view to ascertaining, number one, whether we need a new Companies Act in this Province. Recently I was authorized by government to retain Mr. Leo Barry, LL.M., to do a study of the company laws as they exist in Canada and in the United Kingdom. He is a gentleman who certainly has the ability and the expertise and the kind of mind that is necessary to do this research, because our research to date has indicated that the Companies Acts in most of the provinces, if not all the ones we looked at, do not have any provision different from that which prevails in the Province of Newfoundland and there is

MR. HICKMAN: obviously a very good reason for it, and the reason for it is that if -

MR. NEARY: Lawyers are -

MR. HICKMAN: - if someone wants to remain incognito, or to do business behind a company in private that they can do it by way of a trust.

MR. NEARY: Why should they be allowed to -

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied as yet that there is sufficient evidence to indicate the need for a change. The reason why the practice has been followed by lawyers in all provinces that I know of in signing the memorandum and articles of association at the time of incorporation has been purely a matter of convenience. It enables the company to be incorporated on the instructions of one's client -

MR. NEARY: Not in all cases.

MR. HICKMAN: - and following which the necessary formal meetings are held and then a lawyer-in most instances, and I think back to the days when I was in practice - would then take instructions from his client as to the number of shares to be issued and there would then appear the actual shareholders of the company. Nothing wrong with it at all! If the government or some other company or person is doing business with a company where the share list still shows three persons who were not the true shareholders as being the incorporators, surely any prudent government, any prudent person, any prudent businessman, any prudent bank lending money to that company would find out, and would have the right to find out and could very easily find out, who the shareholders are. They have to know because they are dealing with them. They negotiate with them. They must know who they are.

MR. NEARY: No, they do not! No, they do not.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman from LaPoile would do me the same courtesy as I did him, I might be able to in the



MR. HICKMAN: very few minutes that are at my disposal, deal with this matter and indicate to the House what government is proposing to do.

What we intend to do and have decided to do is, after we have had a review of our act to decide whether or not Newfoundland needs a new Companies Act and in that respect, Mr. Speaker, I would draw to the attention of the House that one province, the Province of British Columbia about three years ago, after many years of study, came in with a massive new Companies Act which was supposed to plug every loophole known, which was supposed to repeal and change the company law of Canada which has been following the Companies Act of England in most of the provinces for over a century. They have now come to the conclusion in the Province of British Columbia that the new act is so cumbersome that the only real beneficiaries from this legislation are the lawyers and the chartered accountants. And the former Attorney General, Mr. Alex MacDonald who was in the Barrett government, announced that they were giving very serious consideration to going back to the act that they had repealed. And there is the tendency today, particularly in the Canadian provinces as opposed to what you would find in the Parliament of the UK, to bring in complicated, massive pieces of legislation in the field of consumer protection, companies law, trust law, and then they find that they are so complicated that they cannot be enforced; whereas our English brethren, our English parliamentarians, still tend to stick to simplicity and have come to the conclusion that because a piece of legislation has been around a long time does not necessarily mean that it is not good.

But the instructions that have gone out to Mr. Barry, who has been retained by the government, is that after he makes his

MR. BICKMAN: Initial report, and assuming that it is indicated that there should be major amendments to our company legislation or alternatively a new Companies Act, that he will then seek representation from the Newfoundland Federation of Labour, the Board of Trade or the Chamber of Commerce, the Chartered Accountants Association, the Law Society of Newfoundland, and anyone else who may be interested or may have some ideas as to what should be incorporated in any major amendments to the Companies Act or in a new Companies Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman's time has expired. The second matter for debate relates to the decentralization of certain Manpower Training Programmes and as this affects the Carbonear District Vocational School.

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, in order to present a logical argument I would like to first discuss what is the purpose of the BTSD programme, which is called the Basic Training for Skill Development programme, which is a federal/provincial programme here in the Province for students of Newfoundland. Then I will talk about decentralization, its supposed advantages, and the supposed advantages of centralization and then apply them to Carbonear, which I am specifically interested in. Basic Training for Skill Development, Mr. Speaker, the important factor there is that it is Basic Training for Skill Development. That is to say the purpose of the programme is to provide a student who does not have basic education with basic education so that he can continue on to acquire a skill, that is to say, in this Province a vocational training, plumbing, electrical, etc. The clientele of this programme, or the type of student who enrolls in it is approximately twenty-seven years of age, is unskilled and is an elementary or high school dropout who has been in the labour force for five to ten years, a very important thing to remember.

Now from all the information that I have gathered the only advantage that the Department of Education, the hon. minister's department is proposing by decentralization is that it will reduce the threat factor, and the threat factor is the attitude of a student who has to move from his community to another community to take a course. The threat factor then is that student becomes homesick, disenchanted or whatever you have and decides to drop the course and return home. The advantage of centralization, however, is obvious and has been gone over for years, larger and better equipped facilities, more qualified staff which are attracted to larger, major centres such as Carbonear, St. John's, where the social life and what have you is more attractive, of a better quality. The threat factor of decentralization does not exist because of the clientele under the BTSD programme. The

Mr. R. Moores.

threat factor may be a logical argument for the lower programmes such as L-100, the Educational Development programme or the BLADE programme which is supposedly an under-programme that you step from BLADE into BTSD. So if there is no threat factor, or the threat factor is minimized in the BTSD programme, why decentralize? Why take the course to the students, because you are only delaying the inevitable. The student has to go from the BTSD programme into vocational school if the long-term goal of the programme is to be achieved. You do not just give them education and then say, "Well, boy, go back home." He is given BTSD training to go on to acquire an electrical trade or a plumbing trade in vocational school.

Now to put that in tangible terms supposing a student in Brigus receives the course in Brigus and passes his BTSD or receives it or what have you, The only things that happens then is the inevitable. He has to then become mobile and go to Carbonear, centralization, for a vocational training. It is foolishness! It is a waste of time, a waste of the government's and the taxpayer's money. Now how does it apply to Carbonear? From Canada Manpower's figures there is at present in Trinity and Conception Bay, Harbour Grace Manpower, thirty-one per cent unemployment. That has worsened this year because of Come By Chance closing and because of the Old Perlican fish plant burning down. So you have population - we all know that there is about 50,000 in Trinity and Conception Bay which are, by the way, serviced - at least half of them - by the Carbonear vocational school. Carbonear also has the staff -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to this and I cannot do much better than I did the other day when I answered the question. Except for the logic of the hon. member for Carbonear's argument, if we followed the logic of his argument we would not have a BTSD programme in Carbonear at all. We would have them all in Stephenville because that is where they start. If we did not decentralize we would not have had one there. So if we had followed that kind of logic we would not have had one to debate about today.

Mr. Speaker, we have decentralized the BTSD programme because the factors mentioned there, people twenty-seven years of age and so on, a lot of these people are family men and obviously they would sooner be living home if at all possible and get this particular training. We have these schools - there are nine original, Bell Island, Placentia, Carbonear, Bonavista, Springdale, Baie Verte, St. Anthony, Stephenville and Happy Valley.

Last year the Department of Manpower and Immigration Unemployment Insurance Commission put out a programme for an eighteen month period whereby they said, "Well, it is better to put some literacy training on or BTSD training than to have people unemployed." So they put this one for an eighteen month period. We put some programmes in Gander and Burin and Bay d'Espoir as well as some in some of the other existing places that I just named.

Now if you will look at that, these programmes, the Minister of Manpower the other day announced that they were going on until the end of June I think this year and they would have to phase out because there is no more of that kind of programme. So we look at the situation. Between Springdale and Clarenville there is no upgrading because we took this programme out of Gander. There is none on the Burin Peninsula and none in the Bay d'Espoir area. So what have the Committee said? "Well let us take some seats out of some existing schools and put the seats into places like Gander, which is right in the center, Burin and Bay d'Espoir. So consequently they did not destitute these communities. They took fifteen seats out of Placentia, which only had

MR. HOWSE:

forty-five, fifteen out of Carbonear which had ninety, fifteen out of Bonavista which had forty-five and fifteen out of Springdale. Of course they placed these in these other areas. The logic is just simple, we try to centralize and give the service to the community.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the other arguments: I have not got any reaction from any other community despite the fact that three more or four more communities lost more than Carbonear. The basic reaction I did get was not from the pupils. I got it from the member. But I did get reaction from a teacher. Now we cannot bring pupils to teachers. That is not the policy. We bring the teachers to the pupils. That is the philosophy of this programme and that is why it was done.

MR. SPEAKER: The third matter for debate this afternoon is with respect to the recent negotiations between the Province of Newfoundland and the Province of Quebec with respect to Labrador.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My request that this matter be discussed on the Late Show or debated on the Late Show, whatever the case may be, was prompted not so much by a quarrel with the position which the government have adopted as it was with the fact that this is really the only way that we can even have a brief discussion at this point in time because of the way the rules of the House work. I say not so much a quarrel because I think the position which the government have taken is exactly the same as the position which all of the political parties in this Province have taken. I believe that position, Sir, is one which every citizen of this Province would agree with. So it is not so much a matter of a quarrel or a difference of opinion, which is the normal Late Show subject matter, as it is of the opportunity to say a few words and in turn the minister to say a few words, possibly to expand upon some of the points which he made in reply to a question which I asked him at two of the clock when we met, or possibly to respond to one or two of the suggestions which I will make.

MR. ROBERTS:

The position, Sir, should be quite clear and I think it is quite clear. I believe it is summarized in a phrase which I have used. I do not claim it to be an original phrase. I think it has probably been part of the political life of this Province for many years, possibly even generations, and I do not think it is even unique to Newfoundland and Labrador. The phrase, Sir, is a very simple one, "What we have, we hold." I am glad that the government have come to that position and I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the cabinet today have confirmed the position as outlined by the Minister of Mines and Energy because when I saw him on the television last night - now it was only a cut, a portion of what he may have given in an interview, it may have been taken out of context - but at that point the minister was quoted as saying, indeed not quoted, in his own words, was saying on the television that we were going to give consideration to this proposal to take seventy-five - well the minister shakes his head, but I know what I saw on the television, on the CBC news at about twenty of seven last night. I am sorry, six-thirty on the National News, the lead story on the National News last night. Well, the minister has set that straight and it is well because, Sir, if it was wrong to trade off part of Labrador, 7,500 square miles or 10,000 square miles, if it is wrong to trade it off, it is equally wrong to sell it. To sell it, Sir, would be a policy of prostitution, to do for money that which we would not do for principle. I am glad the government have rejected it and they have done the right thing to reject it.

I also, Sir, welcome the Premier's commitment for a debate and a discussion in the House. I believe the House should be given a full and a complete briefing. We have not had one since the minister's quite lengthy statement at the end of November, and the debate that followed on that and now there have been five months and much water under the bridge and many developments. I believe, Sir, that the debate should be given before a commitment is taken by the government. The debate should be held before the commitment is made by the

MR. ROBERTS:

government. The questions asked by the gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) were not semantic. I think it is a very important point because, Sir, if it is merely a matter of the government coming to the House to seek ratification, which they will presumably get because they have a majority to their backs, that, Sir, would not be as helpful in the public interest as it would be for the government to come before the House and say, "This is what we propose. Here is why we propose it. What does the House say? And then we will strike the deal with the Government of the Province of Quebec." I think it would be very useful if the government were to take that attitude. As I understood the Premier's remarks at Question Period today, Sir, that is the attitude he is prepared to take. I think that is a very generous one and a very right one and I think it is the correct one to be taken on a question that goes far beyond partisan politics.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by suggesting - and indeed I am prepared to move it but I do not think it would be appropriate. If it is felt appropriate I will, with the necessary consent, because there is a resolution in my name on the Order Paper - let me suggest the government bring before this House - and I believe it would go through with a very minimum of debate, would not delay us - bring before the House a resolution which would make three points. Number one - and I believe it would be helpful to have a unanimous resolution to this effect giving not just the people of this Province - they know where we stand - but the people of the Province of Quebec and the people of all Canada and their governments, a resolution rejecting any notion of any transfer of territory, whether it be by sale or by trade. It is an insult for Mr. Cournoyer to suggest that we trade 7,500 square miles, a portion that is larger than many cities or than many counties -

SOIT HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: - but a resolution rejecting any sale or transfer; affirming our willingness as a government and as a people to enter into a joint development of our hydro resources if it is to our joint benefit. Obviously we are willing to talk and to discuss and this House



MR. ROBERTS:

should be willing to approve any reasonable joint development, and calling, Sir, on the Province of Quebec, which after all is part of Canada, to act in the spirit of Confederation, and to act in such a way as to enable this Province to develop a great natural resource which is ours, but to develop it in our interest and in the interest of the people of Quebec, to develop it, Sir, in the interests of Canada. I believe such a resolution would meet a ready acceptance, Sir, and I believe it would be a useful and significant step to be taken because the negotiations are obviously ongoing. They will continue. We are obviously in a difficult position because Quebec as of now at least through the lips of Mr. Cournoyer is being anything but reasonable and conciliatory. Let us have such a resolution, Sir, so that they will know what we are up against. The government's hand will be that much stronger and then let us get on with it and let us get this resource developed in the interest, as I have said, of our people, of the people of Quebec and the people of all Canada. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's suggestions, of course, are well accepted because in effect what he is saying is that he agrees with the approach that we have taken so far. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we need any resolution of the House, nor do I think it strengthens our hand. The government has the responsibility for trying to do what it can to develop the energy resources of Newfoundland, and we will. And we are glad to have the views of the hon. gentleman opposite because they coincide with ours.

The question of the boundaries is entirely an artificial one. Why Mr. Cournoyer ever cropped up with it, I do not know. But our answer to it is clear. We do not need a resolution of the House on that. You would certainly need the House to act if you took any opposite point of view. And the answer to him has been given, and it reminds me of the anti-Confederation song, Mr. Speaker, or to paraphrase the old anti-Confederation song which, as you will remember goes, "Your face turn to Britain, your back to the Gulf, / Come near its your peril Canadian wolf." And as far as the boundary is concerned, to paraphrase that we can say "With our face turned to Britain, our back to the Gulf, / Come near at your peril Quebecois wolf." Because there is no way -

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: Thank you. - there is no way that the Province is going to, as we made clear, have the boundary tampered with, and there is no way that the Province is going to agree to sell any land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think quite clearly that the government must act as a government. If some satisfactory arrangement was worked out with the government of Quebec and this whole situation, the Government of Newfoundland would have to agree with them, and make a commitment. If that commitment required legislation it would certainly have to come to the House. But the Government of Newfoundland will have to make its mind up as to whether anything can be worked out

Mr. Crosbie:

or not, and what its position is. And then when that is done certainly we will tell the House what our decision is, and we would enable it to be debated in the House.

But our commitment is to whether we can settle anything with Quebec or not, or whether any terms can be reached with them or not, we will have to make our decision ourselves, and we will have to tell the House, and our own caucus what we are recommending or what we are going to do, and then it will be up the House to terminate us, if the majority in the House do not agree, they terminate us, and if they do agree they will support that position. So certainly we are prepared to have this debated, but we may or may not have entered into a commitment before it is debated. Obviously if we think we have a satisfactory settlement to the whole problem we will agree to it, and we will inform the House, and it will be discussed and debated. Hon. gentlemen do not need to worry. I can assure this House that the government and myself as minister would not continue in office if we did not reach an agreement with Quebec, if we reach one, that is one that is in the best interest of this Province. We are not going to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: - We are not going to enter into any agreement with Quebec that has deals with land or deals with - if they think they have us by the throat they can rethink their position, because they do not have us by the throat. And, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to enter into any arrangement with them where we have to pay the replacement cost for 600 megawatts from the Upper Churchill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: It is ridiculous. We are not going to do it. We are not going to agree to pay twenty-five or thirty or twenty or forty mils for power that is being sold to Quebec-Hydro at three and a half mils.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: It is just as simple as that. So it is very difficult to see how there can be any agreement. If there can be no agreement, and there are all kinds of advantages to us working together and developing our resources jointly and supplying power to the rest of Canada that we definitely cannot use here, if it turns out that we cannot use it all here, and the like, in developing our resources jointly that is fine, that is the way to go. But if Quebec thinks that they seem to have the upper hand over us and they are going to wring out a hard bargain out of us, then there will be no bargain, because we cannot afford a hard bargain in Newfoundland. So we will not go that route, we will go another route, if that is the choice, which I cannot expand on now, but which some hon. gentlemen may have a shrew idea about.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: And if that is the way we have to go, we will explain it to the House, and we hope that we will have the support of the House in doing that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: So I am glad to hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I think he has been most responsible in this matter and has not gone off half-cocked. Why Mr. Cournoyer has gone off half-cocked, I do not know.

What we are trying to do - I mean, it is a simple situation. We have not been able to do the Gull Hydro site because of the huge amounts involved, the inflation, and all of the questions we have to settle with the Federal Government and with Quebec. We therefore have asked them to let us get the transmission line and the tunnel underway by committing us 800 megawatts from the Upper Churchill for 1982 at a reasonable price.

The recall provision is between CFLCo, the contract is between CFLCo and Hydro-Quebec, It is not between the Province of Newfoundland and Hydro-Quebec.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WELLS: It is just six, 'John'.

MR. CROSBIE: My time is up, Mr. Speaker, so I hope -

MR. SPEAKER: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave. By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy by leave.

MR. CROSBIE: Well I will just - the contract is between CFLCo, then owned by BRINCO and Hydro-Quebec. It was never signed by the Government of the Province of Newfoundland, it was never approved in any formal sense by the Government of Newfoundland. That is the contract between CFLCo and Hydro-Quebec, not between this Province and Hydro-Quebec. But there will be more about that later. And it is not the Province that recalls the power, it is CFLCo that has to recall the power. So, Mr. Speaker, we do not intend to go down to slaughter very meekly on this side of the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: - and I am sure that we will have the backing of the hon. gentlemen opposite when we have to come back and say what the position is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair is now deemed to be that the House do now adjourn. Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay'. In my opinion the 'nays' have it. Therefore I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WELLS: Committee of Supply.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I was commenting on some items in the Auditor General's Report respecting the Department of Education. I am sorry to say, Mr. Chairman, that there seems to be some digressions from proper accounting practices. There apparently seems to be some laxity, some carelessness, some negligence with respect to handling and managing public funds.

Mr. Chairman, in a time of austerity and fiscal restraints we must be certain that we handle the public monies with great care, of course, as in any time. The department has seemed so concerned with constraints to the extent of denying students and teachers in this Province valuable services in the form of specialists, as I have mentioned some time ago, and deferring the teacher-student ratio and yet we find them, as I say, a little remiss, a little negligent with accounting practices and handling the public funds. And I had alluded to the improper charges with respect to the operational grants and apparently there were charges of upwards to \$18,000 made improperly to operational grants, not in accordance with the regulations under authority of the Schools Act, and I was commenting on the expenditure without appropriation. This is the one that I was most concerned about, and here we were talking about monies in excess of \$100,000 which related to the transportation cost for handicapped children.

I certainly have no quarrels with providing transportation for handicapped children, but I think one must question the method in this particular incident. The payments were made without written

MR. LUSH: contracts between the suppliers and the government, and no public tenders were invited for the contract, and of course a very serious matter in that the payments were not grants to school boards, which of course make them expenditures without appropriation.

Now I realize that the minister was not the minister when this was going on, but the government is certainly responsible for this and I wonder what the minister is doing about this to certainly prevent this sort of happening in the future. It is incongruous, Sir, to say the least, with respect to the proper procedures that must be followed.

Another point alluded to there is the Silver Anniversary of Confederation and the only thing I want to mention there is a salary unit which again did not seem to be following the proper practices. The Auditor General makes mention of one salary for \$1,000 per month and he says that these payments were not processed in the usual manner, through the Payroll Division of the Department of Finance, so consequently no salary deductions for income tax, Canada Pension Plan, or Unemployment Insurance were made.

MP. LUSH:

And he mentions another salary deduction of \$2,000 which was processed as current expenses without any indication as to what these current expenses were and without any satisfactory supporting documents concerning the payments being made. Again certainly the responsibility of the minister and of the government is to see that proper procedures are followed in the salary payments through the central payroll system, the Department of Finance.

Another one that I would like to comment on is the - the Auditor General refers to it as the undetermined losses as a result of failure to submit federal claims promptly. This has to do with the Department of Education being able to claim under the Federal Adult Occupational Act various costs incurred by the Province in providing occupational training courses offered by the Province to adults whose enrollment therein was arranged by a Manpower officer. And it seems as though the provincial government can claim for this programme and in this particular instance, the one that the Auditor General refers to, he is referring to a claim that should have been made for the year 1972-1973, the fiscal year. It had to do with the division of Vocational Education and the amount was \$1,771,863.

What the Auditor General is saying here is that the first claim was \$1,771,863. That is what the first claim was but it was not prepared properly. So he sent it back and then it came back a little later with the amount of \$1,612,044. That was thirty-two months after, or it took a time period of thirty-two months to process this amount for \$1.5 million in which case, the Auditor General says, the Province lost undetermined interests revenues on the amounts outstanding. That is a tremendous amount of money and a tremendous loss, really, if you take the \$1.5 million in the bank at a going rate of, let us say, ten per cent, you are talking \$161,000. That is enough to pay several specialist teachers and certainly enough to pay just about all the positions now open in the Department of Education, the four specialists and the four regional superintendents. Here we are



MR. LUSH:

so concerned about this, so concerned that we deprive students of these services, and here we are losing funds through carelessness in this respect.

There is another one there, Mr. Chairman, improper deduction of teacher pension contributions. I am not familiar enough with this one to be able to debate it, actually. But there seems to be some confusion, there seems to be two methods of teacher pensions. There is the one, three per cent, and there is a one, four per cent. This causes all sorts of difficulties really. I think the three per cent is for single people and the four per cent is for married people, but there seems to be some confusion here. At least the Auditor General thinks so and there certainly is some confusion with this. As a matter of fact -

MR. HOUSE: The teacher can elect, you know, for either of the two.

MR. LUSH: Either of the two. Whatever is wrong with it in the deduction of these pensions the Auditor General says that the consolidated revenue fund has been deprived of, and continues to lose, an undetermined amount of public money because the department has failed to properly apply the act. So maybe the minister can explain exactly what is at stake in this particular item here with respect to the teachers' pensions. But as the Auditor General states we are indeed losing money because of the act not being applied properly. Then certainly the onus is on the government to see that the act is applied properly. The onus

Mr. Lush.

the Department of Education and the minister to see that the Consolidated Revenue Fund is not deprived of any money. Another point there relates to the failure to collect revenue promptly and this relates to selling books in the Province. I realize this is a difficult situation. I think it has been a difficult point for a long, long time, but I did not realize that it was so difficult as outlined here by the Auditor General. He mentions that the sale of school supplies comprises of revenue totalling \$576,055. And it goes on to say that ninety per cent of all of these school supplies are sold in the month of September. But, of course, it takes them all year to collect the money, and he mentions that up until in July and August that \$43,000 of this was collected - August, \$43,000. And that seems to be an undesirable practice. I do believe that the Department of Education can do something about this, can certainly encourage principles and indeed demand that the monies get in long before that time.

The last one I want to comment on is the lack of revenue control, and this has to do with the course fees for vocational training and adult education programmes, and from sales and services supplied through its vocational educational division. Here the Auditor General says that the procedure for controlling these fees seems to be weak, and certainly needs to be looked into. There are a few other things there but these are the major things that I wanted to comment upon. And as I say that sort of saddens me to find out that the Department of Education has been rather remiss in handling the public funds and particularly with respect to proper accounting procedures. And I suggested before that it is most important that we discharge our responsibilities with great care and with great prudence in handling the public funds, and the thing that saddens me most is this one with respect to the losing of

Mr. Lush.

the interest on the federal monies, and we are talking about a large sum of money so I hope the minister will take steps and see that these things will not happen, and comment on them when he replies.

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to point out some of the problems faced by education in this Province. I have suggested that vast sums of money are needed if our educational system is to meet the demands of our people. Expenditures on education are one of the best investments we can make in the future. We are deluding ourselves if we think we can make an impact on removing inequalities without providing the necessary resources. I showed how the proportion of money spent on education has not changed in fifteen years, although the amount of money itself, of course, has risen dramatically, but not the actual proportion, the actual percentage of the total provincial budget. I have shown how one study indicated that up to 70 per cent of expenditure increases during the 1960's in this Province could be explained through enrollment growth and inflation. This left about 30 per cent which resulted from other factors such as improvements in the quality of the teaching force, improved facilities and new and improved programmes. A smaller pupil/teacher ratio was another factor that was accounted for in the 30 per cent one. And with inflation in the 1970's the picture no doubt is worse. The purchasing value of the dollar is constantly dropping, hence the real increase in spending is much lower than the apparent increase. In comparison to our present educational needs I have shown that we in this Province are spending less on education than other provinces. Most other provinces spend a larger percentage of its budget on education than Newfoundland does, and our needs are so much greater.

MR. LUSH:

I illustrated, through showing the proportion of the money spent on elementary and secondary education, again that we are spending much less money than we should. Again, Mr. Chairman, I realize that we are in a time of fiscal restraints and austerity. What I have tried to do is to point out the importance of education hoping that the government will see the need for education and see the need to put more monies in education when we can. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, when I came to the end of my forty-five minutes this afternoon I was comparing the new teaching techniques to the old-fashioned teaching techniques. I was arguing with the Committee, or trying to point out to the Committee that the old-fashioned teaching, in my opinion, was the best - the three "r's", reading, 'riting and 'rithmetic. The Minister of Fisheries there looks at me and probably is saying to himself, "Well, you know, maybe the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has something there." Because the member himself never, I do not believe, got on the inside of a university - got his grade eleven probably and went out in the world and did quite well and ended up a minister of the Crown. Sometimes, Sir, it is better to be a practical man, to be a self-made man, to work your way up than to be an educated fool like some of the hon. members of this House, who I will not name.

MR. DOODY: Do not take a year to think about it.

MR. NEARY: No, The hon. minister himself is another example of the three "r's", the old-fashioned method of teaching. The hon. -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Seven years of training.

MR. NEARY: No, I do not think so, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member, I do not believe, ever saw the inside of a university, is as sharp as they come, clever, in my opinion away ahead of some of the graduates of the Dalhousie School of Law, way ahead of some of these guys that only their fourth, is it - you get a first second and third and fourth ticket or something when you

MR. NEARY:

leave the school of law. I do not know what the Minister of Justice got, whether he got a first, second, third or fourth class certificate. But some of the holier-than-thou educated types who stand in this House got their fourth class certificate, just the equivalent of a fourth class stationary engineer. The minister knows what I am talking about. Yet they hold themselves up as the geniuses in this hon. House and in the Province. They just bearly scraped their rear ends through law school. They got a fourth class certificate, whatever that means.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the old-fashioned teaching is the best method, Sir. I listened with great attention to what the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) had to say and I listened to his great plea for more money for education in this Province. Most people feel that we are paying out too much now for education. Most people are beginning to ask themselves and beginning to wonder if we are getting the value for our education dollar. That is why that I keep repeating and keep going back to my suggestion that I have been making for the last two or three years in this House, and that I made when I was a member of the former administration, that the first thing we have to do is to get our education system back on the rails, get it pointed in the right direction. I do not think our education system is headed in the right direction. When the member is pleading for more money for some of the educational witch doctors that we have in this Province, the member does not point out to us the various layers of bureaucracy that were created as a result of the last royal commission that was set up. Some of these superintendents that are roaming around the Province with nothing to do except twiddle their thumbs in their offices all day are earning more salaries than some of the ministers in this House. Does the hon. Committee realize that? They are making more money - they have given themselves higher salaries than the Minister of Justice, who has one of the most important jobs in this Province, and the hon. the Premier. They are

MR. NEARY:

earning more money than the hon. the Premier. And this is what some of the hon. members are making a pitch for, to get more money to pass over and give them a blank check.

MR. DOODY: Are they earning it?

MR. NEARY: No, they are not earning it. I would not mind if they were earning it, Sir. They are not earning it. I wish I could tell the House some of the conversations that I have had with some of the people who are in the system, who do not agree with it. They are there. The hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) probably knows what I am talking about, having been closely associated with the system.

But the system has a great number of weaknesses, Sir, and my argument for a royal commission to look into the whole educational system in this Province, my feeling that we are headed in the wrong direction should not be directed at the Minister of Industrial Development, as was suggested by my dear friend, the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). It is the educational system that I am talking about. We have a lot of jobs in this Province that go begging for people to fill them. I remember only a year or so ago Iron Ore Company of Canada had to go over to Europe to recruit workers to come into this Province. There is a condemnation of our educational system, when we are wacking out millions and millions of dollars every year for vocational training in the College of Trades and Technology and the university, and Iron Ore Company of Canada, for some strange, unknown reason, had to go over to Europe to recruit workers.

MR. DOUSSEAU: According to the company it was their first and last time.

MR. NEARY: I hope it will be their last time. I am glad that the minister said that because I think the minister joined with me at the time in coming down on the Iron Ore Company of Canada like a ton of bricks. But it shows a great weakness in the system.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke this afternoon about all these graduates, all these kids who are conned into going over to get a university

MR. NEARY:

education and get their little certificate and their piece of paper that they can take over to Churchill Square and get it framed and hang it on their wall. It may as well have been a bit of Delsey toilet paper they got for what good it is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder would the hon. member expatiate a bit on this business of the Iron Ore Company, or any other company in Labrador, going to the Azores and going to Europe and other places to bring people in. In what way is that fact an indictment of the education system and of what is it an indictment? What is the explanation? Why do they have to do that? Would the hon. member spell that out a bit more?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. You know, if I had to spell everything out, if members cannot read, my forty-five minutes will not be long going. But I will spell it out for the hon. the former Premier, yes, spell it out. The responsibility for vocational training and technical training in this Province comes under the Department of Education. The College of Fisheries, the College of Trades and Technology and all the vocational schools comes under the Minister of Education. I claim that if the people who are responsible for vocational training had researched the job market, had gone out to find whether the need for training existed, the kind of training, the Iron Ore Company of Canada, or any other company in Newfoundland for that matter, would have not found themselves in the position where they could not get the trades and skills that they required to work in their plant in Labrador. They had to go to Europe to get the trades and the skills and the people with the attitudes. Apparently attitude was a bit of a problem, the attitude of living in isolation may be part of the problem. Maybe the Portuguese and the Germans and the English and the Irish may feel, with all due respect to my hon. friend who I am so glad to see back in the House, may feel more at home and may earn more money and there may be a greater incentive for these people to go and settle in Labrador than the people here on the Island of

MT. NEAPY:

Newfoundland. But Iron Ore Company said at the time that they could not recruit the trades and the skills in Newfoundland that they required, that they needed to maintain their operation in Labrador City and they were forced to go to Europe to recruit workers.

MT. SMALLWOOD: Because why?

MT. NEAPY: Because they could not recruit the men in Newfoundland with the trades, with the skills that were required to maintain their operation in Labrador. Yet here we



MR. NEARY: were, here we have been for the last fifteen years lashing out millions of dollars to give people a trade, to train young men and young women in this Province in the various trades. And yet they could not find tradesmen to go to work in Labrador. And here we were at that time with the highest unemployment rate in Canada. Now does the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) understand what I am saying?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think so, yes.

MR. NEARY: I do not know if I can made it any clearer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is pretty good.

MR. NEARY: Not too bad:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Pretty good.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Chairman, while this was going on we are pouring \$40 million into Memorial University this year. We give Memorial a blank cheque. They do not have to account to this House as to how they spend that \$40 million. And I want to go back to my old beef again about the university having to account to this Committee, to this House, for the money for their budget, for the money that is spent at that university. That is not an invasion of their academic freedom, Sir. The President of that university had the gall, I think it was in December or November, to come out and say, "We will publicize our budget in the newspaper for the people of Newfoundland but we will not give it to the elected representatives of the people." That is almost enough, anybody who takes parliamentary government serious, the Minister of Finance, it is a wonder he did not have a stroke when he heard the President of our university, a man whom I have known for a good many years, make that sort of statement. Why that is contempt for this Legislature, contempt of the House! He will publish it, he says, to his own liking in the newspaper and put it on the radio but he will not submit it, not give it to the elected representatives of the people. All he expects us to do here is to collect it and pass it over to him. What silly, foolish nonsense!

MR. NEARY: Oh, there is a lot of support in this Province, Mr. Chairman, a lot of support for the contention, I am not the only one who feels it, there are other members of the House who feel that the university should account for its expenditure to this House. I sent over recently, I have had some dealings with the university in the last year or so, I deal through the Public Relations Department at the university and I must say when I ask for information that is within reason I get good co-operation from the Public Relations Department, Mr. Woodland, who has to consult with the various faculties, the various departments that are involved. But usually if I wait a few days I get the information back.

I called up the Public Relation Department on one occasion and I asked if I could have a copy of a voucher, of a \$25 voucher, that I knew was floating around this city. And sure enough the next day in the mail I got the \$25 voucher. I do not know if members are aware of it or not but down here at the university - we cannot have it in government, the Minister of Finance cannot have it down in his department, nor the minister of Public Works, nor the Minister of Mines and Energy - but they can have it over at the university where they have a little booklet with ten vouchers in it worth \$25 each, They are blank, and if you could save up enough of them you could go out and buy a motor car that you do not have to account for. They are blank, absolutely blank. You fill in the details yourself, worth \$250 that book of vouchers.

MP. HICKEY: Used for what?

MR. NEARY: They are used for miscellaneous, incidental things. The various heads of the faculty are issued these for buying little things you do not have to go back you know and get a voucher for them - \$250, \$25 each they are worth.

MR. HICKEY: Give us some examples.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I will give some examples, Sir. One example that I mentioned that was widely publicized in the newspaper was that one individual, now I might say not on the administration staff, a member of the faculty, took his vouchers and went down and got a set of wedding pictures.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Whose wedding?

MR. NEARY: Of one of his family.

He went down and had the wedding pictures all done up, paid for with these vouchers. They are taken to drug stores to get prescription drugs. They are taken all over this city, but I understand now that as a result of my enquiries that they may be done away with. I do not think they are done away with yet.

MR. DOODY: Are they considered legal tender for exchange?

MR. NEARY: It is just like the voucher you used to give the welfare recipients at one time. They can take them out and they can peddle them anywhere, only their's is a little better. It is just like a cheque. I wish I had it with me. It is down in my office. I wish I had brought it up with me tonight.

MR. HICKEY: In other words you can just sign them.

MR. NEARY: You can just sign your name and fill in a few details.

MR. HICKEY: But the shop owner has to sign it before you can cash it.

MR. NEARY: Exactly, it is just like a cheque. Two hundred and fifty dollars worth, and when you use that up you do not have to account for it. You send over somewhere and you get another book worth \$250.

Now that is the kind of thing that is going on that I have been objecting to.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that voted by this House?

MR. NEARY: That is voted by this House, and they refuse to account to this House for that sort of thing, and that whole system of vouchers is highly abused.

MR. PIDEONT: Do you have any idea how widely they are used?

MR. NEARY: No, I do not.

Look, I only called up the public relations fellow over there and asked him to send me a blank because I had heard

Mr. Neary.

rumours around town that these were being peddled all over the place, and sure enough they were. And my usual source of information told me about the case of the wedding pictures and buying cameras and electronic equipment and transistor radios. As I say, if you could save up enough of them you could probably buy yourself a car.

MR. MURPHY: You are jealous.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not jealous, no, Sir.

The minister may think, you know, we are joking, but when you look at it.

MR. MURPHY: No, no!

MR. NEARY: And then I was told by a doctor's wife - look, members sometimes wonder where I get my information. Well, I will tell you where I get my information. Sometimes I get it from people who are jealous and envious of their fellow man. Sometimes I get it from people who are absolutely genuine, who hate to see the public treasury ripped off. And I had a call from a lady, whose name I will not mention in this House, who was the wife of a doctor on the staff of the Medical School, who called me and told me me, who had given me her name, and she said she wanted to put in a complaint, that apparently the doctors on staff of the Medical School are given a blank cheque. When you want to bring somebody in here for an interview to see if they are interested in coming to work for the university, they bring them in, they are vined and dined, their expenses are paid, they are put up in the best of hotels, they can bring the whole family if they want to. Okay, that is fine. The hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) says, well that is the only way maybe you can attract good people. But this particular lady said that she was assigned the job of entertaining this particular family that was coming in. So rather than go down to the Hotel or down to the Starboard Quarter and run up a big bill and send the bill into the Minister of Finance, she arranged a spread at home to save the taxpayers a few dollars, a spread probably as good

Mr. Neary.

as you could get at the Starboard Quarter or Hotel Newfoundland or the Battery or any other place. But the next day she said that she had to put up with all kinds of abuse from wives of other doctors who said, "Oh well, you know, you are making it bad for us. What did you do that for? Why did you not do what we do? Go down and sock it to her and add an extra \$100 on to the bill when you send it in for incidental expenses, cigarette money, cigar money?" And I am sure that every minister knows that this is going on. And yet, Sir, there is not a thing we can do about it. We are completely hamstrung in this House because the university does not have to answer to this House for their expenditures. And I could go on, and I could give all kinds of examples of abuses at the university.

MR. NEARY:

Why, they sold a bunch of houses over there recently. I do not know for sure, I am not quite sure, if they were sold to all people who were employed by that University or not. I do not know if Mr. Vincent J. Possiter, who is appointed to - what board is he appointed to? Public Service Commission? I do not know if he is the same Mr. Rossiter who brought one of the University houses or not. I would say - (let me see if I have my little note I got in the Registry Office this morning) -

MR. DOODY: The Academy of Side Steps!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: No, that is a gentleman in Isle aux Morts. I would say in 1975, I believe it was in 1975, and, as I say, I could be wrong, but I certainly went down and I saw it listed under Memorial University, from Memorial University to so and so.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What would be wrong with that?

MR. NEARY: I will tell you what is wrong with it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, what would be specifically wrong with this matter?

MR. NEARY: I will tell the minister what is wrong with it.

The houses, if they are going to be sold to the general public, first of all should be put on public tender.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Were they not?

MR. NEARY: They were not. They were offered to the occupants of the houses, the employees and the members of the faculty of Memorial University. Then if they did not want them they were supposed to go to public tender. They did not go to public tender. And all the houses, incidentally, were not sold. They still have their favourites who are occupying some of these houses. I do not know why they were not all sold.

But as the minister says, there may or may not be anything wrong with that. But it leaves it open for suspect. And if the thing was put on public tender and done in the proper way then there would be no argument. It is just one of these little things

Mr. Neary:

that I stumbled on during the time I was doing my reasearch. But, Sir, the whole things points up to one thing, and that is the government of this Province, and I do not care whether they are Liberal or Tory or NDP, it is about time that whatever government is governing this Province would take the University by the scruff of the neck and make them come into this House and give us some details of their budget, of their expenditure. And let us not be so wishy-washy and sit back and take the kind of insult that we took a few months ago when we were told, oh, we will publish it in the newspaper, but we will not give it to the elected representatives of the people. What are we suppose to be, scum? Collect the money, we will be collectors of the revenue and pass it over to them and give them a blank cheque, and now they got their little task force set up over there.

The task force is set up and is supposed to be looking into economies, and where they can improve their academic teaching and so forth. I would say the task force is set up to try and head off the very thing that I am looking for, and that is a royal commission to look into post-secondary education in this Province. They are trying to head it off and they will brainwash the members and brainwash the government and the academics especially. They will not brainwash us poor,old,ignorant non-academics. They will not bluff us, but they will bluff the administration and they will bluff the ministers and say, "Ohwe appointed a task force to look into all of this." The task force is designed to head off exactly what I am talking about. Because the image of that University is on the downgrade,unfortunately,in this Province, on the downgrade. It should be on the upgrade. And nobody is more sadder than I am to see that happen. It has only happened in recent years. Mr. Chairman, that University should be doing a great service for this Province,as well as the College of Trades, and the vocational schools. One thing the University has not done,in my opinion, in the last twenty-five years has gotten out into the community. They have kept



Mr. Neary:

to themselves. They set up their little bureaucracy and their little empire over there. Top secret! They did not let us know what was going on. They should have gotten out more into the community, and they should have gotten out and researched things in Newfoundland. They should have helped the fishery. They should have helped this industry and that industry. They should have been one of the most important institutions in this Province, and I think that is what the hon. former Premier (Mr. Smallwood) meant it to be. But it is not today.

Mr. Neary.

And they are spending \$40 million of our money, and it did not turn out to be the great dream that the hon. former Premier thought it was going to be, a great institution of learning, which was supposed to be the best in the world and instead of that today, I would say, we are slipping, if anything. And we are slipping because the university has not gotten out into the community. Why should we, Mr. Chairman, every time we need a commission or a study or research done for the government -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: If I could hear myself talk, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Why should we pay out hundreds of thousands of dollars every year for royal commissions and for experts to do research when we have them right on the staff, and we have the students to do it right in the university, and right in the College of Trades and Technology and in the vocational schools. Why do we not utilize that university more?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would be the last person in this world to argue that there should be an invasion of the academic -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Is there not a rule that only one hon. member at a time can speak audibly in this Chamber. I just heard about seven different members all chatting away audibly. I could hear them, but I could not make out their words, which annoyed me, because I would like to hear and understand every word that is uttered. But one hon. member has the floor. It is pretty important stuff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

I would say that the point is very well made that the noise was unacceptable. I believe it has now been taken care of.

Mr. Chairman.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I have to toss out one other example of why I feel that the university is not towing the line insofar as the disclosure of its budget is concerned, and the hon. Premier may be interested in this example. The government brought in a public tendering procedure of its own a few years ago, a couple of years ago and made it law, mandatory in this Province that public tenders for everything over \$1,000, I think it is - perhaps my hon. friend over there from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) can refresh my memory?

PREMIER MOORES: Fifteen thousand.

MR. NEARY: Fifteen thousand. No, Sir. I will have to correct the Premier now. There are two ways that you can do it. If you are calling tenders for big buildings, you know, and things of that sort, it is \$15,000. But, you know, if there are number of small items it is \$1,000. I looked at the Public Tendering Act, Mr. Chairman, for the Premier's benefit. But over at Memorial University they will not call public tenders for anything under \$10,000. Now I am not saying that there is abuse, but it certainly leaves it wide open for abuse. They are not following even the government's own public tendering procedure, and maybe everything is straight and aboveboard. I am not making any accusations, Sir, but I do know, Mr. Chairman, I do know from the number of business people who have contacted me that they are not invited to tender. I know that a number of them have asked to have their names put on the tendering list, the same as they asked the Minister of Public Works and Services to have their names placed on his tendering list. They do the same thing with the university, but they are never notified. They are never asked. They are never invited to submit tenders. Somehow or other the tenders are dealt out like you deal off the top of the cards. And that is another reason that I argue that it is about time that the government and the members of this House insisted that their budget be brought in and disclosed in this House. If I were in the Premier's place

Mr. Neary.

I would not give them another red cent until they agreed. They do not have to agree. We can insist rather than have the insults flung at us that they will put it in the newspaper, but they will not tell the Premier or his cabinet or the members of the House, they will not give us the details of their expenditure, and put it in the newspaper. They have not done that yet. That is another beef I have.

I do not want to bore the House with this foolish Harlow campus again.

Mr. Neary:

As far as I am concerned it should be boarded up, and the faster the better, although it is only costing, I am told, \$70,000 or \$75,000 a year. But whatever it is that \$75,000 could be put to better use.

I heard somebody make a statement the other day, I do not know who it was, but whoever it was must have been awfully silly and foolish. He said, "Oh, if we close it up, there would be universities in Canada rushing in to take it over!" What foolish nonsense, universities in Canada rushing in to take it over! You know, they think down here we are a bunch of hicks, with a foolish campus over in Harlow. And the sooner the shutters are put on the windows over there, I say the better.

And, Mr. Chairman, although I would not agree with this House interfering with the academic part of the University, my God, I will tell you this, that I would be tempted to with some of the courses they are teaching over there. Turning out graduates or mass producing them, turning them out like you would turn them out on an assembly line, and they cannot find jobs. As I said this afternoon. And I have an example right here in front of me, Sir. This is typical of thousands of students who graduated from that University, and here is one lady who lives in my hon. friend's part of his district over on Bell Island, and my hon. friend knows who I am referring to.

MR. DOODY: Down on the Beach.

MR. NEARY: Down on the Beach, that is right.

This young lady got her B.A. from Memorial University, I do not know, I believe it is the same degree that my friend has here, do you have a B.A.?

MR. P. MOOPES: I have two.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member has two degrees. Thank God he ended up a member of the House or he might have been unemployed. But this young lady has a B.A. from Memorial University. She cannot get unemployment insurance because she has no stamps. She cannot get

MR. NEARY:

welfare, because she is a single girl. Her father is on welfare and he cannot afford to feed her, and she cannot get any work.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Committee, what can she do?

MR. W. YOUNG: There are lots of jobs for grave diggers.

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not know, I have not heard of any ladies yet going into that profession of grave digging.

MR. ROBERTS: It is still no laughing matter.

MR. NEARY: No, it is no laughing matter, Sir. This is typical of hundreds, literally hundreds of young men and women in this Province today. And according to the Morning News there are going to be 8,000 more out on the street within the next month or two that will not be able to find jobs. That tragic part, Mr. Chairman, of our whole unemployment problem in this Province is that the largest majority, 50 per cent, are in the age group between sixteen and twenty-five, and that is the tragedy of it all. And I would say, Sir, that with all due respects to the arguments that I have heard from the old-line Liberals that we should pump more money into our education system - maybe it does need a little priming, maybe it does - but I am the Doubting Thomas at this moment who would like to see, first of all, before I agree that that is so, I would like to see an impartial, independent study, fact-finding study, if you wish, on our whole educational system, to see if we are getting the best value for the money we are spending on it now, and to see, above all, if we are headed in the right direction, if we are educating our students in the right way, giving them the training and the education that they should be getting.

It is all right for those sons and daughters of millionaires who can become professional students to go over and get on the roster over at Memorial, spend five or six years there, waste their time, get a couple of degrees, loaf around, go up to the Mainland, go to University, loaf around. But how many families can afford to have their

Mr. Neary:

sons and daughters do that? I would not. I have got four myself, and I would not like to see them waste their time. I think they need a little -

MT. R. MOOPES: Check and see how much loans, how much -

MR. NEARY: Yes, my hon. friend just reminded me of a very important point that I almost missed. While they are doing this, while they are over their loafing around getting their pieces of paper for five or six years, they are running up debts to the tune of \$15,000 and \$20,000 that they have got to pay back the moment they go back to work. And so, Sir, it is quite an important matter.

I just want to come back to the present Minister of Education, who I met for the first time when the member was elected to this hon. House. And I must say up to now I am impressed with the hon. gentleman. He strikes me as being a very common sense Newfoundlander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: And I believe the hon. gentleman is in agreement, maybe he does not agree with everything I said, but I think the hon. gentleman is in complete agreement with a lot of the things I said, especially with regard to the direction that we are taking in the field of education in this Province. And the hon. gentleman must not look upon it as being a personal thing. I said earlier this afternoon that we have made rapid strides in the field of education in Newfoundland. We have nothing to be ashamed of so far. We have teachers now who are better trained than ever before, better paid. We have beautiful buildings. We have all the electronic equipment in them. We have all the labs. We have everything. We have kids bused to school. And we have a beautiful university, and a nice regional college, and a nice College of Trades and Technology and beautiful vocational schools.

But, Sir, that does not stop what I am talking about, the physical aspect of it. I am talking about the philosophical, the philosophical aspect, the ideology. Are we training our young men and young women in the proper way; and I submit that we are not, that somewhere along the line we got off the rails and we have to get the system back on the rails again. I am not talking about firing anybody or getting rid of this outfit or that outfit, but let us take a look. That is all I am asking. I am not asking to cut down the amount of money we are spending on education, to increase the amount we are spending on education, to fire anybody, to eliminate this board or that board. That is not what I am saying. I am merely asking the House, and pleading to the House before it is too late, because the damage once it is done will never be rectified, I am asking the House to take a good, hard serious look at setting up an impartial, independent fact-finding study of our whole educational system, done by a non-academic, somebody unrelated to the system. What is wrong with that? Maybe it will not prove



MR. NEARY: anything. It will only take about six months or nine months or so to do it. You do not have to drag it out for years and have an expensive royal commission. You do not need that sort of thing. I think it would be very revealing, and I believe if the minister went around this Province and asked the businessmen and the employers questions about the attitudes and about the qualifications of some of the graduates of our university, he would probably be amazed to find out that a lot of them can hardly spell, and in some cases can hardly read. My God! When I was Minister of Social Services I used to get applications from graduates of Memorial University, and here I am just a low ignorant from Quigley's Line over on Bell Island, and I would get these applications from graduates, signed BSc., BA, B.Ed., and you should see - look, I should have kept some of the letters for a collection. You should have seen them. They could hardly read or write. I have seen them, the same thing, from people in charge of school boards. I have had letters from. It would turn your stomach if you ever saw the spelling and the English.

That is all I am asking. I am asking the minister to take a look at that because I have a feeling, Sir, that if we let it linger on and linger on and linger on it will be too late. We have to adapt our whole educational system to the age we are living in, this technological age, and we have above all, Sir, we have to change the attitude of our people and the only way that you can change attitudes is to start right down in kindergarten and come right on up to university. You have to get away from the Santa Claus syndrome. Somebody gets a certificate, a piece of paper, he goes out in the world and he thinks the world owes him a living, He does not have to work now. He got her made. He has got his certificate. He can retire. We have to change the attitude of people, Sir, so that they start relating what they earn, what they get in their pay envelope, they start relating it to what they produce and what

MR. NEARY: they do. We have lost that in Newfoundland unfortunately and we have to get rid of this Santa Claus syndrome, and if people are going to enjoy the standard of living that we have at the present time, we are going to have to increase our Gross Provincial Product. We are going to have to make that pie, that everybody wants a share of, we are going to have to make it a little bigger. Employers

Mr. Neary.

want to get more out of it, they want a little more, and then the employees want a little more, and the pie keeps getting smaller because we are not producing like we should because our young men, and our young men to a large degree - not all of them, but a good many - have the wrong attitude. And yet, Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) told us this afternoon, when they go up on the Mainland they become tops in their field and the next thing you know they are managers of factories, they are foremen, superintendents. And yet in Newfoundland, somehow or other - I do not know what it is, what comes over our people - they got the attitude well, screw the boss and screw the company, get everything you can out of them, but do not produce anything. And anybody who has got a grain of common sense at all knows that if you are going to maintain the standard of living that you have, and to improve that standard of living, that you have to produce more.

The Minister of Finance tells us that our Gross Provincial Product this year is going up by 2 per cent.

MR. HOUSE: It is going up by 100 per cent.

MR. NEARY: That is right. No, pardon me. He is going up by 2 per cent, which is 100 per cent more than it was last year. Last year our Gross Provincial Product increased by 1 per cent - 300,000 down-days because of work stoppages, strikes, legal and illegal, and our production record was the worst in Canada. We produced less per capita than any other province in Canada, and Canada is next to Italy, I believe, and Italy nearly had chaos there a year ago. And the only way you can change the attitude, Sir, is in our educational system. And the minister may get up and tell us, well, you cannot do everything with the educational system.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. member allow me to ask him a question? When he says that Newfoundland has the lowest, or one of the lowest rates of productivity in the world, is he talking quantitatively, the actual volume, the actual weight and yardage that you can see and lift and measure

Mr. Smallwood.

of goods and services, or is he thinking of value? Because, you know, you can work your heart out and produce a certain volume of, say, fish, the value of which compared with the value of aluminium up at Arvida could be ridiculous, and that could bring down our productivity in value though not necessarily in volume. Has he got an explanation of that?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the only way I can answer that is to say that I am talking about the value of the goods and services.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The value.

MR. NEARY: The value.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not volume.

MR. HOUSE: The man-hours make a difference.

MR. NEARY: That is right, and the man-hours.

MR. HOUSE: Quite a difference.

MR. NEARY: No, it does not make quite a difference at all.

Our record for producing in this Province is very, very poor. It is the worst in Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is not that the fault of the organizers of industry, not the workers, the planning and organizing of industry?

MR. NEARY: That may be quite true, Sir. I am not going to lay the blame on labour. I am not going to lay the blame on management.

AN HON. MEMBER: Both parties are probably to blame.

MR. NEARY: Both parties are probably to blame, Sir, and maybe we need some management training programmes in this Province. Because I have a feeling, Sir, - and I have knocked around a little bit, and I worked for private industry myself for about twenty-two years - I have a feeling, Mr. Chairman, that we have got supervisors and foremen and top management people and middle management people who have not got a clue. They do not know what they are doing. They do not know why they are there. They do not know why they got the jobs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I have to remind the hon. member his time has just about elapsed.

MR. NEARY: I thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am only just starting, Sir, to hit my stride. I am just getting in full flight, but maybe when I hear the minister, Sir, maybe there are a few more points that I would like to make.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. J. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to speak at any length in this debate, but I do want to have a few words. I have heard a lot of fatuous fatuity in this House but the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) takes the cake. Mr. Chairman, I have heard the Opposition on complaining in recent days about the fact that there are only seventy-five hours in considering the estimates. The hon. gentlemen opposite, and particularly the member for LaPoile, do not want to consider the estimates. All he wants to do is get up and make long-winded speeches. He is not interested in discovering what the government are going to spend money on, or in what direction it is going to spend money or what the details are. He wants to seize every opportunity to use forty-five minutes of the time of the Committee, you know, to discuss his own fatuous ideas—and half of them are not his ideas, and he does not even believe in them anyway — and get on with a lot of wind, all of which should and could be done in the Budget Speech or the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Seventy-five hours is more than adequate for the estimates for the hon. gentlemen opposite to find out where the money is to be spent and why and ask questions. And the proof of that is how quickly the estimates go through once the first vote is left and we go down through the estimates. It takes about an hour then to go through the department. Because hon. gentlemen opposite, not all of them, but certainly the member for LaPoile does not want them to find out where the money is going to be spent. He wants to put forward his long-winded, and mostly nonsensical point of view, he wants to get

Mr. J. Crosbie:

a headline in the paper tomorrow. He wants to repeat his familiar attack on the University, and get on with the usual nonsense that we hear from the hon. gentleman from LaPoile, who is the biggest abuser of the estimates and the time spent on the estimates of any member in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CROSBIE: Now I do believe that in the members of the Official Opposition are hon. gentlemen, you know, who want to look at the estimates and discuss what the estimates are all about, but that is not true of the hon. flatulence from LaPoile, who is only interested in hearing his own voice ringing in this House day after day, most of it nonsense, and he is not interested at all in finding out what the Department of Education is going to spend the money on.

MR. SIMMONS: He does not listen to others!

MR. J. CROSBIE: Yes, and once anyone else speaks he runs from the House, and blocks his ears.

PREMIER MOORES: Oh, no not quite.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Chairman, as far as the University is concerned, you know, I am a member of this government and when the Opposition comes in looking for money I take a pretty skeptical attitude to it.

AN HON. MEMBER: The University, is it?

MR. CROSBIE: The University. When they come looking for money I take a pretty skeptical attitude, you know. Now there is a Cabinet Committee - under this administration there is a Cabinet Committee in Memorial University finances, which was started at my suggestion, the Minister of Finance is the Chairman of it, and the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Health and the Minister of Education are members of it, and I think at the present time I am a member, and the Minister without Portfolio is a member, and the University comes before that Committee. When Mr. Morgan wants to discuss matters with the government he comes before that Committee, unless he makes an in-run,

Mr. Crosbie:

sometimes he makes an in-run into the Premier around the Committee, but there is this Committee set up. And proposals from Mr. Morgan and Memorial University for spending are looked on with a pretty jaundiced eye. Why? Because this government have got to look at all proposals for spending with a pretty jaundiced eye, because we have not got the wherewithal, because there is too much to be done and the financial resources are limited.

But we have to be fair and we have to be reasonable. We know that if the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) in his government authorized them to go ahead with a medical school in 1966 or whenever it was, 1965 or 1967, and Memorial was authorized to go ahead with a medical school, and given authorization to go ahead with the medical school, but that was going to cost considerable monies, and in the event it is going to cost some \$50 million to build the facilities with some help from the Federal Government, no major help, but if they have a medical school they have got to operate a medical school. They cannot have a medical school at

MR. CROSBIE: and not spend millions operating it. It is going to cost millions, so that if government authorizes Memorial to start a medical school, and to have forty-five or fifty students a year, that it is going to cost some number of millions a year to operate, you cannot operate it on nothing. So we cannot cut down, or we cannot prevent Memorial spending nor should we prevent giving them enough money to operate properly or half decently their medical school.

If the last administration authorized Memorial to go ahead with an engineering building, and we confirmed it, or we confirmed it a year or two after, then they start an engineering building, we know that an engineering building, a big new building has got to cost more money to operate and they have to have money to operate it. And we know to operate the university they have got to have money and we know that they are subject to inflation the same as the government is, then Memorial has to have money to operate. And we know that in the 1960's it was very popular to support universities, not just in Newfoundland but in every province. Universities were the thing. They were to be supported. They were to be started. They were to be initiated. They were to be given money. They were going to bring about miracles and we know that in the 1970's the miracles have not been brought about and people are starting to get a bit jaundiced about universities and it is now popular in some quarters for some people to be against universities. We know that. We know that because the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is now critical of universities. When it was popular to be for universities and to be for more university spending, the member for LaPoile for it. So when we see him now being critical of universities we know that the public mood is against spending of universities, that the public is jaundiced about university spending.

MR. NEARY: What do you not sober up. Stay out of the dining room.

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



MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I will ignore the hon. Cheap Jack.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we know that it is popular now to be against universities because we see the hon. bellwether, you know, that moves whichever way the wind is going, we hear him criticizing universities, whereas three or four years ago he would not say a word against the university. He would be the first up here defending it and saying how much they should be given and how much additional they should be given. Now he has gone the other direction. Well, it is not a question of whether universities are popular or unpopular. It is a question of what do you have to do to support the university we have, so that Memorial University gets no extra special treatment from this government. We give the university exactly what we feel it must have to operate, now what they have asked for, but what we feel they must have to operate. We have to be fair. They have to operate to do a job, and that is not only true here, it is true elsewhere.

Now should we bring the university up before this House in a detailed budget, it would not make any difference. If the university budget came in before this committee in detail, would there be any more statesmanlike discussion of the university? Will we hear anything different from the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary)? Not at all, it is only a debating point! If every detail of the university budget was to be brought in here were as detail as the rest of the estimates, would there be any better debate? Would we know any more about it? We would not! We would hear the same long flatulent speeches on the minister's vote. We would have no more intelligent discussion of the university than we have now. It would be a futile exercise and it would be a wrong exercise. If we do not think that the university is properly administered then get rid of the President of the University and the people who administer it.

The people who represent the public at the university are the

MR. CROSBIE: Board of Regents who are appointed by government on behalf of the people, and some are elected by the alumni. These are the people to whom we have to look -

MR. NEARY: Rubber stamps.

MR. CROSBIE: - for a decision. If they are rubber stamps that is of their own choice. They do not have to be rubber stamps. If I am on the board of regents I can assure you I would be no rubber stamp, or if

Mr. Crosbie.

hon. gentlemen opposite, if some of them or most of them were there they would not be rubber stamps. It is the job of the Board or Regents to represent the public in that university and it is their job and their responsibility to ensure money is not wasted. It is their job to represent the public and to ensure that the university is doing the right thing. It is their job to check on the president of the university and on the administration, not ours, not the politicians. We vote them the money, because this is a public university in Newfoundland. It could never have started without the support of the government. It could not operate for five minutes without the support of the government.

MP. FLIGHT: An international university, now?

MR. CROSBIE: Well, it has got an international clientele, international students, but its support comes from this government apart from funds they get from the federal government for research and the like. So all of this talk about the university's budget should be brought in before this House, it has all been discussed before. It was discussed when the hon. gentleman was a member of government, with the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) as the Premier of Newfoundland. And the government of that day said, "No, they would not do it. It would be an invasion of academic freedom. They would not tolerate it or permit it." But now the hon. gentleman is the Independent member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who can speak any kind of nonsense that he wants to speak to speak, he will never be held responsible for it, he will never form a government, so we hear all this. You know, he can get up and suggest anything. He was already a member of the government who said, no, they would not interfere with academic freedom.

The estimates for Memorial University come before the Cabinet Committee, and university finances have to be approved by the Treasury Board, and they get so much money based on a formula, the rough guide is a formula: How much per student does it cost, will

Mr. Crosbie.

they get in arts and sciences and medicine and so on? The same as is done elsewhere in Canada. And the amount per student here I believe is less than a lot of other universities. That is the check that we have on them. How much does it cost per student in other universities across Canada, and how much does it cost per student at Memorial University, and how much are we paying them? And our payments to Memorial University are calculated, I believe I am correct, on a lower per student basis than anywhere else in Canada. So where is the waste and extravagance the hon. gentleman wants to suggest? Memorial University is operating on a lower per student equivalent basis than any other university in Canada. Now are we to go further and to go over to Memorial University and decide whether they should have this course or that course, or whether they should employ this professor or that professor, or how many professors or departments they should have, or how many lectures they should have or how many janitors they should have and the like? That would be an intolerable interference with the administration of an institution that should be independent of government. If we do not want to supply Memorial University with funds then do not supply them with funds. Or if we want to make some arbitrary cut, if we think that there is some waste and extravagance over there, fine, let us make a decision and cut the \$40 million down to \$35 million.

Any hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House can move that Memorial University's vote or any vote be cut. The hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) can move that the vote be cut from \$40 million to \$35 million.

MR. NEARY: I would like to move that your salary be cut.

MR. CROSBIE: And if we accept that then he will have to explain to the students at Memorial University why this department is cut or the Extension Department is cut out or whatever. Let us see him follow up

Mr. Crosbie.

his nonsense with a motion. Let us have the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) move that the \$40 million be reduced to \$38 million or \$35 million or \$30 million.

MR. NEARY: Let us give them some of what was flying around in Fisheries when the hon. minister was over there.

MR. CROSBIE: Listen to his little irrelevancies now. Let us have the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) act instead of just mouth off, and move that so many millions be chopped off the Memorial budget or move that Memorial be cut out altogether.

MR. NEARY: I move that you be flung out of the House and save your salary and pass it over to them.

MR. CROSBIE: Listen now look! He is getting feebler and feebler, look, by the moment. In a few short minutes I have demolished his forty-five minutes of flatulence and he does not like it.

MR. NEARY: I did not have -

MR. CROSBIE: Now I say let hon. gentlemen opposite, in particular the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), follow up with some action and let us have a vote on a motion. Let us have a motion from the - the official Opposition, I do not think they will move it, they support the university - from the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that the vote for Memorial be cut because he says there is waste. He says there is extravagance. He says there are cocktail parties. He says that is too much travelling and this and that. Let us have him move a reduction in a vote instead of all these little accusations which he has no proof of, and which are irrelevant. The university deserves our support, and you can depend on this, Mr. Chairman, they are not getting any more support from this government than they can absolutely convince us in all justice they should get, because every nickel hurts. Every nickel that we have to pay the university hurts, because there is so much else we have to do. So no one need worry in this House that we are giving Memorial too much money. We are not giving them too much money. But we do believe -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. minister allow me?

MR. CROSBIE: Well, how could I resist, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SMALLWOOD: How does the hon. minister know, how does the hon. Premier know, how do the Cabinet know whether in coming here to the Committee, and then asking the House to vote to the University what the University asks for, or what the government says they should have, how do the government know whether that is enough, too much, not enough, how do the government know? They do not see the budget.

AN HON. MEMBER: How do they know?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I never knew.

AN HON. MEMBER: How did you know?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not know. When I was Premier I had no knowledge of the University's budget, I did not know whether the amount they wanted was enough, too much, or what. I never did, never, never, never, and I doubt that the present, I doubt that the hon. minister knows.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, we did, we had long discussions with the University on it, and we were almost at the point - it was debated here in the House - almost at the point of bringing in -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, I am just finishing my question to the minister. - we were almost at the point of bringing in legislation here requiring that the budget of the University be tabled in the House.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Is the hon. member saying there was an audit of any university then?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, there was a university.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we have -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Alberta, I think.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Saskatchewan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CROSBIE: I do not want to interrupt anyone, Mr. Chairman, you know. We have the budget of the university, we have it accessible

Mr. Crosbie:

to us. And it has got headings and so on like the departments. That is available to us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Just an outline.

MR. CROSBIE: But what a confession of absolute bankruptcy on behalf of the former Premier of the Province who says that for twenty-five years or twenty-three years he did not know whether they asking for enough, or too little, or too much. Well, if he did not know his Minister of Education and his Minister of Finance must have had some idea.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no!

MR. CROSBIE: Just because the hon. gentleman did not know does not mean to say that no other government knows. What is asked for in this budget here, Mr. Chairman, is not what Memorial asked for. It is what the government decided that Memorial should have, not what it asked for. And it is done on the basis of looking at what it cost last year, what it cost the year before, how much per capita it was the year before that, and allowing for inflation, and the increase in the cost of living and allowing so much for that; and then the government estimates, and the Treasury Board, how much they really need and that is what we are asking the House to vote for them. And the officials of Treasury Board can go over to the University, and they have gone over, and they can go over every detail with the University, and they do.

Now no more, in my opinion, is required. If we do not have any faith in the administration of the University, if we think they are incompetent, if we think they are wastrels, you know, if we think they are not capable of running the institution then we can ask the Board of Regents to change them.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so foolish, boy!

MR. CROSBIE: But, you know, to get up in the House and suggest that we will be any better informed if we had a few more details on what Memorial needs the money for is just so much nonsense.

Mr. Crosbie:

We are asking the House to vote the University just bare bones, enough to keep them operating at the level that they are operating now and carry on, not what they asked for themselves originally. And I am convinced that Mr. M.O. Morgan is doing everything he can to save as much money as he can, and operate as cheaply as he can. And our other recourse is to look to the Board of Regents who represent the public, and they represent this House and the government, and some of them represent the alumni, and it is their job to look into the details, and it is their job to represent us in going into the minutiae, not our job.

The hon. gentleman opposite suggest that the University has never gotten out in the community. You know, what kind of nonsense is that! They have got an Extension Department over there. It has been out in the community all over Newfoundland and Labrador and done a lot of fine work. And to say they are not out in a community is just—you know, the complaint from the last administration was, the administration that the hon. gentleman from LaPoile was a member of, was this nefarious Extension Department was too much out in the community, that they were out encouraging people to be independent and speak out, because in those days, you know, people were afraid to say a word. They felt that if they said a word against the government they would lose everything they had. They would lose their allowances, they would lose this, they would lose that, they did not dare in the days prior to 1972 speak out against government. They were afraid the all powerful government that had been for twenty-three years would crush them. And Memorial University's Extension Department went out and helped to organize people and helped to organize local associations and regional development associations, encouraged people to speak out. And the Smallwood Administration did not like that, they hated it. They did not like



MR. CROSBIE: that Extension Department. They wanted to abolish it. That was the attitude of the last administration to Memorial going out in the community. They wanted to crush that. And now the hon. gentleman from LaPoile, the hon. flatulence from LaPoile, gets up and says that the univeristy!is not out in the community. You know,how a leopard changes its spots. How good a little session in Opposition is for an hon. gentleman's point of view. It is just wonderful. And the hon. gentleman from LaPoile, you know,has changed his spots so often in Opposition, so very, very often. He did not want the Extension Department out in the boondocks when he was Minister of Welfare in Newfoundland, and lashing it out in all directions and exercising his power. That was the last thing he wanted to see, an Extension Department at Memorial University.

So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should put his money where his mouth is. Let us have the hon. gentleman move a deletion of the whole \$40 million or some substantial part of the \$40 million, or if he says there is waste and extravagance,the amount - does he estimate it is \$100,000, is it \$50,000, is it \$25,000, is it \$1 million, is it \$500,000? Let us have him move the amount he says is waste and extravagance, the amount that he estimates they are not spending properly up there so we can vote on it and so that he can be on the record.as to how much he wants to cut Memorial University by and how much he wants to cut the 8,000 students by and just how he wants to treat Memorial University.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, I just intend to take a couple of minutes of the Committee's time. It is not an issue of earth-shaking importance, perhaps it has been discussed here but I think it is one that is of great importance to many students in our schools across the Province and it is certainly an issue that is important to me.

Now sometime ago I asked the Minister of Education in the Question Period whether the High School Drama Festival,which was initiated during Newfoundland's Twenty-Fifth Anniversary celebrations,

MR. HODDER: had been dropped for good or if it had been dropped only temporarily. And at that particular time the hon. the Premier was in the House, and in asking the question I mentioned that the Premier had promised that the first drama festival would continue, that it would be an annual thing. And when I asked the question the Premier asked me to bring it up during the debate on the education estimates, and at the time said that it was a decision that he had found hard to make.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Newfoundlanders have always had an aptitude for acting. In our small communities the best loved entertainment was the local concert as it was known, and this was held several times a year with small skits, some humorous, some serious and sometimes a one act play was performed. I suppose this had been going on for hundreds of years in Newfoundland and was common to most of our communities in the Province.

Now in the last ten or fifteen years the concert has faded away in many of our communities. We have become more urbanized. We now have regional schools, students bused from long distances and whatever the reason the local play, the skits which were common to our communities, the concert, the variety show it might be classed nowadays, is no so evident in our small communities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, some schools did get involved in play acting, some of the larger schools in St. John's, because they had a large number of teachers, and among those teachers there are always people who were talented. The more teachers you have the bigger your school the more chance you have that you have a talented teacher who can teach drama. And in Stephenville, at the school in which I was principle for some years, we did for three years produce a three act play, and I believe also in Stephenville the St. Stephen's High School there won the first regional drama festival with a Shakesperian play. I believe

MR. HODDER: for some three years they have put off a Shakesperian play. But in many, many, many of our schools this was not the case.

Now the High School Drama Festival was something that caused a great deal of excitement among the students, and I was in the education field at that particular time.

Mr. Hodder.

And the Premier announced that it would continue, but the next year it was dropped, and there were many students who were disappointed. The High School Drama Festival gave drama itself publicity.

MR. NEARY: It was voted in the estimates.

MR. HODDER: Well, my understanding was that it had been dropped.

MR. DOODY: Page twenty-nine, 607-02-06, High School Drama Festival, \$15,000.

MR. HODDER: I see. Well, anyhow if it is, that is lovely. But I would say that, just to continue on, that if this is so and if I have missed that, my understanding was that it had been dropped.

MR. DOODY: Yes, you are right. There was a debate about it.

MR. HODDER: And if it has not been dropped, I should say, then I would say that this is a very, very good thing, because I think that it should be continued, and not only continued but enlarged. In the overall scheme of things it does not cost much. It is something that is perhaps more important than a road or some of the other things because it deals with the development of young people, and I do feel that it is one of the more worth-while projects in education. It is not great perhaps in the overall scheme of things, but I do think it is a worth-while thing. And if indeed the drama festival will continue this year, if it has been announced, then I am very, very pleased with that. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I assure you I will not take very long, and I had no intention of getting involved in this debate. However, it was some of the remarks that the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy that prompted me to say the few words that I am going to say. And I say it on the basis, Mr. Chairman, that, number one, I have a son in university, and I hark back, Mr. Chairman, to the days when

Mr. Flight.

every university student from Newfoundland had no choice but to go to the Mainland to go to university, because Memorial University was a college, and it was confined to the elite of St. John's or the elite of Newfoundland. And there was no doubt - it does not matter who the administration was - there was no doubt of the needs of a university in Newfoundland. But the needs, I think, envisioned by the people of Newfoundland for a university was that Newfoundland students could become educated, could get degrees. Mr. Chairman, the question, I think does not turn on most people in Newfoundland today outside of the Board of Regents, maybe, and outside of the people who say we should make a place; it does not turn on Newfoundlanders to know that Memorial has become an international university. It does not turn them on to know that a very fair amount of the percentage of students in Memorial today are from countries far removed from Newfoundland. I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that I attended Mount Allison in 1956 and 1957, and the fact is today that Mount Allison university is serving the needs of New Brunswick. No student need go outside of New Brunswick in order to get a degree in New Brunswick today, outside of Mount Allison. And the fact is that Mount Allison has not become an international university to the extent that Memorial has become. They have not, Sir.

MR. HOUSE: It was when you were there.

MR. FLIGHT: You got to be kidding, Mr. Minister. When I was there the bulk of the students in Mount Allison were Newfoundlanders. At least there was no trend towards international status as such.

MR. CROSBIE: Never less than 40 per cent.

MR. FLIGHT: Bermuda was the only, yes, and mostly theology students. I do not want to be sidetracked. I want to say what I have to say, because I believe it and I am not espousing party politics and I am

Mr. Flight.

not speaking for anybody else. I am speaking for myself, and the fact is that I doubt very seriously if very many people in this Province today are concerned as to whether Memorial becomes an international university. They recognize the need for a university. There is no reason in God's world that a Newfoundland student should have to go to the Mainland like we did in 1956 and 1957 and 1958. But maybe what is contributing to the escalating costs of operating Memorial is that we see ourselves as being a second McGill or a second Queen's. And if we cannot afford to build extensions to hospitals in Newfoundland, we certainly cannot afford, and we should not aspire to being

Mr. Flight:

an international centre of education, And Memorial could well serve the purpose for which it was designed, I think, by simply catering to the needs of Newfoundland and giving our Newfoundland students degrees. That, Mr. Chairman, is about what I have to say, and I think there is some justification in if we are financing the University, if we have any say into the course the University takes over the years, that until we are in a position, and until we feel it is in our better interest to operate an international university and a great learning centre in some part of the free world such as Newfoundland we should confine our aspirations to what we can afford and that is to provide a university that can provide the education for our students, and give them the degrees they need to get out into Newfoundland, and any student that aspires to courses that cannot be gotten in any ordinary Canadian University then certainly it means you have to go outside of the Province, because up to a few years ago they had to go outside of the Province to get any degree. And, Sir, if it is a possibility that some of the cost of operating Memorial University comes from the fact that we are indeed becoming an international university, I am repeating myself a few times, then I think that aspect of the thing should be looked at, and all we should be trying to do is operating a university that meets Newfoundland's needs. That is it, Mr. Chairman.

MP. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, in typical fashion the Minister of Mines and Energy of course once again demonstrated to the House the - what shall I say - the technique that he uses in trying to rebut a strong debate, a strong point that is being made by this side of the House, usually resorts to his name calling, character assassination that he is well noted for, that started when the hon. member was over on this side of the House. But, Sir, I am not going to retort by name calling. I am merely going to point out to the House, Sir, one of the great weaknesses in the minister's great defense of the administration, of the government, that he put forward, And it is this, Sir; The minister told us, the member for LaPoile, his townie accent,

AN HON. MEMBER: LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: LaPoile. The gentleman who went out to Port aux Basques and at a public meeting got up talking about the Harbour Le Coucuckoo and got booted out of the hall, almost got booted out of Port aux Basques.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The member told us that any time the member for LaPoile wanted to he could move a reduction in the vote for the University. Now that sounds great. Wonderful, It sounds wonderful. Great. A good argument. Under the rules of the House I am not allowed to move an increase. But, Sir, how could I or how could any member of this House move that the vote for the University be reduced by even as much as one cent when we do not know what the budget of that University is? We do not know the details of the budget. And that is my main argument. Bring the estimates of the University into the House, and maybe after we have gone over the estimates with a finetoothed comb, maybe I might even be convinced to suggest that the budget be increased and not decreased. The minister has dragged in his usual red herring and tried to bully the Committee into his way of thinking. No wonder, Mr. Chairman, that there are members on the government side of the House who think and who are browned off, and cheesed off, because they think it is the Liberals over on that side of the House that are running the government and not the P.C's. Because I know of certain P.C's on the government side of the House who have publicly stated in this House, and outside of this House in recent weeks that they feel, and they are the real Tories, the P.C's,



Mr. Neary:

that they agree with me that the University's budget should be brought into this House and scrutinized. The P.C's, the real P.C's that got the party elected, not the Liberals who are over on that side of the House. That is why the minister is so despised and resented because he gets up and tries to leave the impression that he is speaking for the administration, and most of the people who sit on that side of the House do not agree with him. They resent him because here you have two Liberals sitting together there running the government that they worked so hard to get in power. The minister has been noted, Sir, to make a few mistakes over the last two or three years that have gotten the administration in trouble, and I would not be a bit surprised if the minister is wrong in his defense of the University not tabling their budget, their estimates in this House.

Sir, how do I know? I suspect there is extravagance and waste, but how can I know for sure until I see the estimates? And how could I move that the estimates be reduced when I do not know what they are? The House is being asked to give the University a blank cheque. How could the members vote on it intelligently if I made a motion, if I move the motion, the foolish motion the minister was talking about? I saw the hon. minister headed for the dining room at suppertime. I had the pleasure of being there during lunchtime, I did not leave much wine, I do not think, for the hon. minister. But, Sir, the hon. minister I was hoping would make a better contribution to this Committee.

But my hon. friend there from Windsor-Buchans I think touched on a very important matter. There are some members of this House, Mr. Chairman, who just do not know about the educational system in this Province. And how could they know, Sir, when they were in knee pants they were sent away out of this Province to school, and what do they know about our educational system? Was the Minister of Mines and Energy a student over at Memorial? What does he know about the involvement of the Board of Regents? What does he know about the

Mr. Neary:

functioning of that University or our educational system, our elementary school system and our high school system? As my friend from Windsor-Buchans says, "The elite of this Province were sent away to finishing school, to boys school." They know nothing at all. They know absolutely nil, zero about the educational system of this Province. And the minister can resort to all the name calling he wants, but I will just keep turning the other cheek.

MR. FLIGHT: That is right.

MR. NEARY: But one of these days I might fight -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. member is famous for turning the other cheek.

MR. NEARY: - one of these days I might start hitting back if the minister -

MR. CROSBIE: I have more cheek than anyone else.

MR. NEARY: - if the minister -

MR. SMALLWOOD: You have got more cheek to turn.

MR. NEARY: - if the minister keeps it up one of these days I might start hitting back.

But, Sir, I would submit that the minister when he spoke was not speaking for his party. He was not speaking for the majority of members seated on the government side of the House. He was not speaking for the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) or the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) who have already publicly stated -

MR. CROSBIE: I never have.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, never have and never will because these gentlemen are the men who worked and strived night and day to organize the P.C. Party, to get it in power, and now they have no say in the operations of that party. And I do not blame them for being cheesed off.

MR. CROSBIE: You can come to a caucus.

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Chairman, the minister looks down his nose at the member for St. John's East the same as he looks down his nose at most of the ministers when he was on this side of the House, with his hpiity-toity attitude and his nose up in the air looking

Mr. Neary:

down his nose on the rest of us who he considers to be scum, dirt under his feet.

MR. CROSBIE: I never have my nose up anybody's, you know, I was always looking down, never up, not like some other hon. gentlemen.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will

MR. NEARY: say what I was going to say to the hon. gentleman, because if I start that then I will be just as bad as the hon. minister, Sir. I am not going to get down and roll in the mud with the hon. minister. The hon. minister is responsible, I suppose, on more than one occasion for the deterioration of the decorum of this House. And, Mr. Chairman, we did not set the seventy-five hour limit, it was the administration, the government that set the seventy-five hour limit. I am prepared to come in here night and day, move my bed in here if I have to, and because we are working towards a seventy-five hour limit nobody is allowed to express themselves, make points when you are discussing the estimates. It was the administration that put that seventy-five limit on, and when the time runs out and the clock keeps ticking and the time runs out it will not be my fault. I think I have made a pretty major contribution so far to the estimates in this House, and I have made a few disclosures and I have gotten some information out to the public that ordinarily would not have gotten out. Now maybe before the estimates are finished, if we can ever get to Industrial Development, Finance and to Justice, there may be a few more little tidbits that I can get out. We do not call the orders of business in this House. We do not set the priorities.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I can say about the remarks made by the hon. minister that they were typical, that they were stund, stupid. The minister, I would submit, Sir, when he talks about the Board of Regents being responsible is merely trying to champion the cause of some of his cocktail buddies. This is where the policy is all made, down in the St. John's East cocktail circle, not in this House or over in the Board of Regents. They have as much say now in the running of that university as my cat. They just rubber-stamp what goes on over there.

Maybe that is our fault in this House. Maybe it is. But the next time the minister sees some of his old buddies when they are

MR. NEARY: out sipping cocktails, perhaps he would tell them what he said to the members of this House tonight, "Get out and do your job. You are responsible to the people and to the House." They are not doing their job. It is too bad the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is not here. I would like to hear his reaction to the minister's remarks to see if there is any dissent in the ranks, if everybody is 100 per cent behind the minister, or those who worked so hard to get that administration elected, and who want to run the administration, what their views are on this forward, positive suggestion that I made, if they agree with the minister, with the Liberal philosophy on that side of the House, or will the PC policy dominate the government benches.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that when the minister rises in his place that he will not stoop as low as the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy who obviously is in a foul mood tonight, who has been wrong on more than one occasion, Sir, who was wrong on his fishery policy, wrong on kicking out Churchill Falls Corporation, kicking out BRINCO out of Newfoundland, wrong on kicking out the linerboard mill people, wrong now on his approach to Quebec on the development of the hydro potential of Labrador, wrong on his negotiations with the Public Service a few years ago, wrong, wrong, wrong! What a track record! He has gotten the administration in more trouble than all the other minister put together. And someday I would hope that the hon. the Premier, one of these days, it may happen over the oil refinery as he managed to do his dirt on that too and get that closed down. Everything he set out to do is negative. He is -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman -

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we are discussing the estimates of the Department of Education, and if the hon. gentleman is going to get on, and be permitted to get on with statements like, "He did his dirt on the oil refinery and caused that to be shut down," then

MR. CROSBIE: I will debate the oil refinery when I reply. I am not going to stand for that. It is an improper comment and it should be withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member if he could be more relevant.

MR. NEARY: Well, Your Honour, the only thing that I would hope, Sir, in connection with the Education estimates and the university budget and so forth, and all the other valid points that I have made, that I hope that soon the Premier of this Province will recognize the fact that in connection with important matters such as the university estimates in this House, that the Premier

Mr. Neary.

of the Province is the one who states the policy on behalf of the government, and that pretty soon - and a lot of people in this Province are just waiting for that day to come - that the Premier of this Province will grab the Minister of Mines and Energy by the scruff of the neck and give him a hobnail boot, the Royal Order of the Boot, and show the people of this Province who the real boss is of this government and of this House, and not the Minister of Mines and Energy, because I would like to hear the Premier's view on whether or not Memorial University should table its estimates. It is too bad the Premier is not in his seat or I might be able to bait him to get up. I obviously touched a sensitive nerve with the Minister of Mines and Energy and got him on his feet and got him to make a fool of himself. I am looking forward to that day - and I do not think it will happen on this issue, I do not think this issue is as important enough, but it is bound to happen - that the day is going to come when the Premier is going to say to that minister, "I am the boss of this administration, and if you do not like it you can lump it."

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I may have a few words in this debate.-

MR. CROSBIE: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: - and whilst I realize we have spent several hours debating the minister's salary, the Minister of Education's salary, it is my opinion that any time spent by this House in taking a look, in discharging our responsibility, in taking a look at the way which education should go is time well spent -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: - not necessarily continuous repetition, not necessarily continued debated over Memorial University, but just - and most hon. gentlemen here have had some experience one way or the other in the field of education. Some, I suspect, have served on

Mr. Hickman.

Boards of Regents. Many have served on school boards and we have a pretty strong representation of the teaching profession here in this hon. House and the House is all the better for it. The hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is placing a great deal of emphasis on the need for another commission, a royal commission, or whether it is a commission, a person or persons, to take a look at education and to see where it is going and to see whether we are heading in the right direction.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not subscribe to that view. We had a Royal Commission on Education under the chairmanship of Dr. Phillip Warren, and that commission did a magnificent job in reviewing the educational requirements - I will not say for the foreseeable future for this Province - but certainly for a period beyond the time we are now in. I believe that the educators we have in Newfoundland - and we have some pretty competent men not only at the university but occupying the seats of superintendents of education, principals of schools and classroom teachers - are reacting very quickly, certainly as quickly as their counterparts are in other parts of North America to the changing needs and demands. My concern, Mr. Chairman, is that as a result of the very traumatic changes that were made in education following the Warren Commission report that education lost, or may be losing, some of the support and commitment that it had from Newfoundlanders before that time. It was very necessary - and this started before the commission report - that we move more and more toward consolidation. There is no question at all, I am sure, in anyone's mind that one of the great handicaps that those of us fortunate enough to grow up in rural Newfoundland in the 1930's and 1940's had to work under was the duplication of effort in some of our smaller communities. Three schools when we should have had only one, one school when we should have had only half a school and a high school consolidated with the next town. And in our anxiety to



Mr. Hickman.

consolidate, and I confess that I played a fairly active role in the consolidation before I entered public life, of the three major Protestant school boards in the Province,

MR. HICKMAN:

we removed some of the community interest, some of the community pride that was so essential to maintaining an active interest in education. It was a price we paid. It was the penalty that we had to pay. The result of that penalty was, in my opinion, a better standard of instruction, certainly more sophisticated equipment, certainly more sophisticated and more specialized programmes, because this resulted in the concentration of our high schools in particular in some of the larger centers, and very drastically increased the cost of education so far as the transportation by bus is concerned.

I believe that educators are sensing, and certainly parents are sensing that the pendulum is swinging a bit too far and has swung a bit too far the other way. A few years ago this House passed legislation, not too long ago, in fact it has been amended during the life of this administration, to allow for elections to school boards. There used to be great clamour for, you know, representation. If there is going to be taxation there must be representation. But did anyone notice what happened when school board elections were called in this Province, that this great interest in education was not there? That time after time elections had to be postponed because nobody showed the interest, parents or anyone else, to run for school boards? Now this is a rather strong indication in my opinion of a waning lack of interest on the part of the people of this Province, the taxpayers of this Province, towards education.

Now I can recall as a boy in Grand Bank twice a year the men of the community going around from door to door collecting money to try and pay off the school debt on what at that time was the fourth largest school in the Province outside of St. John's. These people who contributed towards the operation of that school had a pretty keen interest in what went on inside the classroom doors. They, through their school board, who came from the community, some of whom, many of whom had very limited formal education, but they had the ability to assess the capacity and capabilities of the school.

MR. HICKMAN:

teacher or the classroom teacher, and if they were not performing they replaced them.

In the last few years that kind of personal involvement has been slowly but surely disappearing. The government has been making almost the entire grant or contributing the total cost of the school. I find now when I am in a place like Grand Bank and I ask what is going on in the schools, no one seems to know. And what is far more disturbing, no one seems to care because the schools are being operated from a central office over in Salt Pond. When the John Burke High School burned down a few weeks ago there was no great panic, no great alarm, money will come from the government, it will be replaced. They knew they did not have to go out and face years and years of almost tithing to pay for the replacement for that institution.

This, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, is one of the very real threats we have to maintaining public support for the massive amount of monies that we ask each year and will continue to ask this Committee and this House to vote for education.

Another somewhat disturbing development - and I speak primarily of the area that I represent in this hon. House - is that jobs are more plentiful in certain parts of Newfoundland today. It is no trouble at all for a young man or young woman in Fortune or Grand Bank or Burin or Marystown or Harbour Breton to get a job in a fish plant.

MR. HICKMAN: A couple of years ago I was at a graduation in Grand Bank and I noticed that whilst the population of that town is almost double what it was when I was a boy, the number of graduates in grade eleven were only a few more than when I came out of there in 1942. I made some enquiries and I was told by the principle of the school, the late Allison May that there is a continuous attraction to young men and young women as soon as they reach the end of the compulsory school attendance stage to go down and work in the fish plant where they make reasonably good salaries for a seventeen year old boy or girl, and they make that break at that time, probably at the end of grade nine, probably at the end of grade ten, and, tragically, they never again get back and complete their education. Those who do, whether they get better jobs is not that relevant. I believe they enjoy living a great deal more than those who passed up the opportunity, because the opportunity is there.

There is very little doubt today, Mr. Chairman, that any Newfoundlander with the ability and the ambition to obtain a university education, a vocational school education, a Trades College education or a Fisheries College education that he or she can avail of that opportunity if they want to. But a lot are not doing it. And Newfoundland is going to be all the worse for it.

There is developing, not only in this Province but in North America, a panic that I believe is relevant to the role of the university today. If you see what is happening in the United States you will find that there are a number, a small percentage of university graduates who are unemployed. There are another group of university graduates who are not employed and who are not as gainfully employed as they feel they should be. People with their Ph.D's who are doing work which, in their opinion, they could have done, and they are probably correct in this, if they had

MR. NICKMAN: but only a Bachelor of Arts degree, or a Masters degree.

What we have to be very careful, those who run universities, in my opinion, have to be very careful of and that is to be certain that they do not over react to this temporary full employment syndrome that university graduates seem to be dedicated and aiming toward. Because if this happens, Mr. Chairman, and there is a reduction in the quality of the programme in the drive for research amongst the universities, then in my opinion when the time comes for the, and the time is here anyway, but when the demand is a bit greater than it is now, when the decline in the university population reverses, the universities may find themselves many years behind educationally than if they had continued their programme, as if the people of North America and the potential students of North America demand that there be no diminution particularly in the field of research.

The universities today are filled, it seems to me, or partially filled or almost filled with two types of students; one group who go there to become educated for the purpose of increasing their knowledge, expanding their knowledge so that as we move further into this century and there is more leisure time they will be able to take full advantage of it and enjoy it, those who want to emphasize and take full advantage of the liberal arts programme. There is the other group, and they are certainly not to be condemned for it, who look upon the university as simply a meal ticket, the old Methodist ethic. The great ambition when I was a boy in Grand Bank of every deep sea fisherman, be he a dory fisherman or a skipper, or working on shore, or anyone else was to get his boy or his girl into Mount Allison University, very few went to Memorial University except those who were going into education,

Mr. Hickman.

because of the natural affinity and historic connection between that part of the South Coast and that university. But why do they want them to go? To become learned? No, Mr. Chairman. Their ambition was that their son or their daughter would not have to go into the fishing dory. It was a meal ticket. It guaranteed them a greater income, could they only give them a start. I can remember sitting around the dinner table in my home and that is all that was ever talked about. My father saving \$5 this month when I was ten years old, and \$10 the next month so that he could get me one year in university, and this was so typical of what we found, not only in the South Coast of Newfoundland but in other pockets, in the Carbonear - Bay de Verde area, in the Lewisporte area and many other areas that I am not aware of. That was a very commendable attitude, very commendable ambition, and today the way is open in Newfoundland for almost any Newfoundlander if they want to improve their lot to avail of that kind of programme for that kind of reason.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are some delightful signs on the horizon. There are things taking place that we should take some pride in in this Province. This tendency that we had - and I believe, and gentlemen who have been in public life much longer than I have been around, much longer than I, would know whether I am right or wrong that getting back to this concept of trying to improve one's lot, one's earning capacity that some of this came from the fact that for centuries Newfoundlanders were a servile race, and that come Confederation, indeed come World War II these bonds were broken. They started to be broken. In our anxiety -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is servile the word that the minister has in mind?

MR. HICKMAN: Servile is not quite the word. The point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is this; that people used to think that there

Mr. Hickman.

was something wrong with working for somebody else, that there was something demeaning about working where you had to serve a person in a restaurant, because so very few people had the money to go into that restaurant, that the masters were few in number and the servants were very plentiful, and in our anxiety to break these bonds we may have gone a bit too far the other way. We may have demeaned the fishery as an occupation that deserves the support and commendation of Newfoundlanders.

I can recall back in the early 1950's the phrase, "the educated fisherman" which was being used by the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), and it found very little acceptability in this Province at the time, because no Newfoundlander believed that the two things were synonymous, that if you were a fisherman you were not educated. Overlook the fact that they were confusing education with learning. Because Mr. Chairman, make no mistake about it, that that man in Gaultois who could not read and write, but who could take a three master and take her to Naples without seeing land even going through the Straits of Gibraltar, was a well-educated gentleman. He was not very learned, but he was very well-educated. These things are changing a bit. This House will be pleased to learn, I am sure, that there are captains of draggers fishing out of Newfoundland today deservedly making high incomes, but who are university graduates in the liberal arts, not in navigation, not in the sciences, but in the liberal arts. And I suggest to this Committee that these Newfoundlanders are enjoying the fullness of life, that this gentleman who is sailing out of Burin, when he is on the Grand Banks and when he is not discharging his responsibilities as skipper, because of his education, is getting from his leisure hours more enjoyment, he has more understanding of what is going on around him, more appreciation, the ability to speak out on issues that have nothing to do with his particular occupation,

MR. HICKMAN: and this is coming, but it has got a long road to go yet. We continue, in my opinion, to look at certain segments of society, to look at certain occupations, and in particular the fishery, as demeaning occupation.

About a month ago I was coming back from Ottawa and there were two young couples got on the plane ahead of me, and they waved, they were well tanned, I looked at them, I was sure I recognized them but again I could not place them until I got in my seat and then when one of them spoke I realized who they were.

MR. DOODY: Were you travelling economy?

MR. HICKMAN: I was travelling economy.

MR. DOODY: Good.

MR. HICKMAN: These were two inshore fishermen from Fortune and their wives coming back from a four week well earned vacation in Barbados and my hon. colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, was with me and I mentioned it to him, and he said, "If you only knew the number of inshore fishermen in Newfoundland today, and deep-sea fishermen, who are enjoying the recreation that at one time was reserved for a very few," he said, "you would get some appreciation as to what is happening in that particular occupation." And it is happening, I am told by those who have visited Norway and Iceland in particular, that those who are employed in the fishery are at the top of the social status. They are the ones who are admired by the landmen, by the landlubbers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the merchant marine.

MR. HICKMAN: And the merchant marine in Norway. They are the ones that they look up to. I recall in Grand Bank when we used to hang around the barber shops, how we used to look up to these skippers over in Billy Matthews' barber shop when they would come in, the fact that Captain So-and-So who was just back from - has gone around the hump in Brazil and you were filled with admiration and envy and ambition to try and accomplish the same as he did. That is



MR. HICKMAN: the sort of philosophy, the sort of trend that I would like to see develop more and more in this Province. And I do not think that we need suddenly take the emphasis away from the university and suddenly put it on the vocational training schools because the demand happens to be greater there right now to accomplish the thing that I have in mind.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just one more thing, The hon. gentleman from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) raised a question of the High School Drama Festival and it was pointed out to the Committee that the hon. the Minister of Education has announced that the grant for the High School Drama Festival will be made this year and the drama festival will be held in the Fall.

That drama festival is a first class activity on the part of young Newfoundlanders. It gives them an opportunity to stand on a platform and assert themselves. It takes away that shyness that so many of us had when we were growing up in isolated parts of the Province.

But, Mr. Chairman, I for one was quite disappointed over the reaction that came from many Newfoundlanders when there was an indication by the Minister of Education that we were having some difficulty in finding the \$12,000 or \$10,000 or \$15,000, whatever was necessary to make that grant this year. Because I regarded it as proof positive of the suggestion that many Newfoundlanders had decided that insofar as community activities are concerned initiative is gone. It puzzles me why government has to make that kind of grant.

Let us take a look at the other great festival in Newfoundland, the one that accommodates between 15,000 and 20,000 young Newfoundland students every year, the Kiwanis Music Festival that is in St. John's, Grand Falls, Carbonear, I think Corner Brook and is beginning to start on the Burin Peninsula. There has never been any suggestion that there be any monies come from government to sustain or support that kind of activity,

MR. HICKMAN:

and it is my belief that if there had been in the very beginning, if there had been a government grant, no matter what it was, that that festival would not have achieved the outstanding success and the national prominence that it has during the past few years. I would suggest too, Mr. Chairman, that there would not be 15,000 or 17,000 students from all over Newfoundland going to the Arts and Culture Center every Spring all looked after by volunteers if the government was involved.

Whilst it is essential that so long as it is financially possible we must keep that drama festival going. But this Province now is dotted with service clubs of all kinds. I think there are more Lions Clubs in Newfoundland than in any of the Maritime Provinces or the State of Maine. They are dedicated. Their constitution says that they should support and maintain public endeavours - Kinsmen Clubs, Kiwanas Clubs, one or two places Rotary Clubs. The fraternal societies seem to be somewhat strapped to find outlets. There was a time when they had to look after orphans and widows of deceased members, and members who found themselves in financial difficulty. What are they all doing? Are they spending their money to build clubhouses, keep dart leagues going? Have they forgotten the real purpose why they set up these organizations? I have seen signs that they have, very disturbing signs.

AN HON. MEMBER: What association?

MR. HICKMAN: I say service clubs generally. I have seen throughout the Province, service clubs that ten years ago where the men had off their jackets and were out with their shirt sleeves rolled up and were working on community endeavours, were raising money for a small swimming pool, who suddenly got the idea that what they should get is a liquor license and build a clubhouse, and that great drive now is to pay off the clubhouse. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the community activities are not as far to the forefront as they used to be.

If these service clubs in Newfoundland are looking for a great

MR. HICKMAN:

provincial project that will benefit their Province, will benefit their community, and which with the proper approach will engender the support of parents throughout Newfoundland, then I would strongly urge them to seize onto this high school drama festival programme, the same way as the Kiwanis Club did with the music festival programme, and reach the stage where they would be insulted if somebody came along to them and said, "We are going to get you some government money." Because the Kiwanis Music Festival would be insulted if there was a suggestion that there would be public funds going to help them carry out their programme which handles so many thousands of Newfoundlanders.

I do not know if my remarks have been apropos of anything, Mr. Chairman, except to say one thing, to get back to my original comment, that if we continue to place our total emphasis on the number of dollars that are going into education, if we continue to rely less and less on local involvement, the time will come when elected politicians will suddenly realize that because of lack of interest, because of lack of involvement, the taxpayer of this Province will not allow us to spend the money that is needed for education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: I was going to respond, Mr. Chairman, to some of the remarks made this last couple of days. Mr. Chairman, in responding to the speeches I have heard in the last couple of days, I am quite happy to say that I have heard a lot of good things. The other thing is that I believe we are right on in the budget, because the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) is saying we are not spending enough and the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) is saying we are spending too much. So we are right in the center there, we are right on.

Now the first thing that was brought up, Mr. Chairman, was regarding the aims and objectives of education. I am going to dwell

MP. HOUSE:

some time on that, and dwell on it a little while with respect right through to the university and the trades schools and so on. The hon. member for Terra Nova talked about aims and objectives. I mentioned going through that of course the Department of Education through the general advisory committee have very detailed aims and objectives of education. As a matter of fact they revised them last year and found that, of course, aims and objectives do not change too much when you are talking in terms of general education. We have tried to put an emphasis on the major skills, the skill development of pupils, and people say our curriculum is narrow. But in the skill development areas, particularly in the language arts of instance, and the mathematics which are two main skills, and again in the social studies - and again unfortunately social studies have not been too social, they have been too much content oriented, we all know that - we have been emphasizing skill development.

Then to prepare people for today's society, that is the other thing people talked about in aims and objectives. But to prepare people for today's society is very difficult when the society tomorrow is very different. So the development of skills in the primary and elementary and secondary schools, the development of the skills, necessary academic skills, social skills, and the development of the intellect and the proper attitudes to keep people ready for the change, to meet these eventualities as they come, is what we aim for and that is embodied in our objectives.

Now with regard to attuning people to what the culture and the industry of the Province and the offerings of the Province, I think our vocational schools, our university and our Trades College and Fisheries College, of course as well as the other institutions - and I think in terms of the nursing schools and so forth - they are very much attuned to our needs, and our young people are very much made aware of the needs in our Newfoundland schools. We have a lot of guidance counsellors. The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) - and I am referring to some of his statements because I have

MR. HOUSE:

them down here first and of course it will embody a lot of the other speakers also, what they said. We have a lot of guidance counsellors around in our schools who are trained people who are there to advice and direct pupils in the direction of their lifes, number one, and in the selection of their vocation. But one of the things, Mr. Chairman, that the guidance people do not do, they do not and cannot play God. That is one of their cardinal sins is for them to force or try to coerce certain people into certain slots. They make them aware of what is available, what the best opportunities are. But you cannot say to a person, "You cannot go to university because there is no opportunity." You are closing his options. And we cannot say to another fellow, "You cannot go into an electrical school for electrical training." We are closing his options there. So people have to have their own selection in the final analysis.

Now, we talked about what our trade school are doing, what our technical schools are doing. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned today about the Fisheries College, what they are doing there, and what are some of the things offering. I think it would be a very good exercise for all hon. members of this House to visit the Fisheries College and to visit the Trades College and the university and see what is going on there first-hand.

We talked about some of the things that are going on. I just brought along this thing to read off about the fisheries college. Skilled training for fish plant workers; crab processing courses; smoking techniques; herring food production -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Should this be allowed. We are trying to listen to the member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HOUSE: - fundamentals in sea food processing; advanced food technology; then of course electronic technology and boat building and so on.

The hon. member also mentioned the fact that people are there

MR. HOUSE:

taking courses in boat building, but you do not see any people getting jobs in boat building. That is not the purpose for the course. The course is there to teach people, show people how to build their own boats, new ways of building boats and how to care for them so that they can go back and do their own work themselves. That is the purpose of boat building courses at the Fisheries College.

The same thing applies to the College of Trades and Technology. I mentioned yesterday when I was going through about keeping abreast of what is needed in the Province. And despite the fact that we have a pretty overloaded building over there, we are going to accommodate some 125 people next year in new courses because we see the demand for these courses, or the College sees the demand. I will just mention these three for instance: general laboratory technology; computer studies - I mentioned when I was talking the night before last I believe that somebody talked about a data processing center being built here. So they are putting on courses to try and have people prepared for that when it arrives. Another course, they are putting on a new one, is the appraisal assessment technology. So I want to just point out these things because our trade schools and colleges and universities are keeping abreast with the needs as far as they possibly can. Of course that is embodied in the philosophy of the total education programme.

Now some mention was made also today about the university population dropping off. I think it did level off a little, and the other year when they did the study to determine why people were not going to university, they came out and said it was because of cost. I think part of it was true possibly. But the main thing we must bear in mind is that there were a lot more options open to pupils than the university. One thing we have got to learn and recognize about education is it is not something that develops overnight. We had trade schools come to this Province - I do not know how long ago it is, perhaps twenty years ago, fifteen or twenty years ago, I do not know how long - and for the first number of years -

AN HON. MEMBER: 1957-1958.

MR. HOUSE: 1957-1958, I do not know. But for the first number of years anyway we were not getting the top quality students going into the trade schools because it had not received the kind of respectability that the university had. You know that was a place you would send your lower level students because they could not qualify to get into university. As a result of that, of course, we got poorer quality students. Not poorer quality people, poorer quality students. And perhaps our trades trainings was not as good.

Now I was talking to the vocational school principals this year. They are telling me now that they are getting the top quality people coming in for trades training and they feel it is going to have a great effect on the productivity because you are getting better caliber students.

The other thing, of course, that brought the university enrollment down a little was the fact that in the trades the wages have gone up tremendously the last two or three years and that is fairly attractive and a lot of people have gone in there. So there is a place for all of it, and I might say that I think that all of the institutions are doing a relatively good job. There may be need for improvement, obviously. We cannot sit down and say we are doing great, there is nothing more to do. We always have to keep plugging. This is why I do not think we need this independent study. Because I do not know how an independent person, who may not be an educator, can assess these kind of things. There is continuous assessment going on and there is continuous improvement.

The talk about the university not getting out into the field, some other hon. members mentioned the University Extension. There are new courses of studies. Perhaps because of the excessive expense this last two or three years of the new Engineering School and of

Mr. House.

the new Medical School, we have not been able to get the other things. We are just getting a School of Music there now. We also wanted to train teachers for a vocational education, which we are doing now, and for industrial arts to get these people out in our schools, but that will come with time, and these are all new things coming in to the university, meeting the needs as we can foresee them. The thing that the university should be doing is more research. One thing I want to advise the hon. member about is the fact that university people are hired to teach and to do research on an organized basis. And anything that government departments want, anything that any other group want, I am sure the university is willing to accommodate them. Of course, they are going to have to be paid extra for these kind of things because they are being paid for their teaching and organized research, and any other groups that want it will have to pay for it on a contracted basis. They are willing to do that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Pay their expenses.

MR. HOUSE: Yes, pay their expenses. They are very willing to do that, and a lot of the departments of government have been using them. We have used them throughout the Province in education quite often, and I know other departments have used their resources. And I am assured by the university that they are willing to do this and very happy to do it. So that part of it I am not to be disconcerted with.

Now the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) was talking - and I am going through a number of other things - about our selection of textbooks, and how good salesmen came in and did this and that and did the snow job and sold, of course, the kind of textbooks that they wanted. I might add that that is a kind of a little knock against the teachers of our Province. I will say that for this particular reason, that curriculum is largely now the burden of the Department of Education, but the assistance and the input comes from teachers in the field.



Mr. House.

We have set up in the Province a number of curriculum committees - I do not know if it is nine or ten - that deal at all levels. We have a number of people coming in from across the Province once a month and sitting down and discussing the aims and objectives of courses, and looking at the skills that they need in each grade level, and then trying to select textbooks that will bring about the realization of these skills. That is done by the teachers of the Province, largely selected because of their academic ability and, of course, with strength in their own subject field. They are the ones who do this and they make the recommendation and almost without reservation the Department of Education accept their recommendation. So, you know, it is not done on a haphazard basis, nor somebody coming in and selling a good textbook. The hon. member, who happened to be in civilian life, I might say, a language arts man, knows that in the language arts we have a variety of materials, and I do not think that he can say -

MR. LUSH: I just want to say that I realize - I am thinking of language arts - I really believe in this, and my point in question was whether or not we had the same sort of arrangement as other subjects, that I was not sure of. And the point I was making or trying to make was that in our school, for example, we brought in a French text about four years ago, I think, *Le Francais Partout*. And we had that in the schools for three or four years. Everybody is dissatisfied with it. Now we have got to go and get another new programme. And I just wondered, you know, how extensive that sort of thing was. But with the language arts, I agree with you. I think we got a very good system.

MR. HOUSE: Yes, The same was done for the other programmes, by the way, and that programme was, as people thought at that time, a very good programme, the French programme.

MR. R. MOORES: With regard to the minister's statement about curriculum input by the teachers: Would this apply to the history text for Grade X and Grade XI, Poselei, which teachers have been requesting and recommending be abolished, I think, for the last nine years?

MR. HOUSE: That has been a relatively weak one I would say, but the social studies group are making recommendations on that and some teachers have been wanting to abolish it, but not all.

MR. HOUSE: I have not heard too many people say that world history, which is the one we are talking about, and of course there is current events that go with that, and they have additions to it in that way.

Well, the other thing we talked about, the check on the growth in population, I could not say that I could understand too well what the hon. member was talking about when he said that the costs are related to growth. In the last five years we have gone from \$100 million to \$260 million and the population has been declining. So I do not follow the argument he put forth there.

The other thing, as I mentioned going through, that we had sixty-two per cent of our pupils in 1975 passed grade eleven. Those were pupils who had begun Grade II nine years before they finished grade eleven. That did not include the people who dropped out and went into trade schools. It did not include the pupils who dropped out and went into meaningful work, which goes to show that our drop-out rate is even lower than we expected, because I do not consider if a person qualifies at grade nine to go into a trade school, and that is what the trade calls for, grade nine, he is not a drop-out. So it is sixty-two per cent plus, in the calculations you were talking about.

Another criticism, of course, which we receive is the fact that our facilities are not up to date. When I presented the insurance package and talked about it here in the House of Assembly, I did mention that the value of school buildings in the Province, the assessed value of school buildings in the Province, is something over \$350 million. \$100 million worth of these have been built in the last four years. The replacement value, of course, is something over \$600 million. But it just goes to show again that we have been building a considerably large number of good schools. Now there is not enough, I grant you, but we cannot do it overnight. We cannot do it in one year, two years or three. It has to be done in relation to our economy and I think it has to be done in relation to the

MR. HOUSE: ability of the trades to be able to stand it.

I think if you had a couple of hundred million dollars right now to spend on schools, the price of the schools would go pretty high because it would be a contractor's market. So it has got to be gradually for a number of reasons, and the best one I can give, of course, is the fact that we have got to do it within our ability to provide the funds.

The pupil-teacher ratio, again the hon. member mentioned that we have got the highest in Canada. I do not know. I have not talked to all the schools across Canada, or all the provinces or their departments. I know that Nova Scotia is supposed to have the lowest pupil-teacher ratio in the Maritimes, and their pupil-teacher ratio is one to eighteen last year, Ours, if you divide - and that includes all the people involved in education; superintendents, supervisors, specialist teachers and so on - you divide all this, it comes out to one to twenty, and Nova Scotia this year cut back by 500 or 600 teachers which puts them near about the same as ours now, and I think how ours is higher - better than New Brunswick.

The other thing I want to mention here too, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the pupil-teacher ration is one to twenty-six. We have a lot of specialist teachers. We have a lot of special education teachers, and the pupils for these are counted in two ways, so a lot of boards in the Province - in the school district I was in over in Deer Lake, I always want to speak about that one, it was a very good district and I do not think we had any more than, I do not think in the primary grades we had one more than thirty pupils in any grade in the primary, and very rarely did we go over thirty-five in any. And I remember having one class we had to put forty-one pupils in and I put two teachers in that classroom and made a team teaching project out of it. And when schools tell me they got forty and forty-two pupils in the classroom, it seems to me like they are doing something with the teachers that was not meant. And I know a lot of boards

MR. HOUSE:

of course, are taking regular teachers and putting them in other lines of work, consultant work and so on. That has happened. And of course that is not the fault of this department. We give specialists and that is what they are for. If boards so want to overload their schools, well, that is their business and there is not much we can do about it.

MP. SIMMONS: Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. HOUSE: Yes.

MP. SIMMONS: I might have missed a part of his comment about how the pupil-teacher ratio is arrived at. Would he first of all indicate for my benefit who is included in terms of on the teachers side in arriving at the ratio?

MR. HOUSE: I mentioned that. I mentioned everybody involved at the board level, everybody.

MR. SIMMONS: The superintendent, too, for example?

MR. HOUSE: Yes. I took it on the same basis that Nova Scotia did theirs. They take all the people involved, supervisory, superintendents, teachers and all divided by the total population.

MR. SIMMONS: One further question and a related comment. The minister has indicated that it is not the department's responsibility to dictate the allocation of teacher personnel. I certainly agree with him on that. But my question relates. It is this: Would he or his department be in favour of, in the forthcoming negotiations with the NTA and the School Board Federation, would he be in favour of a clause in the collective agreement which would provide that a class size cannot exceed a certain number of students? May I just comment before giving the floor back to the minister?

It seems to me that the minister has zeroed in on a very real abuse. It is not a widespread abuse, but it is an abuse in some schools in the Province where on paper the school or the board, the district has a very low, relatively speaking, low teacher-pupil ratio. But in terms of the numbers of students in a given classroom they do, and there are dozens and dozens of examples where there are over forty

MP. SIMMONS:

students and forty-five students. I actually, on one occasion in the last two years, saw a class of fifty-three kindergarten students in the one room. Now, first of all, there is no way that that is a manageable number, from an educational standpoint or even from a physical standpoint. But more important, it is a real abuse of the regulation that was designed to lower the pupil-teacher ratio.

My question again: Would the minister be in favour of a clause that would delimit the absolute number that could be in a classroom? You know, the number be  $x$ , be it thirty-one, thirty-two, twenty-five or whatever. Would he in principle be in favour of that kind of a delimitation as a clause in the new contract with the teachers?

MP. HOUSE: Mr. Chairman, if you say you were not, it would be almost against motherhood, because I do not think anybody should be in a classroom with one teacher, anymore than thirty-two or thirty-three particularly when we have a one to twenty-six ratio on regular teachers. But I will have to reserve judgement on it. But the only reason why, I think, that we have to be cautious about this is because you run into situations where you might have thirty-two, thirty-four or thirty-five. You know, you say thirty-two and you go in a school and you have thirty-five pupils. So what are you going to do with these three? Put the three Grade V with the Grade VI class? It would be very difficult to do that in our Newfoundland situation. So I would have to think about it some time before I could make a recommendation on it.

MP. SIMMONS: Would the minister permit just one other comment while we are on this subject? I appreciate that in any cutoff point the arbitrariness of the point you pick creates problems. If you pick thirty-five you are going to have a class of thirty-six at some point. But would he in taking this under advisement, would he take this suggestion as well: Consider a cutoff point, be it twenty or twenty-five, or as he suggests thirty, and then a rider which would say

MR. SIMMONS:

that in certain extenuating circumstances, for example, if the cutoff were thirty and there were thirty-two, and to bring another teacher in would create all kinds of problems from a number of standpoints, could there be a rider that either by mutual agreement of the Teachers' Association, the board and the department, or as another alternative, only with the permission of the minister, for example, could the board, or it does not have to be as high - when I say the minister, I mean under the minister's authority - it could be a designated person in his department, such as the chief superintendent or one of the deputy minister's assistant deputies, but under the minister's authority I mean. Would he take that matter under advisement? I see the need for nailing this down in principle because I think there are abuses. I would not want my comments to mean that there are abuses in a majority of situations. But there are enough abuses that the education of students is being adversely affected as a result of these abuses.

MR. HOUSE: Thank you.

MR. HOUSE: I will certainly take it under advisement and, as I say, I think any parent who has got a child in a classroom of forty-two for instance, for instance one teacher, I know that their child is not getting the advantage that they should be getting, and there are abuses, right.

One other thing I want to just zero in on here, too. I was with the Maritime educational ministers a little while ago, and one of the things we were talking about was pupil - teacher ratio, and we talk about increasing ours here, and we got a lot of flack because we did not cut back, we did not implement a particular programme. They are cutting back in some provinces. And would you believe in New Brunswick they are saying to school boards, "We will give you a block of money to hire teachers, and you can hire as many as you like with that block of money." And, of course, I was expecting to see some kind of an outrage by the Teachers' Association, but I never heard it in the Province. When I was up there I never heard a word about it. But that is what they are doing in New Brunswick this year. Instead of saying you can hire all the Grade VII teachers if you can get them, they are saying they will give you a block of money and you hire the grades of teachers that you think you can best do the job with.

The programme about training or getting some education or some head start for our pupils under five years of age, that is something that is not very prevalent across Canada. And the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) referred to it as a programme that went on in the United States. I might say I happened to be studying in the United States for a couple of years when that programme was on, and it was not the astounding success that everybody had hoped it would be.

But there are a number of things that we are doing, and we are talking about programmes that we have extended in other departments giving some assistance to people who are deprived, and I think that might be something that we can follow up. We talked



Mr. House.

about the programmes being narrow, we talked about having a wide variety. And, Mr. Chairman, only a few days ago I read an article in one of the United States' magazines, and we always look to the United States about our education programmes because that is where a lot of them emanated from, and they are setting up schools now, optional schools in some of their big cities so that necessarily you will not have to send your child to one of these progressive schools. They are setting up schools, and the pupils can go to them, and they got the option to go to them within boards, reading, writing and arithmetic, the straight line curriculum like we have here. They have to have prayers in the morning, and prayers in the evening, and I thought to myself it is very much like we have got in the Province. And if we keep far enough back the other crowd will catch up with us a little later. So we are having it now, a lot of it.

The cost of education today: the hon. member was using 1974 figures when he was talking about the cost per pupil for education in elementary and primary and secondary. And I think he would have to admit that two years ago, before the teachers got the fairly substantiable salary increase they got now, our salary range for teachers was considerably down in relation to the rest of the country. It has caught up very well now, and I think if you would take the statistics from the estimates this year you will see that our estimated cost for secondary education, elementary and primary is about \$1,150 a pupil. That is the estimated cost. Now he has got to bring in every aspect of it, but every other province brings in every aspect of the budget. So it is about \$1,150. He made mention also to the school taxes, and I did not want to mention it because I understand there is a motion on the Order Paper, but this year it is projected - and according to the amount that is coming in - we will collect something like \$9 million in school taxes,

MR. HOUSE: which is just \$2 million less than we are giving for the capital budget this year. And when somebody spoke today about local involvement in education, this is the first thing flashed in my mind that local involvement depends - raising money in one big local involvement. I have been in education a number of years throughout the Province, and one of the phenomena that happen, it has always struck me to be odd but it just happens, we had Home and School Associations across the Province and for years these Home and School Associations were prolific, right across, practically every school had one, They have died down considerably, there are still some but they have died down considerably. But what was the main thing that held these home and school associations together? It was not getting in and discussing curriculum. It was not getting in and discussing basically what is going on in the school, although you did some of that, but the main thing that held them together was the raising funds for buying drapes and that sort of thing, and I maintain that had a very important effect on education. You have got the people there and you could discuss educational problems with them at that time.

MR. ROWE: That is local involvement.

MR. HOUSE: That is local involvement. The other thing about school taxes, now nobody likes taxes but there is a \$9 million that we would have had a struggle to have found otherwise.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, would the minister permit a question? I got very strong feelings about school tax authorities, but the hon. minister suggested that there is \$9 million we would have found it very difficult to get, presumably the government to get,

MR. HOUSE: Yes.

MR. ROWE: Where is that \$9 million coming from? It is coming from the pockets of the people of this Province.

MR. HOUSE: Right.

MR. ROWE: Which is exactly where this provincial government gets some of its money. So it is coming from the same source, the people's pockets.

MR. HOUSE: That is correct. It is coming from the people's pockets. There is also a fairly substantial amount coming from the federal government, since we are able to tax or to get grants in lieu of taxes from federal government properties. That is an excellent point.

MR. ROWE: Yes, it is a good point. But it could still be done without having School Tax Authority.

MR. HOUSE: Now the other thing I want to mention with the school tax, one of the things it does give a measure of local control. How many times, I think, some of the teachers or some of the people who are principals have had, parents phone them very irate, very irate about something that is going on in the school, some child who was not getting a fair deal or something. And what did the parent say, "I am paying my taxes." And invariably I ask her "What taxes?" She said, "My \$5 a month." She considered that was her total input into education. And I submit if it comes from the Central Treasury people are not thinking of it in terms of theirs, and that has a little bit of an effect.

The other thing when you think about power, money does have some power. Nova Scotia, for instance, is cutting back. They are going to centralize and of course build their schools from central funds. What are they doing? They are saying, "We are going to determine the size of the schools," the department, the government, no input from the boards. "We are going to determine the size of the schools and we are going to determine the amount of money we are going to give you," and I think the figure this year is \$30 a square foot and the size is going to be determined by the Central board. So their boards has got nothing to say whatsoever in the construction and building of their schools. And the same thing is happening in New Brunswick.

MR. HOUSE: So I maintain that we have not a decentralized tax base. We have got decentralized power. It is going to have a better impact on the education in the total area.

The regional superintendent's office, the hon. member mentioned that one. I want to mention that just briefly. It was not seven that was suggested, it was six, and of course we are thinking in terms of five and a maximum.

With the new system we have in the last seven years, the integrated system I call it, with a number of small boards into a few big boards, we have got a lot of highly skilled people in these boards, and the regional superintendent's office has not been one that we have been overly convinced is a real significant one, although we think it is important not of such great magnitude that it takes a top priority. We have two

MR. HOUSE:

and we are keeping these staffed at the level they are now. trying to get some support staff. We think that before we fill these five offices we should be able to afford also to put in enough support staff. What I mean by that is the kind of specialists in these areas that boards cannot justifiably have themselves. For instance, I do not think any one board would need perhaps a school psychologist, one small board. Perhaps it would be a regional thing. The same thing with speech therapy. So that is still very much alive, very fluid, but we are not in any great rush to get it done. I notice in the estimates we do have salary units in there for the five regional superintendents.

I think the hon. member also mentioned that I seemed awfully apologetic when I was talking about the money. I think perhaps without divulging any cabinet secrets he might ask my colleagues if I am very apologetic when I am trying to get money for my department.

One of the other things I want to zero in on at this stage is the special education. The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) had a long talk on special education and special needs. I think he was referring basically to, of course, the kind of people that we are not really doing too much for now. Although I might add, Mr. Chairman, that we do have a lot of these people he was talking about around the Province. We do not know how many. These are people who are bedridden, who are invalided in various ways, multi-handicapped I think we call them. We have means of taking care of students who are deaf, students who are blind, students who are trainable mentally retarded. We have these, and we are getting a good programme organized there. We also have a programme going, a very good programme, for those who are educable. But we do have this group that the hon. member referred to.

It is very difficult to organize a programme for them because, first of all, we do not know where they are. But two or three years ago this department, in conjunction with the Department of Health, started trying to gather statistics and finding out where these people were, because there were people - and I will give you an example - I was

MR. HOUSE:

in Deer Lake for seventeen years and I discovered, only about five years ago, that there was a person not too far away from me, from where I was living, who was completely invalided. I did not know the person existed. The person of course was kept there like this because the parents just did not want to display the fact that they had this child. And that was going on. So we have been trying to identify a lot of these and getting a lot of information in. Just two days ago - I should have announced it perhaps in the Legislature of the estimates we were on, and I did not. I said I would do it at this time - we have appointed a registrar of handicapped children, and this year that person of course will be collecting the data and identifying where these people are, because you cannot think in terms of facilities or programmes until you know the number of people and where they are.

We had a report done by Kendall on this particular thing. One of the things he did mention is that the very first thing you have got to do is your identification because, he suggests, with people like blind people it is great to have a center Halifax for all the blind. We need that, but for a lot of these other kind of people it is better to have them close to home. So you would have to identify where they are and then, of course, from there on in you would have to determine what kind of programmes would be offered.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is the registrar?

MR. HOUSE: It is a lady. I do not know if she is a Miss or a Mrs. Snelgrove. She was appointed two days ago.

MR. SIMMONS: She is in the position now?

MR. HOUSE: Yes the day before yesterday she took up the position.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister also a moment ago referred to the Kendall,

I believe, report. Do you keep a record on the report?

MR. HOUSE: The report was done, I think, two or three years ago.

It was basically done with regard to handicapped children in the Province. I think it was in terms of all kinds, the blind and the deaf and the multi-handicapped, cerebral palsy and that sort of thing.

MR. SIMMONS: Could the minister indicate, was the report in the nature of a survey of numbers of these people, or rather a recommendation for a programme for these people?

MR. HOUSE: Recommendations.

MR. SIMMONS: For a programme for these people.

MR. HOUSE: Right. And the report recommended we set up a registry for handicapped children.

MR. SIMMONS: As a first step, as it were.

MR. HOUSE: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: Is the minister in a position to indicate the nature of the programme that is being contemplated or that the report recommended?

MR. HOUSE: No. I cannot elaborate on that now because I am not fully conversant with it. I have not read the total report. I just got a briefing on it so I would not have that much detail.

The other thing too is that there is an inter-departmental committee set up and we are studying the possibility of doing some work for pupils between, for instance, zero years and five before they go to school, particularly those who are classed as mentally retarded so that they can have some facility when they are old enough to go to these trainable mentally retarded classes. And of course it is going to go farther than that, the study is at least, because we are thinking in terms of people beyond the school age also.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of work and planning and studying being done, and I think the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) said if we cannot do it this year we should be thinking in terms of doing these studies, and I am very happy that he agrees with what we are doing. I think most people who have knowledge of these kind of people would welcome that kind of service.

MR. SIMMONS: I move the adjournment.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole on Supply have considered the matters to them referred, made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, ten o'clock in the forenoon and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 A.M., carried.



C O N T E N T S

April 29, 1976	Page
<u>PRESENTING PETITIONS</u>	
By Mr. White, two petitions, one in behalf of residents of Birchy Bay and the other in behalf of residents of Campbellton protesting increasing electrical rates.	6140
<u>NOTICES OF MOTION</u>	
Notice was given to ask leave on tomorrow to introduce Bills Nos. 47, 46, 49, 50, 51 and 52.	6141
<u>ORAL QUESTIONS</u>	
Number of teachers to receive sabbatical leave this year, and what section of the Province they come from. Mr. Lush, Mr. House.	6142
Guidelines used in the selection. Mr. Lush, Mr. House.	6143
Establishment of criteria. Mr. Lush, Mr. House.	6143
Order of debate in the House. Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Wells.	6144
Alleged offer by the Government of Quebec reported by the press to purchase 7,500 square miles of Labrador. Mr. Roberts,* Mr. Crosbie.	6145
*Mr. Roberts gave notice under Standing Order 31(g) that he wished to debate the matter on the adjournment.	6150
Outline of Government policy sought. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Crosbie.	6150
Premier's position in meeting with Mr. Bourassa. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	6151
Query as to when debate will take place in the House regarding electrical power of Labrador. Mr. Smallwood, Premier Moores.	6152
Query as to discussion on joint development of Labrador Rivers flowing into Quebec. Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Crosbie.	6154
Query as to whether Mr. Cournoyer was expressing a personal opinion or that of the Government of Quebec. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Crosbie.	6155
Query as to what language the discussions were held in. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Crosbie.	6156
Negotiations with Trizec to provide office space for Government. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	6157
Query as to whether different results could be expected were future discussions to be held with Premier Bourassa. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Crosbie.	6157
Query as to when the balance of 137 questions placed on the Order Paper by Mr. Neary will be answered. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	6158

C O N T E N T S - 2

<u>ORDERS OF THE DAY</u>	Page
Bills Nos. 40, 41 and 42 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.	6161
Committee of Supply - Head VI - Education Estimates (continued)	
Mr. Simmons	6163
Mr. Neary	6188
Mr. Smallwood	6210
Mr. Lush	6232
On motion the Committee rose, reported progress, asked leave to sit again and was ordered to sit again presently.	6245
Debate on the Adjournment	
Aspects of the Companies Act whereby lawyers' secretaries' names may be used in the registration of companies.	
Mr. Neary	6246
Mr. Hickman	6248
Decentralization of certain Manpower Training Programmes as this effects the Carbonear District Vocational School.	
Mr. R. Moores	6253
Mr. House	6255
Recent negotiations between the Province of Newfoundland and the Province of Quebec with respect to Labrador.	
Mr. Roberts	6256
Mr. Crosbie	6260
The House rose at 6:00 p.m.	6263
The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.	6264
Committee of Supply - Head VI - Education Estimates (continued)	
Mr. Lush	6264
Mr. Neary	6270
Mr. Crosbie	6296
Mr. Hodder	6308
Mr. Flight	6311
Mr. Neary	6314
Mr. Hickman	6322
Mr. House	6334
On motion the Committee rose, reported progress, asked leave to sit again and was ordered to sit again on tomorrow.	6355
ADJOURNMENT	6355