



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 55

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, MAY 3, 1976

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to draw to the attention of the House the death of Magistrate Howard Strong. Magistrate Strong served with distinction in the Royal Navy during the Second World War, and after the war was appointed magistrate and served at various parts of Newfoundland, but most particularly he served, and I remember myself his serving in Corner Brook from 1949 until very recent years when he came into the Traffic Court in St. John's. As I say, Magistrate Strong has had a most distinguished career, and he will be sorely missed not only by the magistracy in which he served so well, but the community as a whole.

And certainly I would like to express on behalf of the government, and I am sure on behalf of all members of this House our regrets to his family, his wife Beth and to his children.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues I would like to endorse the remarks by the Government House Leader, and I guess it will probably be in the form of a motion to his family. So I would only be too happy to second that motion on behalf of my colleagues. And I read somewhere that Magistrate Strong was a humorous and a very fair man. I only had one occasion to appear before him on two traffic violations, and I blew my own case, and he was fair enough to split it evenly. He convicted me on one, and let me off on the other. So the man was a very fair man, Sir, and a very wise man. I am only too happy to endorse the remarks of the Government House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the late Magistrate Strong was a very warm, personal friend of mine. I deeply grieve over his death, and I agree with the Government House Leader that Newfoundland has lost a good son.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it probably would be in order at this time to simply congratulate the House Leader upon his installation as Chancellor of the Eastern Newfoundland and Labrador Diocese of the Anglican Church in Newfoundland, and I am sure I say this on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I doubt that there ever was an occasion in the history of this House since 1832 when among us as members of the House were two hon. gentlemen who were chancellors in the Anglican Archdiocese and Diocese of Newfoundland, the hon. Government House Leader and Minister without Portfolio has been installed, and a few weeks ago the hon. member for St. John's East was installed as chancellor of another Anglican Diocese. And I would imagine that if hon. members behave themselves from now on, it can only be, I take it, because of the strong, very powerful ecclesiastical influence on us. I am sure we are all proud and happy to have two of our colleagues as members of the people's House who are chancellors in the great Anglican Dioceses of our Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, on the same subject, just a few weeks ago on two occasions, both at the time of the election of the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and after that the election

Premier Moores.

of the hon. House Leader to these two very august positions, I passed on congratulations, and I suppose it was a bit of naivete at the time, because that was for the election as opposed to the installation, which is now the event. The fact that one could survive one and still make the second, with the record of the House itself, always makes one wonder if that was a possibility and probably this is the time for the congratulations of both these members.

It is indeed, as the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) has said, to them and to us a day of credit, a day of pride, and a day of congratulations. And certainly on behalf of the government side of the House I would also like to add our congratulations, personal congratulations to these gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling ministerial statements there are two groups of students I would like to welcome to the House. One is a group of twenty-one students from the District Vocational School at Bell Island, with their teacher Mr. Pinsent; and the second is a group of twenty-nine students in secretarial science from the College of Trades and Technology in St. John's who are visiting with their teacher, Miss Dorothy Halleran. And I know on behalf of all hon. members I extend to you a welcome to the people's House and the hope that your visit here will be interesting and enjoyable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: We also have in the House of Assembly this afternoon representatives from the Community Council of Burlington, Green Bay, and they are Mr. Kelly, the Chairman of the Community Council, and two of the councillors, Mr. Mills and Mr. Bartlett and to these gentlemen also I extend a cordial welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Government House Leader, the hon. Minister without Portfolio. Would the hon. minister enlighten the House, or tell the House how he can be so certain that Mr. Morgan, who purchased the MacPherson property, how he can be so certain that Mr. Morgan had an option to purchase this land long before the Summer Games came on the carpet? How can he be so definite when there was nothing in the letter of reply to the minister that indicated that Mr. Morgan did have an option? So how could the minister be so certain and so definite when he made his statement to the House on Friday?

MR. WELLS: The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is that simply that I was told that that was so. I have been told that that is so both inside and outside the House. However, if there is any doubt about it or any concern to the hon. member, I would undertake to check it out formally, and see if that was so.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile on a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, Sir. There is some doubt about it. In fact somebody is lying, not the minister now, but somebody who provided the information is lying. And I would like for the minister to get a copy of the options on that property for the House, and to send for the documents as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

As the hon. gentleman is aware he is recognized now to ask a question -

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: - but not to make statements on the general subject.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I understand. I am asking the minister if he would send for the documents and have the documents tabled in this House within forty-eight hours. That is the option agreements that Mr. Morgan had

Mr. Neary:

on the Macpherson property, all the options that Mr. Morgan had. Can the minister have that in this House within forty-eight hours, because somebody is obviously lying?

MR. WELLS: I do not know within forty-eight hours, Mr. Speaker, but I can certainly request the options, yes.

MR. NEARY: The minister will get the options?

MR. WELLS: I will request the options, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Province is in complete turmoil over the government stand on the price of oil, would the Premier or the House Leader indicate exactly what the government's policy is with respect to the increase of oil in view of the fact that the Premier is reserving judgment and the House Leader has come out and said that he is dead against such increases? What is the government's policy on this since we have had two contradictory statements?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Obviously The Daily News is the, you know, the Bible of the hon. gentleman in this particular regard.

MR. ROWE: And The Telegram as well.

PREMIER MOORES: Or whoever.

The fact is, Sir, as far as the oil and gas increase is concerned, we have taken a stand, as we have said many times before, that over a period of time from the Canadian national point of view that it makes sense for Canadian oil and gas prices to be the same and competitive with international oil and gas prices, and I said over the long-term.

In the short-term, with the difficulties that this country is facing today, that is the stand we took with Alberta, in support of Alberta just over a year ago. In the meantime with the tremendous inflationary problem we have had, with the recessionary problems we have had, we have said this should be done more gradually than was the case then. And any large increase would be wrong at this

Premier Moores:

time, but we have to work towards that objective eventually.

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the hon. member it has been drawn to my attention that there is a third group of students visiting the Legislature this afternoon to whom I wish on behalf of all hon. members to extend the same welcome, and that is a group of students from North West River, There are nine of them, and their teachers Mr. Hanrahan and Mr. McLeod.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct to a question to the Minister of Health, and it relates to the news release made by him this morning. I wonder would the minister be a little bit more specific about the Prevention Advisory Committee on Health and Manpower that he announced was established this morning. What specifically are its objectives and the aims of that Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Health.

HON. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as the name implies one of the main functions of the Committee will be to give direction to me, and of course to the government, in terms of our manpower needs, what direction we should be taken in terms of specialities etc. that sort of thing.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not, according to the information he has right now whether we have an undersupply or an oversupply in our health and manpower situation at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there are areas of the Province where I would not say we have an oversupply, but there are areas of the Province which are pretty well, to use a common term, pretty well doctored. There are other areas of the Province of course where we have had some difficulty in attracting doctors. Overall, on an average basis, we still have, not a long way to go, but we do have

Mr. Collins:

some catching up to do.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister, I think it is the Minister of Industrial Development, and if the minister does not want to answer it, perhaps the Premier might answer it. I would like to know, or I would like for the House to know, what is happening in connection with the Pyramid Homes at Argentinia? Is it shutting down? Has the company gone into receivership or bankruptcy? Will it start up operation again? Could the minister give us some information on the Pyramid Homes operation in Argentinia? Is it finished? Is it going to keep working? Or what is going to happen to this industry?

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

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, Pyramid Homes is a private company that has established in Argentinia, as the hon. member knows, with the co-operation from the Department of Industrial Development. The extent of supporting, there is not any financial support, but to indicate that we would be willing to assume responsibility if they were removed from the area. The company is in a lot of difficulty across the whole of the Canadian Continent at the moment, and we are getting a report some time this week about their plans but it does not look good at the present moment. It does not look good at the present moment for Pyramid Homes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not look good now?

MR. SPEAKER: It does not.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It does not.

Now I should not go beyond that, Mr. Speaker, because it is a private company. They have made certain comments to us, they have advised us of their problems, and we are trying to work with them, but there is not a good deal we can say at the present moment. Now we have asked them for a complete report on their problems. Anything we can do to help them we are quite willing to do it, but it is a real serious problem, and I hope that the Board of

Mr. Lundrigan:

Directors will decide to continue their operations. But I still have to advise that it does not look good.

MR. NEARY: Well, I thank the hon. minister. A supplementary question then. Would the minister inform the House how many employees, how many workers, male and female, are involved directly and indirectly with the Pyramid Home operation?

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

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the work force varied from eighty to over one hundred. The last time I visited there would be six or seven weeks ago with the member, I would say there would be approximately one hundred people involved. They have turned out about one trailer per day, I believe, was their output. One of the problems they are claiming they had is the fact that the overhead was so high, that is the fixed overhead costs for the productivity they have had in terms of the output. They could with the same overhead process and manufacture a considerable number more, and the market did not -

MR. SMALLWOOD: One trailer a day or one mobile home?

MR. DOODY: One mobile home.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: One mobile home per day.

We have had some discussions with them. The department have been involved with them from day one as the member knows. I am advised by my colleague to my right something I was not aware of that there was a small bit of an initial assistance given of to them, a very few thousands of dollars. I think our aim basically was to help clear out the obstacles with the American Government at the time in leasing property, and I believe our commitment was in the form of saying to them that in the event that they were not able to continue their operation there that we would have to assume, or we would assume the responsibility in the event that they were forced to leave the facility premises. I will say that our advice is that their problems do not relate to the productivity of the work force in the area. I was concerned about that, because the attitude

Mr. Lundrigan:

had been abroad that there was some lack of productivity, I have heard that rumour and comment. Their advice was that the work force is comparable with the work force in the other three plants they have across the country.

I am not very happy to have to just announce that aspect of it because that is not very positive when the company is in danger of not continuing their operation. Perhaps I should not even announce that at this moment because really in fact it is not final and conclusive. When the original move was made it was a two week close down, and the information seem to point to the fact that they were having an inventory problem, We immediately sent off our people in the department to their parent company and they investigated the problem and looked at the extent of their problem across the nation. They lost quite a bit of money last year across Canada in their four plants. The most serious losses were suffered in the Newfoundland operation. They are looking at, assessing, all of their operations across the country, the four plants that they have and I could not comment on what their decisions will be. It is an internal thing. We have got no influence or control. We have got no authority. We cannot say to them you must continue.

MR. NEARY: But you are entitled to the information.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We are certainly entitled to the information. And we have had from their managing director, I believe is his title, a good deal of information in recent days to indicate to us the extent of their problem. We have had formal communications from them. But I feel a great deal of sadness to have to suggest that perhaps the extent of their problem might be more serious than we in fact knew when we started to investigate what we thought was a temporary layoff. I was advised about a week ago that we would in ten days receive an official word from their Board of Directors as to what their firm plan was. I have not received that communication, I hope to receive it this week. And I am reluctant to have to say what I am saying today because I had hoped that we

Mr. Lundrigan:

could have had a firm position of the company, but I do not feel I can be any more reluctant or continue to be reluctant in giving this information bearing in mind that the hon. member requested it.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MP. NEARY: A further supplementary, Sir. In view of the seriousness of the situation at Argentia - and the minister need not apologize because the people are aware of it in the area anyway, it has been rumored for months now - but in view of the seriousness of the situation would the minister tell the House what steps the government will take to establish one of these typical task forces that we saw, for instance, in the case of Come By Chance, to deal with this situation, to try to find alternatives, alternative employment, alternative industry, for the Argentia, for the Placentia area? Will the government be taking immediate action to set up some kind of a committee to deal with this situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. LUNDPIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if a task force is the approach that one could take to attract industry. In recent days the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, and the member for the district, my colleague who sits behind me, and officials of the departments involved had fairly intensive meetings with the aim of course to try and, first of all, resolve the problem of administration at the Argentia Naval Base. That is one kind of a move that we are making. There are three types of activities that we are pursuing as they relate to marine industries in the Province that I cannot indicate today because they are still only in the discussion stages and in the formative stages of development. I would not want to make any comments on these now, to try to suggest to anybody in the area that we have any formal types of activity that can alleviate the problems in Argentia.

But I can tell the hon. member and I can tell the hon. House that we have really worked hard in government in trying to deal with industry across the country and in the Province, to suggest to them that anything that we can do at all will be done to facilitate their establishing in the Argentia area. I hope that some time in the near future we will be in a position to be more definitive. The Premier has been advised formally on some of the discussions we have

MR. LINDPICK:

had and it is too premature to make any comments on it but we hope to attract a type of industry that will provide some stability to the economy of the area. We recognize it is one of the biggest challenges we have in the Province.

MR. NEAVY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Is this a supplementary?

MR. NEAVY: No, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Then I recognize the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the same minister, the Minister of Industrial Development. I put a question to him on April 8 which he undertook to answer for me and get the information for me. I remind him of the question and wonder now if he has got the answer. It relates to the freeze in the Bay Bulls area, the land freeze effective the Summer of 1973. I was wondering if the freeze was still in effect. Does the minister have the answer?

MR. LINDPICK: I did ask for the information. It has not been forwarded to me at the present moment and I will just have to hope that he can have a little bit of patience. I realize I should perhaps have had that information available. I raised it with the officials. The Easter recess intervened. I did raise it four or five days ago. I have not got the information but certainly as a result of his second question I will feel a good deal more urgency in trying to get a response for him.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow a supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary to the same minister. I wonder also would the minister indicate to the House or undertake to find out for the House whether the Province, either through his own department or through some other department, has had any involvement with the federal Environment Department in connection with the planning of this marine service facility which was announced a month or so ago for the Bay Bulls area? What has been his department's or the provincial government's

MR. SIMMONS:

involvement with the planning of that facility?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. LUNDRECAN: Mr. Speaker, coincidentally on Thursday I believe it was, Wednesday or Thursday, I sat specifically on that issue with the people in the department and I raised a question about what the federal attitude was, the basis for the federal decision. I do not want to sort of suggest in the least that we challenge any decision they have made because I do not know the reasons for them and the basis for them. But we were not consulted or informed or involved in any way in the decision to move in the Bay Bulls area. And consequently I found it necessary to raise the question ourselves. My deputy minister and the Director General of Fisheries or Environment I guess, Mr. Crowley, are supposed to be sitting down. I hope they have arrived at a decision to meet and discuss the issue. I have asked for a report on it, not to challenge any decision that has been made but to find out the extent of what will happen.

Also I feel myself that the federal government in making decisions of this nature, without getting involved in sort of any provocative comment about the federal government considering the attitude of my hon. colleague from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) about the need for co-operativeness and consultation and the like, but at the same time I feel that the federal government in making decisions involving the developments in the Province should be a bit more willing to share with us their information and at least consult with us even though some of the jurisdictions might be totally within their ambit of power.

On the other hand, of course, there are questions, because I have asked the question myself as to whether we have the authority to be able to say to the federal government that in view of the fact you will need property and you will need space and you will need available types of opportunities to establish a physical presence in the Province that we might in fact have a right and a bit of authority. Therefore all the more reason why the federal government should involve

MR. LUNDPTICAN:

us in their discussions and their decision making in this instance.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would have addressed this question to the Government House Leader but he is absent from the Chamber at the moment, so I ask the hon. the Premier if he can give us some approximate idea as to when there will be a resumption of the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech From the Throne that was delivered to us going on six months ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the estimates at the present time table should be finished, or it looks as if they will be finished, around May 11 or May 12. I would think immediately after the estimates have been dealt with that the Address in Reply, the budget debate and the legislation will obviously be coming in then. But hopefully for the hon. gentleman's benefit if there is some particular reason he would like it called on a particular time, he will find the government most co-operative in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the hon. the Premier would be willing to comment on the fact that in the parliament of our nation, the House of Commons, the estimates, the budget are not permitted to come down until after the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne has been completed, and then only by law is the budget and are the estimates permitted to even be brought down.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to comment on it. First of all the House of Commons in Ottawa sits for approximately ten months a year. The Address in Reply is limited to eight days, the budget debate is limited to eight days, and the estimates are all handled in Committee which takes very little time out of their business and they normally deal with legislation as opposed to here where political points obviously are more important than laws and it

PREMIER MOOPES:

is the waste of time, Sir, that is the problem and not the order of business being called.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. POWE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. I wonder if the Premier could indicate to the House whether or not it is the government's intention to have officials or representatives from the provincial government present at times when proposals or approaches are made to the receivers of the bankrupt oil refinery for the purpose of purchasing the oil refinery. Is it the government's intention to have representation or officials present?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, they have been to date. The situation I suppose, someone could come into the receiver's office and make a proposal. Certainly it would not be very long before the government and the first mortgagee, the British ECGD, that department of British government, would be advised because obviously they would be the first ones to be advised. If there was anything material or relevant in the propositions, they would be called in on any discussions that were being held, I would assume. Certainly whilst they may not be there at the very initial contact - obviously they could not be - but before any degree of negotiations went on I would think so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE: Well, a supplementary. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier could indicate whether or not there will be officials present when the group of exporting companies get together in Toronto later this month in connection with the proposal to buy the Come By Chance oil refinery, in connection with Mr. Cay.

PREMIER MOORES: Jay as in bird.

MR. ROWE: Jay right. There is a bit of a difference, I admit.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, we have not been contacted by Mr. Jay. I do not know if the receivers have or not, but as the fellow said around the bay, Sir, you know, I am not sure but I think he probably went to wing.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one further supplementary.

MR. ROWE: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the question was answered. It is indicated in one of the newspapers that both federal and provincial government officials could attend. The question is will we have representation in attendance.

PREMIER MOORES: We have not been asked. No one will be going to my knowledge.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George's and then the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. ROWE: It is not just a curious question.

MRS. MCISAAC: I have a question for the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment. I wonder if the minister is aware that the blue whale that washed up on the beach at the Highlands has still not been disposed of in the manner recommended by his department some three weeks ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

MR. MURPHY: I thought the matter had been disposed of because the Department of the Environment, the federal government, it was their responsibility, we were working together on it. I thought recommendations had been made by our department on behalf of the people in the area and I thought that they had been fulfilled. But at the present moment I will phone immediately and check with my office to see just what has happened to that blue whale.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. Would the hon. the Premier tell the House just now what is happening in connection with the fishery gear scandal? Has the initial report been received? What action will be taken

MR. NEARY: on it? Is that why the Minister of Justice is absent from the House today? Is he pondering over the report? Just give the House a report on what is happening in connection with this investigation.

PREMIER MOORES: No more, Mr. Speaker, than was passed on by the Minister of Justice the other day. The Minister of Justice today is in Fortune, in his district, I understand. The RCMP and the Constabulary are still busily involved in trying to come up with a position on the gear replacement programme and the difficulties that may or may not have happened there.

The fact is, Sir, that, you know, it is being done as fast as it can be done, but the thing is that you do not want to isolate any one individual at the expense of others. I mean, I think that it is only fair that the people who are at fault here that they all be brought in line at the same time or as soon as the evidence is available. It is not a government decision. It is a Justice decision.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. the Premier - obviously the hon. the Premier did not understand my question - is the hon. the Premier aware that the Crown Prosecutor, Mr. Kelly, I think it is, stated publicly outside the House that the first part of the report had been received and this is what I am asking the Premier about? Is it official? Can the Premier tell the House whether or not there is a report in and when we can expect action on that report?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, when we are dealing with matters of criminal offences in Justice there is never interference by this government with that procedure.

MR. NEARY: I am not talking about interference.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Does the hon. gentleman have a supplementary question?

MR. NEARY: Yes. All I want to know from the Premier is, has the government received an official, partial report on the fishing gear?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, if a report had been received, which I understand it has, it would go to the Director of Public Prosecutions. There is no reason for it to come to me or to the government. It is for the Public Prosecutor to prosecute people who have been charged with criminal offences. It is not for political mileage. It is for the Public Prosecutor to act upon in his position as Public Prosecutor.

MR. NEARY: Well has he received the report?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: I have no idea, nor do I want to know.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate and the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Minister of Education tell us in connection with a statement that I believe he made, he did make the statement and I believe what he said was, that in Newfoundland the number of persons who are functionally illiterate was, I think, around 60,000 or -

AN HON. MEMBER: 80,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: 80,000, some astonishing figure, would he tell us, if I understood correctly, that he said that a functionally illiterate person was one who had not gone above grade five - and he nods approval that he did say that - what would his comment be on the stories on the radio today - or was it yesterday? - that in Canada as a whole there is an astonishing number of people who are functionally illiterate, functional illiteracy being under grade nine? How is the difference, grade five in Newfoundland, grade nine for Canada as a whole, used as the definition of functional illiteracy?

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the hon. Minister of Education I think I should state that if during Question Periods, or indeed any periods any hon. member thinks that another is out of order, then I think what should be done is that the hon. member would rise on a point of order and make it and to give his reason to the Chair rather than sort of saying that the Chair can hear order, order, but without specifically making a point of order.

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, do I understand that someone was in doubt as to whether I was in order in that question?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! There is no point of order before the House at the present time.

The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the statement I made was that there is about, according to our figures and estimates from the Division of Continuing and Adult Education, that there is between 80,000 and 100,000 people who are functionally illiterate by our standards.

I did mention when I was going through the estimates that across the United States, in the terms of elementary and primary reading, we classify nationally and internationally, we were classifying people as functionally illiterate, who were not up to a grade four standard generally across the North American Continent. And I said we used the grade five standard because we had to do the testing on that basis because a person had to have a grade five standard in order to be able to avail of the BSTD programmes, the illiteracy programmes to get into the BSTD programmes. We used that figure which was one grade higher than the national.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are national in the United States.

MR. HOUSE: They are national here and international, yes, and in Canada at that particular time, yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And Canada?

MR. HOUSE: Yes, at that particular time.

MR. HOUSE: Now for a group to come out, and I do not know if any hon. members know more than I do, I have never heard the term "illiteracy" being applied to a grade nine level. That is something I would have to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Functional illiteracy.

MR. HOUSE: Functional illiteracy, yes. I have never heard it applied at that high a level.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was on all the radios today.

MR. HOUSE: Well anyway I will check that out for the hon. member.

MR. NEARY: You could get it up to grade eleven or university.

MR. HOUSE: Right. The other thing I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member is, he said that anybody who had not gone beyond grade five. That is not necessarily the way it was said. It was said anybody who does not have a grade five standing.

There are a lot of people, Mr. Speaker, who leave school with a grade eight level, possibly, and they go into jobs and trades and never bother to upgrade or do any reading, and when they apply perhaps to go to some upgrading school they may be below a grade five de facto. So they could have had grade eight at one time in their life before, a grade eight standing, but now of course they have not kept up with it. That is a possibility.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Can the hon. minister tell me -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - he was principal of a school and I think a school inspector, what would now be his functional grade, would he pass now? I know I would not.

MR. DOODY: You had twenty-three years in the House of Assembly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well of course that took it all away.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: We cannot take it lightly, Mr. Speaker. Most people

MR. HOUSE: continue to improve but there are a number of people who say drop out at grade five or six who deteriorate a little in their academic upgrading as well as a few people above that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Those with grade nine or grade eight and go back even to grade five.

MR. HOUSE: Yes. There is that possibility.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It is time for one further question. I recognize the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This question to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. There was a statement within the past few days indicating that the Buchans Task Force Report would not be completed, or therefore presented, I suppose, until May 31st. Would the minister advise the House as to what is causing the delay in the completion and presentation of that report?

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

MR. MAYNARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can advise the hon. member. The subcommittee reports, and as the hon. member is aware there were a number of subcommittees set up to investigate and report on various aspects, transportation, tourism, mineral, etc., to report to the main task force. There was some delay in the presentation of the subcommittee reports and, as I understand it, there is one or two maybe that we received only a week ago. On all the committee reports and on the main task force there are people from the union and from the general public at large in Buchans, and they are all making the decision as to when the task force report can be presented. It is in the final stages now and I hope we can meet the deadline of May 31st.

MR. FLIGHT: One extra, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The time has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of delaying the estimates, but I feel compelled to talk on a few points again, having spent fifteen years of my life in education and a number of years in university training to become a teacher, that I have some very strong feelings on education and, of course, it does take some little time to comment on some of the - what I feel to be - some of the major issues that have been raised in this particular Committee. And I do not want to bore members. I mentioned, I think, when I first spoke to this in this Committee that there were some things that I realized that probably had not received the emphasis in this Committee that they probably should have and that it was my intention to bring a few things to the Committee that I thought should be discussed. And I do want to clarify some of these points that I have mentioned.

Before getting on to some of these points, however, I do want to comment on a few of the statements that the minister made when he was speaking just a couple of days ago. One was the pre-schools, and the minister seemed to suggest that he was not placing a great emphasis on pre-schools, and that is unfortunate, because there is not another province in Canada that needs pre-schools more than Newfoundland does. And the very fact that he mentions that in Newfoundland there are somewhere between 80,000 to 100,000 functional illiterates, this makes it very important that we have pre-schools particularly in relation to the fact that I mentioned here some time ago that it has been proven that one of the most important factors with respect to education is the home.

Mr. Lush.

And when we realize that we have 80,000 to 100,000 people who are functionally illiterate, - and, of course, there was a time when we used to break that statistic down into the illiterates and the functional illiterate, but now we combine them, and it would certainly be good to know, pretty helpful to know in this debate if we knew the number of illiterates, but apparently Statistics Canada gave up finding out this piece of information so everybody now is grouped together as functional illiterates. So when we realize these two things, that there 80,000 to 100,000 functional illiterates in this Province, when we realize that the home is probably one of the most important factors in education, we can see the real need for pre-schools to help the culturally deprived, to help the disadvantaged. And I think we must in this Province give pre-schools greater emphasis. We must have pre-schools if we are to help those students that are culturally deprived. It is a must.

The minister mentioned that these kinds of schools in the U. S., the head start programmes, that they were a failure, or were not so successful as they had hoped for. And when the minister said this, I asked him to comment on why, because that is a very important thing as to why those kinds of schools failed in the United States, And I again do not want to belabour this issue, but it is most important. The pre-schools in the U.S. did not fail. Really the pre-schools in themselves were very successful. But why they failed - and the minister I am sure is aware of this - why they failed was because when these kids came into the mainstream of the educational system that our system was not geared to take care of these students. Indeed, in the pre-schools these kids were brought up to the level that educators wanted them brought up to, they were very successful, But when they were placed into the educational stream they got left behind again, because the educational stream is geared to the middle-class, if you will,

Mr. Lush.

and these students started dropping further behind. So the fault for the failure of the programme rested with the schools, with the educational system, the failure to co-ordinate the whole thing, and to make sure that this programme that was geared for the head start people sort of continued that way, and that is why it failed. So, Sir, it is very important, I think, in view of the facts that I pointed out, that the government certainly put stronger emphasis on pre-schools in this Province and see that we do get pre-schools to help the culturally deprived and the disadvantaged children in this Province, the people who never see books before they come to school, people who never know what a magazine looks like, and this sort of thing. And when these people come to school they are at a distinct disadvantage; hence the tremendous importance for pre-schools in this Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? This term 'pre-school' implies, I take it, some kind of training in the home for the youngster before the youngster goes into school, and the hon. gentlemen speaks of magazines in homes where the youngsters have never seen a magazine or have not had this or that or the other advantage. Would he be kind enough to tell me and tell the Committee a little more about this pre-school? What is involved? Who is to do it? What is the cost and so on? Would he spell it out a little? It is frankly, if I may say to him, it is a rather new idea to me. Many mothers do teach their youngsters before they go to school the alphabet and a number of other things, but this is not what the hon. member means, I think. I would like to know it is.

MR. LUSH: That is specifically what I refer to when I am talking about the disadvantaged children. Many children do not get this sort of thing, that they do not know the alphabet, that

Mr. Lush.

people have not read to them. And it is only when you are engaged in teaching that you realize the vast numbers of students who come to you not having these things done.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the remedy?

MR. LUSH: The remedy is a pre-school, a pre-school that would be naturally established by the government, the same as they do with other types of schools. Now there are all sorts of pre-schools, and they do not have to be structured in the same way that the ordinary school does. It can be on a community basis involving parents. They do not need to be nearly as expensive. They do not necessarily have to have trained teachers, but people who are concerned, people who would probably work for a far less fee than teachers would. But the pre-schools, if we are to look to the United States, and indeed Canada for pre-schools, it is a fully government sponsored thing, and the people in it are full-fledged teachers, if we were to look to them for examples. But I think, you know, that we can look to them for examples, but we can fabricate our own kind of pre-school geared to our needs. Now we would have to go into all the different kinds. There are all kinds of pre-schools, and the minister is aware of this as I am, and I do not want to get into that. You know, I am not going to get into that point at all. I am just talking about pre-schools that will help students from culturally deprived families, disadvantaged communities to help give them a start, to help them to catch up to people who were exposed to the kind of educational experience to which I referred.

The other point, when I was talking about expenditures, and I was referring to some of the factors that resulted in the cost of education escalating in the way that it has in the past three or four years, or in the past eight to

Mr. Lush.

ten years, for that matter, and the minister will recall that I mentioned a couple of factors that were important or that caused education to rise the way it did. To point out, of course, that the real cost was not apparent really when you looked at the total picture. And the minister mentioned, or I mentioned, that the increased enrollment was a factor, and the minister said that the enrollment has been going down in the past three or four years, and that is true. But, of course, I was taking a total picture from about, let us say, the past ten years. And in the past ten years, if you take 1965-1966, I believe, and compare

MP. LISH:

the student enrollment of 1965 with the school enrollment of today and I think you will find out that we have approximately 12,000 students more in our schools today than we had in 1965-1965. So there was an increase in students. The decrease actually is very little. I think it is only dropping off - and the minister could correct me on this, I am not sure of the statistics - but I think the decrease started somewhere, the real decrease, probably started somewhere about 1973-1974. Since that time it is probably going down 1,500 a year, 1,200. It depends, I suppose. So 1973 from that time on it started to go down.

But even with that today we now have 11,000 students more in our schools than we have ever had. So indeed the increase in student enrollment is a factor. Another factor that I was trying to point out in pressing for more expenditures in education, and in comparing the amount of money that we spend in education as compared to other provinces, that we have - and the minister mentioned this statistic - more of our young people - that is a percentage of the population - more than any other province in Canada. I am not sure of the statistic, but I believe that we have something thirty-two per cent of our population enrolled in schools. That was another factor.

So that is all I wanted to comment on there. I just want to say I was surprised to find that the minister was not as strongly for these pre-schools as I thought maybe he should have been. What I have been trying to do, even though I have been talking about more expenditure in education, what I have been trying to do - and I have mentioned that I realize we are in a time of restraints and a time of austerity - what I have been trying to do is to make us see that education is very, very important, that we are not spending enough money if we want to eradicate all the inequalities that exist in education, all the problems that we have. So I want to make sure that we keep education as a number one priority, or that

MR. LUSH:

we try to put it higher in the spending priority when things change, or when we do come into a situation of a little more money, or when we are looking at the provincial expenditures to try and assign education a little more importance, if you will, a little more prominence. I am trying to point out the importance of education and the fact that we really do need more monies to be spent on education than we now have if we are to make our educational system -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman before he sits down, confirm the impression that I have formed from his words, that in advocating a greater effort by the government and a greater expenditure on pre-school education, and generally in advocating more expenditure on education, what the hon. gentleman is doing is stating the need, sort of staking a claim on the finances of the Province for the education effort in Newfoundland. But with an increase of twenty odd million for education this year compared with last year he is not pressing for still more expenditure over and above these twenty odd millions at the present time but is content to stake his claim, stake our claim in Newfoundland for more money for education if, as and when there is more money for the purpose. Do I understand him correctly?

MR. LUSH: That is almost it. I am in a little more of the middle of the road, but that is almost it. I realize having been an educator for, as I said, fifteen years, that we cannot do the things that we want to do because we do not have the money, and I am trying to stress again to government the important role of education and that they will make every effort to assign it a higher priority. But I am aware of the restraints and the kinds of fiscal restraints that we must have. But I will get down a little more to talking about these things specifically when I get into the specific estimates.

But there are a couple of points I want to make because I do not think that I have made myself completely understood in this House, and I refer to some of the comments I have heard from the media

MR. LUSH:

and this sort of thing. I remember somebody quoting me as saying that we should take a fresh look at education and then immediately, of course, they referred to the Warren Commission. When I say take a fresh look at education I am not talking about anything like the Warren Commission, another commission. I am not talking about that at all and I want to make that point clear this afternoon, what it is that I really mean when I say that we should be taking a fresh look at education.

To do that I just have to back track just a little bit and look at the four major recommendations of the report of the royal commission. They were, one, looking into the organization of education; number two, the level of teacher qualification; number three, to undertake a comprehensive revision of the curriculum. There are four things really, and I have just forgotten the other point at the moment but I will think about it as I am going through.

Organization of education, that we have done very well. But that is what we have been really concerned about, the organization of education, the structure, the administration. This is what we have really - these are the parts that we have really taken from the royal commission and we have done a fine job. I am reasonably satisfied with the organization of education in this Province today. I am not one hundred per cent satisfied, but I am reasonably satisfied with the organization.

Number two, the level of teacher qualification. We have certainly made giant strides in that area. The other one was financing of education. That is the other point I wanted to mention. I have commented on that here in the House. I could spend ten hours talking about financing of education but I do not want to. I have raised the major questions, I think. How much money is to be spent, in a vague way? I have not specified it in dollars and cents but I have indicated that there should be more. How should the money be raised? I alluded to that and it has been

Mr. Lynch:

further enlightened upon by my other hon. colleagues.

Another point that I would like to talk about is how should the money be distributed. But I do not have the time. I would like to talk about that because we are not distributing the funds properly that we now have. How can we get best value for the money that we are now spending? That is what I want to concentrate on right now. I talked about the other issues but I want to talk about how we can get the best value. This is what I am talking about when I talk about a fresh look at education.

The major point that the Warren Commission - one of their four points were - and I have to give you these four points again so that we make sure that we understand them: Organization of education; level of teacher qualification, then the one that I want to talk about - financing was the third one - to undertake a comprehensive revision of the curriculum. I have stood here saying that the most important thing for this Province to be concerned with in education right now is the establishing of aims and objectives.

Now generally people look at that as not very important, to get aims and objectives. I mentioned in this House that we do not have them in this Province. We have got the rather general aims that everybody would agree to, you know, of producing responsible, well-informed and thinking citizens with intellectual, social and emotional and moral qualities necessary for successful living and for the successful growth of our society. These are the general aims. We have those. These are just motherhood aims. But I have said we should go further than this. This is what I want to make clear in this House today. And I do not want to make it tedious, and I do not want to make it boring, but this is the crux of education, this is the essence of education.

What we fail to do in this Province is to act upon those recommendations in the Warren Commission that deal with the revision of curriculum. That means establishing aims and objectives for specific

MR. LUSH:

subject areas. You know it is amazing, it is absolutely fantastic the progress that we have made in this Province without these aims, without these objectives, without any direction, without knowing where we are going. It is absolutely fantastic!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Of course, this has to be attributed to the teachers that we have had, to the people, the dedicated people out there in the field. But we at the department level, at the government level, we have not given the necessary leadership. And we do not need a committee, we do not need a commission, we do not need to spend more money to do this. We have got the people. We have got the people starting right with the department itself, starting with the minister, all the way down.

Mr. Lush.

We got the people who can do it. All we need to do is to deploy the people properly, is to give the leadership, to set up those aims, to set up those objectives. Now the minister says we got them.

MR. NEARY: Leave it up to the bureaucrats and the witch doctors .

MR. LUSH: And I do not want to refute what the minister is saying.

MR. NEARY: The parents.

MR. LUSH: I will get to that too.

MR. LUSH: I do not want to refute what the minister is saying, but I still insist that there is only one place that we really got them and that is in the language arts. I would almost ask the minister to lay on the table of the House the objectives and aims in other subjects, health, religious education, physical education, social studies. Now how, if we do not set the aims and objectives, if we do not establish in the curriculum the kinds of things we want done, the kinds of subjects we want included - and this is what I have been saying. This is what we got to do in this Province. When I say take a fresh look, we got to look at the kinds of programmes that should be in our educational institution, not only just in the primary and the elementary and the secondary, but at the university, at the trade schools, all the post-secondary institutions. We must look and, see look at the programmes there, to see if these programmes are fulfilling the needs of our people, and to look at the skills that are being taught. This is what we got to do. When I say take a fresh look at education this is what I mean. To take a look at the things that are going on, to take a look at the kinds of things we are teaching in the schools. With the general aims, I am sure, we all agree. But I want to look at the more specific things. I want to look at the skills in reading, in writing, in listening, in speaking, mathematics, developing appropriate social skills, encouraging critical and disciplined thinking, introducing students to a study of the arts, the sciences and the social studies. These are the kinds of things that I want the government to take lead in so that we know where we are going, giving

Mr. Lush.

direction. These things are general. They are still general. The minister mentioned aims do not change very much. These general aims do not, but the ones I am talking about do in curriculum. They got to change to meet the needs, the contemporary needs of society. They got to change. An aim today might not be an aim tomorrow in the way of attitudes.

Let us take concepts first. What concepts do we want our students to learn? We do not know. What attitudes do we want to teach? In this hon. House I have heard it mentioned so many times that our people do not think in the right way about unemployment insurance, about social assistance, we do not think about them in the right way. What better place to develop healthy attitudes about unemployment insurance and about social assistance than in the school? It is very difficult to start with people who are fifty years old, fifty-five and sixty to try and change their attitudes, the way they think about those things. But certainly if you want to change it, the place to do it is in the school, if we think that is desirable. If we do, then we must get together and think out those things. Do we think these things are being taught in the schools today? I see nowhere people say it should be is what I am talking about. What should be taught in the schools? What aims and what objectives? What concepts do we want our students to know? What skills? We must get together and do this. How do we do it is the important thing? Number one, the government must take the leadership role. They must do this. There are all kinds of people, teachers are looking for it all the time. They want this direction. As a matter of fact the unfortunate thing is that many school boards have started this on their own. They have initiated this action, even without the leadership up here, they have initiated this action, when indeed it should be the government who should be the people

Mr. Lush.

to initiate this kind of action, and they involve all the personnel in education in the post-secondary institutions, in the school boards, and the teachers, and this, for the benefit of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), this is where the parents come in, and the students themselves. We involve them in this process of setting up, of establishing what we want carried on in the schools. They should have some input. This is where the parents will come in, and we very seldom involve parents in Newfoundland in education, very seldom. The minister mentioned that we had some good Home and School Associations. I maintain that the only thing that these people did was to raise money. That is the only thing they did, and that is why Home and Schools failed when we should be getting more into curriculum, deciding what are the things that we want our students to know, and that is not being done.

I would suggest that the time has come for this kind of a look at education, not setting up of a royal commission. We do not need it. We got people anxious to do this. We got people and schools boards, superintendents, supervisors, we have got teachers anxious to get into this, but they want some direction, guidance from the top to get this done, and in this area we should involve the parents. This is where parents will certainly enter into the picture. So when I am talking about aims and objectives then this is what I am talking about. I am talking about curriculum development, the very nitty-gritty of education.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Young): A point of order has been raised.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman is making some good points. I would like to hear him. There is so much noise in the Chamber here we cannot even hear what is going on. Could the Chair call order?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that we should be paying a little more attention to curriculum development. We should be paying a little more attention to what is going on in our schools, and in all our educational institutions. What subjects are being offered, what courses are being offered? Are they going to be valuable for students to make worth-while contributions to society. This is what I am asking. And we involve all the agencies in education that we can to come up with this. We do not need a royal commission. We not need extra monies. We just need somebody to initiate this action.- And I am suggesting that it should be the government - to carry out these numerous suggestions in the royal commission on curriculum, which have not been acted upon; to carry out some of the things that I have mentioned in the past couple of days with respect to improving the curriculum in our elementary and secondary schools and indeed in all post-secondary educational institutions. So we need to do this. And for fear that somebody might think that I am impinging upon the professional expertise of the teachers and this sort of thing when I said to bring all of these together to do this sort of thing, and to bring parents, and the only thing that I would want to point out here is that what I am suggesting here is that - in doing this in setting up aims and objectives - we are concerned with what we are teaching. And in order to do that we must involve as many people and as many agencies as possible. But the how, that rests with the professional people. That is as to how these skills will be taught, that is their domain. That is not the domain of those of us who would decide aims and objectives.

MR. MURPHY: I hate to interrupt the hon. member but when he speaks of involvement, for example, the social workers, are they ever asked to visit schools, or a worker with forestry? What is their input actually to getting in the top? I was just wondering.

MR. LUSH: It is sort of haphazard. This is what I am talking about, to have some system. It is haphazard because we do not have these aims and objectives. We do not have these skills listed that we should be teaching and the kinds of concepts that we want taught. So, therefore, schools all pursue it in a different way. Some schools would do that sort of thing. Other schools would not. There are boards throughout Newfoundland doing things quite different from other boards. There are schools within the same boards doing different things.

I just want to make this point, Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify what I meant by a fresh look at education. I did not want people to confuse this with setting up a committee. I just wanted to point out the importance of taking a look at curriculum, what skills our students are learning, what subjects they are learning. These are the questions, I think, that we should be concerning ourselves with and I do this to point out again the importance of education, and the tremendous task that we still have ahead of us. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Young): The hon. member for LaPóile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to deal with a matter that was raised by the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) the other day when the hon. gentleman, deliberately or otherwise, Sir, maybe innocently, took what I said, my criticism of the university, completely out of context and tried to lead the Committee to believe that the statements that I had made and the statements the Minister of Mines and Energy had made were one was an attack on the university and the other was a defense of the university. Well, Sir, I do not know how the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) could read that into what I said. My attack, with regard to the university, was on extravagance and waste at the university, not an attack on the university.

MR. ROWE: I made that quite clear.

MR. NEARY:

No, the hon. member did not make it quite clear in the hon. member's cute little way. The hon. member is not now associated in any way with the university. He does not have to apologize. He does not have to go home now and take the abuse of the phone calls that the hon. member used to get.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

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

MR. ROWE: Several times over the past two or three years the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has indicated that I have not opened my squeaker against the university, or questioned the policy of the university because I was tied to the university by contract and I would get a phone call from the president of the university taking me to task. That is what is indicated in his remarks that he has made in the past and he is making again today. I would like to go on record as stating that since I have been elected to this House I have not been on contract in any way whatsoever with the university except for six weeks.

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order, Sir.

MR. ROWE: Just one second. If I can have -

MR. NEARY: It is not a point of order, Sir.

MR. ROWE: - the privilege of replying to some remarks made by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that can be certainly misinterpreted by those who do not know the difference. I have never been answerable to the Memorial University since I have been elected to this House of Assembly. And anything that the member says indicating that is totally false and totally wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I feel it is not a point of order, but a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, when I was a member of the old-line Liberal caucus, Sir, many is the time it was very, very subtly hinted to me that I better lay off the university, that I better not do this and I better not do that. One of the reasons was - and the hon. member told me himself - that every time I criticized the university, religiously,

MR. ROWE: Completely false!

MR. NEARY:

The hon. member would not get a phone call from somebody saying, "Why do you not shut Neary up?"

MR. MORGAN: Now we hear it all.

MR. BOUF: False, for the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Well I can only repeat what the hon. gentleman told me himself. So therefore, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it abundantly clear, loud and clear, that I make no apologies to anybody, including the hon. member, for my remarks I made the other day in connection with the extravagance and the waste at Memorial University.

Only the other day, Sir, I heard of a contract. Hon. members might remember that I said that the university do not conform to the government's public tendering procedure. They will only call public tenders for anything over \$10,000. The government has to call tenders for everything over \$1,000 unless it is a big project, a big building, a huge building or something. The government itself has adopted the attitude that it will call public tenders for anything over \$1,000. The university, Sir, says they will not call public tenders for anything under \$10,000. For anything under \$10,000 they will not call public tenders. In other words they are thumbing their nose at the government and saying, "Ah, you go ahead and follow your little public tendering procedure you put through the House but we are not going to follow it over here."

Only the other day I heard of a case where a contract was awarded to a company. I do not believe it was even a Newfoundland company. And they were the highest bidder. They were \$6,000 above the lowest bidder and the contract was awarded. Nobody dare question it. And that is the kind of extravagance and waste that I am trying to bring to the attention of the Committee before we pass the estimates of the university, to substantiate my argument and the feeling of a lot of people in this Province that the university's budget should be brought into this House and that the president

MR. NEARY:

of the university should just not thumb his nose at members of the House and say, "Oh, we will put it in the newspaper but we will not give it to the elected representatives of the people." That is contempt for this House.

So, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that the old-line Liberals have now reversed their position, that they are now supporting my contention that the university's budget should be brought before the House to be scrutinized, not because we want to become involved in the academic freedom of the university, but only because we want to eliminate extravagance and waste and stop certain individuals at that university from gypping the people of this Province, gypping the taxpayers of this Province. If the hon. member can construe that as meaning an attack on Memorial University, well then, Sir, I would say that he must have a great imagination.

MR. DOVE: You are misinterpreting it.

MR. NEARY: I am not misinterpreting, Mr. Chairman, I am merely stating a fact. The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy the other night took a different position. The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy is not in his seat at this moment. He claimed that the university should not table its estimates in this House so that members can take a look at it to see if they are awarding contracts to the highest bidders, as they did there a week or two ago, that started such a fuss in the P.C. caucus. They almost had resignations over it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Over what?

MR. NEARY: Over the contract that was awarded over at Memorial University to the highest bidder. I know the hon. gentleman looks at me as if to say, "Well where do you get this information." I do not have the minister's telephone bugged or anything.

MR. ROWE: You have bionic ears.

MR. NEARY: Maybe I have.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A bionic eye, too.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, somebody has to be the conscience of this

MR. NEARY:

Hon. House. Somebody has to try to keep the hon. members straightened out.

Now, Sir, with regard to the case just made by my hon. Friend, who took his seat, for more money, his great plea for more money for education. Then he went on with great pains to explain to the House, this did not mean now that he is interested in a royal commission or fact finding or anything like that. He does not want to offend his buddies now. He is something like the hon. member who represented Memorial University for so long in this House.

MR. BOWE: Mr. Chairman -

MR. NEARY: A point of order, go ahead. A point of order, come on.

MR. BOWE: It is not worthy of comment.

MR. NEARY: He does not want to offend his buddies, Sir, does not want to offend all those who are earning more money than the ministers, who are earning more money than the Premier. I am not talking about the teachers. The teachers have my sympathy. The teachers are the ones who are caught in the middle. I am talking about the witch doctors and the bureaucrats in our educational system who all they did was move out of Confederation Building and move downtown. Now they have hit posh offices downtown, better than the Premier has, better than the ministers have, and they are earning more money. They are paying themselves higher salaries.

The hon. member gets up and tells us today-what an admission for a former member of a board to make!- that the officials of the department do not know the direction that education is headed for in this Province. He says, "Oh, I am only trying to draw attention to it to make it seem more important!" In his great plea to get more funds for education. We are only spending a quarter of the total budget of the Province now on education. The hon. member wants us to give them a blank check. Maybe not right now when there are restraints and cut-backs and belt tightening, maybe not right now, but

MR. NEATY:

as soon as you get a few more million fling it over to education, pass it over to his buddies, give them a blank check.

Well, Sir, I would say - and I have said it before and I am going to say it again - that before we dole any more money over to the education authorities, it is about time - and I will make no apologies for this, I am not like the hon. member - it is about time that we just stopped for a moment and took a new, fresh look. And if the hon. member does not want to be quoted on it, because I saw the editorial in The Evening Telegram, it was I who said that it was time we should take a new, fresh look at education and not the hon. member.

MR. NEARY:

It is time, Sir, it is time, because education is the kind of a thing, Sir, that it is hard to get a handle on it. It is not black or white. There are a lot of grey areas. You do not know the damage is done until it is too late. We allowed a system to go on now, and just go higgledy-piggledy helter-skelter all over the place as it is going now, and just allow the bureaucrats and the witch doctors in the education system to tell us the kind of education we are going to have for our kids, ten, fifteen, twenty years from now it will be too late to rectify it.

MR. HOUSE: Continuous improvement.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I said in the beginning of my speech the other day that since Confederation, Sir, we have made rapid strides in the field of education in this Province, that we have nice, new, big, huge buildings now. We have all the electronic equipment we can afford to buy. We have nice, big, yellow school buses. But is education today judged on the size of the building that you have? Well, Sir, it is to a certain degree.

MR. LUSU: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. NEARY: Yes, sure, go ahead.

MR. LUSU: I am just wondering when the hon. member refers to witch doctors who he is talking about, whether he would like to name those witch doctors?

MR. NEARY: The hon. member knows who I am talking about, Sir. I do not have to name -

MR. LUSU: No, I do not.

MR. NEARY: I do not have to name the witch doctors and the bureaucrats in the educational system. We all know who they are. But, Sir, I would say to the Minister of Education, and I have said it before, that if that minister wants to make his mark, wants to make a name for himself in the field of education in this Province as a Minister of Education, as a minister of the Crown, that he not hesitate at all in launching into an immediate fact finding study of our whole educational system, especially

MR. NEADY:

our post secondary educational system where you got a situation today where the enrollment over at Memorial University is decreasing and you got a situation at the College of Trades and Technology where they are turning away four out of five students who apply for admission to the College of Trades and Technology. You have got students in this Province, Mr. Chairman, who have told me themselves, who have come to my home, come to my office, I have been over at the university and they have told me themselves they make two applications every year, one to the College of Trades and Technology and one to the university. They get turned down at the College of Trades and Technology and they get accepted at the university. They realize they are in there taking courses that have no relationship at all to what they will do when they go out in the workaday world. The certificate that they get is no good to them. It will not get them a job. When they are finished up nine chances out of ten they have to go then and do vocational training or go and take a course at the College of Trades and Technology in order to get a job.

So there is where the weakness is, Mr. Chairman. The minister has not told us yet about another idea that I put forward the other day about introducing grade twelve into our high schools. I beg your pardon?

MR. HOUSE: I have not had a chance to respond yet.

MR. NEADY: The minister, Sir, had a chance to respond to my suggestion. The minister has spoken since I spoke the other day. I put forward this great idea of - now, mind you, a lot of the students may not like it. They may panic or say, "Whoa, it is bad enough now to have to stay in for grade eleven." Up in Ontario they teach up to grade thirteen.

AN HON. MEMBER: Some parts of Ontario.

MR. NEADY: Some parts of Ontario, grade thirteen. Well I do not think that is necessary.

MR. DOODY: They need it up there.

MR. NEADY: Well maybe they do. But I would probably say that we need

MR. NEARY:

grade twelve down here too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! I have to remind the strangers that they are not permitted to enter into the proceedings of the House by any manner or means, by word, by gesture or by any other manner or means.

The hon. member.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are to be seen and not heard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seen and not heard.

MR. NEARY: Sir, grade twelve, in my opinion, would serve a multitude of purposes. First of all, Sir, it would give the students a better foundation for university or technical training, whatever they wish to take, would give them a better foundation. I know, I had a brother who took grade twelve before he went into Memorial University, took grade twelve over at St. Bon's. There is a living example of the advantages of grade twelve.

MR. MURPHY: Is that the equivalent of first year university?

MR. NEARY: No, it is not considered as first year university. You can get credit for it. But it certainly is a great help. So there is the first advantage. It will eliminate, Mr. Chairman, all this nonsense of having to go to the Regional College in Corner Brook or go to an upgrading school or go to the courses they used to run here over here at Memorial University for upgrading before you could qualify for professional or technical training. In other words, a lot of the students when they come out of grade eleven are not equipped for university. Now they have reached the stage over there where they start at the highest qualified and they gradually work down. So they are turning a lot of students away. So I would say that grade twelve would eliminate all this expensive upgrading that we see going on, especially in the Regional College, for that is about all it is, a glorified upgrading college. The minister can tell us, "Oh, you get a two year course." What do you get a two year course in? What advantage is it? Would it not be better if we put grade twelve into our high schools rather than spend \$11 million on a Regional College and

MR. NEARY:

instead of putting a Regional College out there; put a College of Trades and Technology or a Polytech out on the West Coast because there is where the real need is. Not only that, Sir, but by instituting grade twelve in our high schools, it would also bring the students along to an age when they would be better equipped, when they would be a little wiser, when they would be able to more intelligently take the great decision that they have to make as to whether they are going to go out and go to university or whether they are going to go to the vocational school or to College of Trades and Technology, to choose their profession in other words. They would be a little older and a little wiser. Another thing, Sir, - and this may be the last reason but certainly not the least - it would keep the students in school for another year and would keep us from throwing all these students on to a labour market that cannot absorb now the number of students that are graduating from our high schools and from our university and from the College of Trades and Technology and from the vocational schools.

We are told that 8,000 students this year will not be able to find employment. Well it would keep the students in school for another year. But that is not the chief reason. The main reason is that it would be to their advantage. Although the students may not like it, they may say well, you know, it is hard enough to have to go to grade eleven, but in the final analysis, Sir, it would be to their advantage to have grade twelve if they wanted to. If they want to go on to grade twelve then they should have that privilege.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to belabour the point. I am not going to -

MR. DOODY: What of the people of Bell Island?

MR. NEARY: No, the people of Bell Island are doing upgrading. They are glad to hear their former member get up and say a few words, as I promised them I would this afternoon. They have not heard from the hon. member yet about the ferry rates that are going to be increased across

MR. NEARY:

the Tickle. They would like to hear the hon. member talk about that. They would like to hear the hon. member talk about the transportation that the indigent people, the people on welfare used to get back and forth to St. John's. They would like to hear about the water delivery that was stopped over there. They would like to know whether they are going to get the road paving this year.

MR. DOODY: They have heard that one, too.

MR. NEARY: These students and their teacher came in here today expecting to hear from their hon. member, the hon. Minister of Finance. They have not heard a peep out of the hon. Minister of Finance and they will have to go back to Bell Island very, very disappointed indeed. But at least they will be able to tell my good friends and colleagues and supporters and friends on Bell Island that they heard from their former member, the member for LaPoile.

So, Mr. Chairman, the main emphasis that I have been trying to make over the past few days - and I do not deny the fact, Sir, that we need to put more money into education. I am not denying that fact. Neither am I criticizing the teachers. I am not. I think they are doing a fantastic job under the circumstances - is I think, Sir, that we have to stop now and pause for a while and take a good, hard look at the direction in which we are headed in the field of education in this Province. We are spending \$40 million over at the university and we are spending \$5 million over here at the College of Trades and Technology. I mean, you know, you want to be deaf, dumb, blind or all three if you could not recognize, if the minister and his colleagues and his officials could not recognize that the real need, the pressure today, the real need is to expand the facilities of the College of Trades and Technology.

MR. NEARY:

This year again in September I would say that four out of five students will be turned away. And that is the kind of thing I am talking about, Mr. Chairman. Before we turn any money over to the education witch doctors and bureaucrats for their illusions of grandeur, let us take a look at the system. That will not cost us anything. Let us get an independent impartial study made.

MR. HOUSE: By whom? By whom?

MR. NEARY: I do not know. If the hon. Minister of Education will give me his salary, and give me his job, and let me go down and work on it for a while I would produce the 'by whom' the hon. member is looking for.

MR. HOUSE: I have heard this so many times that I would like to know by whom. There must be somebody the hon. member has in mind. I would like to get some advice on it.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, I do not have anybody in mind, but -

MR. SMAILWOOD: But there must be people though.

MR. NEARY: - there must be people on the North American Continent who can do it, who are not now wrapped up in the system. And this is where I disagree with the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). I think, Sir, that by having a study done of our educational system, especially our post-secondary educational system, that every aspect, every phase of society would be given an opportunity to make a contribution, the labour unions, the management, the parents, above all, Mr. Chairman, the parents - why, parents have very little to say in the education system of this Province. Maybe it is because they are complacent and apathetic, maybe they have not taken advantage of the opportunities that are there, but I can speak as a parent - I have four small children in school - I have no say in the curriculum, I have no say in the way my children are going to be educated.

MR. DOODY: Thanks be to God!

MR. NEARY: I am not one of these that can afford, Sir, to send my children away to the mainland to finish school; they have to get their education right here in Newfoundland and I would like for it to be the best education available. And that is all I am asking the minister to do, Sir. I am not condemning

Mr. Neary:

the system outright. We have made rapid strides.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, does this House realize that the trade union movement in this Province for the last twenty years have been trying to get labour relations matters added to the curriculum in the schools, taught in the schools? And to my knowledge, Sir, so far the government and the minister have resisted that suggestion by the Newfoundland Federation of Labour. And, you know, Mr. Chairman, the most important thing - Mr. Chairman, could I move that the Committee report no progress, Sir, and ask leave to sit again?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The Committee is not in a position to report a negative, so I would rule that motion as being out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the Newfoundland Federation of Labour for the past twenty years have been trying to convince government that they should teach the students in our schools something about the trade union movement, and so far to the best of my knowledge governments have resisted it.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things that will affect students more than anything else in their lives, I suppose, when they graduate from high school, and from university and from the post-secondary institutions, the thing that will affect their lives more than anything is the trade union movement. They come out of school, they come out of the post-secondary institutions, Sir, and they have not got a clue about unions and about the trade union movement not a clue in this world. They do not know but a union is something that you have on your table for breakfast, do not know, because they are not taught about it. They are taught about the capitalistic system, and they were taught about the industrial revolution, and we are taught all kinds of nonsense, but nothing about the trade union movement.

Mr. Neary:

Mr. Chairman, you would be amazed at the amount of ignorance on the part of students as far as the trade union movement is concerned when they graduate from high school or when they come out of the university or out of the College of Trades or the College of Fisheries or the vocational schools. They do not know the least little thing about it. So, therefore, Sir, it is easy to understand the confusion, the lack of productivity, the lack of co-operation between management and labour, it is easy to understand why our Industrial Relations scene is so bad in this Province. The only time that they come in contact with the union is when they are negotiating for a contract. They do not attend union meetings. The membership fee is deducted from the payroll, and they hardly even bother to go down and get sworn in, I would say most of the new members of unions, most of the memberships of all of the unions today have probably have taken the trouble to go to get sworn in. And the only time they learn anything at all about the trade union movement is when they are trying to get a bigger slice of that pie at negotiating time.

I claim all of this should be taught in the schools. They should not be taught about just one aspect of society, the capitalistic system, about the value of the almighty dollar. That would be sufficient reason alone, Sir, for having an inquiry of some kind, a fact-finding study, call it what you like, a commission, call it anything. But I think it is very necessary, Sir, so that we will start to remedy some of the weaknesses in our system. And this is all I am advocating, Sir. It is not a condemnation of the system as a whole. But I want to make sure, and I am sure that all other hon. members of the House want to be sure that we are headed in the right direction, that we are getting the best value for our educational dollar. We are spending one-quarter now of the total budget of the Province on education. And we want to be sure that our children are getting the best education available, that they are being trained in the right things, that they are being trained in the right skills, that they are being trained to take advantage of the job opportunities,

Mr. Neary:

and they are not just being brainwashed into getting a certificate to put on your wall that will not get you a job, and that is what has been happening up to now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: I am glad my hon. friend agrees with me. And so that is why, Sir, we have to look to see if we should be putting more money into the university, should we be putting more money into the College of Trades, and I know the minister will get up and say, "Oh, yes. It is obvious that we should have a polytech, we should expand the College of Trades." Well then if it is so obvious why do we not do it, instead of pouring the money into the university, why not put it into the technical training?

And I question, Sir, whether we are getting the full value we should be getting today out of the College of Fisheries. I think it could be doing a pretty fair job, but I am afraid it is fallen down somewhere along the road. And, Mr. Chairman, there are too many people, in my opinion, looking for a berth for the Winter just getting in out of the cold, getting in out of the bad weather in the Wintertime, and getting into some of these institutions so that they can get manpower allowances which are, I suppose, a glorified form of welfare. And then they come out.

And I would like to do the research. I heard the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) mention it the other day, that the hon. member said he was amazed and astonished at the number of graduates of the Fishery College that had excellent jobs. Well what I am suggesting, Sir, is that if they do have jobs, and I hope they do, they are not working at the things for which they were trained. And you will find the same thing in connection with the university, although the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) says, oh, they might have reached the stage down in the United States where there is a surplus of Ph.D's and B.A's and B.Sc's and they have to go out and work as labourers, bartenders and taxi drivers, but we have not reached that stage, he tells us, in Newfoundland yet.

May 3, 1976.

Tape 2390

PK - 5

MR. NEARY:

Well, Sir, I know quite a few. I gave one example there the other day of a young lady over on Bell Island. She has got her B.A. from Memorial University. She cannot get unemployment insurance, she has no stamps. She cannot

MR. NEAPY:

get welfare because she is a single girl. Her father is on welfare. He cannot afford to feed her and she cannot get work. So what can she do? And you can take that and you can multiply it by several hundred, I do not know but several thousand in this Province. And the hon. member tells us we have not reached the stage yet in Newfoundland where we have a surplus of people with degrees. Now the education will not do her any harm over her lifetime. It will broaden her outlook on life. Well a trip to Europe could do that, broaden your outlook on life, if that is all you want. But this poor girl obviously is looking for a job and she cannot get it because she has not got the training.

MR. HOUSE: I would suggest she train for a job. She is not trained for a job.

MR. NEAPY: Well she has a B.A. She spent three or four years over at Memorial University getting her B.A. She got her certificate, probably hanging on her wall, and she is going traipsing down to the welfare office looking for welfare. Sir, we have got to get back to the old-fashioned method of teaching. All the experts and all the analysts and all the people that I have talked to, and all the things that I have read in the last few years indicate beyond any doubt that you have to get back to the old-fashioned method of teaching. They say that is the best.

The three 'rs', reading and 'riting and 'rithmetic. And the minister was talking about functional illiterates and the hon. the former Premier asked him today would he be referring to Grade V, VI, VII. Mr. Chairman, I hate to have to say this but we have a lot of functional illiterates with Grade VI who can hardly read and write, who can hardly spell, who know very little about - that is a fact, Sir - who know very little about English, for that matter. That is another reason why we need this fact finding study so that the employers, the businessmen can make a contribution, can tell the minister if they are satisfied with the attitudes and the qualifications of the students who

MR. NEARY:

are coming out of our educational system. That is easily done. It is very easy to poll the employers, the businessmen of this Province, to find out. I have talked to quite a few of them myself who tell me that they are not satisfied with the attitudes and the qualifications of the graduates of our post-secondary educational institutions in this Province.

So there must be something wrong, Sir. I am not saying everything is wrong. Maybe there is only 0.1 per cent wrong. But I think it is even a little worse than that. If we do not recognize the fact that there is a great need at this moment to just take a new fresh look at our whole educational system, then I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, we are making a big mistake.

As far, Sir, as the pre-school training is concerned, well I would say, Mr. Chairman - and I have had four now start off in the last few years in school, I have got twins in Grade II - I would say, Sir, apart from the little bit of training maybe that I was able to give them in reading them stories and so forth that the best training they got was right from the television from Sesame Street. I certainly do not recommend television as a continuous diet for kids. But I can tell you they learned a lot more from Sesame Street than they learned the first year they were in school.

I will tell you what happens, Mr. Chairman. Sesame Street is probably the best technique for training kids today that I have ever seen. What happens, Sir, they watch - and the kids are really interested in it - and they watch Sesame Street continuously and then they go from that to Kindergarten. When they get in Kindergarten they are taught all the things that they learned from Sesame Street. So they spend a whole year in school completely bored, completely browned off because they already know this, they have learned it all from Sesame Street. Now I do not know if that is a weakness, a hazard, a danger or what it is. But it is certainly there. I can tell the minister that whatever it is, the hon. minister can describe it how

MR. NEADY:

he likes, but it is there because I saw my two kids who started school three years ago. They watched Sesame Street every morning, and they learned their ABC's, and they learned to count and they learned all sorts of things and then they went in Kindergarten, and then they were completely bored for a whole year. I do not know if they should have gone straight into Grade I or not, but anyway it is a bit of a problem.

MR. HOUSE: I agree.

MR. NEADY: The minister agrees. Well I am certainly glad the minister agrees because, you know, I am living with it every day.

But, Sir, without anybody getting up in the House and attacking me and saying, "Oh, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) now is after attacking the educational system, attacking the teachers, attacking the university, attacking this." I am attacking nobody. I am trying to make a few positive, constructive suggestions to the minister. We are doing the educational estimates and I am trying to impress upon the Committee the need, in my opinion, - maybe other members will not see it my way - the need for us to take a good hard look now before it is too late. Five or ten years from now will be too late. It is hard to recognize the damage that is being done. It is not one of these things that you can see. It is invisible practically but it is there. So we want to find out if we are headed in the right direction.

And the fact that the Warren Royal Commission reported ten years ago has no bearing on what I am talking about at all, none in this world. Times have changed, Mr. Chairman, **change almost** from year to year. We have to be willing to change with it. The times they are a changing. It is a job to keep up with them. Maybe the minister and his officials have done the best they can. I am not condemning the minister and his officials, not in the slightest, but, Sir, I think they should allow the parents to have more input into education because under the United Nations Constitution of Human Rights, Sir, one of the clauses in that constitution is that the parents

MR. NEARY:

have the right to choose the kind of education that they want for their children. Up to now we have not had that opportunity.

MR. MURPHY: Would the hon. member permit me?

MR. NEARY: Take over.

MR. MURPHY: It is very much indirectly the same thing. As far as PTA's are concerned, the hon. member does not think the parents are getting enough input in direct relation to the curriculum, is that what the hon. member refers to? Or in what other way would he feel? I think we are all interested.

MR. NEARY: The hon. minister mentions the PTA. Well I have had occasion in the last few years to attend some of these meetings. And you are either given a bunch of tickets to sell, or you are told about the card game that is coming up, or we are going to raise funds for this or that or the other thing. It is very seldom you talk about the curriculum, very seldom. I have not been at one yet. There are times during the year, three or four occasions during the year when you can drop down and talk to the teacher about your child's report card. That is a very valuable thing. I have never missed one yet. I always go and talk to the teachers and thank God so far I do not have too many problems with the kids. But the PTA I would say -

MR. MURPHY: Brilliant like the father, I suppose.

MR. NEARY: Well I hope so. I hope so. In all modesty, Sir, I hope so. But, Mr. Chairman, I do hope that the minister will not take this as a personal affront, that the government will not take it as a political issue. It is not. It is just that I feel myself from all the signs that I have seen, from all the things that I have read, from all the things I have heard on radio and on television and in the newspapers, I believe now that the time has come when we must take a look at our whole educational system, especially our post-secondary educational system, to see if we are getting the proper value for the dollars that we are spending in education, and above all to see if we are headed in the right direction in the field of education in this Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to get in for a few days and I try to be able to respond after every two or three speakers because it is quite something to take in the debate that is going on and respond to it all at one time. So I heard the debates today and a lot of positive topics being discussed, positive ideas. Now I want to begin with the idea of the aims and objectives again because it is the second time I have had to react to it, and to the community input into education in general. I reacted the other day by stating that we do have general aims and objectives that can only be general, and they can only be minimal in the sense of the word that it is the government's outline of what we think is the bare minimum, pretty well, of what we need. That is why we have very sophisticated organizations around the Province in school board offices to supplement and to develop the detailed philosophies and aims and objectives to suit the needs of the people right there on the spot. That is being done and that is being promoted.

MR. HOUSE: Now, you talk about direction and people input.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how many hon. members know this but we seek continuously to have local input from people outside. We make a deliberate attempt to say to the public, "You have got a responsibility to your children and you have got to impart that responsibility to us, tell us what it is." And hon. members must realize that it was only last year that we went to considerable expense at the Department of Education to bring together people in districts. Our officials went out from the Curriculum Division, went all over the Province, set up meetings of parents and the general public. We even played down the idea of having teachers involved for the simple reason we thought that the teachers would colour it their way too much, and the idea was for them to tell us what they wanted in education. Not only did we go out, bring our resources to them and direct them, we planned the Areas, sent people out and then of course they came together and then we had one general meeting here in St. John's where they imparted the kind of thing that they thought that we should be putting into the curriculum. We are following that up by bringing together teachers in the fields, supervisors, to take this material that we got from the parents.

So, you know, there is a constant attempt to do these things and to keep the people involved. You talk about the Home and School Associations, you know, people say all they did was raise money. I said the other day, I made the statement that since we took the fund raising ability away from them they have not gotten together and I was a superintendent of an area, a supervising principle, and I had Home and School Associations very active, and very active in curriculum knowing what is going on once a month. But the thing died down as soon as we took away that cohesive force from them, that ability they had to raise money.

Now I will go on to the attitudes. It has been espoused here, you know, that we have got to teach attitudes. That is a very

MR. HOUSE: strong statement, teach attitudes. I wonder can we teach attitudes? It is certainly an academic question, a very academic question, and certainly one that has been talked about loud and long in education circles. And the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) mentioned it very explicitly in both his speeches that I have heard in the last two or three days. He said, "You know, it depends on the parents what kind of pupil you get, not only for content, not only for the development of skills but more important by attitude," and there has been some pretty convincing studies done to show that you cannot teach attitudes. Attitudes are something that evolves from the community and if we have got a poor work ethic - people have been saying this, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has talked about the idea of the lack of productivity - I do not think you can place that blame on the schools. We are trying our best to do the jobs in training people, and I mentioned the other day the fact that we were getting a better calibre student now into the vocational schools and into the College of Trades and Technology and in the Fisheries College. But the attitudes towards work has got to be emulated from the people around you, and when you have had a milieu, an emphasis on socialism, welfare and this sort of thing throughout the past quarter of a century, no wonder we got a poor work ethic, no wonder we got people who have got a poor attitude towards work.

MR. NEARY: But we have to change that, do we not?

MR. ROUSE: We are trying to change it. We are constantly trying to change it. One of the reasons now why we have got, for instance, twenty-five per cent of our people in pre-vocational education is because we are trying to develop in them work habits, and that is one of the reasons also why we want to get more pre-vocational education and that is the reason why we are trying to get so many industrial arts and home economics teachers in our school is to try and teach details of work. So that we can try through that to develop different and better attitudes.

MR. HOUSE: Now then with respect to -

MR. LUSH: Would the minister permit a question?

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

MR. LUSH: I wonder if the minister would agree that you have certainly in the schools have the responsibility to expose students to issues and they have to discuss them, certainly I agree with not to teach them, certainly from the point of view of indoctrinization but they have to be exposed to various issues in order to - And there are cases where the homes do not do this sort of thing so the whole school has got to take care of this sort of thing.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I have stated that is what we are trying to do, as I said, the development of a good attitude towards work for our programmes and so on.

Now with respect to pre-school, I agree in part with the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) when he talks about the exposure that young children are getting today to the media - now albeit some of the exposure they are getting is not that good - but there are programmes that are very good and we would hope that as time progresses that there will be better programmes for children to be exposed to.

But I agree also with him on the point that a lot of young children come in today, and you are supposed to have a mental age, they tell me, of six years old to be able to read. Well we have got a lot of young people coming in today who can read, read already, and the fact is in a lot of cases they are not challenged, they are bored and of course again what we put out from the Department of Education as a curriculum guide for kindergarten and pre-reading is just what is said, and there is no reason in the world why the schools themselves cannot advance beyond that and that is why we have built up expertise in these schools for them to do it. And they have to go ahead to do it. There is nobody who is going to keep a child back because he knows this and therefore he can stand still.

MR. HOUSE: But the pre-school, it would be sort of expensive. There are a number of things we are talking about now. We are talking about, as I mentioned the other day, the idea of giving help to the more severe cases, and of course the Department of Social Welfare is already doing some part of this and of course there are some groups of people who have banded together and got some modicum of pre-school education going.

There are a lot of other priorities right now that goes beyond bringing about a fullfledged pre-school programme. First of all there has got to be identification problems and the first step we are taking towards some of that is, of course, trying to identify some of our most basic needs and that is being developed at the present time.

Now there are a number of things that came up today, Mr. Chairman, that I will embody as I go along. But I want to mention some of the things referred to a couple of days ago in the debate, and somebody talked about the community use of schools, and this is a thing I am very strong on, the community use of schools. Now as everybody is aware in Newfoundland, the responsibility for education rests with a number of levels; it rests with us, it rests with the churches and of course the churches and the state together give that authority basically to school boards and one of the things school boards have the responsibility for is the operation and the use of their schools, That is school board responsibility. But I think our efforts have been to try and promote the community use of schools very much in the department, because we have had two or three studies done on it. We have also called a conference of all school boards in Gander two or three years ago and put forth the ideas. And I am very happy to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is a lot of use being made of a lot of our schools. Particularly I can only quote from - well, the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) mentioned a community of Springdale. I can mention many other communities around the Province where there is a great use being made of

MR. HOUSE: school buildings.

One of the uses of course, they are even using it as public libraries, some of the schools are being used as. And of course their gymnasium facilities being used by the communities and the sports groups.

Now that is not universal. There are a lot of schools not available. But the best we can do is to promote the idea and I think we are having a lot of success in doing that.

One of the little things that irks me about it and of course it is one of the little problems that is against the centralization of schools, and that is the fact that pupils, in some cases high school pupils are leaving the schools at two-thirty in the afternoon, there are some cases where that is happening in Newfoundland. And now whatever advantages there are to the "x" for extra curricular activities, or for cultural activities, that is gone when a student has got to get on the bus. And that is all

MR. HOUSE:

as a result of the fact that schools, they run a sort of what we used to call a straight school one time. They just have a short break for lunch and they stagger that. Now in my way of thinking not only should there be a short lunch period, there should be an extended lunch period because that would be the time the students from the communities outside could take part in their inter-sports activities and the other cultural activities that go on in the schools. Sometimes people argue and say -

MR. NEARY: Would that mean then they would get out possibly later in the evening?

MR. HOUSE: Yes, of course. That rationale for letting them get out early is the fact that they can go on home and do what they have to do. Nine chances out of ten they have nothing to do except go down to some town council office and badger the council into trying to build a youth center for them because they have nothing to do.

MR. NEARY: If the bus is there at three o'clock they have to catch the bus. If it leaves, there is no way they can get home.

MR. HOUSE: Yes, that is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: They could use it as preparation time.

MR. HOUSE: Yes, well there is a lot of preparation time that could be done in between also.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is on the community use of schools. I want to go back now to the junior college. The hon. member has left the room - I mentioned this the other day - the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) - and I talked about the junior college. Now I want to say it again and he is absent. The junior college is a full-fledged junior college doing the first year, two years of degree programmes in arts and science, fullfledged, and you get the same thing, the same programme. Perhaps not so wide a variety at the present time as you get here at the main campus, but you get a fully fledged two year programme. Last year we started it with a one year programme and next year coming up, I suppose - and I am not able to say that in full detail yet - it was planned to have a fullfledged

MR. HOUSE:

second year programme.

Now we wanted to go further than that also. I was an active member. I was on the advisory committee of that college for a number of years. Well I was the first one and I was on it until I was elected here. We wanted also to give further services, to give community services such as upgrading for business and industry. We also wanted to give upgrading programmes for young people who felt that Grade XI was not far enough for them to go, but they wanted to take another year general education. We thought we would do that if the demand were great enough and if we had the space.

So, to call that a glorified high school, of course that is not a derogatory term. I do not see anything wrong with that term 'glorified high school'. It is just extending general education and there is nothing wrong with it. Now with respect to Grade VII, I think that came on the carpet a number of years ago, about four years ago, and it was the object of a lot of study and a lot of debate. I remember being involved with it and a lot of hon. members in this House, or not a lot but a number of them were involved with it.

Four years ago the school boards in this Province felt they were not ready for Grade XII, and that we should make a more detailed study of that kind of programme. The Warren Commission Report suggested a series of junior colleges. They never suggested Grade VII, to my knowledge. They suggested a series of junior colleges across the Province that would replace the need for a Grade XII. But we just started a junior college last year and I think we are going to have to see how that works out. On the other hand, there is nobody has their mind closed to Grade XII, but I am not so sure that I do agree with what a lot of people's concept is of Grade XII. There is a good rationale. There is a good argument.

If it required eleven years or twelve years, because we have twelve years in school now, if it required twelve years in school ten years ago, perhaps with the quadrupling of knowledge like we

Mr. HANSEN:

have had in the last number of years, perhaps another year is necessary. But you have got to think about the social implications of just adding another year of general education, and you have got to think about the cost, not only to government but you have got to think about the cost to the parent. One of the things I think that we will have to look at, and look at it very hard, is Grade VII, but I would never think that the public would accept it as just an extension to the school programme. It would have to be something along the lines that we have in some of the other provinces, and that would be that it would have to be accepted as a first year university programme or a certain standard of it would have to be accepted.

But these are details that will have to be worked out and I am not saying that it is going to be done or anything like that. What I am saying is that it will have to be investigated because I think it is time we took a look at it. I just mentioned for the hon. member's benefit that the junior college is certainly a fully fledged two year programme.

With respect to a few other things that have come up with the university. There was quite a debate on the university presenting its budget and having it torn apart and ripped apart and detailed in the House of Assembly. I am not going to suggest that there should be no disclosure, but in all fairness to the university they did give a breakdown last year within a certain range, so much being spent for each faculty and each department. And with all fairness to them they have not been able to present that this year for a very basic reason. There is no harm in saying what that reason is. Because of increased costs they asked for more funds than we were willing to give in the estimates. Of course I can say that because the president of the university has stated in public that he wanted \$2 million more, I think, to meet the minimum amount required. He has stated that.

Well, he has appointed a task force within the university to distribute the amount that we have designated, the \$37,500,000, I

MP. HOUSE:

think, in our estimates, and they are not able to give a breakdown as to how they are going to do it at the present time and that was not saying that he would not give it if he had it. It is understandable that they have to go into some detail because they may have to establish priorities, which services they are going to offer and which they are not, because the difference between \$37 million and \$39 million is a substantial amount when you think in terms of programmes and when you are thinking of delimiting programmes.

One of the things I am a little afraid of when we discuss and debate the university on the floor of the House of Assembly is the term 'academic freedom' and it was discussed here the other day. I take it to mean any number of things, not only the kind of courses that will be taught. The government itself determines which faculties there will be. I think the government have determined there is going to be a medical college, medical school.

MP. SMALLWOOD: Does the minister really mean the word 'determines'? Would he not rather use the word approves or confirms, that the initiative surely lies in the main, not perhaps in every last instance but in the main lies with the university itself?

MR. HOUSE: The point I was trying to make is that the university could recommend a medical college and I do not think the university is going to go ahead with it -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The initiative there came almost entirely from the government. That is an exception.

MP. HOUSE: Yes, okay. What I am saying is for these new faculties to be established obviously it has got to get approval of government.

MP. SMALLWOOD: The government has to pay for it.

MP. HOUSE: Right. But after this is done, the course content, basic course content is the job of the Board of Regents and the senate of the university, of course, which has representatives basically from the academic world.

The other thing about the academic freedom I maintain is the fact that a university should be free as to how they are going to

MR. HOUSE:

do research and what they are going to research. Because hon. members must realize that a university, the tradition of university is the fact that it is very futuristic in its research. There may be things that they are doing today in industry have been the result of research done in universities twenty years ago. The same thing applies now. The university may be doing something in the field of research that may be twenty years in the future. But they must be futuristic in their outlook because they have to keep ahead of the industry currently in vogue.

Today for instance with a lot of people talking about the demand in certain provinces for new sources of energy, one of the provinces is talking about atomic energy. If research had not been done years and years ago in that, they would have been pretty well fixed now because there would have been nowhere to turn. So we cannot inhibit the university in the way it does research or in the kind of research it does. That is part of the academic freedom of a university.

I am sure if any hon. members had ever read the story

Mr. House.

and they would have had a government breathing down their back because they were not producing, because they were non-productive-, they would have been inhibited. And I doubt if these two gentlemen would have ever had isolated that wonderful drug. But because they had the freedom to work, they were not impeded by any other source outside them. They looked like they were wasting time in a lot of cases, but that was the nature of research. And most of our research has been done that way, and that is one of the reasons why I would be very careful and cautious about trying to impede the way that a university is going to operate.

Now the other pet there was the Harlow College. People talk about the Harlow College, and I do not know the exact cost. Somebody told me it is about \$70,000. But the purpose of that Harlow College, hon. members, is to help in our teacher training programmes. Newfoundland is a very isolated community, isolated in terms of geography, and we are isolated within ourselves. And Newfoundlanders grow up, they teach in Newfoundland schools, and they go to school in Newfoundland schools. They come to a Newfoundland university, and they train to teach in a Newfoundland university, and most of them are trained to teach by Newfoundlanders themselves. And they are attuned then totally to our way of life, which is good, which is not bad at all. But the idea of Harlow is to have student teachers do some of their instruction and some of their practise teaching in another setting, in another culture, and it gives them a little better perspective by virtue of exposure to a little different educational culture.

I had been one superintendent, and I know another who have been very happy to get some of these young teachers trained with a little different perspective, and I think the value is much more than \$70,000 a year, and it is something that I would like to see continue very much.

MR. NEARY: Why not Singapore or Australia or Massachusetts? Why Harlow?

MR. HOUSE. Why Harlow? Because, of course, this is close to our own traditions, very close to our own traditions.

MR. NEARY: Lord Taylor built Harlow, that is why.

MR. HOUSE: That, Mr. Chairman, does not matter at all about Lord Taylor or anybody else. It just means that we have a very strong British tradition in this Province, and there is a very strong educational culture in that country. And I think it is one of the better places we can try and emulate if we got to emulate anybody.

MR. NEARY: Do not try to cod us. The minister was doing quite well up to this point.

MR. HOUSE: Now the other thing I want to mention is the turning away of students. The other thing, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) mentioned the international university concept at Memorial University. Again I take exception to that for the simple reason that the idea of a university is universality. That is the idea of it. And again by virtue of the fact that we are isolated, I think having people from other nationalities coming in and living and working in the university side by side with the other students is an excellent idea.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There should be no boundaries in knowledge and learning.

MR. HOUSE: Right. There should be no boundaries. I agree. And the fact is -

MR. SMALLWOOD: No national boundaries.

MR. HOUSE: Yes.

If somebody sneezes on the other side of the world of course it affects us either emotionally or financially. And I think the more exposure we can get our people to other people in other parts of the world, the better. And, of course, we even have now an international college, I think, in British Columbia that we are helping to support. So Mount Allison University went down in my estimation, if it is true, that they do not take in international students, certainly went down

Mr. House.

in my estimation - it is a university that I have a lot of respect for - but it certainly went down in my estimation if that is true.

The turning away of students, Mr. Chairman, from the trade schools and the vocational schools and the schools of nursing and the Fisheries College - I think there are a lot of things that you got to bear in mind. When students apply for any of these schools they make a half a dozen applications in some cases, and send them around, and only one place can accept them. Then the word goes around that there are six people who were not accepted for a certain school. So, you know, I think we got to get our basic facts straight and perhaps do a little bit of research in that and see just how many would have followed up their applications had they been accepted. Because this is the trend today. It is not to make one application for a job or entrance to a school, but it is to make several, and then select the first one or the best one that suits you when the times comes.

MR. NEARY: That is a poor way to do it, if you take potluck at whatever you can get. That is a poor way to do it.

MR. HOUSE: This is the way it happens.

MR. NEARY: I know, but that is not the way it should be.

MR. HOUSE: Now, Mr. Chairman, the other thing the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was mentioning there was the idea of the B.A.'s and the B.Sc.'s, and the number of people who are without jobs. He got a B.A. and a B.Sc., and he is without a job. I think with the kind of exposure, the kind of complex society we are in today, I believe it is almost safe - and I can only do this from the point of view of what I think - it is almost safe to say that it is just as necessary to have a general B.A. degree or a B.Sc. degree today as it was to have a Grade XI twenty years ago. I believe you can generally say that, because we are in a very complex society, and when you talk about the number of forms that most people in the community got to go and get somebody to help get it filled out, because these things are getting

Mr. House.

very complex. Now I am not saying, of course, that everybody should get a B.A. or a B.Sc. What I am saying is that it is more necessary today than ever it was before. But the point I want to make here is, Mr. Chairman, that the B.Sc. and the B.A. are prerequisites to certain other schools, be they technical or professional. You got to have a B.A. degree today or a B.Sc., I suppose, to go into chartered accounting. Some schools will take them below that, but most schools require that as a prerequisite. Schools in the United States today require a B.A. degree before a person will go into nursing in a lot of cases. Again in medicine it requires a B.Sc., or at least three years of pre-medical training. So a B.A. degree is just a prerequisite for going on to professional work. And then, of course, when a lot of people get these degrees they find that they are not able to get into professional schools.

One other thing I want to mention is in response to the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) on the point of the percentage of the provincial budget, educational budget being spent in elementary and secondary education, that is just a direct response, but I say to the hon. member that you have to be very careful about the statistics you use. You have to be very careful about statistics. You got to make sure we are comparing the same thing. If you are comparing elementary and secondary education in Newfoundland with elementary and secondary education, say, in Nova Scotia, even, it is not the same thing. Because Grade XII is classed, for instance, as secondary education, but then their university degree is only a three year programme. So the four year programme in university does not exist in the sense that it does here. So the primary and secondary education is a year longer. So, therefore, it is going to cost more, a bigger percentage. Coupled with that is the fact that in some provinces there is a system of vocational high schools where they get some of their trades and occupational training as part of their secondary education

Mr. House.

programme, and , therefore, that is going to be reflected in cost. So ours only go to @grade XI , and as a consequence we are not very easily able to equate the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, I am just about through on this particular round, but I do want to mention a couple of points about the Auditor General's Report. I have to respond to that, and it is quite lengthy, but I might point out that the number of things mentioned does not appear to be a great lot of negligence at the department level.

Mr. House:

If you look at the Education estimates with over two hundred-odd million dollars, there are a lot of headings and subheads and so on, you are bound, number one, to get a lot of eventualities come up but you have no headings to put them under. And as a consequence we would have to go back to Treasury Board and get the approval of Treasury Board to take some out of one place to pay for something that we missed out on in the estimates, And that was the case with the study that we did for a couple of school boards, and it was the case certainly with the school for Bide Arm where there is no provision made for the Department to operate school boards, but we had to find the funds somewhere.

But the rest of the suggestions are very easily explained. And I am just going to zero in on two or three because those were of major importance. The idea of busing, the \$100,000 that was taken from one subhead and put into another for busing, and busing was let, for instance, as a service to school boards, yet we had to take \$100,000 out to look after the transportation of handicapped children, and put in another subhead. This year we got it in a separate subhead, so that thing will be taken care of.

Now with regard to the tendering of these buses for handling handicapped children, it is more difficult than it appears by the Auditor General's statement. In order to tender for a busing service for handicapped children to institutional schools, you have to look at what we are doing; we are bringing people who are crippled and handicapped, multi-handicapped, and one bus service cannot do it. You cannot tender to the general public and say, "You get this bus and we have got our problem solved," because there are so many eventualities that come about. We have to take pupils by taxi to the Janeway Hospital, we might have to take some home early day after day. So we have to negotiate an agreement with a taxi company, and that is what we have been doing. And I do not see how we can tender that kind of a service. It is negotiable and, of course, we do not know what it is going to be until the end of the year. There is no way that

Mr. House:

we can predict what the cost is going to be completely.

The other thing, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that out around the school districts we have a number of young people who are crippled and who are going to the regular schools, and you go into a community and you have got to get a special service to take them to the schools. Now you cannot go and tender and say, "We want transportation for one pupil." We can do it, but you are not going to get any response. You have got to go and try to coerce people to do it. Nine chances out of ten you have got to try to get some teacher to go and pick these students up every morning and take them in, and just negotiate with them and sent into the department and say, "This is the best we can do." So there is very little we can do with that kind of thing other than that. And it is not a real major expense, but it is one, of course, we have taken into consideration, and we will do the best we can with it, and certainly we will put the \$100,000 in a separate subhead this year.

With respect to teacher pensions, and this is one that puzzles me because I have been in education for a number of years, was part of the group that was working on pensions at one time, and the Auditor General interprets the Pensions Act different from the teachers and different certainly from what was intended, but I am not saying that he is not correct. I think technically he is correct. But the Pensions Act provided for by teachers stated, of course, and what we submitted was the fact that single teachers would pay 3 per cent of their salary, married teachers 4 per cent of their salary; the single teachers will pay 3 per cent they would not have any dependents covered in that. And then when, of course, a person married they went to the 4 per cent of their salary, and that included coverage for their family.

And now the Auditor General is stating - and of course what happened there, a teacher automatically went on until he became married and he went on to 4 per cent - the Auditor General is saying that the -

AN HON. MEMBER: -those who were at 4 per cent stayed at 4 per cent.

MR. HOUSE: Yes, yes! That to date just includes male married teachers, but any female married teacher that is classified as the breadwinner in the family can apply and get a 4 per cent also.

Now the Auditor General said the spirit of the act states that all people go on the 4 per cent, but that the single ones opt out of it, they write themselves out of it. And he is saying that a lot of them would not do it and therefore we have been losing money.

MR. LUSH: I find this difficult. Would you say that again about what the Auditor General said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! There is a certain undertone of conversation which makes it difficult for the minister's words to reach right to the end of the Chamber, so I would ask hon. members if they would hold down the noise level. The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: The legislation can be interpreted and is interpreted, and we feel the legislation was not done in the spirit that it was suppose to be. It states that everybody would pay the 4 per cent, but the single teacher would opt out of it because, of course, he is only covered for himself, individual benefit. And the Auditor General says we are losing money there because a number of them would not opt out. So I think that is questionable because I do not know of anybody who is going to pay 1 per cent of their salary for a benefit that they are not going to receive. So I think that argument is dismissed. Anyway the legislation is being reviewed on that particular item, and I am sure should come up in this session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. J. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say briefly a few words -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Do I understand that the hon. minister has finished his remarks?

MR. HOUSE: I am not finished my remarks. The hon. member was going to ask me a question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, somebody else has a question. I thought the minister was finished his remarks.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, what the Auditor General is saying when he mentions that the Province is losing money is because, the way he reads it is the single teacher should be opting for the 4 per cent, is that right?

MR. HOUSE: No. He is saying that the single teacher would be put on to pay 4 per cent.

MR. LUSH: Right.

MR. HOUSE: And he is saying he would not opt out of it necessarily.

MR. LUSH: Right. Right.

MR. HOUSE: He would stay on the 4 per cent rather than go to the 3 per cent. But our argument is that -

MR. LUSH: That he would.

MR. HOUSE: - he would, because he is not going to pay 1 per cent of his salary for no benefit.

The last one that I have to mention here, Mr. Chairman, that is the one on the federal claims, and that may look a little serious. The federal claims - and this is something that is peculiar to all the provinces - and the Federal Government comes on with programmes, and of course we have got to set up machinery at the department level to take care of these problems. And of course it is something that you cannot do overnight. So these claims are made by each province, that is the federal claims for Manpower training, and they are made on the basis of their actual cost of training done under the Manpower Training Programme. And they have always been, and this has been a tradition with all of the provinces, two and three years late in getting that adjustment. It is not only in Newfoundland but as I say in all province. In fact, Manitoba was seven years behind two years ago in getting their complete and proper adjustment.

The problem for the Federal Government and the provinces has been so great that the whole procedure has now been changed and the programme is no longer subject to a final claim. From now on in we will get it at the time we make our first adjustment. The

Mr. House:

claims in Newfoundland have been brought up to date through a very special effort this year, and we had it brought up to date as of March 31, 1976. Now it cannot be done until after accounting for the full year has been completed, it has always got to be a year late. And the preparation of the claims of course is very costly and very time consuming. We have remedied ours in that we have got it up to date, number one, and number two, the Feds have changed their programme so that the whole procedure has been changed so that we will get it within the year.

I just have one more comment, Mr. Chairman, and that is on the labour education. I remember very distinctly labouring through labour relations in Grade VII and VIII in trying to teach the programme in a civics course in Grade VIII, and it was so difficult and so complex that we asked the labour people to rewrite it on a number of occasions. It never happened. But we thought it was a little bit heavy the kind of details they had to go into, and of course that programme was taken out of the Grades VII and VIII, that is, the labour relations civic programme that we used to have a few years ago, a civic programme with labour relations.

MR. HOUSE:

But now there is a unit in the grade ten social studies, labour relations. It is in the grade ten social studies this year. It is in a new programme in grade ten called "Canadian Problems" and that is a new programme started this year. Also, there is a course for all vocational students when they go into vocational schools in labour relations and of course another in communications.

MR. NEARY: Very necessary.

MR. HOUSE: Yes. So this is being done, very well taken and very necessary. But one of the things we have to guard against is that every group that comes into being want their programmes put in the school. We cannot put in a full year's course on labour relations. It has to be part of other courses. That is happening. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say and say briefly a few words on the subject that has engaged some attention here in the Committee and that is the subject of academic freedom. Now academic freedom is two things: one, it is one of the most important matters that men can think about, and two, it can be used as a red herring to divert attention from the need to keep a very sharp eye on the spending by universities. In other words, Mr. Chairman, it is quite conceivable that universities will use the matter and the argument and the virtue and the wisdom and the necessity of academic freedom as a false screen, as a false and fictitious reason why their expenditures ought not to be most carefully scrutinized. It is a terribly easy thing to spend somebody else's money, for one to earn the money and someone else to spend it. You often hear - you do not hear now quite so much as you use to do - in Ottawa the argument that it is wrong for the government, for the Parliament of Canada to impose law enabling the Government of Canada to collect money from the Canadian people and hand it over to the governments of the provinces to spend, that thereby you separate two terribly important functions - one, the raising of money, two, the spending of money. Well if that argument has any merit at all in it with regard to revenue raised by the Government of Canada pursuant to laws passed by the Parliament of Canada and passing it over to the governments

MR. SMALLEWOOD:

of all or most of the ten provinces to spend, then certainly by the same token there is power and there is reason in the argument that the House of Assembly of Newfoundland ought not to pass laws at the suggestion of the government giving the government authority to go out and raise tens and scores and even hundreds of millions of dollars by revenue in charges of one kind and another levied on the Newfoundland people and then pass a large block of it over to the university for the university to spend it as they please, as they see fit, without being answerable to this House or even to the government, without having to account in any detail for the way they spend the money. Now I think that is self-evident. I do not think that any reasonably minded man can fail to feel a certain amount of uneasiness, just as some hon. members of this House have felt and continue to feel a certain amount of uneasiness at being asked to vote in the current year, for example, \$1.5 million, \$1,500,000 to one hon. minister of the Crown so that that hon. minister may make secret loans to secret persons in secret amounts in the Province. There is a lot of uneasiness about that \$1.5 million. But, Sir, important as that is, it is only a flea bite so to speak. It is - what? - one thirtieth of what this same House, this Committee, then later the House are asked to vote and pass over in cash this year, in twelve months, to the university for them to spend as they see fit. That situation ought to leave us with a feeling of uneasiness. It left me with a feeling of uneasiness when I was Premier. It left my colleagues in Cabinet with that same feeling of uneasiness. The amount then was not as much as \$40 millions. It might have been closer to \$30 million a year. It had previously been \$20 million and before that it had been \$10 million. Before that again it had been \$5 millions a year. Now it is up to something like \$40 million a year. Well, Sir, when I first became Premier of this Province the grand total budget of Newfoundland, of the government of Newfoundland, was something of the order of \$10 million less than this \$40 million that we are now asked to vote to the university. It is a lot of money. It is a lot of money to be spent by academics. It is the academics who spend it, scholarly men, scholars, learned men, students,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

researchers, but not commercial men, not men with commercial minds, not men certainly with commercial experience, with commercial knowledge, with commercial skill. For \$40 million in a year, that is a lot of money. That is a very large sum of money to be spent by men no matter how honourable, no matter how honest, no matter how well intentioned, but lacking ordinary commercial experience and the skill that comes from the experience.

Now on this matter of academic freedom: I doubt that there is any hon. member of this House who believes more than I do in academic freedom, who believes more than I do in the absolute, the sheer inescapable necessity for universities everywhere to have academic freedom. Mr. Chairman, we live in a very commercial world. We live in a world whose philosophy might be summed up with the term "balance sheet economy, profit and loss, dividends, interest, profits, investments." It is a commercial world. It is an industrial world. It is a business world where people get all the money they can get, catch as catch can, a very, very commercial world. Sir, that is the kind of world it is. Rightly or wrongly, wisely or unwisely, it is in fact the kind of world we are living in, very, very commercial. The almighty dollar is the guide and measure of virtually everything, virtually everything. We see in the world a powerful dilution a powerful dilution of religious faith and religious worship and a weakening, a tremendous weakening of that side of our lives, and side by side with it an incredible, an absolutely incredible and almost immeasurable growth in materialistic concepts of life and a

MR. SMALLWOOD

tremendous explosion of knowledge, an explosion of science, an age and a world of sheer materialism. Now in that particular world - and there is no doubt that that is the world that we live in, no doubt of that - in that particular world what is the greatest need? Perhaps I should say that the greatest need for mankind is religious faith and religious worship and practice. But I will not say that. I do believe it. I think that it is so. That is not the point I wished to make. Surely, Sir, surely the one supreme need of mankind throughout our world, the whole world, all the continents, the supreme need of mankind is for a number of oases in the desert of the world, the desert of commercialism, the desert of money making, the desert of balance sheet considerations, the balance of the world of profit and loss, the world in which everybody is striving to make money, to make it fast, to make a lot of it, to make it honestly if they can but to make it, in that world surely the supreme need is for an oasis here and an oasis there and here an oasis and there an oasis like MacDonald's Farm. What kind of oasis? An oasis of pure learning, of independent learning, of pure scholarship, of independent scholarship - not for the sake of making a fast buck, not for the sake of making money, but true, honest, sincere, detached, objective, independent study and research. If not, if we do not have that tell me, pray, where is that going to happen if it does not happen in the universities? It is no answer to me to say that some of the vast corporations, United States Steel, Standard Oil, the great corporations of North America, especially of North America, and to some extent the great corporations of the continent of Europe and of the United Kingdom, that they carry on tremendous research, that they spend untold millions of dollars doing research into all kinds of scientific matters. That is true. I know that that is so especially in North America. Canada is frequently accused of being backward in that matter compared with the United States. The Government of Canada is frequently accused, and probably rightly so, I think rightly so, accused of begrudging sufficient money to the National Research Council of Canada, the great national body

MR. SMALLWOOD:

that carries on research into all kinds of things. I think that is quite true. I think they do begrudge. They do not spend anything like enough. The drug firms, the pharmaceutical firms, the manufacturing companies, the processing companies in Canada do not spend anything like the amount they should be doing on research. But great corporations are spending vast sums of money in the United States making research of all kinds. But, Sir, why, why do those companies carry on such a tremendous amount of research on such a tremendous scale? Why do they do it? What is their motive? What is their purpose? Why do they spend tens and hundreds and even thousands of millions of dollars to carry on this very extensive and very expensive original research? What is back of it? Why do they do it? They do it, Sir, to make money. They do it so that they can come up, their researchers can come up with a new drug, which is good for mankind, admittedly, very often, not always but very often, come up with some kind of an improvement in an industrial process in industry or commerce so that they can make money. The whole purpose of it is to make money. It is just as much part of their money making effort as any other part of their effort. It is just to make money.

I am not going to deny for a moment that that is a good thing. I am not going to deny that such private, corporate, commercial, industrial profit-making research has produced a lot of good things for mankind. I am not going to deny that. It would be stupid, be foolish to deny it. It is too obvious that they do produce a lot of benefit. But, Sir, if mankind depended entirely for research, original thinking, independent thinking, detached and objective thinking, depended entirely on the employees of great corporations who are having research done at enormous expense to increase their profits, if mankind is to depend on that kind of research, then the condition of man is a sad one indeed. For what? Well, for, say, since the year 1100, roughly speaking, 1100 - I was in the University of Coimbra near Oporto in Portugal and the University of Coimbra is said, sometimes said to be the oldest university in the world - I was there and delivered a lecture once. That university was started in the twelfth century, somewhere in the 1100's. Men came from the whole continent of

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Europe to that one university for a while. There was only that one. Men came on foot and on donkey back and if they were a little better off on horseback, but mostly they came on foot from all points of the compass in Europe and came to Oporto to attend Coimbra University and they have been there ever since. Other universities sprang up and today throughout the world you have got I do not know how many thousand universities there are in the world today but there must be several thousand, all over Europe, all over Asia, all over North America, South America, Africa, a tremendous number of universities. Now the difference as I apprehend it; in Cabinet we used to discuss this matter, we would bring Lord Taylor in to argue with him in Cabinet. We would bring Moses Morgan in when he was acting President of the university before Lord Taylor was appointed, and we would have long, almost interminable discussions on the university, our Newfoundland university - how much money it needed, this question of the budget. We would say to him quite frankly, "Lord Taylor, look, really this thing is difficult to understand. You come in here and you tell us you want us to give you \$30 million, \$30 millions so that you can spend it and we not know how you are going to spend it. It is public money. It is not our money. If we were rich men, if we were Rockerfellers or like that and we gave you \$20 million, \$30 million, \$40 million to spend, that is one situation, but this is public money." So we would argue and discuss it. This went on for a number of years. We came almost to the point, we never quite came to it, almost to the point where, of deciding that the whole budget of the university had to be produced to the government and the government would lay it on the table of the House so that all members of the House could read it and know where that big portion of the peoples' money was going. The thing that stopped us was the argument that was put up continually, and it was dinned into our ears, the argument about academic freedom. Now I am not completely lacking in pride in any part I played in bringing Newfoundland into Confederation. I am not ashamed of that. I take some pride in the part I was privileged to play in it. I have often

MR. SMALLWOOD: asked myself since then, that was 1949, what has been the greatest thing to happen to Newfoundland since then? A lot of good things have happened. You know, a thousand new schools have been built since the coming of Confederation, 5,000 miles of road have been built, 30 hospitals have been built and so on and so on. You could go on and on and on. A lot has happened since 1949.

I believe that I have come to the conclusion that the greatest thing to happen to Newfoundland, next only to Confederation, is what has happened in education. Not only the starting and the upbuilding of the university, that in particular, I think that perhaps fifty years from now thinkers, objective thinkers then, philosophers, thoughtful men and women, in looking over say the first seventy-five years of Newfoundland's life as a Province of Canada, will almost certainly say that the greatest thing to flow out of Confederation, the one great thing that could not have come at all but for Confederation, the greatest single result of Confederation was the virtual explosion in the field of education and then they will probably spell it out in some detail. It is so easy to see the magnificent new school buildings, sometimes I think called plant, the plant, the factories, the shells within whose walls education takes place. These are only buildings of wood or concrete or cement or brick or some material, and it is easy to point to the handsome buildings. And no Newfoundlander, surely Mr. Chairman, no Newfoundlander is going to fail to be thrilled by some of the magnificent school buildings that are to be seen around Newfoundland today. I see the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing looking quizzically and I perhaps, I think, I hope, a little sympathetically at me over my argument, I think of the superb school building in Springdale. I happened to be there to be one of those to open it on that occasion. I think the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) I believe was either the principle of that school or very high in connection with it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How can any man, how can any Newfoundlander fail to thrill with pride as he sees that magnificent school building in Springdale and compares it with - well, makes two comparisons; number one, compares it with the schools there were in Springdale before Confederation, and compares it with St. John's and Corner Brook and Grand Falls and Gander. After all, you know, Mr. Chairman, it is not all that long ago when the only really magnificent schools there were in Newfoundland were those in St. John's and Grand Falls and Gander and Buchans and Corner Brook, with some very good ones at Carbonear, Harbour, at Harbour Grace, at Placentia, at Grand Bank, nothing compared to what has come to those same places since Confederation, but before Confederation in a few places only there were some splendid school buildings. But God in Heaven, today you can see around Newfoundland, on the Island of Newfoundland and the Labrador part of Newfoundland today, you can see school buildings of which St. John's itself would have been intensely proud before Confederation, because they did not have the like in St. John's even before Confederation.

But the educators are quick to point out, yes, oh yes, so far so good, these are fine buildings and it is nice if you can afford it to put up ornate buildings, that is grand. It shows that someone is valuing education. Of course that is the easiest part of it if you find the money to erect the building, that is the easiest part of it. Then you get your teachers and you get them trained, you get them to become more skilled, you get them better paid and then you are on your way, a good plant with good teachers and the next thing you know you are on your way in education.

But the schools are only one part of it. Take a thing that has been discussed here, I think it was the hon. member, my dear friend from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), the hon. member for there who brought in a petition about school buses. Mr. Chairman, in the whole field of education, since Confederation, surely, surely with whatever defects there may be, with whatever faults there may be

MR. SMALLWOOD: in the school bus system, surely to God, Mr. Chairman, the coming of the school bus system and enabling the coming of the regional high schools, enabling the coming of the central high schools, enabling the coming of the seventeen trade schools, enabling all kinds of things, surely the coming of the school bus system has been one of the great cardinal peaks, one of the high peaks in the mountain of education progress in this Province. Surely. Though there will be instances, there will be cases where it is anything but good, there will be cases where it is anything but perfect and I am not unaware of the serious flaw there is. A school bus comes along at four o'clock, a mad rush to get aboard and be carried six, ten, eight, twelve, fifteen miles to your home, the loss of the school community aspect, just the classroom, come out of the classroom, get aboard a bus and go and thereby lose a highly valuable part of school life. I recognize that as a serious flaw. I do not know if there is an answer to it. I do not know if there is a flaw that we must have. I do not know if it is a penalty that we cannot avoid.

MR. NEARY: You cannot be kept in after school because you have to catch the bus.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You cannot be kept in after school, you cannot go out in the playground after school because you have got to catch the bus. But serious as that is, would anybody in this House, would any member of this House actually advocate doing away with the bus system? Would anybody seriously suggest that the millions we are now spending on school buses we should save and we should not have school buses? Would anyone suggest that? He will suggest, it has already been suggested in this session by one hon. member, my friend from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) that in one particular instance it might well be done away with. Now what the substitute for it would be I do not know without spending a lot more money.

But, Sir, I stood up to say a few words and to say a few words about academic freedom in the university. Somehow it is I believe

MR. SMALLWOOD: necessary and I hope that the hon. the Minister of Education will see it, I hope that other hon. gentlemen in this House who are teachers or former teachers will see it, somehow or other there has got to be a reconciliation of a practical character of the two vital interests of academic freedom in the university and at the same time, simultaneously, control by the people's representatives who, hundreds of years ago by chopping off the king's head, by other drastic means, by the shedding of blood, by violence, hundreds of years ago won for the Newfoundland Parliament the power of the purse,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

that we regain the power of the purse in connection with the university. There is something highly improper about this Committee, later the whole House, voting \$40 million to the university without any questions asked, leaving it to them in their wisdom solely, they and they alone, they, by themselves exclusively, to decide how they will spend \$40 million of the peoples' money. There is something incongruous about that. There is something in that, Sir, that flies in the face of one of the great triumphs of parliamentary democracy under the Union Jack, under the British system, the great principle that every dollar that is collected from the people shall be authorized by this House that the government dare not collect any money - the government are the Queen's ministers - in other words, the Queen dare not through her ministers collect any money from the Newfoundland people, not a nickle, not a cent, not a dime, no money shall be collected by the Queen through her ministers, through the government from the Newfoundland people except what has been authorized specifically by this House. That is the power of the purse.

If the House gave the School Tax Authority the authority to do it, then it is done by authority of the House, is it not? If the House give authority to the cabinet to do it, then the cabinet does it by authority of the House. But the authority rests here. The peoples' representatives, the elected representatives of the people have the power of the purse and dare the government collect any money from the people except on the authority of this House. And similarly, and by precisely the same token, dare they spend any money except by authority of this House.

Now they have come in and they have asked us for authority to spend \$40 million on the university. They have asked us now. That is what we are debating. Shall we vote the Queen's ministers, in other words shall we vote the Queen \$40 million for the Queen to hand it over to the university? Shall we do that? Or shall we say, "No, no, no. Noway we will not vote this \$40 million to you for

MR. SMALLWOOD:

you to hand it over to the university until first you tell us precisely how it is going to be spent."

MR. HOUSE: The hon. member is talking about the university, the \$40 million he is using - that may not be the exact term but it is close to it anyway. As I see it are you not just quibbling with amount because the hon. member in twenty-five years gave or submitted just a block vote to the university. You are only quibbling with amounts, the principle is exactly the same as it was.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I see. Well, I quite agree. The hon. gentleman is absolutely right. It is not the amount. I said earlier in my remarks that it used to be around \$30 million when I was Premier, in the later part of my Premiership. Before that, still in my Premiership, it was \$20 million. Before that again it was \$10 million. Before that again it was \$5 million. So it has come up from about \$1 million or \$2 million up to \$40 million or forty odd millions. The amount is not the thing, it is not the principle. The principle is giving them any money without knowing precisely how they are going to spend it because it is public money. It is not my money. It is not his money. It is not the minister's money. It does not belong to anyone in this chamber. It does not belong to the government. It is the peoples' money. The government come and ask the House to give them \$40 million so that they may give it to the university and we have to say yes or no to that in our vote.

Now I do not doubt that we are going to say yes. Of course we are going to say yes. But before doing so we ought to do what we have done-up and down this side of the House. We have heard from a number of hon. members arguing, and I think arguing correctly and properly and truthfully, that the budget of the university ought to come before the House.

MR. HOODY: We are going to ask them what details, how far broken down, what -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The president of the university in the last year

MR. SMALLWOOD:

or two of my administration would bring along what he called a break-down.

MR. DOODY: Well we get that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, exactly. Well the hon. gentleman is getting it now because they began bringing it to me.

MR. DOODY: We are getting a lot of things now that began with the hon. member.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right, that I initiated. This was a compromise on the part of the university.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman - I have been listening although I have been signing a few letters and that, to his comments and -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I read newspapers and listen to every word.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes, I have learned to do that over the years, and the hon. gentleman of course has that skill as well. We are great at it. In any event, seriously, when the hon. gentleman was the Premier of the Province and he obviously had intentions of having the budget brought forward and brought before the House, I believe at some point do I understand that he made some kind of an indication to the president of the day that that was requested and that was the government's position and that it did not follow through. Now the question is, why did he not follow through with his intentions as he sort of indicates his philosophy shows today?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well the hon. gentleman says that he is able to sign letters and listen and I said in reply that I am able to read newspapers and not miss a word that is said in the House. But I am afraid he did not listen all that intently because -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I was out of the House one time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well maybe it is when the hon. minister was out of the House. I said that we argued this matter for a number of years, year after year with Lord Taylor, with Dr. Moses Morgan and

MR. SPALLWOOD:

they would come in sometimes singly, sometimes several of them would come in, deans and so on, and argue the matter out and we would argue the matter back with them. That is the matter of their budget, that we felt very uncomfortable about agreeing to ask the House to vote this money to us so that we could hand it to the university without any detail. We felt unhappy about it.

Well the argument would be put up to us every time about academic freedom. Now I personally have felt for a good many years the absolutely vital character, the vital necessity of academic freedom in the universities. If a university has not got academic freedom it has got nothing. It is an empty shell. It is a fraud. It is fraudulent. It is a sheer waste of money to have a university that has not got, that does not enjoy academic freedom. This has been a strong, strong conviction of mine. So I was never able psychologically in cabinet, in my administration, I was never capable psychologically because of this tormenting but very real conviction of mine, which I had before I was Premier, while and since I was Premier, that a university that has not got academic freedom is a hollow fraud, it is less than nothing. In fact it is an evil because it is not what it is supposed to be, it is just an imitation, it is a substitute for a genuine university.

So I was never able to bring myself to the point of - we debated it here in the House. Oh, we had debates on it, strong debates. I remember that Mr. Speaker who was at that time the Leader of the Opposition, the present Mr. Speaker of the House, then the Leader of the Opposition and himself a university man argued powerfully against bringing down the budget of the university. He was a very ardent opponent of it. And there were other opponents of it within and without the administration, some private members on our side of the House, some ministers on our side of the House, and certainly in cabinet meetings and in party caucus the matter was an issue for a number of years.

I suppose the reason we did not do it is to be laid at my feet. The blame is to be laid on me. As Premier if I had come down

MR. SMALLWOOD:

strongly on the side of making it a condition, the university would have done it. They would have had no choice. I remember being in correspondence with the then premier of the province of Saskatchewan. They were obliging their universities to bring into the government and the government tabled in their House the -

MR. DOODY: That was the only province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The only province but that province required all the universities in that province to bring, to submit their detailed budget.

MR. SMALLWOOD: However, I did not come down on the side of making the production of the budget compulsory. I did not. That is why we did not do it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: May I ask a follow-up question? The hon. gentleman sort of tells me that he could not quite bring himself to make that kind of a decision. I would ask the hon gentleman if he ever at any point made the decision that he wanted the university to table their budget, or to present to the people of the Province, through their House, the budget and made it a condition, or informally or formally or verbally or written fashion and said we want the budget and then he found himself having to back away from that kind of a decision?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, Mr. Chairman, I never found myself in that position. That never was the case. At no time, and there are hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House who were members of my cabinet, and they can confirm that at no time was there ever a decision on the part of the government or on my part personally that we would require the submission of the university's budget to this House, or to the government and from the government to this House, at no time. We argued it back and forth. I remember long discussions, personal discussions with Dr. Moses Morgan, and Moses Morgan lent me books on that topic. He raked his library or the university's library and found some books of which I read meticulously. The next time I was in London I went to the university book shop, which is near the great university of London, and I got out ten or twelve books myself on this subject, The Nature Of The University, What A University Is About and so on, and the whole subject of Academic Freedom. And I really boned up on the subject. It fascinated me and it still does.

Look, I think that we should almost be willing to shed blood in protection of the university's right to have academic freedom. But I also remember that blood was shed to give parliament the right to control the public purse. You have two great principles, and the problem is to find some synthesis - is that the word? - find

Mr. Smallwood.

some way in which both great principles can be respected and observed and enforced. Can that be done? Is it possible for the lawyers to write out a bill, which would become an act if the House passed it and the law of the land; is it possible, as a matter of draft, to draft an act so carefully and completely as to give the university academic freedom, academic, not financial, academic freedom so that the House, the government, no one can interfere with academic freedom or limit it, and at the same time give the House the right to decide what money, and for what, shall go to the university? I do not think anything is going to happen in this present session in this matter. The matter has been raised, I think it was raised by my hon. friend, honourable and fearless friend, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and it hit a responsive cord in me. Evidently it hit a responsive cord up and down this side of the Chamber. I am sure that there are hon. members over there in whose hearts a responsive cord was struck, I am sure, because of the sheer common sense of it, the sheer common sense, the sheer fairness of it.

However, it will not be done this session. I do hope that the words that have been spoken, not just by me, but by all who have addressed themselves to the Committee on this subject, will sink it and that perhaps if the hon. Premier is the hon. Premier next session, next year, if he is still the Premier, and if his colleagues are still there, if it is still the same administration, that perhaps next year

MR. WELLS: Planning on moving up?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I believe probably, the likelihood is that it will be the same government there next year and the year after, because they got a total of five years from the day on which the House met there last Fall, and we took the oath and signed the roll and elected a Speaker, five years from that date, and I dare say that the present administration will still be over there for most of those five years, but I do not guarantee it. I would say that there are some people who

Mr. Smallwood.

are not presently in the House - I do not know how many thousands - let us say a total of about 10,000 or 12,000 Newfoundlanders, they will decide that probably late in the coming Fall, and they will have a lot to say about it, which is only fair, only right, that the people should decide, should they not? There is nothing wrong with that.

But if the hon. the Premier and the hon. the Government House Leader and their colleagues, if they are still here next year, I suggest to them that they try between now and then to work out a fair and very practicable, but very, very fair formula which will entrench two great principles, one for which blood was shed many years ago; they chopped off the head of the king - the king! - King Charles' head was cut off to enforce this great principle that the elected representatives of the people, not the House of Lords, who are not elected, but the Lower House, the House of Commons, that they and they only should decide, and no one else could decide, what money would be collected from the people in taxes, and how that money would be given by the House to the Queen and her ministers to spend, that great principle, entrench that. And also entrench the great principle, just as great, that the government in asking the House, the elected members, including their own supporters, the government, the Queen's ministers, in asking for \$40 million or whatever the amount is to be handed by them over to the university shall do so after they have told the House precisely how the university is going to spend that money. Two great principles: Can we have both? If they can in Saskatchewan, why not in Newfoundland? Why not find out how Saskatchewan is getting on? Why not find out how the universities in Saskatchewan now view it? They have been submitting their budget now for - what? - ten years or a number of years. Find out how those universities are reacting, find out from the government - what are they? What stripe are they there now in Saskatchewan? - NDP. Oh, well, all right. They were NDP, then they were Tory, then they are NDP - is that it?

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. DOODY: Liberal.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Liberal, were they? All right.

MR. DOODY: Premier Thatcher.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Thatcher was NDP - oh, he was Liberal, right, Ross Thatcher, right, he was Liberal. I went out there, and I campaigned with him. Yes, I should remember that.

However, there they are, the great province of Saskatchewan. They have enforced both great principles, both. Should we not do it? We have only one university. It makes me sick. I know that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has not said a solitary word to condemn the university, not a word. I have not heard a syllable from him. I have heard him demand. you know, I have heard him denounce some of the sillier things, or what he says are some of the sillier things they have done, such as the Harlow College, in the city of Harlow, outside London. I have been there. I was one of those in my administration who agreed that that college should be opened. I really have not got any opinion as to whether it should be continued. If there is going to be one, let it be in England. Why England? Because it is England, that is why. There could not be much better reason. If you are going to have a college outside Canada let it be in England.

MR. NEARY: That hon. member is not getting nasty, is he?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I am not getting nasty.

MR. DOODY: Would you consider doubling it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would not mind doubling a sub-department, a sub-branch of it.

But, Mr. Chairman, I love that university. I love it, I am not a university man myself. I was not lucky enough. The one who put me through school, through Bishop Feild College, well, there was no university then, and he would not go so far as to send me out of the Province to a university so he sent me down to what was then, in his view, and I say in mine, the best school there was in Newfoundland, Bishop Feild College.

MR. NEARY: Could not send you to finishing school on the mainland?

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Well, he could have, yes, but he thought that was going too far. I am not a university man but I think that the university - you will hear criticism and you will hear snide remarks about it, but every time I think of the sons of widows all around this Island and the sons of poor fishermen and labourers and railroaders and clerks and civil servants, when I think of seven, eight, nine thousand young Newfoundland men and young Newfoundland women up at that university sitting at the feet of several hundreds of scholars brought in from all around the world - and I rejoice in the fact that they have been brought in from all around the world - when I think about that -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is time about up?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I am about up too, Mr. Chairman. When I think of that I say I am a proud Newfoundlander and I hope that this will go on but I do beseech the government to consider these two great principles for next session if we are all here next session.

On motion subhead 601-01 to subhead 605-03-01 carried.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, the Operational Grants, this is about the only monies in this particular classification under 605, this is about the only monies over which school boards have control really. You look at all the rest of them, salaries, teachers and this sort of thing. These are monies over which the school board has no control at all. So it is only 605-03-02 which is \$20,400,000. If you will notice, of course, this one is up \$400,000 from last year. I think in the budget the Minister of Finance grouped these two together and called them \$22 million to the school boards as operational grants. So I would like to discuss these two, if I may, in relationship to each other since that is the way they were submitted in the budget.

The insurance, the \$1,600,000 is certainly of benefit to the school boards. There is no question about that in so much as they

MR. LUSH:

now are getting their insurance much cheaper. But still I do not think that the \$20 million is at all sufficient for the school boards even with the insurance, even through this certainly gives them a little more money than they would ordinarily have and the insurance scheme is certainly a good one and I certainly commend the government on this plan. It is a good plan. I have reason to believe that every school board in the Province is happy with it. It is giving them a few more dollars this year for their own spending than they would have ordinarily.

But, Sir -

MR. DOODY: It also gives them more insurance.

MR. LUSH: Right. So it is a good scheme and from what I can gather school boards are indeed pleased with it, they are happy about it. But the operational grants to school boards themselves, this is certainly not enough money for school boards. They are going to find it very, very difficult to get by with this amount.

I think the minister mentioned that we have thirty-five school boards in the Province. Is that right? Thirty-five school boards to be assigned this \$20,400,000. This is the money of course that the school boards use to buy support materials, to try and make the teaching a little more interesting, to try and help teachers to be able to do their job a little better, and this \$20 million is certainly not going to be able to take school boards through this year.

I mentioned also at one point here how the specialist grant was reduced. I think that is included in this amount. This also is going to affect school boards where they thought they had \$1500 per specialist teacher that was brought back to \$1,000. That is certainly going to hurt the ability of the school boards to be able to get the materials that they want.

Also I want to say something about the way this grant is allocated. I mentioned that we have many inequalities in education.

Mr. LUSH:

And of course to try and give equal opportunity in education this means that we are going to have to spend unequal amounts of money in certain places, particularly in the rural areas, these areas that I referred to with a lot of culturally deprived students or with a lot of disadvantaged students. If we are to try and provide for equal education in the Province, then of course this means giving unequal amounts of money. It is my understanding that one of the major parts of this grant is an allocation to school boards I think of \$123 per student. I believe that is the way it is, \$123 per student.

There are other things there, I think \$8.00 per student for resource materials and this sort of thing. But the point I want to point out is that in order to make educational opportunity more equal I think we have got to change this system of grants because we also have schools in certain urban areas that have a lot of teaching aids, a lot of equipment, and these people do not need the same amount of monies as school boards in the rural areas. Now I realize that school boards in urban areas have different problems, different sorts of problems but what I am pointing out is the principle of the thing. In order to bring up, if you will, the educational facilities in many of our rural areas it means a different system of distributing funds, if you will.

So I just want to point out here that this amount of money, \$20,400,000, even with the insurance scheme which I again would commend the government for, but the \$20,400,000 is not going to be sufficient, I do not think, for school boards to be able to carry on. They can do all kinds of paring, they can do all sorts of eliminating, it is going to be very, very difficult for school boards to make it on this \$20,400,000 and it is the only figure there, it is the only amount over which boards have real control.

As I mentioned, the teachers' salaries, that is assigned to them. They do nothing about it. It just goes to the teachers, and the same with the bus transportation, the whole thing down through. But the \$20,400,000 - and this is I think one of the things that really

MR. LUSH:

people do not understand about the educational budget. We look at the amount there of \$174 million, I think, to school boards but the only amount out of all of this which they have discretionary spending powers over is the \$20,400,000. We can include the \$600 insurance if you want. But the only amounts over which they have to give support materials to their schools, to pay for maintenance, this is the only amount they have. And all I want to say is I think this is going to be insufficient. I do not think school boards are going to be able to make it on this. They are certainly not going to be able to buy any substantial amount of support materials that we would like to see in the schools, the equipment that we would like to see. They are not going to be able to do it.

Of course these materials are certainly needed. There are some people who would say you can get by without them. But in this day we need a lot of materials. We have got equipment in schools that cannot be used, a lot of it, because we cannot buy the materials we need. We cannot buy films, we cannot buy tapes, all of these things. And when

MR. LUSH:

we look at \$20 million, \$20,400,000 or \$22 million, if we so want to look at it that way, to be divided among thirty-five school boards we are talking about a small amount of money. I think last year the government had to come to the rescue of school boards in this particular item. I believe it was this one. I could be wrong. Was it this one?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. LUSH: Yes. And I believe we are going to find ourselves in a similar situation this year. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Education.

HON. W. HOUSE: I just want to respond very quickly to that, Mr. Chairman.

The amount of money there allocated, it makes school boards on an average of \$13.50 per pupil, just about \$14.00 per pupil more than last year. Now that is only on an average, because it is not given that way because the insurance did not affect all school boards in the same way. It does range from a high of \$24.00 per pupil in some boards down to \$7.00 or \$8.00 in some others. But all the insurance did, it favoured the - in terms of what was - it favoured the more remote boards and the more remote schools. So it would tend to ease some of the problems in some of the outlying districts of the Province.

With respect to the distribution of operational grants, of course we are required by law to distribute the grants in that particular way on a per pupil basis. That was done about, I believe, eleven or twelve years ago - I do not know for sure - when it was done on a classroom basis and the size of schools. But we have done it on a per capita basis for a number of years now. We found it so much of a problem - and I think this was before my coming here - that the Premier and the last Minister of Education, they commissioned a study to see if they could not come up with a better way of distributing these funds for operational grants. Of course, it had to have consent of the school boards because as it stands now it is a per capita basis. So they have not come to any conclusion. They cannot come and will not. They still maintain that the most equitable way to distribute

MR. HOUSE:

the fund is on a per capita basis to school boards. We have been meeting on this particular thing all year. This is the conclusion that we have come to on that particular item.

On motion 605-03-02 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 605-03-07 carry?

The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, 605-03-07, Building and Equipping Schools(Capital).

I was wondering if the minister could indicate where we stand in this Province now with respect to the new construction of schools to meet the school population in the Province? This is an increase of only \$1 million over last year. Presumably because of inflation that \$11 million as compared to \$10 million last year would be something less than, or at least no more than the amount voted for this particular subhead last year. Last year, of course, we had additional DREE funds come into the Province for purposes of school construction. I am wondering do we have a basic need throughout the Province for fairly massive construction of new schools? In my own personal feeling, there are certainly areas of the Province where new construction is very badly needed, particularly on the Northwest Coast and the Coast of Labrador. I can remember when I had the honour of representing St. Barbe North the school plant conditions, if I can use that expression, on the West Coast were pretty bad in the area of Green Island Cove and some other areas. I am not as familiar with other areas of the Province. But I was always under the impression that there is still a great need in this Province for new school construction. But it has to be looked at in prospective in the sense that the school population may be starting to level off within the next - is already probably started - and it will continue to level off in the next three or four years. But could the minister just indicate to the House whether that amount of money is adequate to meet the need in the next year, and why it is that we - well I know why it is we have not got any additional DREE funds. There was some question about whether or not the Province

MR. ROWE:

could in fact afford to operate the DREF schools as they were built. We had a great debate one year on why the Provincial Government could not modify the legislation and modify the specification of the DREF-built schools so that we could better afford to operate these schools once they were built with Federal Government money. But obviously if one looks at the estimates we can see a substantial drop when we consider the provincial vote coupled with the DREF vote, then we can see a substantial drop in the vote for school construction this year. I would just like to know what problems this is likely to cause with respect to meeting the needs of our students in some of the areas that I have indicated?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Chairman, the \$11 million voted this year is part, of course, of a programme over a ten year period. That amount goes up each year. The idea, of course, of that was to give boards the ability to borrow money under relatively long terms. We are thinking in terms of ten to fifteen years. Of course, I did mention also that there is a fairly substantial amount more of money this year coming in from school taxes which will obviously be used for school construction. Now with the basic needs, we have asked the Denominational Education Committee to do a basic needs programme over the next five years, or give us the information they have. What is projected, of course, in the next four or five years, there is well, I guess, over \$100 million needed to meet their needs. Now I do not know. We have not got that based on what we call critical need, because that is something I do not think they have done as yet, what are the critical needs immediately. So obviously if you had perhaps \$50 million immediately we would not be able to meet all the need. But boards are working within the amounts they have got and the amounts they are able to regenerate in refinancing loans to meet some of their most critical needs. Now, the areas you are talking about of where the greatest needs are are very difficult to determine from my point of view. There are some districts in the Province, and some of the more remote districts who have very, very

MR. HOUSE:

good school facilities. Perhaps some of those that are having the least facilities are those areas where influxes of population are coming. But again we give monies to the Denominational Education Committees on a per capita basis and they distribute it to the various districts.

I know a couple of superintendents have spoken to me about some of the areas. There are two or three areas in the Province where they need a fair amount of money. But to say what we need immediately this next year is very difficult. But in a five year period they want upwards to \$100 million to, I think, finish up their most critical needs. I believe if we had that, you know, it would be certain somebody would certainly be looking for more. We cannot meet all the needs this year and this \$11 million - of course, the construction is going to be down next year also because of the DRFE schools. But they are all finished. Obviously we cannot, as a Province, find the funds to do what DREE and what the Province, both of them, are doing. So we are trying to keep up by escalating our prices. As I say this year it is \$11 million. Next year I believe it is \$12 million and so on until it reaches \$16 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I will just ask one more short question. I have not been following education to the extent that I had last year because I am in a different capacity now. But I can remember over the last two or three years that there was an urgent plea on the part of school boards and people concerned with construction in education have longer term financing. Is the government still receiving strong representation from the various school boards or association of school boards or what have you or the Denominational Education Committees to set up a mechanism whereby they could have longer term financing than they are having at the present time? Because if these bodies could have longer term financing obviously they would be able to raise more money more quickly and be able to pay it

MR. ROWE: off over a longer period of time and they can get on with the job of building the physical facilities that are required throughout the Province. I am just wondering if there is still this plea or this request or this representation being carried out by these bodies for longer term financing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. ROUSE: Mr. Chairman, yes, we have been in consultation. We are in consultation periodically with the - it is the denominational committees we meet with because they are the ones who do the building of schools. We are in constant contact with them. I think the fact is that no matter how far you extend the lending, or the borrowing, you are still going to run into problems. Just a few years ago we had it for a five year period, and now there are boards who have loans up at least to fifteen years. I know of cases where they have loans up to fifteen years and of course what they are doing is, as we project our times, they continue to refinance. So, yes, there is continuing dialogue about it but we have not made any decision on any more long-term financing than the ten or twelve years that we had projected last year.

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

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not once again get into the record on this subject. It is an area of the budget which I addressed myself to in some detail last year, so I shall try and do it much more quickly today.

The minister is a gentleman whom I have a lot of respect for, and I was very delighted, not only respect for him personally but for his competence as an educator, and I think I have said in many ways before, and let me say once again, Sir, that what follows my initial comments will not be taken as criticism of him personally. But if he brings to the ministry the kind of competence and ability he brought to his other jobs in education we can look forward to a period of real leadership of the department.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel what I have said very strongly but

MR. SIMMONS: it needed to be said at this particular time because I just saw the minister do something that disappoints me. He soft-peddled badly a couple of subjects that he feels very strongly about unless he has had an about-face in the past year. I know why he soft-peddled them, because the party line was what he gave very faithfully of for the past few moments.

Now the minister knows full well that one of the more pressing needs facing the school boards in the need for more capital financing, that is one of the needs, and in his response to my colleague from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe), I thought he soft-peddled that need somewhat badly and said at one point that if we had \$100 million they would still need more. I am paraphrasing him badly but that was essentially what the minister said.

I recognize the truth of what he says but it soft-peddles the real problem, and the problem is that students in Gambo for example are being short-changed badly because of the lack of funding to the Terra Nova School Board. The students in Victoria Cove - Gander Bay are being similarly short-changed because of the lack of availability of capital funding to that same school board, the Terra Nova School Board. And I could cite cases of at least ten or fifteen or twenty other communities around this Province where on the board's priorities for building there are a number of communities right at the top for new elementary or high school facilities. And the only reason those boards have not begun these facilities is the lack of money. Now that lack of money can be handled, it can be catered in one of a couple of ways. One obvious way is more capital financing on a year to year basis made available to this vote in the minister's estimates. There is a limit to what can be done there and I think we in the Opposition appreciate that. We do not believe that \$11 million is the limit, \$11 million, which is the present figure, or the figure before us now, at best takes care of inflation, endorsing my colleague's comments, the comments of my colleague from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe), I question seriously whether it even takes

MR. SIMMONS: into account the inflation factor here. But having said that, I recall that in 1969, seven years ago, when I was involved with the NTA I made a speech I believe to the Rotary Club here in St. John's and at that time I was talking about the need for a minimum of \$16 million a year. That was in 1969, \$16 million. Right now I understand that the boards need about \$110 million to \$125 million over the next four or five years to take care of their immediate capital requirements, so that the figure of \$11 million is certainly not good enough and what got me to my feet at this particular point was to say that I was rather disappointed that the minister chose to soft-peddle this one so completely, because it is a very pressing need and he is a former Superintendent of Education, knows exactly how pressing the need is and could be, if he wanted, or if he elected - I am sure he wants to - but if he elected to do so he could be a lot more articulate about this need than he was a moment ago. And I appeal to him to shake the party line for a moment and to come to the defence of his former colleagues, the Superintendents of Education, the school boards, and, more important, come to the defence of the students of this Province who are being short-changed pretty badly now because of the unavailability of adequate funding, capital funding.

The second point that the minister soft-peddled somewhat badly was this whole question of longer term financing. Again, Mr. Chairman, had not the exchange taken place between the minister and my colleague from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) perhaps there would be no need to raise this again, because I fully understood that everybody in the Committee, and certainly the Minister of Education having been a former school board administrator, would appreciate pretty completely what this long-term financing proposal would do for school boards. Here we are most of us as home owners, the individuals in this Committee as home owners, and we have recognized long since that if the life of a building, a house in this particular example,

MR. SIMMONS: is going to be twenty or thirty years, we ought to be thinking about financing it over those terms, over that length of time, I ought to say. We ought to think about financing over the longer length of time, and we have been able to do that. We finance our houses over twenty, twenty-five and thirty years.

But here we are putting up school facilities that are to last thirty, forty, fifty, sixty years and this generation is being asked to pay for that facility although future generations will be able to avail of it.

Now we all know the arguments for longer term financing in Education so I will not belabour it. But, Mr. Chairman, I do appeal to the minister not to soft-peddle this important matter. It is very important to school boards and, more important than that, it is important to the students of this Province. If the school boards had available to them this mechanism of longer term financing, they could be building essentially double the facilities that they are building now with the money made available to them. The minister knows that and he and I have sat around the same table and argued for it on a number of occasions. He argued a lot more vociferously than he was able to address himself to the subject today. Now I am not asking him to come across the floor, that we would be very pleased, very honoured, but Mr. Chairman, I am asking him to, on behalf of the students of this Province and the school boards of this Province and his colleagues and mine in Education, I am asking him not to soft-peddle so badly two very crucial issues, the issue of more immediate funding, capital funding for education, and the pressing issue, the urgent issue of the government making the proper arrangements so that long term financing can be a reality so that school boards can begin to use more effectively the meager amounts that they are getting.

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

MR. LUSH: I too just want to address a few words to this section, the

MR. LUSH: Building and Equipping of Schools, and I pointed out I think in my general remarks the importance for new and better schools with better facilities, water and sewer, many schools without these services, and I think what is happening right now with our school board setup is basically the same sort of thing that happened without that system, mainly that there is still a tendency to give to those places that have, and not giving sufficiently to those places that have not, those schools that do not have the proper facilities. Again I am talking about the schools in the smaller rural areas. You only want to take a look at any board and you can see what is happening. You take a look at the Terra Nova School Board and you can see those communities, those larger communities that always had more facilities than some of the smaller school systems, that still the same thing is happening. It seems to be giving more to

MR. LUSH:

those places which have and giving less to those places which are have not. This is unfortunate. I concur with the remarks of my hon. colleague from Burgeo-Ray d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). He referred specifically to some schools in the Terra Nova school board, but we can take other school boards. There seems to be a need of some priority drawn up so that we can ensure that the people in these smaller areas are going to get better schools and not be continually disadvantaged and deprived of the school facilities that other students in this Province have.

In mentioning about equality of educational opportunity, I have said several times that not only should we ensure equality of educational opportunity to our students in this Province as compared with other students throughout this Dominion, but we must ensure within our own Province. I think the minister must agree from his own experience when we look at it that there are many students throughout this Province who are deprived of equality of educational opportunity. As I go around the schools in my own district, Mr. Chairman, and go to several schools and see the types of schools that our students are attending, the types of facilities which these schools are lacking - just a couple of days ago I was in a school in Charlottetown, a school within the boundaries of the Terra Nova National Park. I thought, what an indictment on our educational system the school must be, a school right in the boundaries of the Terra Nova National Park and people from all over this country, people from all over the world go to this community and view that school. It is a terrible situation just to walk in there and look at the stark nakedness of the school. The same think, of course, with schools in other parts of my district.

So I think that even with out school boards the principle is almost the same, that we give more to those places that have and less to those places that have not. And I think this is something that we should take a serious look at. Thank you.

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

MR. FLICHT: Mr. Chairman, just in keeping with the line of thought from my hon. colleague from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), the point that he made, Mr. Chairman, I want to elaborate on for a minute. In his remarks today earlier the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) ticked off, listed some of the greater schools that existed in Newfoundland prior to the last few years. Now one of the better regional high schools that existed in Newfoundland I suppose was in the town of Buchans, because we had the system where the mining company there made grants available to the school. There were things happening that put Buchans in a position to have a better standard of facilities than probably existed in the community outports. We operated, as you know, for years and years with the old school board, the Buchans School Board. Then suddenly we became part of the Integrated School Board

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that there was x number of dollars on hand, that board had on hand x number of dollars, any amount, it was in the thousands, it was a fairly substantial figure, and when we came under the Integrated School Board those funds were passed then to the Integrated School Board for administration. We have a member, as the minister well knows, on the integrated school board. But I am suggesting, Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman, that the facilities have been allowed in that particular instance to be downgraded. The money that was on hand at the time of the bringing about of the Integrated School Board, the funds that had been collected in that town and the area that that town services is being spent. I am not questioning - I am not saying that every dollar collected in every town should go into that town. I do not mean that, of course. But what I am saying is that I do not understand a situation that is permitted where one school's facilities are permitted to be downgraded. I can give the minister specifics.

Now, what I do not understand nor do a lot of people understand, that if they know there is a need in their school for a certain thing, be it an extension in classroom services, be it shower facilities, be it anything, you know, they automatically assume, well, the Minister of

MR. FLICHT:

Education or the government. But in reality I am beginning to doubt very much if this government has got any input at all into what happens in the various schools that are under the jurisdiction of those school boards. I very seriously doubt that if a request on behalf of people goes into the Integrated School Board or the Consolidated School Board of any given area in Newfoundland that the Department of Education ever becomes aware of that application. The decision is made right there by the superintendent or by that committee. And I am not too sure that is a good - we are putting \$11 million in this particular subhead into the hands of these Regional School Boards and I think there should be some accounting to this government as to whether or not each community under the jurisdiction of that school board is treated equally.

I am aware of a situation, Mr. Chairman, that the Regional High School in Buchans went for two years before they could arrange to get showers, with no showers. Now imagine a school the size of that contributing as much as the people of that town is contributing and not being able to come up with a few showers! Finally it was almost on the threat of resignation of the recreational director and all kinds of pressure that there were showers made available. Then it was on a temporary basis, just ordinary showers brought in and slapped in the school. That is just a point.

You know, Mr. Chairman, I think it is happening, and that is one specific case that has happened, that the educational facilities - I am thinking about the capital assets, the buildings are being allowed in that particular case - and there may be a reason and this is why it is so important when we talk about the life expectancy of any give industry or any given town - the fact is that the educational facilities in that particular instance are being downgraded and apparently have been downgraded with the knowledge and with the consent of the Department of Education. That concerns me very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, as it is approximately two minutes to six

MR. WELLS:

we have to rise the Committee, I feel, and have the Speaker for the adjournment.

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 Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report some progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. WELLS: I move that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at two o'clock in the afternoon.

On motion that the House at its rising do now adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at two o'clock.

C O N T E N T S

	Page
May 3, 1976	6446
Mr. Wells informed the House of the death of Magistrate Howard Strong.	6446
Commented on by:	
Mr. Rowe	6446
Mr. Smallwood	6447
Mr. Rowe extended congratulations to Mr. Wells on his installation as Chancellor of the Eastern Newfoundland and Labrador Diocese of the Anglican Church.	6447
Commented on by:	
Mr. Smallwood	6447
Premier Moores	6447

ORAL QUESTIONS

Query as to how Mr. Wells could be certain Mr. Robert Morgan had long held an option to purchase the Macpherson property which was subsequently sold to the Summer Games Committee. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	6449
Request that copies of the option be tabled within 48 hours. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	6449
Outline of government policy sought respecting increased petroleum prices. Mr. Rowe, Premier Moores.	6450
Aims and objectives of the Prevention Advisory Committee on Health and Manpower. Mr. Rideout, Mr. H. Collins.	6451
Query as to whether an oversupply or undersupply exists in Health and Manpower. Mr. Rideout, Mr. H. Collins.	6451
The situation at Pyramid Homes in Argentina. Mr. Neary, Mr. Lundrigan.	6452
Number of Pyramid Homes employees. Mr. Neary, Mr. Lundrigan.	6453
Government action to deal with the situation at Pyramid Homes. Mr. Neary, Mr. Lundrigan.	6456
Land freeze in effect at Bay Bulls since 1973. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Lundrigan.	6457
Role of the Government of Newfoundland in connection with plans of the Federal Department of the Environment in establishing a marine service facility at Bay Bulls. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Lundrigan.	6457
Query as to resumption of the debate on the Address in Reply. Mr. Smallwood, Premier Moores.	6459
Reaction sought on the practice of the House of Commons whereby the debate on the Address in Reply must be completed before the budget and estimates are brought down. Mr. Smallwood, Premier Moores.	6459
Query as to government's intention to have officials present when offers are made to the Trustee concerning purchase of the Come By Chance oil refinery. Mr. Rowe, Premier Moores.	6460
Government's intention to have officials present when a group of companies meet in Toronto later in the month in connection with a proposal to purchase the refinery. Mr. Rowe, Premier Moores.	6460

C O N T E N T S - 2

<u>ORAL QUESTIONS (continued)</u>	Page
Disposal of a blue whale which washed up on the beach at Highlands. Mrs. McIssac, Mr. Murphy.	6461
Status of the investigation into the fishing gear replacement programme. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	6461
Receipt of the first part of the investigation into the fishing gear replacement programme. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	6462
Query as to whether government has received a portion of the report. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	6463
The number of functional illiterates in Newfoundland and the means by which people are so adjudged. Mr. Smallwood, Mr. House.	6463
Query as to the cause of delay in receiving the final report of the Buchans Task Force. Mr. Flight, Mr. Maynard.	6466
<u>ORDERS OF THE DAY</u>	
Committee of Supply - Head VI - Education Estimates (continued)	
Mr. Lush	6467
Mr. Neary	6481
Mr. House	6501
Mr. Smallwood	6522
On motion 601-01 through to 605-03-01 carried.	6541
605-03-02	
Mr. Lush	6541
Mr. House	6545
On motion carried.	6546
605-03-07	
Mr. Rowe	6546
Mr. House	6547
Mr. Rowe	6548
Mr. House	6549
Mr. Simmons	6549
Mr. Lush	6552
Mr. Flight	6555
On motion the Committee rose, reported progress, asked leave to sit again, and was ordered to sit again on tomorrow.	6557
<u>ADJOURNMENT</u>	6557