

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

House of Assembly

For the period:

Monday, March 21, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I want to table the copy of a telegram which I have today forwarded to the hon.

Romeo LeBlanc concerning certain questions and concerns that were raised and expressed at the recent fisheries conference that concluded in St. John's on Thursday, March 17th.

In my telegram to the minister I informed him of the grave concern that has been expressed to me by the vast majority of inshore fishermen who attended the fifteen regional meetings in our Provincial Conference on Fisheries, which concluded on Thursday, March 17th. These fishermen, Sir, are concerned as to the adequacy of the conservation measures which have been put into effect with particular reference to Northern cod in the ICNAF area 2J and 3KL.

In my telegram to the minister I informed him that I expressed to the delegates the fact that the total allowable catch has been reduced from 300,000 metric tons in 1976, to 160,000 metric tons in 1977. Nevertheless many questions were raised by inshore fishermen about the state of the resource and the management decisions required in order to ensure that the resource will recover as quickly as is practically feasible.

I went on to say, Sir, that specifically they asked whether the total allowable catches for 1977 are sufficiently low to allow adequate regeneration of the resource and revitalization of the inshore fishery on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland. I pointed out to the minister, Sir, that these questions can only be answered by his department since it is the federal government which is responsible for the management of the resource.

MR. W. CARTER: I told the minister that I share the view of our fishermen that there must be full disclosure of information relating to management of the resource, including the basic management principles and biological information about the effects of offshore fishing effort upon shoreward migration of fish. Also it is of fundamental importance that we who are most vitally affected by these decisions be aware of any commitments which Canada has given to other countries concerning management of the resource and foreign access to Canadian fish stocks.

I pointed out to him that it is essential that we be informed as to the flexibility and freedom which Canada has in setting the TAC's for the restrictions imposed upon Canada by the bilateral fisheries agreements.

It is my understanding that the total allowable catches for 1978 will soon be set by Canada for all stocks within the 200 mile zone.

MR. CARTER: I said that in view of the importance of these decisions I am hereby requesting that the biological and economic information used in reaching such decisions be made available to my department and to representatives of our fisherman and our fishing industry. The total allowable catches must be set at levels which will allow a viable and vibrantly healthy inshore fishery. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the total allowable catches must be set at levels which will allow a viable and vibrantly healthy inshore fishery.

I went on to say that if restoration of a healthy inshore fishery requires that the total allowable catch be cut to such a level as to eliminate foreign fishing effort for cod in Northern Newfoundland waters, then I and the government I represent are prepared to support such action. I told the minister, Mr. Speaker, in my telegram that this government is committed to the restoration of the inshore fishery and we want to make it abundantly clear that the revitalization of the inshore fishery is our principal concern and our highest priority in fishery management.

The declaration of a Canadian 200 mile management zone in itself is of little benefit if the management principles are not fundamentally changed. The former management regimen was recognized to be inadequate and indeed reprehensible. The principle of maximum sustained yield is a principle of biological management which is insensitive to the economic and social needs of our people. It is my sincere hope that our new Canadian management system will be sensitive to the needs of our Canadian fishermen whether they be inshore fishermen on the Northeast Coast or trawler fishermen sailing out of communities on the South and East coasts of our Province. And I am still quoting from the telegram to the minister, Mr. Speaker.

"I am hereby requesting that there be consultation with the government of this Province in the formulation of suitable management principles and in the establishment of total allowable

MR. CARTER: catch levels based upon these principles. I would like to conclude by again repeating the concern of fishermen in this Province that the total allowable catch for Northern cod may be too high and as a consequence that foreign fishing effort may still be excessive. Unless there is hard scientific evidence to support the conclusion that the present total allowable catch will allow the resource to rebuild sufficiently to allow the revitalized inshore fishery, we would favour a further drop in total fishing effort.

"The government of Newfoundland, Sir, is prepared - again I am quoting the telegram to the minister - the government of Newfoundland is prepared to support the elimination if necessary of foreign fishing effort. In the absence of definitive scientific evidence concerning the effects of alternative total allowable catch levels upon our inshore fishery creates a risk for our inshore fishery, we would prefer that this risk be minimized by opting for a lean offshore effort. If there is to be any error we would prefer that the management decision err on the conservative rather than the liberal end of the TAC spectrum.

"I want to repeat that these are issues of great importance and grave concern for our Province. therefore I would welcome an opportunity to discuss these matters personally with you at an early date." Signed, Walter Carter, Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, over the years I have been in the House I have heard my share of ministerial statements that take a lot of words to say nothing but the one which we have just heard, Sir, sets new records. Nobody could find fault with the minister's statement of concern. Of course nobody could. Mr. Speaker, I

MR. ROBERTS:

listened as best I could to the minister's statement which seemed to go on and on and on, and there is so little of substance in it, Sir, that to try to comment upon it in detail is like trying to grapple with the minister's policy and other points, and that is the same as trying to put your hand into a bowl of jelly.

Mr. Speaker,

MR. ROBERTS: to make two specific points with reference to this; first of all and most importantly, Sir, it is obvious that the future of the inshore fishery on the North-east coast and the coast of Labrador - Labrador, of course, was conspicuous by its absence from the minister's thought-but that inshore fishery, Sir, and its future must be of prime concern to this House and to the government which answers to this House.

The total amount of fish that can be taken from those stocks is obviously the key question in the management of that stock. The minister used a great number of words but he said no more than that. It is right and proper that the government be concerned about it, Sir, but I find it passing strange that it is only now that the minister sees fit to get in touch with M. LeBlanc.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is aware that the rules will only permit him now to make general comments and not to debate the matter in the Ministerial Statement.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. I am trying very much to avoid debating it. I would like nothing better and perhaps we will have another sub-amendment on this.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point remains that I think the minister has come late to the party. I find it also, Sir, to be a very great change in the government's policy, because the principles which he has enunciated, the principles which we on this side have enunciated before this, Sir, obviously require the complete abandonment of any further thought of joint ventures which threaten this very stock, and furthermore, Sir, obviously explode and expose the minister's great scheme to buy or to rent or to somehow acquire twelve great trawlers from overseas to exploit this very same stock.

The minister's statement, Sir, does not square in any way with the actions that he and his colleagues have taken. Mr. Speaker, I am not allowed to debate it, as Your

MR. ROBERTS: Honour has reminded me, and so I shall not. I would like nothing better and I do hope fervently, Sir, that when we get the estimates in this House under this infamous seventy-five hour rule, we are allowed this year, if we can debate nothing else, to debate the fishery policy. The minister says he is proud of it. I do not doubt he is proud of it, Sir, but I think the House should have the opportunity to examine the minister, let him state his views and let, Sir, other members state their views.

The minister's statement is a penetrating insight into the obvious, Sir. There is nothing new in it. There is a great deal we would welcome because it is what the minister should have been saying all along, a concern for the fishery of the Northeast coast and of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my question is for my sometimes friend, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, and it relates to the question of a road across Labrador.

Now by way of, I hope and trust, permissible explanation, the minister I am sure is aware of the fact that many people in Western Labrador believe that they can have access across Labrador this year by means of putting a car or a truck on a train at Wabush, bringing it down to Ross Bay Junction and taking it North on the railway to Esker and then getting off the railway at Esker and then coming across to Churchill on what is quite a good road, a road built originally by CFLCo. in connection with the project, and then going from Churchill down to Goose, coming East Goose Bay on the so-called Freedom Road, and then connecting with the ferry service, the Carson, to St. Anthony, Lewisporte and St. John's.

My question, Sir, against that background is, is the minister prepared, or are the government prepared, the minister speaking for them, of course, to take the steps that are



MR. ROBERTS: necessary to enable the road between Churchill and Happy Valley, which is there - it is drivable but it is not in very good condition - is the minister prepared to take the steps necessary to ensure that that road is made drivable this Summer and that the people living in Western Labrador are thus able to get access by car and trucks to the rest of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, a short while ago I received representations from people in Labrador West and in particular from my colleague in the House of Assembly, the hon. gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) who brought this to my attention, who speaks on behalf of Labrador on many occasions irrespective of which district or which riding. At that time the request was

Mr. Morgan:

along the lines of looking at the possibility of establishing a car ferry service on the Quebec North Shore Labrador Railway, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned, and then from their to travel by convoy to Goose from Churchill Falls over that road. And the reason I mention 'convoy' is because I travelled that road last year in 1976, shortly after becoming minister, I travelled to Churchill Falls over that road, I had to travel in a four-wheel drive jeep, but the road is a very dangerous hazardous road because it was never built to a standard for the purpose of transporting passengers and goods, in particular, private passenger cars.

The suggestion put forward to me by the hon. gentleman my hon. colleague from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) is being looked into, I have assured the residents of Labrador who made representations to me that I will, as soon as the House of Assembly closes or possibly during the Easter recess, travel to Labrador and take a look at the situation and discuss the matter with the railway concerned. But first of all it has to be determined whether or not we can keep that road open. So as soon as weather conditions allow me to I will be travelling over that road from Goose Bay, as far as we can go over the road, going West, to determine the possibility of keeping it open or having our maintenance crews keep it open this Summer, and for convoys to travel into Goose to connect with the ferry service coming down to Newfoundland, now the William Carson, which was put into service last year.

But there are many questions remaining unanswered about this possible transportation system serving the Western part of Labrador. And hopefully over the next coming months we can answer these questions and make a decision which will be to the benefit of people living in Labrador, hopefully.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister, and I very much appreciate the fact that he will look into it. I think, judging

MR. ROBERTS:

from what he is saying it is fair to say that some thought has been given to it, but no actual field work or groundwork or road work has been done. Could the minister tell us whether he has been in touch with the QNS&L, the railway system running from Sept Isles to Schefferville through our Province? And if so, if he has been in touch with them, what response they made? Are they willing to do what has to be done to enable cars to be moved from Wabush to Ross Bay Junction and then North to Esker?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Speaker, we have made no official contact, I guess I will use the term, with regards to establishing a means of transport and the reason for that is because we want, first of all, to determine whether or not that road can be used this coming Summer, and then if the decision is that we can use the road, or the people in Labrador West, only then will we make representation to the railway concerned. Because if it is done prior to that we are putting the cart before the horse sort of thing. So first of all I have to determine whether or not that road can be used this coming Summer.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A further supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I could, I could say if we are debating it, you know, it would not hurt to get in touch with the railway now, no harm done to make a phone call or to send a letter, but be that as it may, can the minister tell us - and Your Honour and the House will appreciate this, there is a lot of public interest both on the Island and throughout Labrador on it - when he might be in a position to announce some decision, Obviously the minister has to go to Labrador to make a visit, to have a look, and that is fair game, but people are planning, you know, and in their planning would want to take into account the possibility or the likelihood, if it could be that, of being able to go across Labrador by land and then down to the Island by sea. And that is a very great concept, you know, to be

Mr. Roberts:

able to drive across Labrador by road and then to come back to the Island by sea. But could the minister tell us when we might expect to get some decision?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, as soon as the department has totally assessed the situation, and determined the feasibility of possibility of keeping that road open then the decision will be made to proceed further by means of contacting the carrier concerned, in this case the Quebec North Shore Labrador Railway, and hopefully put the thing into effect. But as I mentioned earlier it has to be determined first of all whether that road can be used. Last year the road was officially closed by the Department of Transportation and Communications. They took no responsibility for the road, based on the fact that it is a hazardous, dangerous road, and there are no service stations or public conveniences at all along that route. But despite that I understand a number of residents, in their private vehicles, did travel over the road and came down to Goose Bay and got on the ferry there and came to Newfoundland, the Island part of our Province. But

Mr. Morgan.

until that situation is totally assessed by the engineering division of the department - and also my own travels to the area which I have assured my colleague, the hon. gentleman for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), I will do this Spring - until then we plan to take no further action until we can determine whether or not the road can be used.

MR. ROBERTS: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us what degree of priority he puts on this road question, and where will it rank in his consideration of where - I imagine funds are going to be less available to go everywhere this year if I am any judge of the situation and I think I am - can the minister tell us where this ranks in the priorities? Will it be at the top of the list, the bottom, somewhere in between?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, transportation in Labrador is always of high priority in the Department of Transportation. Any means and methods to improve transportation in Labrador naturally is of high priority as long as I am minister, and I am sure all my colleagues will agree with me. But in this case, because of the substantial investment required to put that road - I am referring to from Goose Bay over to Churchill Falls - in a condition considered to be acceptable for use of private vehicles, that it is obvious to all concerned that it will require federal government assistance, and I cannot at this time comment any further on any forthcoming or possible forthcoming or potential forthcoming assistance from Ottawa on that matter.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I know I said it was a final supplementary. The minister has raised a new point. May I trespass on Your Honour's generosity.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. Leader of the Opposition for a final, final.

MR. ROBERTS: All right, a final, final one. The minister mentioned federal assistance, a new thought in his public statements on this. Can he tell us when application was made to Ottawa for assistance with this road?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Sir, application for assistance to improve transportation systems in Labrador are almost on a continuing basis. But with regards to the -

MR. SIMMONS: The farmer hauls, you know.

MR. MORGAN: If the hon. gentleman for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor) has something to mumble about let him stand in his place and do it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, on a small point of order befitting the minister, he may have a quarrel with my friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), but my friend from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor), Sir, to my knowledge has not - I have no doubt he has good cause to be involved in discussions with the gentleman from Bonavista South, but, Sir, let the gentleman from Bonavista South refer to my colleagues by their correct designation. The gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir certainly has some strong views on the minister's performance and so do most of us, and so do the people in Bunyan's Cove and elsewhere throughout the Province.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as I earlier indicated if an hon. member of the House of Assembly on the Opposition side asks a question of a minister on this side of the Chamber, if he is genuinely interested in obtaining information he should refrain from making comments while the question is being answered. Now, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the answer -

MR. ROBERTS: I made no comment.

MR. MORGAN: No, one of your colleagues did.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: I mean I can take so much of the minister's searing attack on me, this searing condemnation of my own self here. How shameful! All I have done, Mr. Speaker, and I will continue to do, is take exception, strong exception, Mr. Speaker, to any indications that applications have been gone, when they have not gone to Ottawa, when the minister misleads the House.

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

There is no point of privilege before the Chair. The hon. minister is now recognized to answer the question.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I was on the verge of answering the question before being so rudely interrupted. Mr. Speaker, this administration made representation and application, official application to the federal level of government, our national government in Ottawa, for assistance on improving, as I mentioned earlier, all transportation modes in Labrador, including airstrips, and also with particular emphasis - three years ago a particular application was made specifying required assistance for the necessary upgrading and reconstruction of the Trans-Labrador Highway. That application was made and filed by this government three years ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance, the President of Treasury Board. In view of the fact that there are so many difficulties arising now in connection with pension plans, first the teachers, and now the Waterford Hospital strikers, will the minister tell the House why the government refuses - or let us put it

MR. NEAPY:

in a positive way - will the minister tell the House if the government is going to fund the pensions of its employees and place them under a trusteeship with contributions and benefits set down on sound, actuarial principles?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: It is a matter that government has under consideration Your Honour, and, you know, the government policy in that area will be announced when it is ready.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans followed by the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister of Mines and Energy. Would the minister advise the House as to what percentage of the petroleum products and Bunker C being purchased by the government and its agents is being refined or produced by the Golden Eagle Refinery at Holyrood?

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have not got the answer to that question at my fingertips so I will take it as notice.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister also endeavour to advise the House when he answers the original three questions what was the dollar value of the petroleum products purchased from Golden Eagle by government for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1976?

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

MR. PECKFORD: No problem, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

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

Could the minister confirm whether it is too late for Eastcan to conduct a major drilling programme off Labrador this Summer and Fall?

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

MR. PECKFORD: I am not a petroleum geologist, Mr. Speaker, so therefore I cannot answer that question.

MR. STPACHAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.



MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the minister acknowledge whether officials from his department are in Calgary or were in Calgary or will be in Calgary to attempt to negotiate a last minute compromise with Eastcan?

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

MR. PECKFORD: Were, yes. Now, no. Future, I do not know.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the minister tell us whether it is a reasonable probability - and I said a reasonable probability - that necessary agreements will be reached which will allow a reduced drilling programme this Summer?

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

MR. PECKFORD: To speculative, Mr. Speaker. I really cannot answer it.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Just imagine and he is the brightest thing they have over there. Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Finance. Could he indicate if a definite date has been indicated now or decided for the budget, when the budget would be brought down in the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: No a definite date has not been established and has not been indicated at this time, Your Honour.

MR. SIMMONS: Could he -

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could he indicate whether it will or will not be, say, within the next week and a half or so?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I cannot indicate that it will or will not be within the next week and a half or so.

MR. SIMMONS: Shame! Shame! Planning, the government are planning.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova followed by the hon. member for LaPoile and the hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Finance. I wonder

MR. LUSH:

if the minister is in a position to inform the House as to whether there are any new developments in respect to the Waterford situation?

MR. DOODY: No, Your Honour, we have not heard anything further from the union since our last proposal was put to the unit. We certainly would welcome such an overture but since government has made the last two moves we feel it is appropriate for the union to come back with a counter proposal. We are very anxious to get the thing settled, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries. Would the Minister of Fisheries inform the House if the government have been asked for any assistance in connection with replacing the \$1 million fish plant that was destroyed by fire at Burnt Islands in the electoral district of LaPoile?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, we have been in touch with Mr. Eric King of the, I think it is called Kings Fisheries of Burnt Islands, with respect to the fire and we have offered him whatever assistance we can render. Indeed no later than twelve o'clock this morning, noon, we talked to Mr. King and suggested to him that he get his proposal together and if he needed any help from the department by way of advice or technical assistance that we would be very happy to offer that assistance. In the meantime I understand that Mr. King will be applying to DREE for the necessary assistance to enable him to rebuild the plant.

MR. NEARY: This is a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister care to tell the House what the disposition of the three sixty-five foot draggers, The Sand Launce, The Barracudina and The Blue Hake, what the disposition of these draggers are now that we are landing fish at Burnt Islands and in other communities where you have fish plants on the Southwest Coast.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, two of the boats, Mr. Speaker - the disposition of the boats has been under negotiation with T. J. Hardy Limited of Port aux Basques and I understand that negotiations are just about completed for the leasing of the boats for at least a one year period with an option to purchase, and that the third boat will continue to fish in the area, land its catches in the plants in the area but that T.J. Hardy would probably be given the first, I do not know what the legal technical term is, but certainly first refusal on the purchase or leasing of that third boat.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, would the minister tell the House if his department have any plans to convert longliners in the Burnt Islands area into draggers - I forget the term now the minister's officials use, to convert longliners into draggers so that their catch capability can be increased - if so can the minister give us a few details.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are plans to convert at least three longliners into a more diversified fishing area and that they will receive whatever assistance is available to them from the Provincial Loan Board and I presume whatever assistance is available under the federal government as well in that respect. But conversions are taking place I am told with respect to three boats in the area.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The original questioner, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Could the minister tell us now what is happening now in connection with the Isle aux Morts fish plant and the total operation of the fishery in that area, you know in relation to Burnt Island, Isle aux Morts and so forth? Anything new, you know, in the way of evolving that plant?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Nothing except, Mr. Speaker, that we have the ownership changed hands. Now it is being operated by Connor Brothers, probably the largest cannery in Eastern Canada. Meetings have been held between officials of that company and the Provincial Department of Fisheries with a view to finding out exactly what their plans are, if in fact the plan to diversify or to expand their operation and we should be getting word back from them, I suppose, in the very near future as to exactly what they intend to do with that plant at Isle aux Morts.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A further supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the minister's statement in response to a question by the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) about the sculpin class boats, I forget the names of the three of them, but the three special boats, can the minister tell us what those boats cost the government? What are they now worth, if that is different from the cost, and whether the lease payments made by the Hardy Firm in Port Aux Basques and the other leasee, if there is to be a second leasee for the third boat, whether those lease payments will be adequate to recover the costs of building those boats, the capital cost of them? I assume in so asking that the lease will be on a bare boat basis but perhaps the minister could deal with that point as well, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: I will have to take notice of the question with respect to the actual final cost of the three boats. but certainly with respect to the amount of lease I think the amount, in fact I am sure, it will be based on the amortization of the market value of the boats say over the remaining life span of ten years.

MR. ROBERTS: Is the market value different from the cost?

MR. W. CARTER: There will be a slight difference in that, yes.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I will recognize one further supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate to the House, Sir - these boats were built on an experimental basis, I presume the experimental stage is now over - would the minister indicate to the House whether or not the experiment was a success and if there will be more boats of the sculpin type, sixty-five foot draggers, as my hon. friend indicated, will there be any more built by the Department of Fisheries or by the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the boats were built as part of an experiment. There were certain flaws in the design of the boats but I am very happy to inform the House that they are now fishing on the Southwest corner of the Province. They are doing extremely well but I doubt very much if we will be building any more of that particular design. Certainly the boats were,

Mr. W. Carter.

we believe to some extent, maybe over-designed. A lot of equipment was installed that maybe was a little too sophisticated for the type of operation. But certainly the boats are proving to be very, very successful, but we are not sure that we would want to get involved in the building of any more of that particular type, and with that kind of equipment on board.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Might I ask the hon. Premier or perhaps the Government House Leader, preferably I think the Premier, if they can give us some assurance that in the order of business of the House the full attention will be given to the thought that the debate on the Address in Reply should be completed, unless there is some unreasonable delay on the part of members speaking, before too much more business is proceeded with in the light of the fact that his colleague, the Minister of Finance, has a budget to bring down and possibly an interim Supply Bill, and possibly the estimates before he might be ready with the full budget? With that business coming up heavy, massive business coming before the House can we have some reasonable assurance - I do not ask for a guarantee - but the reasonable assurance that we will not have repetition of last year with the Address in Reply being debated four or five months after the speech of which it was an Address in Reply had been brought down?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that question would be more properly directed to the Opposition themselves. The fact is that we have been six weeks open in this House of which five weeks have been taken by the Opposition wasting time debating nothing points on the Speech in Reply. And if the Speech in Reply is finished, Sir, it will entirely depend on them. We will be

Premier Moores.

putting legislation before the House. We will be bringing down the budget. We will be giving them an opportunity to clue up that debate. But if they just want to keep winding and winding it down that is entirely in their hands.

MR. SMALLWOOD : A supplementary to the hon. Premier.

MR. SPEAKER : A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS : How about Scrivener?

MR. SMALLWOOD : I appreciate the humour of his reply but I know the last thing in the world that he has in his mind is any kind of squeeze play on the Opposition. Oppositions are, you know, -

MR. ROBERTS : Squeeze plays on Scrivener.

MR. SMALLWOOD : - going to speak, and they are going to make speeches. But there has been a fair amount of legislation brought down, dealt with by the House, one or two fairly serious matters, but a number not so serious where except for the serious ones the Address in Reply could have gone forward, could it not and be disposed of. Because the whole House, including the members on this side, are going to be so thoroughly fed up with the debate on the Address in Reply, if it drags on and on for months into the Summer .

MR. MURPHY : One hundred and eighty-seven sub-amendments -  
Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SMALLWOOD : Well surely that depends, and there is no reason why there should not be, is there? I cannot debate that, Mr. Speaker, and I fully realize. But the Premier should be happy that he has got a certain amount of legislation done. He should be happy that they are getting ready for the estimates and interim supply and the budget. In the meanwhile would it not be smart to get rid of the - well rid is not perhaps the word - but to get completion of the debate on the Address in Reply and not have it next June or July or some time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing we would rather than to finish the Address in Reply. The Leader of the Opposition says, "There is a squeeze on Scrivener." I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is nothing compared to the squeeze on the Leader of the Opposition after the weekend.

MR. ROBERTS: Ah, ha! Did you see Friday's cartoon?

PREMIER MOORES: I saw Friday's cartoon, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that it is much better to be in a fighting cartoon than being the subject of one for the next six months between now and October.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: A question, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. Would the minister be kind enough to inform the House if there is any truth to the rumours circulating in Carbonear that phase two of the Carbonear by-pass road will begin this Summer?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I very seldom comment on rumours, and I do not intend to start today.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a



Mr. Nolan:

question for the Minister of Finance.

MR. PECKFORD: Late starting.

MR. NOLAN: - and the President of the Treasury Board in reference to the Waterford Hospital strike. Has the government made any new offers at all to the union? Have they offered to bring them together? Or are they now leaving it in a position that it is the union's next move? What is the situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: That was the gist of the answer to the last question, Your Honour. The Government of the Province - I really should stop referring to it as a government, it is not a government problem it is really the Board of the Waterford technically, although in all practical purposes it is the taxpayers money that is involved, so that in effect it is a government problem. The last two overtures, the last two offers have been made by government, the last two attempts have been made by government on behalf of the Board, and behalf of management to bring these people together. We are hopeful that some overture will now be forthcoming from the union, some counter proposal that we can consider. As I said we are most anxious to sit down with the unit and hopefully get the strike finished with and get the thing resolved as quickly as we possibly can.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister tell the House if the Board at the Waterford Hospital are bringing in so-called volunteer workers from outside of St. John's and putting them up at expensive hotels in the city while they are in St. John's?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: My understanding is that there are some nursing staff and management staff from other hospitals from outside St. John's who are working at Waterford. Whether they are being put up at expensive hotels or cheap hotels I really do not know, Your Honour. I do not know if there are any inexpensive hotels any

Mr. Doody:

more. But I guess it is a matter of standard whatever the hon. member means by expensive.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member from Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Is the minister in a position, maybe not right at the moment, but could he bring before this House some indication of how much extra money in overtime, meals, board and lodging and so on it has cost the government since the strike began over and above what it would normally cost to operate the hospital?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I am not in a position, obviously, as the hon. member has indicated to bring that number forward, Certainly if it can done, it will be done, It has been done in the past and the full implications of the thing in terms of its cost, in the monetary sense, will be presented to the House at the appropriate time.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from LaPoile, one final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the so-called volunteer workers who are in from outside the city, would the minister indicate if any of these so-called volunteers are being put up or housed at the Holiday Inn here in St. John's?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: In the first place, Your Honour, I am not sure about the term "volunteer" and I guess that is why the hon. member refers to them as so-called volunteers. I do understand that there are some management people from other hospitals working at the Waterford from outside of St. John's. I can only repeat what I said before I have absolutely no idea in the world where they are living but I do hope that they are comfortable, because they are doing a fantastic job and they are -

MR. NEARY: They are very comfortable, and they are costing a fortune.

Mr. Doody:

- looking after the patients at the Waterford which is our prime responsibility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications or the Premier. Could the minister tell me whether this government or the Department of Transportation and Communications has made a formal application to the Minister of Transport in Ottawa, Otto Lang, for the upgrading of the Trans-Canada Highway? And when I say 'formal application' I do not mean conferences, I do not mean press releases, a formal application from this Province to Ottawa?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is, yes, And Mr. Lang is here on other business on Monday and we will be carrying on even further, and if the hon. member from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) would like the opportunity we could even get an introduction for him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HICKMAN: Order 4, Bill No. 14 second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 4, the adjourned debate on Bill No. 14.

The hon. member from Kilbride.

MR. R. WELLS: I believe, Mr. Speaker, I was in the process of beginning some remarks on this bill when we adjourned on Thursday. What I had said, and I have to think for a moment now to come back

MR. WELLS:

to where I left off. What I had said I think about education up to that point, Mr. Speaker, was that we must not fall into the trap of thinking that money is going to solve every problem of education and that money is the complete answer. I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention, for example, that in other countries this sort of experience has been realized. I remember, for instance, an occasion in England when at one of the major universities a few years ago a miner's conference was held at that university in the Summer, when the university was closed. And everybody was somewhat astonished and somewhat amused to read in the papers after the miners had spent two or three days in the university, in their own conference, that they could not believe the Spartan conditions that existed. They were upset at their own executive for taking them there in the first place and objected strenuously, even in the National Press, at the kind of conditions that they were forced to endure when staying in the regular residences at the university. These are among the more famous universities in the world.

So the point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that it is too easy for us in Newfoundland to think that just because we spend money that we are going to have good education and good educational institutions. Now I was talking about the one room school last week. Obviously nobody wants to go back to that. But let us not sell short the education that a lot of people obtained in Newfoundland before Confederation and before vast amounts of money were spent. We only, I think, Mr. Speaker, have to look at various communities in Newfoundland which, because of the dedication of the people and the teachers who were involved in education, have produced more first-class educated Newfoundlanders than other communities ten times their size.

I can think of one community and that is Elliston. I do not know - whose district would Elliston be in?

MR. MURPHY: \_\_\_\_\_ Bonavista South.

MR. WELLS: Yes, in Bonavista South, the community of Elliston. That community had a dedicated teacher there. I forget his name now, but he was there for probably twenty-five or thirty years teaching and there were more, I suppose for a village of its size in Newfoundland, there are

MR. WELLS:

more people with university degrees have come out of Elliston than probably any other place. That, I think, can be traced solely to the influence of that man. I did not know him obviously. He was a teacher in Elliston for a great many years. Would his name have been Mr. Murphy? I am not sure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS: Yes. But a man who has left his imprint on ever so many young people. I think the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) will agree that the number of people, even when I was a student going to university, the number of people from Elliston with university degrees and university education was astonishing when you consider the size of the place.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman not agree that one of the most astonishing phenomena in Newfoundland is the extent to which, in a number of places, the influence of one man, some one teacher -

MR. NOLAN: Or woman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In Odegin the famous Lord Morris taught with the result that a large number of absolutely outstanding men and women emerged from that little Island of Odegin. Bishop Meaden teaching down in White Bay. Who was the famous teacher over in Brigus? And all around the Province there were absolutely distinguished men who put the stamp of their own personality on the whole community for maybe the best part of 100 years afterwards.

MR. WELLS: I certainly agree with the hon. member completely, Mr. Speaker. And this, I think, has been shown - I was talking on a point which I think is an extremely interesting one. I was talking recently to a lady from Grand Bank and she told me that about forty years ago, in her own experience and knowledge in Grand Bank, there were about thirty persons who were graduates of university, particularly graduates of Mount Allison and in that day. So it shows, in my mind at any rate, it indicates that although money is important in education, money can take education so far but there is no substitute for dedicated teachers and for parents who are dedicated to educating their children and helping them.

MR. WELLS:

You know, I am not decrying for a moment the expenditure of money on education in our schools. I happen to think some of our schools are overbuilt. I believe we have spent too much money on buildings. Not too many buildings, I am not saying that for a moment, but what I am saying is that some of the buildings, I think, are overbuilt for the purpose that they are used for, and that money is part of it. But the real impetus comes, I think, from dedication, from teachers who are dedicated, from parents who ensure that their children take fully from whatever educational opportunities are possible. This, I think, we have got to - we have got to get away in Newfoundland

MR. WELLS: and from thinking that money is going to solve our problems in education or in economic development or any other sphere of life. Money creates as many problems for a country as it solves. It is people that count, and it is the will and desire of a people to bring themselves forward, in educational ways and in other ways, that really counts.

Now, let me say a word if I may, Mr. Speaker, about Memorial University. There has been ever so much debate in this Province about Memorial University, about its budget, about the handling of its finances - and I know that I am straying somewhat from the strict principle of the bill, but Your Honour has allowed a certain latitude in debate and for a few moments I would like to take advantage of that.

Now it has been argued and argued very forcefully that there should be greater financial controls on Memorial University. Perhaps there should, but if they take place - and I would support financial controls, there is no question about that - but I do not think I would support a system where we in this House debated the budget of a particular department of Memorial University as we will debate the budget of the Department of Health or the Department of Education. I think that what we should do and the approach that we should take is to put a ceiling on the amounts that are spent at Memorial University and in running that university. In other words, I do not think that if the university comes into the government and says, "We want \$45 million this year or we want \$50 or \$55 million," I do not think the government should just pass out the money. I think the government should decide how much money it wants to spend on higher education in Newfoundland at the university level, decide and say, "This is what we can afford in a given year, and this is where we are going to draw the line." And let the university then control and manage its budget.

MR. WELLS: Now if university people are travelling all over the world first class, obviously I do not think that we as a Province can afford that. I do not know if they are or if they are not. I hear in this House that sometimes they are. Now that is something that surely a word from the government to the Board of Regents or to the president of the university could surely correct.

I think the government already has the power to send auditors, or its financial representatives, into the university to look at the books to see where the money is going. And I think that power should be exercised. In other words, I think the university should be accountable directly to the government and through the government to this House. But I do not visualize this House going over all the books and saying now, you know, "Who's salary is that \$15,000 or \$20,000, and where did he go when he made that trip?" That is not the kind of control I would envisage. But I would say to the government - I mean, we cannot run away with public money on university education forever. And there have got to be strict limits put on Memorial University. And I think the government should draw the line and draw it toughly and say to the university, "You have got to watch how many new schools you open, a school of this or a school of that."

In other words, I happen to think myself, although I know we needed doctors in Newfoundland, and I think probably we still need them, but where we need them we are not going to get them, because you are not going to get doctors, for example, to go out into the smaller outports in Newfoundland. And you might get the doctor, but a young doctor graduated is usually married, you may get the doctor but you are not going to get his wife. And so the pressure on the man to stay in a large urban area - or not a large, but a urban area the size of Gander, Grand Falls is very great.



MR. WELLS:

And you are not going to get men just because we are turning them out at the Medical School, you are not going to get them pouring up to Ming's Bight or the Coast of Labrador, they are just not going to do it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman would permit?

MR. WELLS: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He said something - the hon. member said something about allowing the university to start this or that or the other school, School of Engineering, school of anything, School of Law, School of Music, School of Nursing and so on. Would he not agree that the decision to start a school ought not to be exclusively the right of the university, but that the government, who are the owners of the university and who foot the bills for virtually all - not all - of its expenditure ought to have the right to say to the university, "We want you" if they do want, "the university to start this or that school;" that the initiative ought not to lie exclusively with the university. There might well come times when the government, as the owner of the whole university, might wish to say, "Look, we will finance, we would like you to start a school of this or a school of that."

MR. WELLS: I agree. I could not conceive of a situation where if as a matter of public policy the government of a province said to the university, because there is only one here, you know, "We feel that you should start a school of whatever it might be and we are prepared to pay for it," and I could not conceive of a university saying no. I think that would be an abdication of all responsibility.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But they have not done so, not butt in and tell them how to run it.

MR. WELLS: Yes, that is the point I am getting at. You know, if we were so good at univeristy administration that we know better than they, then that is what we should be doing. But I think we should, and when I say we, the government, the House of Assembly has the - yes, the arbitors, I suppose is the proper word, of the public policy in this Province. I think we should say which direction - not exclusively. I mean, if we thought technical subjects, engineering or medicine or something like that should be most important, again I would think the univeristy would be abdicating its responsibility if it said, "All right, we will put it into engineering, we will put it all into medicine, and we will cut out the school of fine arts, or we will cut out that sort of thing." University education is a balanced thing, but the point I think here is that our univeristy is not like some of the world's great universities which are largely funded by private bequests and donations and foundations and contributions. Our university I suppose - what? - I suppose ninety-eight per cent of the money funding Memorial University is public money, would you say, Mr. Speaker?

MR. HOUSE: Not quite that much.

MR. WELLS: Not that much, Ninety-five?

MR. HOUSE: Eighty something.

MR. WELLS: Yes, it is well up there. And I suppose

MR. WELLS: there are very few universities in the Western World that have to have a greater chunk of public monies to keep them going. Now the universities of which I spoke, that have only a small proportion of their income from public monies, would tell any government where to go if the government as a string attached to a few million dollars came in and told them how to run their operation, they would tell them where to go fast. I think for instance that if the British Government were to try that with Oxford or Cambridge, very quickly the answer would come back, "Look, we have been running these institutions since 1200, and we intend to keep on running them and if you do not like it you can lump it, and you can keep your money and we will manage." I think that is the answer you will get from these universities, although goodness knows the state is into everything today, particularly in England, to such a degree that even there they may not be able to get along with public monies.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Maybe the hon. gentleman with his usual, gracious, generosity in these matters would allow me? Certain control over all the universities in the United Kingdom, all without exception, a large amount of control is exercised by a public body, appointed by the government, I believe, of the nation, although the appointment may not be exclusively governmental. It may be partly governmental and partly university, but exercised by, I think it is called, is it the University Commission?

MR. WELLS: There is some such name. Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Some such title as that, and they have an enormous amount of say, not in the internal management of the university, not in deciding which professor or associate professor or lecturer or demonstrator will be employed, not in what they are to teach or how they are to teach it, but in certain purely business and financial matters a tremendous amount of authority, without any suggestion of interfering with academic freedom.

MR. WELLS: I am sure that such is the case very, very much more in England now than twenty-odd years ago when I was there, because of course the power of the state is steadily decreasing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And because they are paying so much money.

MR. WELLS: And they are paying so much money. Of course, this is how the state in all modern countries really advances its power. It does not set out I think by ministers and members and people in government sitting down and saying, we are going to move into that, but once they start paying more and more of the shot then their power becomes greater. But anyway I suppose that is another subject.

So what I would say vis-à-vis Memorial, Mr. Speaker, I would have no hesitation and would support the government fully if the government draws a line, as I am sure it will and does, with regard to Memorial. It would have my complete support if it drew that line hard and fast, and if it fought Memorial down in its budget and forced it to economize in certain areas, which I am sure it does. That is fine and I support it totally, but I do not see pouring over the salary or the expense account of an individual professor in this House but the restrictions - yes, absolutely. They have to be imposed. They have to be imposed in every area of our lives here in Newfoundland or we will not survive. That is how I see the situation. But of all the areas of our public life

MR. WELLS:

in Newfoundland, the area where I, as an individual, would sacrifice most in terms of my taxes would be in the area of education. Now to talk more directly on the principle of this bill and the education of young people, which obviously is many fold, but we are talking here of polytechnical education as well as university education. I mentioned the word 'sacrifice' which we all do to a greater or lesser extent by paying taxes in this Province and in this country to keep the whole thing going. I would say this, I feel much better as a taxpayer about paying for the education of the children of this Province and the young people of this Province than any other thing, I think even the roads that I drive over.

I think certain things that we have gotten into, for example, in Canada, certain things like family allowances, I do not think they should continue as they have continued. Quite frankly, I do not see why I should get a check or my wife get a check for family allowance for my children who were whatever age it is - I forget where it cuts off, sixteen or something. I really do not see it. I think many members in this House are in the same boat, many members in the community, who do not need these payments.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is this not done to prevent snobbery?

MR. WELLS: I suppose.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So that the youngster in the classroom who is getting it is not sneered at by the youngster whose parents are wealthy and that youngster does not get it? Is it not to prevent that?

MR. WELLS: It could be. You know, I have heard that advanced and it may be a perfectly legitimate thing. But what I am really saying is that, you know, the budget of this country, of Canada, is getting so huge in relation to its size that control and extent of government is going so many areas, and some areas I think are getting short shrift and other areas so much money is going into. I myself - and this is a personal thing - would like to see more selectivity. You know, nobody would want to see money go more than I to elderly people, people who have served and worked their lives for the community should not be in want. But if a man reaches sixty-five and he is not in want, should

MR. WELLS:

he get an old age pension? Suppose he is really comfortably off and God knows, the state knows now who is well off and who is not: They have got the figures, they have got all the books - you know, should we, should we not become more selective - I am wondering and I wonder it aloud - in our social welfare system so that in areas of technical training, in areas of the people who really need it, elderly people, young people, children who need that education so desperately and have the ability whether it be technical or academic, whichever, you know, should we not be more selective in funnelling our public monies? This is the question we are asking.

But whether we are selective or not and whether we just lash it out or not, I say as an individual and a member of this House, I am more pleased to see my tax dollar go to educate young people than any other thing, any other direction that it can go. I say that and mean it.

Now I know a lot of young people. I have come across them. I have teenage children myself, and older. I have defended people in the courts of this Province. I have defended ever so many young people in trouble over the years, from marijuana, hashish, cocaine, every substance you can think of, every kind of trouble you can think of, from rape to break and entry and all sorts of things. I have spoken at the university, in schools. I have come across a lot of young people. And I will say this, Mr. Speaker, with all our faults and with all their shortcomings - and we all have them - I still think that we are breeding and bringing up a fine generation of young people in Newfoundland today. And I talk to them, I talk to seventeen and eighteen and twenty year olds all the time and I believe they have more on the ball than I had when I was that age and my contemporaries. I really think they have.

So that with all the faults of our educational system, it is not doing everything wrong. Somebody is doing something right because I really think that we are producing young people who can compete and compete well and who have things on the ball, are thinking about questions which, quite honestly, when I was seventeen or eighteen and nineteen I

MR. WELLS:

did not even think about. So that, you know, the last twenty-five years have wrought great changes in education and they have not been all bad. And it upsets me for one to hear people saying, as you sometimes do, that our schools are not doing the job they ought, they are not turning out young people and that the young people in this Province and this country are going nowhere. I do not believe it.

Sure we have got our misfits and we have got our criminals and we have got these sorts of people, but we still have a very fine great many young people who I think are going to make a tremendous contribution in the future and who are already able to make it.

You know I was talking a few moments ago about Memorial and I

Mr. R. Wells:

come back to Memorial now. I started Memorial in 1949, the year it became a University, and I suppose it is hard for me to be objective about Memorial because I owe that institution - not the present one, but what it was - I suppose I owe that University - I spent four years, its first four years as a University I spent there, - and it is incalculable to me as a person and an individual what I owe that institution, and what I owe those who put it there, and paid for it, and in its inception sacrificed, and who it is called after. I cannot think of anything more in my whole life that I owe more to than there, because I think the quality - I cannot judge now, only secondhand - but then I could judge because the quality of the education that was obtained and the training that was given in Memorial in these first four years of its life as a University, which I was there, and partook of and was part of, and I could compare it after to Oxford University, and in the fields, in the various - I know it was not as broadly based, nor did it cover one-tenth of of the subjects, but in what it taught and what I partook of it stood up, I think, and ranked anywhere, and I make no bones about saying it. As I say maybe when I am talking about the University, maybe I am not the one to be objective because I owe so much to it. And there are a great many - and I look around this House, and there are a great many others too in this House who owe so much to that University.

So I do not think that we should ignore it. I do not think that we should let it run away with money. I think we should put the brakes on it, and I would have no hesitation in supporting the government in making that brutally clear to the President and the Board of Regents. But at the same time I do not think we should go right into its guts to the extent that we are making the University decisions and not the University. If they are not making proper decisions, if money is being thrown to the four winds, then I think we should use our power to replace the people who are there. But as long as they are there, and as long as they are doing a good job,



Mr. Wells:

we should support them, But at the same time say, "You only operate within the financial constraints that this Province operates, and that you cannot go on, no matter how important we regard education, you have not got carte blanche and you cannot go on beyond a certain point, and insofar as money is concerned we will, the government of the people, the representatives of the people in this House, will draw the line, and you will fit within it. But within these constrictions you have our complete and total support," and I think that is the way it should be.

So far as technical education is concerned and our young people, I think we have got to face certain other things too, Mr. Speaker. I happen not to think that Newfoundland can absorb at the moment all the young people who are coming out of its University and its technical colleges and its schools, I do not think we can absorb them into jobs which they are fitted and trained to do. Now maybe as the future comes along, as more things develop, I think we will be able to absorb more and more, I think we are absorbing them all of the time. It is astonishing to me sometimes how many young people we can absorb into good, well paying jobs, jobs where they can make the contribution that they are trained for. But at the same time I think it would be wrong for us to preach to our younger people, "Look, you have got to find a job in Newfoundland at all costs, and a job in Newfoundland sweeping the street is better than being a skilled tradesman in Ontario or in New York or in British Columbia or in Southeast Asia, come to that." I think that I would like to see, and prefer to see our young people grow up with the faith in this whole world, and the faith in the country, and the faith in the Continent that they would feel that the whole world was their oyster, and if the opportunity was present here in Newfoundland take it and make something of it. But if the opportunity was present in British Columbia get out there, supposing they had to go on a bicycle. I think that should apply to people of all ages, working ages, I mean

Mr. Wells:

after all, you know, take any of us; if there was no opportunity here surely to heaven rather than sit down and ask the rest of the country to support us we would get up and go wherever it was necessary to go?

MR. NEARY: That was Jay Parker's philosophy.

MR. WELLS: Well, no. If Jay Parker - Jay Parker got in a lot of trouble, you remember there a few years ago for saying, not that, I do not think that is what he said. I think he - the impression I got, was that we should export people. That is not what I am suggesting.

MR. SMALLWOOD: His point was that we just could not support our population.

MR. WELLS: That we could not. I think we can support our population; I think as we develop we will support a bigger population. But the point is that even if there was a job here for a young fellow, a job right here, but there was a better job in British Columbia and he was fitted and qualified for it, surely to heavens he would consider going, and why not? A country is not built by people saying, Well I belong here, and I cannot stir out of this.

Mr. Wells.

My Heavens! Look at us around this Chamber. Our people came from England, from Ireland, from Scotland, from all over the place. Why? I presume for some reason at that given point of history they thought there was a better opportunity in the New World, and why should they not? If people use this attitude, We are going to stick to one little spot, you know, I belong to St. John's, if there is an opportunity in Grand Falls, I cannot go there, you know, because I live here. No country was ever built that way. Just take the U.S., a tremendous country. Well it goes without saying. Look how that was colonized with people from the Old World who landed and built up the Eastern Seaboard but wave after wave of them went West, even up to eighty or one hundred years ago, and built a country, and they did it. They did not do it by being immobile. They did it by having that spirit of adventure, that desire to make something of themselves and the country. That is what made that country great, and that is what makes every country great. And I would hate Newfoundland young people to feel, Well, boys, we will stick here, and we will get any kind of a job, it does not matter, but we will not go on somewhere else to some other part of the country or some other part of the world to take an opportunity because there is a job here. Because I would like to see more people also come to Newfoundland. We cannot absorb a great crowd, but people have come into Newfoundland right from day one and they have made a tremendous contribution. Look, my seat mate here to my right has come from another country and made a great contribution. My friend from across the way has come from Scotland, and he is making a contribution. He is making it here in this House.

Do not ever let us get so small and so parochical that we do not want to see people come in from outside, or we do not want to see our own people go out and enrich another country. We have got to strike a balance and Canada has got to

Mr. Wells.

strike a balance with its immigration policy and with its policies toward people moving about within this country.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. member not agree that ninety-nine per cent of the Newfoundlanders up in Ontario would come down if a new factory started for a better job?

MR. WELLS: They probably would. But you know what would happen, I think, is that they would come back with greater skills, probably greater drive, and a lot of more attributes than if they never had the opportunity to get away and see something else and work somewhere else. So, you know, I say to our young people, Do not feel hidebound; Do not feel that you get a few days work, and go on unemployment insurance and call it a day, but feel that you are in a great country, a country that has a future. and it only has a future if young people and middle age people and all the people who work and contribute are prepared to give it a future. That is the only way it is going to have a future. If we sit down on our backsides and say, Somebody else is going to do it, somebody else is going to support us, somebody else is going to put something here, somebody else is going to pay for it, we will never make this country great. And I think we could take a leaf out of the people of forty, fifty and hundred years ago. And it is a funny thing, you know, but I have no hesitation myself in feeling from what I have read, you know, that before we had the vast social security apparatus which we have now I believe countries built faster. I often think that the social security apparatus does not really encourage a country and the people in the country to build and to make it great. You know, these social services are marvellous things. They serve a great purpose. They are expensive to maintain but, you know, sometimes I feel that they rob people of the initiative that they need. This is the hard fact of any social programme that

Mr. Wells.

you bring in. You bring it in for someone who needs it and should have it, but somebody else who does not need it takes advantage of it and lies back on his oars. We are going to have to look at that in Canada, I think, in the next ten years, and in the next five years, and in the next two or three years. We are going to have to look at that. And we have got to try to come out of this not with the system that they have in Sweden - fine country though it is - where now we read that people are lying back on their oars, and people are saying, Well I have got this right, and I have got that right, and I can take so many days off. I remember seeing in Time Magazine recently - I think it was Time Magazine - talking about the number of days off a man is entitled to. You know, if his children are sick, that is fine. Everybody has to take a day off sometimes if their children are sick. But the point is that apparently in Sweden they are allowed so many days off a year and they take them whether their children are sick or not. No country is going to get great that way.

MR. NEARY: Canada leads the Western World in all time lost by strikes, sickness -

MR. WELLS: Yes, sickness, all sorts of thing.

MR. NEARY: - and all that sort of thing.

MR. WELLS: Yes. That is right! There is something wrong there.

MR. NEARY: Canada leads the whole world.

MR. WELLS: Yes, there is something wrong. There is something wrong. And I wonder if it is not that with this social security blanket that we have in this

MR. WELLS: - country that is not making people say, "Well, what the heck!" And this is a dangerous thing and my feeling is that a country gets strong, not by an individual saying, "I want to make this country strong," people do not go around saying that, but people want to say, "I can get ahead, that there is a future for me and if I work hard and get off my seat, the seat of my pants, and make an effort that I can make something of myself." And if enough people are saying that and enough people are doing it they make the country great. The people who rolled west in the covered wagons in the United States were not saying, "Well, we are going to make this country great." They were going for a life and lives for themselves and their children. But when enough did it it made the country great. And we have got to design our social systems here in Canada in such a way that a young man and a young woman can grow up feeling that, There is something I can do and I am going to get paid for it, and I can get paid for it well enough to live and have a good life for myself and my children, and I want to stay in this country and I want to make it great and I want to have faith in it.

And I did not intend perhaps to get off on this track but -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before the hon. gentleman gets off that theme, I wonder if he would allow me to pose a problem to him? The ambition of the world, the Western world, is obviously an ambition for an ever better and bigger and higher standard of living. Bigger houses, bigger cars, more furniture, more roads, more paving, more everything and better, bigger and more costly and expensive. And a natural assumption on everybody's part that year, after year, after year he has got to rise and rise in the world higher and higher and live more and more expensively

MR. SMALLWOOD:

and have more and more comfort and convenience and luxury, that this has got to be an annual thing. And any year that does not see an increase and an improvement is a lost year. Does he feel that that ideal is right, that it ought to be pursued, that it is right to pursue it, and that the standard can rise? There can be better houses, better furnished, better cars, bigger cars and every everything bigger and better and costlier, that that is in fact possible, that the productivity of Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom and other countries can be improved, and in fact will be improved, that people will work harder, that they will produce more to justify the ever increasing and rising standard of living? Or, on the other hand, the very opposite: Can we all, and would it be good if we all ate less, dressed less, smaller houses, less pretentious, smaller cars? Is it really necessary for us all to maintain the standard of living, the incredible standard of living that we have already reached? Is that - What ought we to aim at to prevent collapse of the whole economy of the world?

MR. WELLS: The hon. member has posed an interesting question and a vital question which I would love to debate with him on. For my part all I can say is in recent years I have eaten less at least, you know. But no, let me say this. I do not think that we can continue to support an ever increasing standard of living in this country - and I mean Canada now. In fact, I think myself that around about 1972 we reached the high point in terms of material increase in standard of living.

MR. ROBERTS: Has the hon. gentleman read the Club of Rome study?

MR. WELLS: Yes, I have read reports of it, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: It is sobering, though.

MR. WELLS: I think there is no question about it. Well, maybe it was 1972, maybe it was 1973. But at that point, when the energy crisis was what really brought it into focus, we got to the point in Canada, when we started, our standard of living - and not only

MR WELLS:

Canada, but the rest of the Western World-started to decline and it declined because although our wages were going up, our money was buying less. And I think the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) would agree with me. I do not know when it was, but it was somewhere in the early seventies. And I think that the standard of living of Canada now is below what it was, material standard, in 1970. Now I do not think for one moment that we should be



Mr. Wells: aiming for bigger cars. I do not think we can aim for bigger cars, I think the cost of energy five years from now, the cost of a gallon of gasoline - well, what is it now? \$1.03, \$1.04, \$1.05 depending on whether it is premium or what?

MR. MURPHY: \$1.08.

MR. WELLS: \$1.08.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that octane?

MR. WELLS: I think myself as an individual with no knowledge any more than anybody else, I think that five years from now it is going to be \$2.00 maybe \$3.00 a gallon I think it is that in parts of Europe now. I think it is -

AN HON. MEMBER: How much?

MR. WELLS: It is \$2.00 or \$3.00 a gallon more. No question about it at all, and that is beyond our control. If we find it off the Coast of this country we are talking twelve or fifteen years ahead, if we are talking Tar Sand development, we are still taking several years ahead. But whichever way you cut the cake, it is going to be \$2.00, \$3.00 a gallon in four or five years and upwards, and ten years from now if we are driving cars they are not going to be any bigger, in my opinion, than would encase your own body and perhaps that of another person along with you. And I would not doubt that we will go back to these - what do you call them? mo-peds or something that you peddle part of the time and have a little engine in the back wheel to take you up over hills. This is the sort of thing that is coming.

MR. MURPHY: We will be right back to your TR2's.

MR. WELLS: Right back. And if we think otherwise, if we think that -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. member is only talking about a car -

MR. WELLS: No, no, -

MR. SMALLWOOD: - only because of a shortage of gas.

MR. WELLS: Oh, yes I am going to deal with other things.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The whole -

MR. WELLS: The whole thing. When you talk about gas you also think of electricity and heating, the same thing is coming to the Western World in that respect. So that we are going to have to scale down our material expectations in certain ways, but this is to do with energy. I think that we will be able to have high material expectations perhaps in other ways, in ways that technology can bring about. So that I do not think, for example, let us take the United States, let us take the supplies of coal which they have, which can support that country in terms of energy for hundreds of years. I think technology will go in that direction, and other directions that I do not know anything about. But I think the oil based technology that we have lived on for the past few years, I think that has to change. Now I do not think that we will ever again have the material expectations that we have had in the last twenty-five years since the war, in answer to my hon. friend's question. I do not think so, but I think that we will have to learn to fulfill our expectations in other ways, and I think technology will play a very important part in that, and I think social pursuits, educational pursuits, human development, is going to be extremely important.

But I would say this to the hon. gentleman, and his experience is vastly greater than mine of life, but I would say this; if you take away some form of attraction, some carrot, something to lead a person on and let him or her make the effort, if you take that away you are going to be back to Brave New World or Nineteen Eighty-Four, where you had a population that was stultified, unable to do anything except behave like sheep; if you take away that you will have what you have in Russia, where I was told by a fellow who visited it, oh this may have been ten years ago, and he said, when he drove in from the airport in Moscow here were women down on their hands and knees with trowels leveling off the asphalt road. Now I do not want to see us come to that kind of thing. And it is not because Russia did not have the technology to build an asphalt machine, it was the social system and

MR. WELLS:

the economic system that they had. So we have got to, if we can find it, we have got to keep rewards for people, We have got to make a difference between the man who lies down and says, "I am doing nothing. Let someone else feed me," and the man who gets up and makes the effort. And if we want to teach our children anything, and if we want to train our young people in anything, as I see it, without knowing all of the answers, without being able to see the global picture, because none of us can, more than anything else we must be prepared in Newfoundland to channel our resources into something to train our young people, and to give them - you know, you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink. If a young person wants to shoot himself full of drugs and beer or whatever else, you are not going to make an educated working person out of him. But if he has the desire and if he wants to make the effort, we have the obligation as the leaders and the taxpayers of this Province and this country to make it possible for him to do so. And if we have to make sacrifices in terms of taxes, if we have to lower our own standard of living to make that possible, then I say, so be it let us do it, and no crying over it. Let us do it.

So any money, any dollar of mine as a taxpayer

MR. WELLS: that goes into a polytechnic or to a university or to a school in this province, I say fine, great, I am all for it. But I do not want to see it wasted, that I think the public of Newfoundland feels exactly the same as I do. I am sure the members of the House do. Let us spend it, let us spend it wisely, let us ride herd on it. Let us make sure it is not thrown to the four winds. Let us make sure we do not have too classy buildings, buildings that are overbuilt, facilities that are not necessary. We may yet have to get into a system where educational facilities are used far more than the few hours a day that they are used now. Let us ride herd on it, let us be rough about it, but let us not deny the opportunity for education. I think we have got into concrete and glass and steel, facilities that far transcend what I think real education is all about.

Education is people, books the wherewithal to do a scientific experiment and the will and desire to do so. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I think my time is run out. I did not intend to get into these subjects but these are I think are interesting and worthwhile debating in this House. And I have no hesitation in heartily supporting this Bill, not only as a member of this House but as a taxpayer and a citizen of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I think I must be the seventh or eighth speaker to speak on this Bill. I just have a few words to say about it. I must say, that all of the speakers that have spoken I think there has been unanimity amongst all of us for the need for a polytechnical institute in this province. Now, I myself spent some five years as the principal of a high school, and I think one of the honourable members here alluded to a topsy-turvy situation that happened some years ago. It was only, I think, three years ago that a particular student of mine told me that she had wanted to go to vocational school but unfortunately her marks did not allow her. But she has gotten into university, she had been accepted for university, however that was not what she

wanted to do she thought she would spend a year there. Now that sort of a situation I think is something that needs to be overcome.

I feel that we must have the wherewithal in the province to be able to respond to the needs of the province very quickly. We must be able to, if it is the Lower Churchill or if it is the fishery, if it is the woods industry, I think that we must have the capability to be able to train our students and train them in the type of skills that are needed in this province. I do agree with the honourable member for Kilbride that when we do train our students in skills, and we do give them a proper education in this province, we are also giving them the capability to be able to go anywhere in the world and to be able to take up the task as an equal citizen anywhere in Canada or in the world. I think there is nothing wrong with this.

However, looking at Bill I see that it is a pulling together of the schools at the present time and the Premier said that there will be added facilities. Now I, even the pulling together of the existing facilities into a polytechnical institute, I think is a good thing. One of the things that has always bothered me is that we have so many facilities in this province in the same areas which are used for so short a time, for such short times, but yet we have duplicated costs in community after community. At the present time in the school that I recently or left some time ago there is a woodworking shop there. The students use it throughout the day, that is the students from the school. There is also a metal shop in that particular school, it is one of those DREE schools. It is not an experiment anymore. It goes on all the time. At the present time the Bay St. George Community Council is using the facilities that is in that day school. The more of this we see in this province, the more of the coming

MR. HODDEP together and using facilities and breaking the structured system that we have at the present time, so that we use our facilities to the maximum advantage, then I think the better we will be off and the more perhaps tax dollars we will be able to save.

MR. HODDER:

Now, there is something else I would like to say and it is on the polytechnical institute. Some four years ago I was a member of the Chamber of Commerce, Bay St. George. It takes in Bay St. George, it takes in my district. There are members on it from my district. And I was one of the directors and I was responsible for education. At that time, as some hon. members may remember, there was a fight between communities in the briefs sent to ministers, all that sort of thing, because the West Coast Regional College was going to be built somewhere. And, of course, Stephenville's and Bay St. George's feeling, the feeling in the area and the feeling from all the groups in the area, all the councils in the area, right from St. George's to the Bill of Cape St. George, the feeling was that it should come in Bay St. George. We fought very hard for it. But the government decided that it would go to Corner Brook. Now that is done. I say nothing about it. We put up our fight. We sent our briefs. We used the publicity. We did all that sort of thing. And it went to Corner Brook. I have at this time, perhaps deep down within me, I would have liked to have seen - I hate to lose a fight. But the day that it did go to Corner Brook - and I am giving the history of the West Coast version of the polytechnical institute - that particular day it was announced by Premier Moores, the Premier, at a Rotary luncheon in Corner Brook - I heard it, I listened to it - he told the Rotarians that indeed they would have the West Coast Regional College, it would be built in Corner Brook, they would not be using the buildings in Stephenville. But he went on to say that Stephenville would get the polytechnical institute. He made that promise. It is documented. It is on tape. I have heard it. So has everybody in Bay St. George. And do you know, Mr. Speaker, that for the

MR. HODDER:

past three years we laboured under the assumption in Bay St. George that the polytechnical institute was going to be built sometime or other, that it had been deferred, and it was only when the Minister of Education made a statement that it would go in Western Newfoundland-or it would go in St. John's,or the thing that was going to be drawn together, that we realized, you know, we are not going to get it.

MR. MURPHY: Is that "the" polytech or "a" polytech, only one?

MR. HODDER: "A", I meant a polytechnical institute.

Now, again if I were on the other side of the House, and I had to make a decision as to where the polytechnical institute - well personally I feel in many cases that perhaps we have centralized our education facilities too much and in this day of quick communication that we can move things in other parts of the Province. However, we ask for a regional college, we were promised a polytechnical institute, and we got a community college. Now there is a bill coming up on the community college in a little while and I will have something to say about that. What I am pointing out here is that there was a broken promise. There was a promise made. It was made. It was printed. It has been said. No one on the other side of the House would dare deny that the promise was made. It has not happened. And I cannot let this bill go by - perhaps I am lowering the tone of the debate somewhat - but I cannot let this particular bill go by without saying that the Premier of this Province has broken another promise in Bay St. George, and that was one that was made firmly. His words were, "A polytechnical institute will go to Bay St. George and in the long run they will be better off than perhaps the people of Corner Brook." Then he went on to tell what a great thing this would be.

So I had to raise that, Mr. Speaker. However, those words aside and those particular feelings aside, I do think that this is a good thing. I do think we need a polytechnical institute. I



MR. HODDER:

do hope it goes ahead this year, as the Premier said it would. It is for the good of the Province. Perhaps the place where it must go, that is a decision. I wanted to point out a broken promise. But I do hope that it will be a successful thing. I say one other thing, that even though the Premier had promised the polytechnical institute to Stephenville, he can still make good because we do have a Bay St. George Community College. That is what we got. I will speak more about that when we get to that particular bill. But I think that there is a potential there which perhaps would solve the needs of the whole area. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Being so far out here in right field it is extremely hard apparently to get recognized. So it is very gratifying that at last after about three days that I can manage to get into the debate.

Mr. Speaker, what I am going to say a few words on pertains to a major part of this bill that I think merits reconsideration by the government. But before so doing I would like to say that certainly we all support the principle of this bill as such to establish a polytechnical institute in Newfoundland. The fact of the matter is though I think we have to remember that this very beneficial institution can only come when funds are available to commence it and to finish it. We have been informed that a start is about to be made. Now the funds will have to come from that portion of the budget available for education, quite obviously, and quite obviously there is far from an unlimited supply of money in this province. So we are going to have to decide our priorities in education as to what priority this institute gets.

Now the thing that bothers me before we decide how to slice the pie as it were, the economic pie available for education, as to how we can possibly make the necessary objective judgements to this end without the budget of Memorial University being available for us to determine how Memorial is really spending its money. As Memorial would be one of the items which would have a very high claim, and justifiably so, on the educational monies which are available from this province for the ensuing year and years to come, and I say pray tellus, we know that this is a very necessary step that is being taken, but how in heaven's name can we make a really objective judgement of the amount that should go to vocational education, the amount that should go to post-secondary education and to secondary education if one of these institutions does not have to come before this legislature and indicate the

MR. MARSHALL: general nature and extent and reasons and what exactly it is doing with its money?

But the point that I want to bring up is probably related to that, but it is a matter on this bill itself, Mr. Speaker, and it is a matter of the financial control of this legislature over institutions, and how this bill, in my mind, falls somewhat short and endangers the possibility of another elitist institute or organization growing up in the presence and persons of this polytechnical institution. Now I think we all agree that every member who has spoken to one degree or another agrees that this institution, and all government agencies for that matter, must be more responsive to this legislature which votes the funds, that there must be a means devised for the purpose of not only of tabling the budgets of the various crown agencies, crown corporations, institutes, university and what have you, but there must be method devised for the efficient means of examining these budgets so that intelligent voting can be made on it particularly in these days where dollars are very scarce. Yet this act to my mind falls a little bit short of a satisfactory procedure for the examination of the budget of this institution.

Now if we look at Memorial, to get back to Memorial again, we see from the Memorial University Act that there is no requirement whatsoever for Memorial to submit its budget to this legislature, or for that matter to submit it to the Minister of Education or to submit it to anybody. I think in actual fact, in practice certainly over the past few years, the practice has grown up that Memorial has presented a budget of sorts, as it were, a very loose budget to the Ministry of Education but it never gets before the floor of this House.

MR. NEARY: As a matter of fact the president made a statement that he would publish it in the newspaper before he would give it to the members of the House of Assembly.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, I do not choose to debate with the president, but if the president made that statement it is a very unwise statement for him to make.

MR. NEARY: For a man who used to teach Political Science it certainly is.

MR. MARSHALL: And not one that I would find myself to be supportable.

But now on this bill, what does this bill do? This bill, as far as I can see under section 13 of the act, attempts to come half way between the position of no reporting that Memorial has the right to, and the responsibility to this legislature that the general public of this Province has a right. Because section 13 says, Mr. Speaker, "The Board shall (this is the Board of Governors in the institution) submit to the minister a budget containing the estimates of that institute for the year - the polytechnical institute - and the minister may approve or disapprove of the budget," and then it goes on in section 14 to say that, "The general funds of board shall consist of any monies appropriated by the legislature for the institute or for the purposes of the board." Nowhere in the bill does it say that the budget of this institute

Mr. Marshall:

is to be tabled here in the Legislature or for there to be provisions for the discussing of that budget before monies are granted to it. What is required is that the Board merely submit a budget to the minister, who may or may not inform the Legislature, he certainly has no duty to do so, and the Legislature then appropriates money. And what I am afraid of is exactly the self same thing will happen in fact under this bill as now apparently happens in practice with Memorial University in that the monies for the polytechnical institute will be voted in one block as they are in the case of Memorial University, and that the budget itself will not get the detailed examination that such a budget must have.

So I am going to make -

MR. SMALLWOOD: They will be treated like the University rather than the trade schools and the technology college and the Fisheries College.

MR. HOUSE: The same legislation now as we got for the technology colleges.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, but what I am afraid of really is, you know, that - I do not know whether I understand the observation - Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can talk over the din either.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member is finding it difficult to speak with the noise, so if hon. members would govern themselves accordingly.

MR. MARSHALL: But the position is, you know, the position is whether it is Memorial University or the polytech institute or the other Cinderellas of the government, the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation, which is really a story in itself as to its latitude that it gets in the expenditure of public funds, or for that matter another Cinderella child, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, whatever the agency or the Crown corporation involved, or the institute involved, that they should be responsive to this Legislature. And I am going to make a suggestion now that I would hope that the minister would take into consideration and that when we come into Committee perhaps the government might see itself

Mr. Marshall:

clear to remedy the situation as presented by this Act.

I think it is a good thing that the Board of Governors have to submit their estimates to the minister, but I think that it should go further. I think there should be a requirement on the Minister of Education or on the government to table the estimates for, or the budget for, this institute within twenty-four hours of their tabling of the general estimates of the government. Because that would mean then that it would be available to this House when the provision, whatever form it comes in, the general estimates would be available, at least, for the members of this House to be able to examine this detailed budget and to have advanced notice and to be able to intelligently debate and answer questions when the particular vote comes before the House.

Now I go even further than that, I think that this provision ought to be in each and every kindred type of legislation of this kind. I think it ought to be provided for Memorial University, it ought certainly to be provided for the Hydro Corporation, the Housing Corporation, for the Liquor Corporation, and for the Harmon Corporation, the myriad boards and Crown corporations that operate under the shelter of this government, and operate from the basis of public funds. I think further, as well, that it is impractical to think that just the mere tabling of these particular budgets will serve the purpose. I think there ought to be established in this House a permanent Standing Committee on Crown corporations, government agencies and the University for the purpose of examining the estimates or the budgets of these particular concerns including the polytechnical institute, that such a committee will have to be given a certain period of time in which to report back, say twenty-five hours before the main estimates are passed to ensure that these myriad concerns which in effect operate very, very independently of this government get at least some type of examination, some intelligent type of examination of their budgets and estimates. Because, Mr. Speaker, I am very

March 21, 1977

Tape 1130

PK - 3

Mr. Marshall:

afearred of the way things are going now we get these block  
provisions presented to us for

MR. MARSHALL: the various concerns. There is not enough information available for members to ask proper and appropriate questions. For instance you take Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro - and obviously I am not going to get into a debate, Mr. Speaker. But before you call me to order about a matter not under debate here this is with relation to the polytechnical institute and the requirement of reporting to the legislature. That is where it hits its relevancy. You take the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation, I mean they have been operating here in its new form for three or four years. They have been more or less the darling of this government for the past two or three years and there are issues that should be discussed. In this province of 500,000 souls we cannot be indirectly supporting a jet airplane with an eligible work force of what? - about 80,000 people and twenty percent of them being out of work and a jet plane being used by one of the Crown corporations to ferry officials of Newfoundland Hydro hither, tither and yon and what have you. If this plane were sold and turned into cash, as it certainly should be, then there would be that much more money available to CFLCo., there would be that much more money coming back in dividends to this province and that is where it is relevant.

MR. NFARY: Come on over on this side of the House, boy.

MR. MARSHALL: I am afraid I could not come over on the other side of the House. I shan't get into the other side of the House today, Mr. Speaker, because I want to talk about sensible things and sensible matters. This is what I am trying to do.

But the only point I want to bring up on this bill, Mr. Speaker, is ask the government, please do not start, do not create another elitist type of institute - you know not to create another, as I say, elitist type of institute or agency which surely will occur if this bill is passed, and to at least provide in the legislation here that these estimates or this budget that is to be presented



MR. MARSHALL: to the minister must be tabled here contemporaneously with the tabling of the estimates, the main estimates themselves, or within twenty-four hours so at the very least we will have the opportunity to be able to intelligently look at the workings and operations of the institute itself so that we can see whether or not they deserve to be voted the money which they wish to have voted to them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the member before he completes his speech allow me to ask him to clarify a point that arose in the course of his speech? He said that the legislation now before the House does not provide for the tabling of the budget of the polytechnic in this chamber and provision of an opportunity therefore for a debate on that budget. I would like to ask him if he can tell me whether the legislation that exists with regard to the Fisheries College and with regard to the College of Technology and with regard to the sixteen or seventeen trade schools provides for the tabling of their budgets which, of course, would lead to the opportunity in this House to debate those budgets? Unlike the case of the university, where there is no legislative provision for the tabling of their budget, or opportunity to debate their budget, that in fact - do I understand him to suggest that in the absence of that particular provision in the present bill that we are now debating, in the absence of that there maybe, in fact, no budget tabled, no opportunity to debate, that it will be exactly like the case of the university? Is that what the hon. gentleman is suggesting?

MR. MARSHALL: What I am saying is these other institutes, to which the hon. member referred, the other concerns are very much similar to this one, the polytechnical institute, that is now being brought before the House here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But their budgets are tabled.

MR. MARSHALL: No, wait now. No, I do not think they are tabled.

Are they? Are their budgets tabled?

MR. HOUSE: Every detail can be tabled.

MR. MARSHALL: Wait now. They can be tabled.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But they are and the Auditor General's reported on them.

MR. MARSHALL: Well now that is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman brings up from time to time when I have made statements like this. But what the Auditor General reports on, and this is a significant fact, is he reports on what has occurred after the fact. He does not -

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is all any audit does.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman will agree with that. It is a fait accompli.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But all audits are like that.

MR. MARSHALL: All audits are like it. Now what I am asking for is something different. I am asking for the budgets that are presented to the minister, be it under this act or any other act, that they be tabled prior to the voting of the estimates for that particular year to which they apply. In other words, we have before us at the time the budgets and we know exactly what we are voting on. We do not get the budgets one year, eighteen months or even two years afterwards, after the monies have been spent, after the Auditor General can only report on irregularities. And the Auditor General never reports, because it is not within his province, as to whether or not it was appropriate to have the money spent in the first place other than the fact if the money were spent beyond the law, beyond the reach of the law. But he never inquires as to whether it is appropriate, whether we can afford it, because these issues are not his concern. And what I would like to

MR. MARSHALL:

see with respect to this particular institute, the other agencies to which the hon. member refers, Crown corporations, Memorial University, is a tabling of the estimates and the establishment of a permanent, standing committee here in this House for the purpose of examining these estimates and reporting back before the main estimates are passed because it is only that way that this House can regain some of the control, a lot of the control that has been wrestled from its hands by reason of the fact that of the creation of these myriad Crown corporations and agencies that spend a large part and a large hunk of the money that is appropriated by this legislature here.

So this is my suggestion. I would hope the minister would address himself to it because, after all, it is this government which has taken steps to restore to the House of Assembly its control over the spending and the borrowing, and what have you, in this Province, and I think that its steps under the Financial Administration Act were good steps that were taken. But I do not think that we should sit back and say that is all that needs to be done. When you see the darlings of this government such as Hydro, the Housing Corporation, Memorial University spending money without accounting to the Province, in such large amounts as this, I think we as members have got to do something about it. Otherwise the statement to the effect and the observation that this House is becoming increasingly irrelevant becomes very true and very meaningful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few brief remarks on the polytechnical institution.-

AN HON. MEMBER: Brief?

MR. FLIGHT: They will be brief. - as proposed by the government.

It is my understanding that a polytechnical institution is really an extension of our vocational school system. And one of the most frustrating problems that is facing students, graduates of the vocational school system in Newfoundland today, parents, House of Assembly members or anybody else, is the inability of those graduates to find a job when they graduate. It would be very interesting statistics to bring into this House, Mr. Speaker, the percentage of graduates out of our vocational school system in Newfoundland today that are indeed employed in the courses in which they graduated. I submit there are more graduates doing something else other than what they graduated in. If that is indeed a fact, and I submit it is a fact, then those students have wasted two years. Because if a young man goes into vocational school and trains for two years or three years to be a plumber or a carpenter and ends up driving a truck, then the two or three years and the money it cost him is of no value to him, it would have been better had he went to the university and

MR. FLIGHT: got two years of general education it would have been more self-serving. So, Mr. Speaker, I think -

MR. MURPHY: Sure he would still end up driving a truck.

MR. FLIGHT: He would still end up driving a truck but at least he would be a little better educated truck driver. The years he spent learning to use carpenter tools would not have helped him and we can talk about that for hours but that is a fact.

I am beginning to wonder Mr. Speaker, if there is not may be enough vocational schools in Newfoundland. If there is not may be too many. The onus on this government, the onus on the department of education Mr. Speaker, is to try to guarantee to the point that can be guaranteed the ability of the student who graduates to find a job. What is happening Mr. Speaker, is that this Province is funding vocational schools and now proposing to fund a polytechnical institution that will send our students out of Newfoundland and to work in areas where the jobs are. They are not in Newfoundland.

It is a great concept. It is a great concept but the question again is what happens when they graduate? The polytechnical institute too, you know, is being supported this past year or two by our claim of bringing in offshore oil. we are going to need expertise, we are going to need individuals who are technicians in that type of thing. Mr. Speaker, the fact is we are not close to bringing in offshore oil. We are not close that I am aware of. We are not in a position to open the refinery. The Linerboard Mill is closing down. Offshore oil is, at this point a dream. So, where are the industries in Newfoundland that are going to take in the graduates of a polytechnical institution when we cannot indeed absorb a half or maybe less of the graduates of our vocational schools.

So, Mr. Speaker, it will be fine to have a polytechnical institution. I am all for a polytechnical institution but I am more for finding ways of guaranteeing

MR. FLIGHT: our young men and women who are coming out of our vocational schools - if we cannot employ those where are we going to employ the graduates of the polytechnical institution at this stage? This is supposed to be a government of priorities. Mr. Speaker, if the Province indeed needs, and if the Province can indeed afford to fund a polytechnical institution, then I question the wisdom in establishing that institution in St. John's.

We have the university in St. John's no one can question that, it is the capital city. We have the fisheries college in St. John's and again the enrollment in that fisheries college is made up of, to a large part, students from outside of St. John's. Now, why Mr. Speaker, cannot some consideration be given to establishing that polytechnical institution in Grand Falls central? The chances are -

MR. HICKMAN: That about Grand Bank?

MR. FLIGHT: Or Grand Bank, You know the minister is very smart - but Grand Falls Mr. Speaker, would be Central. I am just saying that we owe it to the students of this province to be as close to home in their studies as they can be. Grand Falls would be an ideal situation, the Central Newfoundland area, Grand Falls-Windsor. It would serve a better purpose, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The hon. minister does not have a chance.

MR. FLIGHT: The hon. minister does not have a chance. Mr. Speaker, I suppose in the concept of a polytechnical institution we have to think in terms of training people for expertise in forestry, mining, secretarial science this type of thing. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the great, the most people - in Newfoundland today those kinds of needs are not in the St. John's area. You know, I am not aware of any forestry operations, any mining operations, that would require the highly technical skills that would come as the result of graduating from a polytechnical institution in St. John's. I am aware of them in the Central Newfoundland area, Grand Falls and the mining belts. In as far as preparing our young people to take part in the great industries

MR. FLIGHT: that will come as the result of bringing in offshore oil and gas then I suppose the polytechnical institution in Grand Falls could accomplish as much as one in St. John's could accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, this government has indicated on a few occasions that they are concerned with regional disparity within the province, that they are prepared to make moves that would indicate they are as concerned about rural Newfoundland as they are about St. John's. Well here is a great chance for them to prove they are. The polytechnical institute, if indeed it is going to be established, could probably form the economic backbone of a town like Windsor. When I figure the support they will need, the teaching staff, the service area, why not, Mr. Speaker? For years

Mr. Flight:

the town of Windsor have been looking for assistance from this government, not assistance by way of handout, but they have been looking for the type of financial input that will help them create an industrial base, a tax base. If a polytechnical institute can do for Windsor what Memorial University has done for St. John's then, Mr. Speaker, Windsor's troubles will be over. So why not consider Windsor? Why not consider putting it in a town in Newfoundland that would stand to gain the most from that institution being established there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Certainly St. John's is not the place to put that polytechnical institution.

And, Mr. Speaker, I could go on about, you know, I do not want to offend the people of St. John's, but I could go on and make a case against St. John's getting that polytechnical institution. Certainly if the government are real, if they are sincere in their indicated desires to do what they can do to guarantee the economy of rural Newfoundland, then establishing an institution such a polytechnical institution, that would have the kind of benefit, that would guarantee the kind of benefits from an employment point of view and otherwise, then if do, if they refuse to establish it in any other community outside of St. John's, and that could well be Grand Bank as far as I am concerned, but not St. John's, St. John's do not need it, Windsor needs it, Springdale needs it, St. Anthony needs it, but St. John's do not need it, Bay St. George may need it, but St. John's does not need it.

MR. STRACHAN: Labrador does.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, there was some hon. gentleman here years ago who referred to this - I never forgot the phrase, he referred to St. John's as the Parasite City. That may not indeed be a complete fact. But if St. John's continues, that every time there is a new development in this Province, every factory, every



Mr. Flight:

Federal Government agency, every educational facility, if they continue to insisit on having it established in St. John's then they are going to well deserve the title Parasite City, and why not?

MR. RIDEOUT: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, the other concern of mine, and I could leave this for another debate, I understand there is one coming up on a community college, but I will say a few things on it now and I will elaborate on it on the community college. I attended, Mr. Speaker, - again it is priorities - I attended Mount Allison University in 1956, twenty years ago, and when I first registered as a freshman, Mr. Speaker, I found that I was the only freshman from Newfoundland, the only first year student, from Newfoundland, taking first year courses, that all of the students that attended Mount Allison that registered that year when I did were into second year courses. Their first year credits had been achieved in their high schools in the Maritime Provinces. Basically the enrollemnt of Mount Allison is the Maritime Provinces. And I questioned that then, I could not understand it, but when I did understand what was happening they had indeed got Grade XII, and in some cases Grade XIII in their own schools, then I realized that - I accepted it because I knew that Newfoundland educational facilities, the standards of our teachers, the qualification of our teachers and facilities would not have been proper to have even thought that we could have had Grade XII then.

But the question I want to ask now, Mr. Speaker, is why twenty years after we do not have Grade XII into our public education system? Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that a student from Buchans, who wants to attend Memorial University, must attend at sixteen years old, fifteen and-a-half to sixteen years old, and why must it cost his parents \$2,800, in the vicinity of \$2,800 to get his first year university or to get Grade XII? It is certainly not the qualification of our teachers. I suppose there are very

Mr. Flight:

few teachers teaching anywhere in Newfoundland today that do not have the qualifications that would be required to teach Grade XII in our public schools. I am not demanding, I am not asking nor do I expect that Grade XII would be on the agenda of every school in Newfoundland, but certainly in our regional high schools, and there is a regional high school with all the facilities expected of a regional high school in every major community in this Province, Buchans, Grand Falls, Windsor, Botwood. There are regional high schools within twenty miles of every student in this Province. Now

MR. FLIGHT: we are bussing kindergarten students in this province twenty-eight miles so they will attend kindergarten - and they are being bussed to regional high schools - as I understand it that is the longest route that any student in this Province is indeed being bussed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Any grade or just kindergarten.

MR. FLIGHT: Well I am thinking of a specific case for the hon. minister. I am aware of kindergarten students that have been bussed twenty-eight miles to attend kindergarten.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that the longest distance?

MR. FLIGHT: That is the longest distance. I understand the -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of kindergarten grade or of any grade?

MR. FLIGHT: Well I understand that particular one is relative to kindergarten but I understand that twenty miles is the accepted mileage to bus students in this Province. The minister can answer that.

MR. HOUSE: Kindergarten being bussed twenty-eight miles?

MR. FLIGHT: If not kindergarten, Mr. Speaker, grade one. Now grade one I stand on - I guarantee you that the students from Buchans Junction are being bussed to Buchans and the distance is approximately twenty-seven miles. They leave home at eight o'clock in the morning and they arrive back at five. Grade one students.

MR. ROBERTS: They leave home in the dark and get home in the dark.

MR. FLIGHT: They leave home in the dark and get back home in the dark. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of presenting a petition in this House last year on that situation and practically every member in the House of Assembly supported that petition. A year later nothing, but nothing! There has not even been a conversation held on it and then we wonder why the people of this Province considers that this House and this government is not relevant. Mr. Speaker, I want to dwell a little bit more on the grade twelve. I want to hear the minister when he stands up tell me and tell the

MR. FLIGHT: members of this House and the people of this Province why it is that their children cannot have grade twelve in their regional high schools. Why it is that they must be committed to come to St. John's, spend \$2,800 for the first year in university, be away from all parental or any other kind of control at fifteen and-a-half to sixteen years old, when every province in Canada that I am aware of anyway, does indeed have grade twelve? Why? There has to be a reason. There are two reasons I will not accept; one is the lack of facilities and the other is the lack of qualification of our teachers. We have those two and to me that would be the main ingredients.

Mr. Speaker, it is a crime -

MR. NOLAN: There is no lack of qualified teachers.

MR. FLIGHT: No there is no lack and those are two reasons I will not accept, the lack of qualified teachers or the lack of the facilities that would be required. We are, I submit, Mr. Speaker, perpetrating a terrible injustice on the students of this Province, on the parents who live outside of St. John's. There is no problem for a parent in St. John's to send their children to a university. They go as though they were attending public school anywhere in Newfoundland. They get up in the morning and walk to class and walk home or come on bus and they get grade twelve or grade thirteen or whatever until they graduate with a degree. Now the parents and the students outside of St. John's, in Central Newfoundland and Western Newfoundland, are being discriminated against in that sense, Mr. Speaker. There are privileges available to the students and the parents of the St. John's area that are not available to the students outside of St. John's. For my son, or for the hon. member from White Bay or anywhere else to have their children attend university, their sons and daughters attend university, it costs them \$2,800 a year plus the fact that they must live with the knowledge that a fifteen or sixteen year old is gone to live in St. John's, completely

MR. FLIGHT: without control other than by mail and by telephone while the parent living in the City of St. John's it costs them nothing except tuition. There has to be something wrong with that system, Mr. Speaker, and there can be nothing wrong that cannot be corrected.

One of the problems in this Province, Mr. Speaker, with regard to education - I am about to wind up - is that this government, and probably all governments do this but I do not know, have abdicated any responsibility whatsoever in the field of education. All we have decided to do is pay the bill and I submit to the minister the old cliché that whoever -

MR. HOUSE: What is he talking about?

MR. FLIGHT: The minister knows what I mean. All right, I will say this, Mr. Speaker, in as far as the educational policy of this Province is concerned I believe the old cliché, "If you pay the fiddler you call the tune!"

MR. FLIGHT:

In the field of education we are paying the fiddler but we are not calling the tune. We are having no input at all. We are passing out \$252 million a year - I think it is, that figure is close - and we are having nothing to say about the agenda, about the bussing, about the type of facilities available, nothing. And Mr. Speaker, it is time for that to change. And you are going to hear more about it in the next year. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister speaks now, he closes the debate.

The hon. member for St. John's South.

DR. COLLINS: May I just say just a few words. As a man from St. John's I feel after the remarks of the last hon. member, it would be desirable to do so. Firstly, I myself see very little against the proposition that this should be outside St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: I personally am against centralizing everything. I think that this is a very bad move. And I hope and expect the hon. minister to speak to this issue when he rises. One point about students travelling elsewhere, I do not think it is necessarily a bad thing. The hon. member mentioned how undesirable it was to travel into St. John's, say, for university, where the university is. I would think that it would have certain educational value or content if the polytechnic was outside St. John's and a St. John's student wanted to go to that and he did travel to some other part of the Province. I think this would have educational content for him. Another point I would like to just mention in regard to the polytechnic, and that is I would hope that the course of instructions would include entrepreneurial skills. We do have at the university professional and other skills being taught. We do have at the

DR. COLLINS:

vocational schools and at the proposed polytechnic institute, we will have technical skills being taught. But one of the primary lacks in Newfoundland is the ability to organize and to carry out managerial activities in a business, not only how to manage a business, but how to finance a business and so on and so forth. And I think that these would be very desirable skills to get into as well as the purely technical.

The last point I would like to make too, finally on this, is that I would hope that the instructors at the polytechnic will not be totally imported. The hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) made a very good point, I think, when he said that we should not be parochial in our approach to things in Newfoundland. We should not say that things should only be for the people who live here. We should exclude people from outside. But I think we do not err in that regard in this Province. I think we err in the other regard. And this has been said many times. I think the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has made this point a number of times, that we tend to downgrade our own people. We tend to be over-awed by people who do come from outside. And I think we tend to neglect upgrading our own people if they do not fill a role or do not fill a position. We forget that we can upgrade these people and then they can fill the position. Rather we tend to say, "This position cannot be filled locally. Therefore we will go outside." I would hope that we will not get into this as a permanent diet. I think that we do have to bear in mind that this is a poor Province. We can hardly afford to be very generous to people outside the Province. I think that a generosity is required. It is probably required more of the outsider than of the Newfoundlander. The Newfoundland economy has not got much fat on it. Even though one

DR. COLLINS:

might say that our economy is really the Canadian economy, that we are not that poor, if we do have to support universities, polytechnics and so on and so forth we are by and large supporting these from the Canadian economy. I still do not think that is quite true because whereas we do get a lot of help from the Canadian economy, every bit of help we get requires something that we give up. I do not need, I think, to get into too many examples on this. But we have lost, for instance, our export markets.



DR. COLLINS:

The minute we became part of Canada we lost our export markets. We lost much of our manufacturing. We lost much of our fisheries, so on and so forth. We did get benefits from Canada but these benefits are not a one way street. They are a two way street. Every benefit we get, we suffer a loss. So I would think that -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Dollar for dollar?

DR. COLLINS: Well, I do not know dollar for dollar. That is a sum that one would have to sit down and look at very clearly and I would not be a bit surprised -

MR. SMALLWOOD: You might take all of three seconds to do it.

DR. COLLINS: Well I would not accept that it would necessarily be a dollar that Newfoundland has gained. I think that we may well have lost a great deal more than we gained, not in economic terms. We do not live only by economics. Economics is one aspect of things. We live by many values and we live by many considerations. And I think that to draw up a sum, just using one side of a ledger would be very, very shortsighted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. member yield?

DR. COLLINS: Surely.

MR. SMALLWOOD: These losses that we have incurred are beyond doubt. There is no room for argument. It must be admitted. Unless we are blind we know that we have lost substantial values, not necessarily of a monetary character as the hon. gentleman says. But would we not have lost every one of those virtually had there never been such a thing as union with Canada? Are they not due just to the efflux of time? The world all about is in change, and surely we could not have been unaffected by those changes even if we had never gone into union with Canada.

DR. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is too large a topic to deal with in this debate. And I do not wish to give the impression

DR. COLLINS:

that Confederation has not brought great benefits to us. But the point I make is that we have also had somewhat- we have diminished ourselves to some extent by becoming part of Canada. You do have to add up the balance and see which side of it you prefer. But the point I am trying to make here is that I would hope that the instructors and the other people connected with the polytechnic will by and large be Newfoundlanders, that if there are not now at present Newfoundlanders who will fill these posts, let us upgrade the Newfoundlanders that we can find to fill the post and that we should only fill, especially the upper posts, with non-Newfoundlanders where there is absolutely no way of getting our local people in there. And I say that not in any way seeking to be parochial but being realistic about what Newfoundland can afford and who should get the benefit from efforts being made in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Georges.

MRS. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to say too much on it. I think that anything that I could say has already been said, or most of it. But I do feel that I should say a few words since it was common knowledge in the Bay St. George area and on the entire West Coast that the Premier had made this announcement a few years ago in Corner Brook that a polytechnical institute would be established in the Bay St. George area. One of the hon. members questioned whether it was "a" polytechnical institute or "the" polytechnical institute. Well as far as my knowledge is concerned it is "the" polytechnical institute. I have not heard that there would be a number of polytechnical institutes across the Province, so we have to assume that it is "the" polytechnical institute. I

MRS. MACISAAC:

feel that again the people in the Bay St. George area and on the entire West Coast have been let down. They looked forward to this. They thought that if and when a polytechnical institute would be established that it would come to the Bay St. George area. And when it comes from the lips of our Premier you certainly do not have any doubts about it.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MRS. MACISAAC: If it comes from the Premier it is gospel, as far as most people in the Province are concerned.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister of Education fully endorsed it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not any more.

MRS. MACISAAC: I must say that I had my doubts about it because I have seen so many promises made to the people of my district, my area and the entire West Coast, and most of them have been mere promises. So I

MRS. MACISAAC: certainly did not expect the polytechnical institute to come to the Bay St. George area. But I certainly think that the government should take a look at the economic situation in the Bay St. George area and if they did I feel that there is a great possibility that maybe the polytechnical institute will be established there or if not there maybe to some other economic depressed area in the Province and there are several of them. But I cannot see any comparison between St. John's and the areas on the West Coast or even Central areas that have been mentioned here today. I certainly think that one of those areas should be considered for the polytechnical institute. As far as the students travelling, I think maybe it is not such a hardship on them as the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans pointed out. If our students had the opportunity of getting grade twelve before they leave home, well we could certainly be a lot more relaxed and contented about the fact that they are away from home. My son completed grade eleven at sixteen years of age and I certainly did not want to see him over in St. John's and the family on the West Coast - over here to the mercy of the world and the cost involved. I mean there are quite a few families, and I would say the majority of families, just cannot afford to send their children to university, to send them to St. John's to university. An awful lot of them are coming out of school with grade eleven and that is all they will even wind up with because the cost is great to people who are living practically from hand to mouth in economically depressed areas.

In our area in my district there is very, very little employment. There is a lot of unemployment. There are a lot of people on social assistance and just do not have the means of sending their children to university. I certainly hope that all those factors will be taken into consideration. I am not suggesting that a polytechnical institute should be set up in my district in St. George's. I would like to see it but I know that there are

MRS. MACISAAC: other areas that would be more suitable. For instance I would certainly like to see it established in Stephenville where we have numerous buildings, beautiful buildings that certainly could accomodate students from other areas. I hope that a close look will be taken at it and some more consideration given to establishing the institute in an area other than St. John's.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.  
The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know if my friend from Bay of Islands wanted to say a word or two on this.

MR. WOODROW: No, you go on.

MR. ROBERTS: I appreciate it, Sir, not at the moment and I would hope, Sir, when I have finished a few words on the principal of the bill perhaps my friend from Bay of Islands will embroider and add thereupon and elucidate thereupon and generally improve thereupon as I am sure he can.

Mr. Speaker, the debate on this bill, I think, has been as interesting and as significant a debate as we have had in this House for a long time because I think it has gone very much to the heart of the questions and the issues of post-secondary education or certainly post-secondary non-university education as it applies to the people of this province particularly, of course, to the younger people. The bill itself is not very exciting. It is a cosmetic bill and it does not achieve very much. All it does, I think it is fair to say, Sir, in principle is wipe out the College of Fisheries Act and wipe out the College of Trades and Technology Act and replace them with a new act, the act now before us and instead of having these separate institutions, both of which I think have served the Province admirably, we will have a new institution which - I think it is fair to say and the minister

MR. ROBERTS: I think will agree with this, at least for the foreseeable future or the immediate future, perhaps a better phrase, will not be anything more than the present institutions taken together. There may well be some merit in combining the two of them under one board of directors. It is a few fewer seats for the gentlemen opposite to award to their friends on a patronage basis. I suppose that could be held against it. In my books that is to be held in favour of it.

But basically it is a cosmetic bill. It does not really change the substance. It is a little powder, a little paint, a little lipstick perhaps and perhaps even a little perfume but it

Mr. Roberts:

does not change at all, the basic substance, It does not change the courses that are being offered or the curriculums that are being offered, it does not change the opportunities that are being made available to the younger people of this Province to enable them to get the higher education, post-high school, the post-secondary education that they need.

Now, Sir, I regret that, I think the minister, and I do not fault his intent, Sir, I do not fault his desires, if anything I fault the government's lack of ability and the government's lack of commitment to the idea of post-secondary education. And let there be no doubt, Sir, this government has no commitment to post-secondary education. Their predecessor government did. The previous administration, to use a phrase, which was often flung about this Chamber, had a commitment to post-secondary education, and blankety well put the dollars to back it up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: There has been no such great leap forward in the present administration, All they have done is keep it going. They have not expanded it, in fact, they have cut it back, and they have done nothing to enable post-secondary education to become more available to the young people of this Province. They have not built a vocational school that I can recall. They finished a few which were underway when they came into office, the one at St. Anthony, the one at Placentia, the one in Bonavista, the one in Baie Verte, there was a fifth in that programme, there were five, I am sorry, where is the fifth?

AN HON. MEMBER: The one in Happy Valley.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course the one in Happy Valley, Happy Valley-Goose Bay. Those five were underway. They have been completed. There has been no expansion of the University. In fact, we have seen a cutback, and I am not just talking financially, the proportion of the young people of Newfoundland and Labrador, who today are in post-secondary institutions is surely smaller. The absolute numbers may not, but

Mr. Roberts:

the proportion is surely smaller than it was three or four years ago.

MR. ROWE: A thousand less.

MR. ROBERTS: A thousand less my hon. friend from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe), who speaks for us on educational matters, tells me.

There has been no great leap forward, and there has been no commitment by this administration to the idea of post-secondary education. No commitment to the ideal of allowing our younger people to gain the knowledge and the skills which they are going to need; first to enable them to develop their own talents, secondly, to enable them to make a reasonable and a decent living, and thirdly, and of equal importance, to develop this Province. Because I for one - now I could be very critical of post-secondary education or even of secondary elementary education, and sometimes I even agree on this point which my hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I do not agree with a lot of what he says about the University and post-secondary institutions, because we just have a different approach to it, but I agree on much of what he says, and sometimes, although I believe in universities and believe in institutions of that sort, I get the devil in me when I hear and learn of some of the things that are going on at our own University. I am not sure but what, they are inescapable in the nature of the beast, but they still put the devil in me and I think in every Newfoundlander.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that I very deeply believe, and I know that every member of my party believes, that one of the chief aims of public policy in this Province must be to enable our younger people to have access to higher education. And if the Smallwood Administration did nothing else for Newfoundland, and it did a great deal else, if it did nothing else, Sir, its commitment to the ideal of education, at all levels, is surely one of great stature, and of greatness, and is more I might add, than the present administration



Mr. Roberts:

have done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The only thing, Sir, the only thing this administration has done in the post-secondary field is build a regional college at Corner Brook.

MR. WHITE: They had no choice.

MR. ROBERTS: And of course in its financial aspects, and its construction aspects, it is a scandal in the making. It will come out in due course, with full implications of just what went on there. Educationally I think the University are running -

AN HON. MEMBER: Where Scrivener involved?

MR. ROBERTS: - a very - no Scrivener were not involved, at least to my knowledge they were not, although -

MR. NEARY: The Mafia were involved in it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well there is certainly a great deal in the Western Regional College, the building of it, not in its operation, not in its operation by the University, but in the building of it, that requires a very great deal of explanation and it will all come out, just as the truth behind the Scrivener donation will all come out. Of course, it will, sooner or later. Even Richard Nixon as President of the United States could not keep things covered up.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: He tried. But, Mr. Speaker, the only thing this administration have done is build the college in Corner Brook, but I will give them credit for that. That in itself is a significant step forward. They did it for all of the wrong reasons. They did it in all the wrong ways. The Premier announced it in a fit of something or other. The first the

MR. ROBERTS:       minister of Education have heard of him. My friend from Trinity - Bay de Verde will remember this because he was questioning the minister. The first the Minister of Education of the day heard of it was when it was reported on the news. The first he heard of it. The Premier made the commitment. I think my friend from Port au Port said it, at a luncheon, was it?

AN HON. MEMBER:       At a Rotary luncheon.

MR. ROBERTS:       At a Rotary luncheon in Corner Brook, and I think probably the gentleman from Humber East (Dr. Farrell) deservedly and proudly should claim much of the credit for that, and I think, Sir, the gentleman from Humber East has right and reason to be proud of what he has done in that. The Regional College has turned out to be a good thing. Many of my constituents have children there, and they speak well of it, people from Labrador. And, Sir, the very success of that college, or that idea, the very success of that principle should lead the minister to withdraw this Bill and bring in a proper one. One, to establish a polytechnical institute, a terrible phrase. I realize it has been inherited from the previous administration of which I was a part, but it is not an elegant phrase.

MR. SMALLWOOD:       But we could use that one word, the polytechnique.

MR. ROBERTS:       The polytechnique or the polytechnic, but it is still a cumbersome phrase. It is another of those Roman words that has come into English, and I would hope that we could find an English word or an Anglo-Saxon. But be that as it may. I mean it will be called the polytech no matter what name is on it, it will be called the polytech. But the minister should bring in one to, first of all, the polytechnic institute of Newfoundland and Labrador. Let us get that straight. The minister in this Bill is defying an Act of this Legislature. And I am surprised that his friend from Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) have not pointed that out to him, and that should be amended at Committee stage, you know, if nothing else is done.

But a much more substantive point than that: This is not a bill to set up anything new, this is not a bill to broaden

Mr. Roberts:

educational opportunities, it is simply a bill to bring together two institutions, and to pretend and hold them out as something new. It is a cosmetic established by a group of men who have no legislative programme, who have nothing to bring before the people, and who are scrambling desperately to try to do it. I am surprised the minister is part and parcel of it. I do not think he realized what it was all about. But I think he has got the very best of motives. I think he believes it is a step forward.

MR. NEARY: Somebody put together a booklet from the -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the way most of the ministry put together their booklets, Sir, just gives the Auditor General more fertile field for comment.

But, Mr. Speaker, the bill to me is a failure. I do not know if I will vote against it, and I do not know if my colleagues feel that they should vote against it. I do not know. But it is of so little importance this particular bill, it does not set up anything new. It is not going to rate, this debate, will not rank with the debate to set up the College of Fisheries, which was a great step forward; or with that historic debate, that historic action by the Legislature back in 1949 to set up The Memorial University, another great step forward, taking a college and making it into a university. This is simply taking two institutions and putting them together.

And furthermore, Sir, the minister and his colleagues have ignored completely the needs of the rest of this Province in bringing in this bill. Maybe I am putting it too strongly to say that they have ignored it, because that would imply that they have considered it and rejected it. They have just paid no heed to it, Sir. They have paid no attention to it. They are a group of men whose interest literally end at the Overpass.

AN HON. MEMBER: Eleven seats.

MR. ROBERTS: And I am surprised at the minister, a man who grew up on the Northwest Coast of Newfoundland, a man who has made his home and his professional career, and a distinguished one it has been, I think the minister at times wishes he were back there, but

Mr. Roberts:

a distinguished career in Western Newfoundland serving people in rural areas, serving people in the medium sized town of Deer Lake, that the minister has somehow allowed himself to be put down as the sponsor of this bill . It shows no concern for anybody outside.

First of all, of course, it is a **flagrant** repudiation of the commitment made by the Premier at that same Potary luncheon in Corner Brook. My friends from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and St. George's (Mrs. MacIsaac) and others areas have made that clear. The Premier made a flat commitment, but it now has been repudiated. I guess we are getting use to that. The people of the Province are not. We in this House are. But it is a repudiation. The Premier assured the people of Newfoundland and Labrador in that speech at Corner Brook that there would be a polytechnical institute. I forget what name he put on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He called it the polytechnical institute.

MR. ROBERTS: He called it the polytechnical institute established in -

MRS. MACISAAC: In the Bay St. George area.

MR. ROBERTS: - in the Bay St. George area, presumably in the town of Stephenville ; it is the largest town in the area.

MR. HODDER: We were going to become so industrial.

MR. ROBERTS: Right, because we were going to become so industrialized, my friend from Port au Port reminds me. So that promise now joins the heap, the mountain of broken promises of unkept commitments of repudiated promises.

MR. SIMMONS: The trawler fleet.

MR. ROBERTS: Well my friend from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) reminds me, it joins

MR. ROBERTS:

the trawler fleet, the \$40 million worth of trawlers that have now grown to \$35 million worth of longliners. Not one of the \$40 million worth of trawlers, Sir, ever had a keel touch the water. All we got instead were the three sculpins. And when the truth comes out, as my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was getting at it today, we will find out that those sculpins have cost this Province dearly.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$30 million worth of dories.

AN HON. MEMBER: They will be buying dories next.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, my friends over here, Sir, in a jocular mood feel that the Minister of Fisheries' next great ministerial statement will be \$29 million worth of dories. Mr. Speaker, and with the ministry's record, they will probably be built in another Province, brought in.

AN HON. MEMBER: Joint venture.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, and operated, I am told as well, as a joint venture. I can see it now, Sir. Our brawn and somebody else's brains and somebody else getting the money. Mr. Speaker, the first thing is this bill is a repudiation, a repudiation of the commitment to establish the polytechnic institute in Stephenville. The minister was not then in the ministry. He was not in active politics. I guess he was at that stage an open supporter of the Tory Party, or the procrastinating Conservatives as we now refer to them. But he was not at that point in active electoral politics. He had not thrown his hat into the ring, to use that cliché, and had not been elected. But he should be aware of the commitment. I know the Bay St. George area has repudiated the present government and I wonder if perhaps this is punishment, if the ministry feel in their heart of hearts or in their secret deliberations, We will punish the so and so's because they elected three Liberal M.H.A.s.

Mr. Roberts.

I might add to my colleagues that they would have done better financially if they had been defeated, seeing that one of the defeated candidates, with no other apparent qualifications for the job, has just been appointed Chairman of the Harmon Corporation at \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year, a juicy little patronage plumb.

MR. NEARY: The winner out in LaPoile was Al Evans. He was the real winner.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, my friend from LaPoile reminds the House that the "real winner" in the election in LaPoile, of course, was Mr. Al Evans, who is on the payroll at some fat juicy sum for duties which have not been specified in the House.

MR. WHITE: What about Lewisporte?

MR. ROBERTS: In Lewisporte - well the gentleman from Lewisporte at least is not tucked away - I am sorry the former gentleman from Lewisporte - at least is not tucked away in a civil service job, although they will probably try to make it so. I am told that some jobs are being reclassified, but that is another story, Sir. We will have at that. But, you know, I ask quite bluntly, Are the government trying to punish the Bay St. George area? Is that what is in their minds? They may pooh-pooh it. They may say, Oh, how could I, and I may be called all sorts of low and base names. But the Premier made a commitment, a public commitment. He committed two things, the Regional College in Corner Brook and the polytechnic in the Bay St. George area. We have got the Regional College in Corner Brook. Now what has happened to the polytechnic? All we have got is a bill to rearrange, to reshuffle the legal titles to the institutions here in St. John's. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is one point I make. I think the minister owes this House an explanation, and I am sure he will give it. I know the minister, Sir. He is a man of probity and of honour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS. And I know he will give the House this explanation, a fully satisfactory one. And we on this side, Sir, shall reserve our decision on that point until we have heard the minister. He has a right to speak in his own defense, and he should be heard. He shall be heard, Sir, if he but wishes to be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the next point I want to make is that this bill, Bill No. 14, is a complete failure of what I contend should be an important aspect of public policy, and that is bringing the services, the public services of this Province, the services paid for out of the public chest of this Province, closer to the people of this Province. The bill is only cosmetic, and it could be said it does nothing. And, you know, nobody should be the least bit fooled that there is going to be anything new except we will have a new contract for letterheads. That is all we will have. And I say, we will get a new board, and instead of the present patronage appointments somebody else will be appointed and, you know, well and good. It will be spread around a little among the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite. But that is fair enough. But there will not be any new structures. There will not be any new approaches. There will not be any new opportunities. Oh, I know it says in here, you know, "The board may and da, da, da, da." It also says, of course, "The whole thing is subject to proclamation." It may never be brought into force. There is no commitment here to do anything. We all know the financial position of the Province. The Minister of Finance will bring in a budget shortly and will tell us the financial picture, I hope, in detail, and

MR. ROBERTS: I hope with more accuracy than some of his predecessors have. But, you know, there is going to be nothing in the budget next year or the year after. We will hear the usual pious words from some hon. gentlemen opposite about DREE or about Ottawa, as if somehow Ottawa is responsible for doing everything. Sometimes hon. gentlemen opposite, Sir, give the impression we have not got a government here all we have got is a post office to get money from Ottawa. At times they abdicate, they do not want to govern, they just want to say, their answer to every single problem is, "Let us go to Ottawa."

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not a post office. It is just a money order depot.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), who is no slouch, I may add, at making Confederation work, particularly in the sense of getting money out of Ottawa, says, "That is not a post office, that is just a money order depot." They never heard of the British North America Act, gives to us the right and the duty and the obligation to administer educational services. You know, just think now, minister after minister opposite when I asked a question gets up and says, "Well, we cannot do it unless we get help from Ottawa." They do not make any case for it. The Minister of Transportation and Communications has made no case for the help on the Trans-Labrador Road. I doubt if he has even said anything on it until we brought it up today. I doubt if he has ever heard of it, really. You know we get minister after minister - and it drives me to fury - I happen to believe in Canada and I happen to believe in Confederation and I happen to believe we should get bucks sent down from Ottawa and the more the merrier. I am not on the same wavelength as my friend from St. John's South who was fair enough to support the point which I am making that institutions should be outside the St. John's area, but I made



MR. ROBERTS: a point with which I must take issue, with all respect, Your Honour, and that is that the balance sheet of Confederation is not necessarily favourable towards this Province, I think it is. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it should not be simply a matter of economics. We brought a lot to Canada beyond mere dollars, and if we get dollars back we should not necessarily simply be grateful, we should be grateful, but we should feel as well that they are our right and our due as Canadians, as citizens of this great country. But the hon. gentleman from St. John's South in a very real sense spoke only as a man could if he had been brought up in St. John's, which I had the pleasure or the misfortune to be, but had never seen a great deal of the rest of Newfoundland. Anybody who does not realize, Sir, that there were two Newfoundlands thirty years ago, St. John's and the rest.

Today, Sir, we have eliminated some of those disparities and given people in the rural areas much greater access. I do not hold it against the gentleman from St. John's South, Sir. I was brought up in St. John's. My parents made their home here and accordingly that is where I was raised. But many of my colleagues, Sir, grew up in the rural parts of this Province, in the outports, in the outharbours and they can speak with eloquence, Sir, of the changes that Confederation has brought.

Mr. Speaker, that is by way of a digression, a relevant one, I submit, but a digression. The point I wish to make, the government, Sir, should be moving to make services available to all of the people of this Province. They have not done so with the significant, conspicuous exception of the Corner Brook College. Now that should not be an exception. That should be just the initial application of a principle. This bill, Sir, should require the establishment of a polytechnical institute somewhere outside St. John's. Where? I suppose every member could stand and say his district, but to me the obvious location is somewhere, Sir, in Central Newfoundland.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) made an eloquent and I think an effective plea for the community of Windsor. My friend from Lewisporte (Mr. White) suggested it should be midway between Grand Falls and Gander, which I would not be surprised, Sir, if it were somewhere in the district of Lewisporte by some coincidence.

MR. SIMMONS: I say Conne River Pond.

MRS. MACISSAC: Do not forget the Premier's promise.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) comes from the depths of the Conne River Pond. My friends from the West Coast, Sir, believe that the Premier should be a man of his word and keep his word to put it in Western Newfoundland. I have no doubt that my friend from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) thinks it should probably go in LaScie.

MRS. MACISSAC: Anywhere except St. John's.

MR. ROBERTS: I mean we can have a fine display of regional and parochial beliefs. But, Mr. Speaker, I think somewhere in the Central Newfoundland area. I do not pretend to be an expert on the location of these things, and there are many factors that must be taken into account. But, Sir, the government have obviously decided to take none of them into account. They have no intention, none - and if the minister says to the contrary I cannot doubt him but I say that he will be put to the proof - they have no intention of providing any additional facilities outside the St. John's area.

Now does that make me anti-St. John's? Of course not! Some of my best friends live in St. John's, as the saying goes. But, Sir, there is a lot of Newfoundland out there and the minister above all else,

Mr. Roberts:

above all perhaps in this House, should know full well the case for building these new facilities outside of St. John's. Now it is true, Your Honour, that nowhere in this Act does it say specifically that the polytechnical shall be built in St. John's.

MR. FLIGHT: First the City of St. John's Act though.

MR. ROBERTS: Well it does not say specifically, it just says, "An institute to be known as a Polytechnical Institute of Newfoundland" - not Newfoundland and Labrador, you know, damn it we have an Act in this House, Sir, the 1964 Statutes, that this Province is known as Newfoundland and Labrador. And if anybody doubts that we have the power to do it I looked up again Section 92 (1) of the British North America Act, which I would commend to hon. gentlemen opposite because it gives us the right to change the name of this Province. And I will read it specifically "In each province" - this is the general introduction, and hon. gentlemen opposite might do well, because, Sir, this document is the Constitution of Canada, Section 92 "In each Province the Legislature may exclusively make laws," now exclusively make laws.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Only they.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) with his perspicacity and his ability to put it another way with even more affect, says "only they," only this House may make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subject next here and after enumerated, that is to say, one, - it lists sixteen, but I am only going to read the first one because it is the only one we need here. "The amendment from time to time notwithstanding anything in this Act of the Constitution of the Province except as regards of the office of Lieutenant-Governor" but we would not propose in any way to affect the office of Lieutenant-Governor, the Queen's personal representative, the embodiment of executive authority, but this House can certainly change the name, Sir, of this Province. The name of this Province as established by the British North America Act, we have the power to change it. And this House by Act, by law,

Mr. Roberts:

by Statute, has said that the name of this Province is Newfoundland and Labrador. And I assume the minister when he stands on second reading will concede that this is but a drafting error, but an error in printing, a technical error, and it will be of course corrected at Committee stage and that it will be made Newfoundland and Labrador.

But in any event it says, Section (3), Sir, "An institute to be known as the Polytechnical Institute of Newfoundland is hereby established for the purpose of establishing such technical and vocational training programmes and research as the Board of Governors of the institute may subject to the approval of the minister prescribed." Now, Sir, that does not say it is going to be in St. John's. But of course the game is given away by Section (7) which says "That the City of St. John's Act or any other act from time to time in force relating to the City of St. John's," and it specifies some special purposes, "does not apply". It does not refer to any other municipality, it does not refer to the Local Government Act or the Community Council Act -

MR. FLIGHT: The Town Council.

MR. ROBERTS: - or the Town Council Act of the other Statutes under which Municipal Governments throughout this Province are levied. It refers to exemption from Provincial-Municipal or other local taxation. But only the City of St. John's Act is specifically, as I read the act, specifically exempted.

Now, Sir, it is obvious that the - and then of course the further clauses that this Act replaces, the two Acts under which the College of Fisheries is organized, and under which the College of Trades and Technology is organized, then it is obvious that this is only aimed at St. John's.

Now, Sir, my colleague from St. George's, (Mrs. MacIsaac), if I could but get her attention for a moment, has asked me to ask the minister if he is aware of the Premier having promised the college to St. George's district.

MRS. MACISAAC: No, the Bay St. George area.

MR. ROBERTS: The Bay St. George area.

MRS. MACISAAC: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know if the minister is aware of it or not, I guess he should be.

MR. HOUSE: I am not aware of it.

MR. ROBERTS: He says, he is not.

MR. HOUSE: I am not aware of it.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. HOUSE: I am not aware of it.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister is not aware of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Rotary speech.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I accept the minister's word of course, I have no hesitation, I am not the least bit disposed to him except to accept the minister's word. But I mean what the Premier said is a matter of public record. The Premier may not remember, he has a very convenient memory, I find. But the public prints of the day, the newspapers and the other records will show full well exactly what the Premier said, and the minister will have time overnight to check the point. And I might add, so will my friends from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and St. George's (Mrs. MacIsaac).

MRS. MACISAAC: Ask the Premier.

MR. ROBERTS: Because the House will adjourn at 6:00, whether we will meet tonight I do not know, I mean the slave-driving House Leader may require us to be back here this evening, but if not when the Bill comes up again we will have an opportunity to go into this. And I say to my colleagues, to remember, as they are aware, that the Legislative Library will be open during whatever hours the House is opened, and it is but a work of a moment to go down and ask that very charming and efficient young lady who is the Legislative Librarian to look up the newspapers for the day or so after the Premier's speech, and probably best The Western Star because of course

Mr. Roberts:

news from Corner Brook in the St. John's papers is often listed under foreign headlines, you know.

AN HON. MEMBER: CFCB radio.

MR. ROBERTS: Well CFCB

Mr. Roberts.

radio, although that would not be in the Legislative Library. So, you know, we will settle that point conclusively, and I confess I do not remember the words the Premier used. I remember he made both commitments, and I know he made them without the prior knowledge and certainly without the consent of the Cabinet, and without the prior knowledge of the Minister of Education, and I believe without his consent.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who was the minister at the time?

MR. HOUSE: I did not hear it.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister said something?

AN HON. MEMBER: The gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) -

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, the member for LaPoile at that stage -

MR. HOUSE: I said I did not hear it. I heard of a community college concept.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I do not doubt what the -

MR. HODDER: If the hon. Leader would permit?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, sure.

MR. HODDER: The community college concept was not a concept. That concept did not come up until prior to the last election, just prior to the last election. If it was mentioned before, it was never mentioned in Bay St. George. A polytechnical institute was mentioned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The minister has an executive assistant, a former member of this House in fact, a man who hangs upon our walls, a former Speaker, a man of some distinction, and perhaps his executive assistant could be asked between now and when next we debate this bill -

MR. NOLAN: The former Minister of Education.

MR. SIMMONS: Is that the former minister who -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, well the minister might ask his predecessor as Minister of Education, a gentleman of undoubted probity and wisdom and

Mr. Roberts.

honour who could perhaps refresh him as well, or the gentleman from Humber East (Dr. Farrell) who was at the luncheon I guess, the rotary luncheon where the Premier in full flight and fine form made the commitment. The minister was there, was he not?

DR. FARRELL: Yes, but I do not remember every word.

MR. ROBERTS: Fair enough, but I mean we can look it up.

The newspapers will have reports. It would be a good point. But whatever it be, the fact remains that this bill is a repudiation of that promise. We have an act somewhere down below to talk about a community college for Bay St. George, but that is not what the Premier was speaking of, not at all what he was speaking of. Indeed if this bill is a cosmetic, the other bill is only half a cosmetic, a sketchy, powder-thin one.

But, Sir, the point I am making - and I apologize if I digress, Your Honour - gentlemen on the other side and my friends on this side sometimes take me into byways that are of relevance and of interest, but sometimes are byways. The point I am making is that this institution, Sir, should be established outside St. John's. I am not saying that we should close down the Fisheries College and move it. I am not saying that we should close down the Trades College, CTT over here, and move it. Of course we cannot. They are going to be in use for many years to come. The Fisheries College buildings - some of them are quite old. Indeed the original Memorial University College is now being used for the Fisheries College and that is a building that served us well over the years. The old USO building on Merrymeeting Road, I think, is part of their structure. They have got the old Job's plant on the Southside, I think, and they have got part of their operation out in a hangar at Torbay. And, you know, they are generally very spread out.

MR. LUSH: They got the travelling school of the Fisheries College travelling to communities, too.



MR. ROBERTS: Well, of course, the travelling school of the Fisheries College is perhaps the best thing they do.

But the fine, magnificent, new building over here, just nigh to this building, just to the East of this building, will be in use for many years to come. I mean, whether we have a hundred new buildings or not that fine building, designed as an institution of higher learning, will be in use as an institution of higher learning. So I am not suggesting that we should close those. But what I want is an assurance that the new buildings, the new divisions, the new operations, the expansions, will be built outside St. John's, and I have suggested Central Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I have suggested Central Newfoundland. I think the Premier should keep his promise as well. I did not make the Premier's promise. I did not make the Premier make it. And if the minister wants to press me I will give him my opinion which comes from people who were at the dinner of exactly what spirit led the Premier to make those statements at that time.

MR. HODDER: And the former member for Port au Port could certainly -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, one of the many reasons why the former member for Port au Port, Mr. Frederick Stagg, gave up in despair of the present government and refused even to run again, to carry their banner again for them, was the Premier's failure to honour his commitment. Another reason was his knowledge of what his constituents were going to do to him.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) - that road like he did with the loop road.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, it could have been. I mean the Premier has made many strange things, it is true, but we will come back to that, and I doubt if there are any receipts. I say for the benefit of my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I doubt if there are any receipts from

Mr. Roberts.

any lawyers downtown in respect of them. Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that the new institution should be outside St. John's for a lot of reasons. One of them is to give students from other parts of this Island and other parts of this Province a better access to it, and by better I mean cheaper, and I also mean nearer.

MR. ROBERTS: You know, not all the Province lives in St. John's, not everybody lives East of the Donovans Overpass. There are a lot of people, Not all wisdom resides in Confederation Building.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: I sometimes think we should take whole departments and move them out of St. John's. One of the things I would like to do in fact, take the entire Department of Education and move it to Corner Brook, lock, stock and barrel. In a day of jet aircraft, and telexes and telephones, take the Fisheries Department and move it to Marystown, take Mines and Energy and put it in Labrador, and let the Deputy Minister be there and let the ministers commute. I mean, they commute anyway. I would rather have them commuting within the Province than the places some of them go.

But let us give young people outside of St. John's some direct access. The Western Regional College has worked well. The mere fact that the present administration did it does not take away from that. I am the first to admit it, it has worked very well. It has given families in my area a greater opportunity to send their children in, and the point which my friend from Windsor-Buchans made is a very relevant one, of children of fifteen or sixteen going off to school, going away from home. And the minister I know agrees with me. It is a very important fact. There is a big difference between the maturity of a child fifteen or sixteen and a child seventeen or eighteen, and parents feel far happier having the younger children a little closer to the home, or maybe they could get home on weekends, not necessarily commute every day but get home on weekends. Whereas if they come to St. John's they are gone for the term.

MR. NEARY: In my district they are forced to leave at thirteen.

MR. ROBERTS: Well my friend from LaPoile says they have to move to high school. Well, that happens still in some of the remote areas in my district for example, bursaries and what have you.

But that is one good reason, Mr. Speaker, one very good reason. A second is the undoubted economic impact of it. I mean these are industries. They may not be productive industries, they are not necessarily new dollars, but they are industries. I mean, the impact of the Western Regional College in Corner Brook has not least been the impact in the economy of the area. I know my friend from Humber East (Dr. Farrell) will agree with that. To begin with it drove the housing market sky high, every high priced house in Corner Brook doubled in price by twenty - twenty was it? How many houses did the college buy in Corner Brook? Twenty? I mean it drove up - and they were at the upper end of the market.

MR. NEARY: Why did you not try to get the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing to sell you one?

MR. ROBERTS: Well it just shows that the left hand knoweth not what the right hand doeth.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the House Leader would like me to adjourn the debate. I am grateful to him, Sir, because it means we do not have to come back this evening, and the slave-driving, whip carrying House Leader, that ruthless railroader of legislation and other complimentary things, Sir, is going to let us have the evening off to attend our other lawful purposes. Sir, that being the case I move the adjournment of the debate. When it is called I have a very few more minutes and if I am not interrupted as I am by hon. gentlemen opposite, being harassed by them, then I will conclude my remarks, Sir. But really I think this bill is but a slight step forward. I do not think it is something to get very excited at all, and I hope that when the minister speaks at second reading,

MR. ROBERTS: if he insists on going through with it, I hope that he will tell us that our fears are not confirmed and that indeed this is a bill to establish a polytechnical institute for Newfoundland and Labrador and not just an institute for St. John's. I move the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M., those in favour "Aye," contrary "Nay", carried. This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday at 3:00 P.M.