

job to bring in a report which would answer every possible question that could be asked about education in Newfoundland. In going back to the question of what we were sent here for, I think we were to examine and inquire into the financial and economic condition of this island. In view of this we felt that we had to inquire mostly into the amount that was being spent on education. We have that in black and white. We have certain supplementary facts that will come out during debate, but I don't see that it was our business to discuss the philosophy of education. Everybody has ideas on this, and we could probably have gone on at great length discussing such things. I have supplementary information here which may answer the question of the member for St. John's West. For the year ending June 30, 1944, there were the following teachers in the following grades:*

Mr. Smallwood What's the total of graded and ungraded male and female teachers?

Mr. Newell I will give you those figures a little later.

Mr. Job Sometime ago when the Chadwick-Jones report¹ was being considered, I think Mr. Miller made the suggestion that when any report came up we might perhaps consider the findings of the Chadwick-Jones report in conjunction with the new report. Mr. Newell adequately stated that the report was based mainly upon giving the information as to the financial standard of the education business. I noticed in looking into these figures here a rather interesting comparison. In the Chadwick-Jones report the subsidies, grants, etc., for 1935-36 are given as \$696,000; in your report, the total education grant is given as \$956,000, a difference of nearly \$300,000, and the same applies to 1941 and 1942 where the Chadwick-Jones figures are

\$1,094,000 and your figures are \$1,532,000. The Chadwick-Jones estimate for 1946 and 1947 is \$2,350,000, yours is \$3,538,000. The figures are so very far apart that I thought I would like to draw your attention to it, because there is obviously some mistake somewhere.

Mr. Smallwood That matter did come up before. When the report of the Education Committee went before the Steering Committee, before being presented to this house, the Steering Committee noted these apparent discrepancies to which Mr. Job has just referred and returned the report to the Education Committee, pointing them out. The Education Committee, in good humour and without rancour, looked at the figures and were quite content that its own figures were accurate. It had gone to great pains to make them accurate and was rather suspicious of any difference in the Chadwick-Jones report. Being quite confident of our figures, we felt that it was the Chadwick-Jones figures that were wrong. We found that they deal with two entirely different amounts. Our figures include the same things as the Chadwick-Jones report, but they include other things as well.... Our figures include everything. You may take it that the figures in this report are quite accurate. They may not be compared because the two tables deal with different matters.

Mr. Newell The figures for the graded and ungraded teachers are: graded teachers 1,788, ungraded teachers 326. All grades from third up to university grade are lumped together in graded teachers. That would give about 20% roughly of ungraded teachers. That was at June 30, 1944. I think the situation was about as bad then as it has been for some time, due to the difficulty of getting teachers in many parts of the country, and the chairmen of school boards not being able to

* Grade	Male	Female
	No. of Teachers	No. of Teachers
University	98	64
Associate	83	74
First Grade	172	489
Second Grade	137	449
Third Grade	47	175
Uncertified	73	253

¹Volume II:16.