

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, March 10, 1966

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, if I might intervene with leave of the Members of the Committee and with your leave, members will have heard the report that 11 of the 12 bars of gold have been recovered here in Winnipeg and that one person is in custody. That information I think is now fairly widely known. I wanted, however, on this first occasion to say something that I think ought to be said and I do so with enthusiasm and sincerity. This reflects the highest commendation upon the police forces of the City of St. James and the City of Winnipeg and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and each one of these forces is entitled to be proud of the way in which they have carried out their work in this investigation, and in addition are entitled to our very sincere thanks for the splendid manner in which they worked in co-operation together. We hear a great deal about organized crime. I want to say here and now that this is a splendid illustration of organized good police work, and I want to say that we have known of the work they have been doing. It has not been possible for us to say anything about it because it would have hindered the work that was carried on, but I wanted to express my personal appreciation and I think the appreciation of all of us for this very splendid manner in which this investigation has been carried out. There will be further developments in the course of the next two or three days in reference to this particular case.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might be permitted just a word on the statement made by the Minister, to thank him for the statement and tell him that I completely agree with his statements regarding our police forces in this area. I think we have been blessed in Manitoba with very efficient police work. The City of Winnipeg, I think, has a distinguished record in this regard, and I'm pleased to see that here we have a case of one of the area municipalities where their own police force has co-operated as well - another instance of good work - along with the RCMP. It is essential in a country like ours that we do have complete faith in the police forces with whom we work. None of us want to see police forces such as exist in other countries where the police have too much power. We want to have police forces on whom we can depend, who do the job of protecting citizens, and here is a case where we can once again be proud of the work that has been accomplished. So I just want to add my word of commendation to those of the Minister.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, before we adjourned tonight, the Minister of Education gave us some information with a proposal he had for the Interlake. At this time I'd like to ask him to clarify some of the points that he made today. As I understand him, it is the intention of the government to introduce legislation to set up a boundary commission, and this commission would decide where the schools should be located for consolidation of the smaller schools, and as I understand it there would be one board to run the affairs of the whole division or boundary that is established. When the Minister replies, I'd be interested in knowing, will there be an election -- will there be one boundary for the whole of the Interlake, or the rough boundaries as he proposes now? And will there be an elected body, and will this eliminate all the smaller local school boards on the elementary level?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, briefly, the idea is to have a boundary commission which would go in to each of our three or four -- say the divisions.

MR. GUTTORMSON: That are there now.

MR. JOHNSON: That are established now. And within each division map out what would be an ideal system of elementary education with as big schools as possible. They would then have the power to recommend this to the government. Then, if accepted, this would become mandatory without a vote insofar as the elementary establishment is concerned. In concert with this, of course, we're bringing in amendments to opt all closed districts and districts now run by the official trustees into the divisional board; and then the general provisions of the divisional idea, sort of opening - will be coming before you, for your consideration. In addition to just opting in with one fell swoop the closed districts and the districts run by official trustees, any district, we're going to suggest, will be allowed to give up its complete control to the divisional board at will. You know up until now it's been they either all came in or none come in -- you know, the "all or none" sort of philosophy. Now they'll be able to come in one at a time. If 50 percent come in - bingo. You have a referendum for a one-district division we're suggesting. On the other hand, if two-thirds are in, the Minister can say they're all in and form a one-district division. Do you get it?

MR. GUTTORMSON: I'm not sure, but carry on.

MR. JOHNSON: But the Boundaries Commission would be sort of an elementary boundaries commission, if you want to put it that way, to inspect idea consolidations and recommend the sites where the schools should be. This would be mandatory for the elementary portion of it. Now, when we had our studies - and our inspectors have worked for about a year with the people on the ARDA committee - at the meeting we had at Fisher Branch it came through pretty loud and clear that the people felt that without this kind of comprehensive attack you wouldn't get what you desired, and it's been suggested that this will be a pilot project in that area along these lines. Now that Boundaries Commission will also, of course, be asked to recommend within divisions an ideal elementary setup, throughout the province. Now there's some areas, as you know, certain divisions where these consolidations have been effectively carried out. There are others that need help, or where we can direct the Commission to go in and organize it. In the rest of the province, as well as the Interlake, one of the very real problems is that the people really seem to be in the mood after 20 years of activity by the departmental people and government, they're in the mood for consolidation. We think if we can get as much information to them as possible on a joint publicity and informational campaign in co-operation with the trustees and the teachers - and I think there's no problem that we'll be able to get this co-operation - we think that if the people know all the reasons for this they will respond.

There are projects coming before me now in the past year, three or four or five of them - they're growing - where people in an area have effected four or five room consolidation. They've got five districts in, and sitting on the fringe of these are two or three more that just need a little more coaxing and a little more time. Well, one hates to recommend the three or four classroom count school when you know a year later you might be able to get them all in when they see the benefits of it. In the Interlake, because of geography and low assessment in parts of the Interlake, it was recommended to us by this committee that as a pilot project it might be worthwhile with a sliding scale of grants, depending on the local assessment, to encourage the people to accept this approach, and certainly everyone in Fisher Branch who represented both mayors, reeves, divisional people and citizens, recommended strongly that this be made mandatory in that area, and we would like to go forward with such a piece of legislation, but preceded by, as the Boundaries Commission go in, an intensive informational campaign as to just what this entails and what the costs are likely to be.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, one of the questions I'd like the Minister to tell us, this is not going to be - there's no referendum in the Interlake, there's going to be a pilot project. Now, the point that wasn't clear to me, will there be school boards, or will they have a vote -- I mean, whether they want to stay in, like, the local school boards. Will they still operate once this plan is in operation, or will they have a vote to decide whether they want to go in or out? I don't think you made that point clear.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Before you answer that point, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would give me the answer to this. I don't know whether I understand you correctly or not, but my interpretation to what you've said is this, that you will have a boundaries commission which will have the right to go into a division and decide upon what elementary school districts are to be consolidated, and then that area would become a consolidated area. Now, by virtue of it becoming this consolidated area, would it also come under the jurisdiction of the division board or would it have its own board? And furthermore, assuming that they go into Division A, the Boundary Commission goes into a Division A, and carves out four consolidated districts, would that by reason of your formula that you have stated, where 75 percent or two-thirds of the elementary schools in that division area have been consolidated would automatically come in to the division; supposing then, in a case like that, that the Boundary Commission did establish four consolidated elementary school districts in that division area, would these four districts automatically come into the division and do away with their own school boards?

MR. JOHNSON: I'll have to get the details of the legislation before us. If, for example, in one division you carved out, as you pointed out, four consolidations - let's say there's going to be six consolidations in this division and they're elementary consolidations of a group of districts - we will have passed legislation which has put all the official trustee districts and the closed districts under the divisional authority. We will encourage these newly formed consolidations to do likewise, pointing out that a single district division will further equalize their costs over the area, over the division, that is giving up their control to the divisional board. (Interjection) -- insist, you won't by virtue of the consolidation to become part of the division. We will recommend to them, we'll say, "These are the consolidations;

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) ... these are where the elementary schools have to be; this is how big they are; this is the best " This will be done in consultation with the local trustees and so on, the Boundaries Commission hearing them, and there will be the right of appeal and so on. And we'll say, "These are the ideal size schools for this area within the boundaries of this division." Right? They may decide -- they will have a district board of the consolidation. We will say, "You form the consolidation." We will encourage them, in fact we'll point out to them at that time the provisions of the legislation. They'll have three or four alternative ways of running that division. There's 'A', the single district division. Right? now, you may have two of these consolidations and say, "Look, we'd rather give up our control to the divisional authority." If that's the case and with the official trustee in closed districts under the divisional board, 50 percent are now under the divisional board, there would be a referendum. If two-thirds are in, the rest would be automatically declared in and you'd have a single district division. Does that clarify it at all?

MR. HILLHOUSE: I think so, but there's got to be a referendum. Don't you think though that that's going to postpone the day upon which we can look forward to all of the local districts being done away with and all elementary and secondary education becoming under one division board?

MR. JOHNSON: I don't think so. I'd like to get the details, the legislation before us. You've got me on one point here, and I'd like to clarify myself as I think about it. We would make these consolidated areas mandatory. They have to have a graded school if it's at all possible to get it. The bigger -- not the bigger the better, but at least eight classrooms to a graded school. It may well be that 50 percent of the districts are in the division by the time these are formed. If that's the case there would be a referendum immediately to bring it under one divisional control, and the main thing, I think, first of all, is to carve out those ideal elementary situations. Get consolidated schools. This is the best thing educationally. And then I think we would point out to these people in the Interlake, as we will across the province in this informational campaign, that it's imperative with the development of regional technical vocational high schools, that a single district division ideally should have control of all the buildings within their boundaries in order to make maximum use of these elementary schools. The point I quite frankly want to double-check is, once the consolidation is formed whether we have an election then, or on the new consolidation or not. This is the point I'm -- I must see the bill.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, for example, the Lakeshore Division, if we can use that as an example. The boundary stretches from the north, the Fairford River, and to the south just around Oak Point, in that vicinity. Oak Point is in the Whitehorse Plains but just around that point that the boundary line is at the south. The point I'm trying to ask is, once the Boundaries Commission goes into the division, and we'll deal with one division for the moment just to -- and they'll decide where these different schools should be located, now what about those smaller boards that did exist before? Will they go away, or will there be a school board for each consolidated school? Now what about, for example, Gypsumville, St. Martin, which are located on the north side of the Fairford River and they are now in what the department has the name for it

MR. JOHNSON: Special Schools?

MR. GUTTORMSON: No.....

MR. JOHNSON: Remote?

MR. GUTTORMSON: I believe remote. I think they are located in what is known as a remote area. Now what would happen to the likes of Gypsumville and those areas under this new plan?

MR. JOHNSON: Well I think we'd have to wait and see how many children are there and how big a school they can carve out of the area; what is practicable. The Boundaries Commission would have to take this into consideration. I couldn't give you an exact diagnosis now.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well the point I was interested in knowing, Mr. Chairman - I'm using a hypothetical situation. I'm using Lakeshore as an example. The Boundaries Commission goes into Lakeshore and they set up 'X' number of consolidations. Let's say the figure '5' just for the purpose of discussion. Then you'll have 5 elementary school boards in that particular area, and each board will run the affairs of their own consolidation. Is that correct? Then the high schools will be run by the present division board, but there will be no vote or the consolidated school areas that are set up by the Boundaries Commission, they won't have a vote to decide whether they let the division run the whole thing or not. Or will they? This is the

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.) . . . thing I'd like to know.

MR. JOHNSON: It may well be, for example, Mr. Chairman, that after the Boundaries Commission have been out and carved out, say, half a dozen districts within a division, it may well be that the Boundaries Commission would recommend, say, that 8 elementary schools can handle all the elementary population within a given division, and you would then order all these other districts dissolved, and the consolidation formed, and the school's going to be here. When you see the legislation is coming forward at that point 20 percent of the electors may decide to have a referendum, that everything come into the division. As soon as the consolidation is mapped out, you could in effect have a referendum that everything come into the division depending

MR. GUTTORMSON: Where would the referendums be held? In each consolidated area.

MR. JOHNSON: In each division. You've got two things here; you've got elementary and secondary. We're opening up the Act with respect to divisions to give us different methods of bringing about single district divisions. One method when 50 percent are in there's a referendum automatically. When two-thirds are in, the rest are declared. And this is legislation that's going to come before you with respect to secondary education. Thirdly, there will be a bill presented to you, where 20 percent of the electors are on the volition of the Minister a referendum may be held.

Now our hope would be that in making this the target pilot project, that we would get out, get the Boundaries Commission in there, get these recommendations in, and concurrently be talking about the legislation we hope to have before you, and within a division, for example in the Interlake, where there are many Official Trustee Districts which are going to be under the division, as these larger districts are formed it may be obvious that they are all going to be under the division, because more than half of them will be in. I think we have to get this legislation before us, but there will -- on the other hand, the main thing is to carve out these elementary consolidations and go on from there. I know what the member from Selkirk is saying, that if you form these consolidations and have an election you may just be delaying the inevitable turnover to the district, but I think that when you see the various alternatives in the legislation before you, that this will be more clear to you and possibly to me too. You can see there's three ways of bringing about a single district division.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, one that I'm not clear on. When you speak of the Interlake, what divisions -- like there's Lakeshore, and you have the Whitehorse Plains. Now Whitehorse Plains, as the Minister knows, includes the area around St. Laurent, and then there's another portion of it separated around the Elie District, and then you have - I'm not familiar with the names of the other divisions; I haven't got them at my fingertips - like in the Minister's own constituency and in the Fisher area. What divisions will be included in this legislation?

Another question, after this legislation is introduced and passed, when will the Boundaries Commission be set up, and when do you propose to have these consolidations established?

MR. JOHNSON: The Boundaries Commission would be formed immediately. Work would start immediately. The divisions included -- I haven't got a map in front of me. The ARDA area in the Interlake starts just on the periphery of Winnipeg and goes up between the lakes, so it takes in Selkirk, Rockwood, Iberville District, right up to Fisher Branch, Hodgson, all your constituency and mine and Fisher, up at the north.

MR. Guttormson: In other words, then, the Boundaries Commission would be established as soon as the legislation is passed, and it would be hoped then that the results of this new legislation would be in effect by September 1st of this year and that these new consolidations will be in effect. Is this correct?

MR. JOHNSON: We'll move as fast as possible. We have the

MR. GUTTORMSON: The point that I'm interested in, Mr. Chairman, that if you establish these consolidations, I would expect that some of the present high schools would be used for consolidated schools, so what would the area do for high schools if the present high schools were used for consolidated schools of the elementary level?

MR. JOHNSON: That's something we want the Boundaries Commission to map out for us and present a plan which might show, for example, in my area, or in Evergreen Division, that four or five consolidations can serve the area. In doing so there is maybe a four-building school left vacant and so on. We would hope that, in bringing in these mandatory sites for elementary consolidation, we would be able to -- the Commission would recommend a pattern of education in that area which we would take to the people, and with the several amendments

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . that are going to be brought in under The Public School Act, I think there will be three or four ways of a particular district's consolidations and others of operating and bringing about a single district division.

I would like to check the draft that has gone in concerning the actual detail in this area, but this is the concept, that . . . we would have the elementary mapped out. Hopefully, we could go and do this pretty quickly because there's been a lot of work done by the inspectors and the people in the area now, and we would ask the Boundaries Commission to go in and sit down with these people and map these out, make the recommendations to us, and immediately we would start an informational campaign which we're going to do systematically across the province, bringing all these facts to the attention of the people, pointing out what we consider to be the rationale in a single district division at this point to make use of these alternative facilities that it may be vacated and so on. I think that again, as you get these recommendations in, for example, you may get the Commission recommending six ideal consolidated areas. You would say this is what it's going to be. You may then have 20 percent of the electors petitioning you for a single district division, or that consolidation may show that over 50 percent of the districts are in anyway, so you've got a single district division. And everything will be done to achieve that goal.

MR. GUTTORMSON: in the Interlake, there's going to be legislation - there's not going to be a vote in the Interlake, as I understand it, on the elementary level. Now the Minister has indicated that they're going to proceed as quickly as possible with this plan. I'm sorry it isn't clear to me yet. If they do this -- we'll use the Lakeshore Division which I'm very familiar with as an example. Supposing the Boundaries Commission decides to use the Lundar School or the Eriksdale School, for example, as a consolidated school for the elementary level. What will happen then to the high school students that have been using the high schools prior to this changeover?

MR. JOHNSON: have to wait and see.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well then it is possible then, Mr. Chairman, that it may not be possible to implement the plan by next September. Is this correct? I'm not doubting any of the Minister's intentions but this is a possibility, isn't it?

MR. JOHNSON: I'm budgeting for it.

MR. GUTTORMSON: To go into effect? Well then if you're planning to go ahead, where are the high school students going to attend school if their school is taken over?

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, to me it seems that this is a good way to make the best out of a rotten deal, as I could say, by utilizing the present small high schools that were constructed in error, but don't you think that the planning of this new Elementary Boundary Commission will be somewhat restricted because they will have to follow the plan along a base of presently constructed high schools, so their planning will be to a certain extent restricted because they have the high school here and they'll have to plan around it. In other words, they wouldn't have a free hand. Am I right then? That's right then?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, will the Boundaries Commission, when they go into the different divisions will they also be deciding where they should locate new high schools for that division if the present ones are going to be taken over by the elementary?

MR. JOHNSON: I'd like to double check with my staff on the exact nature of the matter.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm very interested in the discussion that's going on regarding this Interlake area. The Minister, I trust, will be able to give us more information on it because there are other areas in the province that are concerned when they see what might happen in the Interlake.

Before I go on to my full discussion on that, I would like to check with the Minister on one thing. On Page 13 of the report that he gave us yesterday, he indicates that they're going to consider the advisability of a regional vocational high school in the Interlake area. Is this to be a vocational school under the federal assistance plan, and if so, has an application been made by the province and where do they intend to locate the school? He can give me that answer when we come along to the subject.

Now the problems in the Interlake insofar as schooling are repeated in other areas. I'm not going to speak for the area of my colleague the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, although I believe that they have somewhat the same area or same problem, but I'm sure the Minister is aware of the difficulties that the Turtle River division finds itself in, and that is very close to that which the Lakeshore division had which I think is common to those areas of fairly sparse settlement, scattered locations, pockets of population, separated in some cases

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . by wide areas of unproductive land or at least land that is not producing taxes for the school division.

Lakeshore Division, for example, I believe had eight schools - the Minister might correct me if that is wrong, I make it eight - six collegiate institutes, one collegiate department and one one-room high. Turtle River Division has very much the same problem. It has five collegiate institutes and two collegiate departments, in other words seven high schools operating on a tax base that is no more, in fact is less than adjoining areas that have a much smaller area to deal with, not much more of a pupil count to deal with, a much healthier assessment on which to levy their taxation, and lower costs because of transportation.

When you look at the map of the Turtle River Division for example and compare it to its neighbours - Beautiful Plains, Pine Creek or Dauphin-Ochre and you look at the assessments of those by comparison to Turtle River, it is impossible to have equality of education under these circumstances. It is impossible for a division board like Turtle River to meet the costs which it must meet without taxing the people in that area very much more than those in other divisions. The result is that by and large they are unable to get the teachers that they would like to get. They have been very fortunate in that they have been able to get dedicated teachers who are prepared to go there and stay there in a number of instances and yet doing it at a considerable sacrifice to themselves, getting less money than they can get elsewhere; but realizing the problems that the division faces, they are willing to go along.

But surely if the Minister is going to proceed with a new scheme in the Interlake then he must be looking at other areas of the provinces where he realizes that somewhat similar problems exist, because the original idea of the division plan was to provide equality of education. In fact, I remember well the ringing phrases of the 1959 campaign, "for every child an equal chance." Well, Mr. Minister, there is not at this moment an equal chance for every child unless the division is prepared to tax the parents in certain divisions substantially more than in other areas. Surely the idea was to equalize the cost of education as well, because to simply say, "well the school is there," if the local taxpayers have to pay substantially more in order to get teachers, then it isn't an equal chance. I'm sure the Minister is aware that this means in some of these divisions a very much greater turn-over in teaching staff. Teaching staff in some of the schools of Turtle River Division have turned over almost completely at each term. This means that there cannot be any continuity and that those children are not getting the equal opportunity; they are not getting the advantages of education that do exist in other divisions.

The problem has become so serious that the teachers and the school board have decided that they must jointly present their views to the government because both of them see the impasse in which they are. I believe if they have not yet presented their brief to the Minister that they will be shortly doing so, and I would like to know from the Minister in view of what he is prepared to do in the Interlake area, what are his plans for those other areas where through no fault of those individuals who live there, but by virtue of the terrain, by virtue of geography, that they are not at present having equal opportunity.

I want to move on then to another subject, Mr. Chairman, and one where I'm deeply disappointed, and that's the question of uniformity of curriculum. We've been talking about this subject in Canada, well I suppose from the very start. I certainly heard about it for many years in this House. There have been meetings held of Premiers and Ministers of Education and a lot of talk about getting uniformity of curriculum, but I see no action in this field. I think it is hopeless to expect to have uniformity of curriculum if we're going to approach it on a straight national basis. I think it is hopeless in pure practical terms to expect that we are going to get the Ministers of Education starting from Newfoundland through the Maritimes, Quebec, Ontario, the prairies, and on to British Columbia, to agree to a uniform curriculum, uniform text books; and if we approach it from that standpoint we are going to get nowhere, which is the position that we are in now.

I'd like to recommend to the Minister that we approach it on a more practical basis with our immediate neighbours, with whom surely we could make some progress. Is it inconceivable that the three prairie provinces couldn't get together on uniformity for the three of them? We have after all the same types of people by and large, the same ethnic backgrounds, living in pretty well the same way, existing on a similar type of economy, facing similar problems. We have fairly substantial movements of population between our three prairie provinces. The fact that many of our operations here are branch operations of national firms means that we have people who come here, they spend a period of time and then move on to some other province.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) Wouldn't it be the proper place to start? To get together with the Province of Saskatchewan, the Province of Alberta, and see if we can't as a first step get those two to agree with us on what should be done in terms of curriculum and textbooks.

Surely when you look at a population such as ours of less than a million people, Saskatchewan with less than a million people, Alberta with a little less than a million and a half, we are dealing with fewer numbers than the Province of Ontario by itself. Surely there could be substantial economies as far as we are concerned and the others, our two neighbours, if we could standardize on textbooks. I get -- not now because the government pays for them, but it still ends up by coming out of the taxpayers pocket, but before that when the parents had to buy the books, there were persistent complaints that there were new textbooks that they had to purchase, that this was a substantial item of cost. The same thing is repeated in the other provinces.

Now couldn't we get together on a three province basis to begin with, then when we get that problem settled, we could start thinking about moving on from there. The next logical one of course would be our neighbour to the east, the Province of Ontario. This would in the long run be very important to us too, because as I mentioned this question of branch lines - or branch operations, many of our head offices are obviously in Toronto. Many of our people who come here come from that province. I think that would be the next logical step, but let's make a start on this. If we continue trying to do it on a national basis, I think we'll continue exactly in the position that we are in, and that is that each of the ten provinces will follow its own course. So I'd like to recommend to the Minister, let Manitoba take the lead; invite Saskatchewan and Alberta to sit down with them, standardize every way we can with those two; and once that is accomplished, move on to the rest.

. continued on next page

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like first to register with the Honourable Minister certain complaints that have been lodged with me for him, and I would like to direct his attention to them and ask him to deal with them in due course.

In the first place, I am informed that there's an elementary school of some 300 children in my constituency which it is planned to be disbanded and spread amongst other schools. Now I don't suppose it's the Minister that decides when schools are opened or closed in a school district such as Winnipeg, and yet I would like to get from him a statement of policy as to whether a 300 child elementary school is justified to stand on its own feet or on its own ground, or is it too small, is it too uneconomic or is it educationally too poor, so that it should be torn down and the children dispersed amongst the other neighbouring schools. It's a serious problem for the people involved. I understand they are addressing themselves to the Winnipeg School Board but I think that the Minister should show leadership in stating as a matter of policy the attitude that he has to the continuation of the school which is an elementary school which services 300 children, and in this case involves sending the children over a further area, forcing some to cross Main Street which is an arterial highway; others to cross Salter Street which is an arterial highway. I'd like to hear a statement on that. Is it better to have a 1,000 children school, be it elementary or be it mixed, than a 300 child elementary school?

Another disassociated question, Mr. Chairman, is the case of a pensioner, a retired school teacher who has come back to work for the school board, who finds that he is still able to make a contribution to the educational system - and certainly these days with the lack of teachers that we do have his services are really required - and he finds that at the end of the month when he gets his cheque he has a deduction from his cheque of six percent of his salary set aside for pension purposes. But this is not his pension purpose because he is already on pension. Apparently he contributes to the general pension fund and this will not, I am told, increase his pension when he does retire. It's a contributory pension but it should be contributory to his own pension and not to that of others, and seems to me to be a form of confiscation or a payment for his licence to teach. Possibly my facts are wrong, and I'll be glad to inform him of that if the Minister informs me that it is wrong.

Now we've heard the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition speak about curriculum and uniform curriculum. I would like to devote a few minutes to the specific work of the Curriculum Committee as it has been going on for some time and ask the Minister to explain firstly how the committee is appointed; secondly, what payment is given to the teachers who give of their time; thirdly, to whom are they responsible, to whom do they report? Is there some larger group where they present their points of view and where they get a reaction to their thoughts?

I am informed that the Grade 11 Physical Science Study Commission has set up a course in physics known as the PSSC course in physics, and I am told that this was brought into Grade 11, given to an average class - the course was given to an average class - and was of such great intensity and high standard that out of 32 children writing the exam, three received a mark of 50 percent or better. I am also informed that subsequent to that the marks were revised; the pass mark was lowered and the report would indicate a fairly successful mark achieved by the majority of the children.

I am informed that the same course with the same examination, and these are departmental examinations I understand 1 out of 33 children passed. I want to know, that this being apparently a trial run, a test of some kind, what sort of test is it? What preparation does the teacher and do the students have for a course such as this, which is apparently a specialized course, this physics course? What program is designed to prepare both the teacher and the students? What type of control is there over a course such as this?

Let me move on to the Grade 12 chemistry course which I understand was brought in this year, a new course, new textbooks, which were presented to the teachers who had to deal with that course, in September, to begin immediate studies with the pupils. I'm told that the Grade 11 chemistry course preceding this one that these children took was not at all adequate to prepare the students for this Grade 12 chemistry course, and still isn't. That is, the Grade 11 chemistry is not a proper presentation for the Grade 12 chemistry. Is that a fact? Are the teachers given sufficient time, or were they in this case to prepare themselves to deal with a new textbook and with a revision in the course of studies for that program? What preparation is there for teachers; what preparation for students. What will be the raw scores when the examinations are held in June? Will they be weighted after it is known what the percentage pass is? Will the teachers involved in teaching this course be informed as to the raw scores

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)... before they are adjusted? Who decides that the pass mark should be lowered so that more will pass?

Now I've not made a general accusation. I've dealt with two specific courses and two specific grades, and I trust therefore that the Honourable Minister will deal with them in the same manner. I'm told that these teachers did not see the textbooks until September. Who plans this piloting? Who is responsible for bringing it in in that way? And again, do these curriculum people deal with the teachers involved in having to teach the course, are they consulted either before or after, or both?

I'm told also, Mr. Chairman, that the former Minister of Education announced in his time that the high school Matriculation Course would be increased from seven subjects to eight subjects and that next year this eighth subject will be brought in, which of course means that each of these subjects will lose one period in order to make up for the eighth subject, obviously leaving less instructional time per subject. Now the present high school Matriculation Course is a rigorous and challenging course, and I think I'm using the words of the former Minister of Education. I am told that the clear pass rate, the constant pass rate in the high school Matriculation Course is about 33 percent. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman? If the subjects are increased to eight from seven, what will be the failure rate in the new course since each subject is challenging and there will be less time for it. Will there have to be an adjustment in the marks and will it then mean that teachers will be teaching a subject and will be given results which will not indicate the actual measure of accomplishment in their case? If the marks are adjusted the children know it, the teachers know it; it is harmful. Now these are pretty challenging accusations that I have passed on to the Minister, and I've done it in this fashion because the information was given to me by people who I believe have the interest of education at heart and have the experience.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have heard it said by the government and by the First Minister that education in this province is the first priority. There must be priorities for the expenditures of tax monies, and education is the first priority. The issue "Financing Education in Canada" which was published by the Canadian Teachers Federation in October, 1965, deals with relative educational effort in Canada, and it shows that the educational effort in Manitoba is fifth in the provinces, and yet it also indicates in a chart, Figure 36, that Manitoba stands fourth in its ability to finance education.

In other words, its ability to finance is fourth in Canada; its effort is rated as fifth; and yet, according to the First Minister, it is the first priority in Manitoba. Now other provinces that may stand ahead of Manitoba don't claim that education is their first priority, but Manitoba does. And it being the first priority, how do we account for the fact that Manitoba's effort is rated by the Canadian Teachers Federation as fifth compared with its ability to finance as being fourth.

Now I don't question the statement of the Honourable the First Minister that education is a top priority. I think we needn't go far to accept that statement, but in case the First Minister would like support for what he has said, I would quote to him from the second annual review of the Economic Council of Canada, Professor Deutch, which maintains that education has a direct effect upon the regional economic growth - and now we're speaking about the economic growth of a province and its relationship to education, and we've heard a good deal about it already in the Interlake area and in the far North - and I quote from Page 119, "The average level of educational attainment within any region will have an important bearing on the average level of income in that region. Moreover, the higher the level of education and skill of income earners, the smaller are the differences in their earnings as between regions."

Then the report suggests that there are important indirect effects, the most important of which is that fact that, and I quote again, "A relatively poor structure of educational attainment in the region fails to support or attract those industries and activities which increasingly rely upon an educated and skilled work force." It goes on to say, "Together, the direct and indirect effects of educational attainment contribute significantly to inter-regional differences in income."

Now these statements suggest to me, and I believe to the House, that a relative lack of material resources in a region could be off-set to some extent by better use of our human resources. We would therefore expect this government to be assigning more of its resources and expending more of its efforts in the field of education, and the First Minister says we are. He says again, education is his first priority. But what are the facts, Mr. Chairman? The Deutch report indicates that we stand fifth in educational attainment of our population.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

I quoted earlier from the Canadian Teachers Federation of last October which says that we stand fifth in effort, fourth in ability to finance. Now we find the Deutch report says that we stand fifth in educational attainment. Ontario, which possessed more material resources than Manitoba, spends more on education in relative terms than does Manitoba. In last year's budget in Ontario, 50% of the budget was spent on education; last year in Manitoba, 33%. This year 50% in Ontario; Manitoba, according to the former method of showing the estimates, it was 27%. It dropped. Now with the inclusion of Federal Grants, it's 28%. So we find a drop in percentage contribution, that is, educational payments relative to the total budget. And in Manitoba, the 28% that I quoted includes the ridiculous misnomer of school tax rebate which doesn't in any way go back into education; which doesn't in any way find its way into the School Divisions that are charged with the responsibility of providing education to our population; and it's included, some \$11 million as I recall it.

The Provincial Government's share of the total cost of education in Manitoba has actually decreased over the past few years in relation to the municipal share. That is, the municipal share has grown. Since 1960, we calculate that approximately 10 percent of the costs of education in Winnipeg have been shifted from the Provincial Treasury onto the shoulders of the municipal taxpayer, and I have here a graph prepared by the Winnipeg school system, which I'm sure can not be seen across the room, but which indicates the change from 1950 to 1966. It shows the expenditures, inclusive of capital grants, of the School Division, starting at about 5 3/4 million in 1950 and rising up to almost 23 million in 1966, and the graph is a fairly regular increase.

The graph also shows revenues from government grants including capital, and it starts in 1950 with about 1/4 million and it rises and there's a jump up in 1960 -- was that an election year - no, they must have been preparing well in advance -- it jumped up in 1960, dropped back in 1961, came up in 1962 - that was an election year - dropped a little, and now it has risen slightly up to some 4 1/2 million. And that change, that rise in cost from 5 3/4 million to 23 million is offset or complemented by the revenue from government from 1/4 million to 4 1/2 million.

Now this excludes the - and may I again apologize for using the term - "school tax rebate", which the government adds to its grants, and if we add that we find that some 30% is the contribution by the government to school costs. Now I include school tax rebates just to talk in the same terms. According to the Michener Commission report, the contribution I understand should be 39.4 percent, so that here we have again an indication that the rise in contribution does not follow what educators think it ought to, and the pride of the government in recognizing education first, I believe, falls on the basis of the figures that we have.

I have another graph here, also dealing with the City of Winnipeg School Division - not the city but the Winnipeg School Division - showing a tremendous increase in the gross operating grants, showing an increase in the general levy based on the assessment formula, and I'm sure the Honourable Minister is fully familiar with the formula. I am not. But it also shows the net operating grant by the province to the school division of Winnipeg, and if only you could see this line which is way down near the bottom showing the government contribution, it is almost parallel with the bottom line of the chart. There is a slight estimated increase now because of the recently announced grants for this year, but other than that there was an actual drop in 1964 to 1965. Apparently, because of the nature of the grant structure, the contribution proportionately is dropping, not increasing.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I must say that when I listened to the Honourable Minister this afternoon, I thought he wasn't feeling too well and I hoped he would be feeling better this evening, and then I listened to him this evening and I felt, "Well, he's still not feeling too well", because he was giving his report in a matter of fact - a report to the shareholders, a president's report to his shareholders, reporting progress. There was no comparison with the report that he gave when he was Minister of Health, when he was helping something grow and develop. The enthusiasm that he gave it then - today I don't see it, and it may well be that he's not -- I mean he may be under the weather for another reason or maybe he's not as enthusiastic about the report that he is making. He spoke of the explosion - was it yesterday that he dealt with his first report - of the explosion in education, and looking at the report and looking at the white paper, I can see an explosion. It was sort of a scatter gun effect. With the explosion, there's shrapnel shooting all over the place. I am wondering whether this is a planned program, whether this explosion is really the word he used, or whether he shouldn't

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). . . have used that word at all because an explosion is nothing that's planned; it's not a deliberate program.

I would like the Honourable Minister to remember back about - not many years ago when he was at school and a little longer ago when I was at school - and think in terms of progress as far as the end result is concerned. Are we turning out better academically trained students? I know we're turning out more academically trained students. Are they better trained academically? Are they better trained from the vocational standpoint? Are they getting jobs more easily? How is their social adjustment? Are they better adjusted socially? Because I picked up - I think this was put on our desks today, Mr. Chairman - the "Guidance Services Newsletter", and having just received it, I only got to the first page. But the first page starts out with "Objectives of Vocational Guidance" and quotes the National Vocational Guidance Association as defining Vocational Guidance as, "The process of assisting the individual to choose an occupation, prepare for it, enter upon and progress in it", and then quotes one Donald Soper, who has long insisted that vocational guidance is really vocational development in process: "Vocational guidance is concerned with a student in his planning preparations and adjustment to the world of work."

This is, I think, a good definition of vocational guidance. I would like to use this same definition to relate it to education and suggest that education is really social development in progress. Education should be concerned with a student and his planning preparation and adjustments to the world, not necessarily of work but to the world, to society and to life in the world.

And having said that, I must mention that I did have time to read today's newspaper and I did have occasion to note some of the words of wisdom that the Honourable the First Minister gave to his supporters last night when he spoke about the parties involved in the election which is about to come, and he brushed off the New Democratic Party as the "pie in the sky" Party. That amused me, because some four years ago he was using the bogey man tactics of yelling, "25 million dollars, that's what their program will cost." This year's estimates are, I think, \$45 million more than they were last year. The \$25 million that he accused the NDP of dreaming about, he almost doubled in this last year. Is it because an election is coming?

This "pie in the sky" that he speaks of, I would suggest is more like a sort of a "writing in the sky", and I suggest that the Honourable Minister and the Honourable the First Minister look up at the sky occasionally and see what is written there. They saw recently the name R. B. Russell, I noticed, because now they're naming a school after him. A veteran socialist, a worker in this city and in this province and in this country, who worked for the development of the individual; who worked for the development of the underprivileged; who clamored that that person must be helped in education, who must be advanced so that he can fit into society better; and I'm glad that the government recognized his value as being a person who deserves to have a vocational school named after him. How many years ago was it when he was in jail for what he had to say? Forty --(Interjection)-- 1919, wasn't it? That's not 42. My honourable friend on my right doesn't add very well the small figures.

In any event, in our lifetime, R. B. Russell was in jail because he believed in certain principles, and today, now he's being recognized by this government, this Conservative Government for the contribution he made. I suggest that the government which has been looking at the sky and reading the writing that we have written for it, should continue to do so and it will find that the "pie in the sky" has become attainable in the lifetime of the people, not when they die, as the song goes. This is not new and we claim credit for things that we say, but we recognize, and we are happy that the other parties follow along that "writing in the sky" which we indicate to them.

I would like to ask the Minister to think not in terms of this year for awhile. Let us imagine the possibility that after an election he will still have a job as Minister, and assuming that that's possible, what will he plan to do for the next four years? Isn't he thinking today about what will happen four years from now? Is he not thinking now about the long-range views of his department and that of education in the Province of Manitoba? Should he be thinking of these piece-meal things that are being done, and they are good things - the attention to curriculum and the attention to school grants and the growth of the school systems and the larger divisions - they're all good things, and consistent with this government which walks slowly and steadily and doesn't look too often up in the sky lest it should stumble, because it doesn't have enough faith, I think, in its ability to walk forward and straight, but it looks up occasionally and then sees a vision, this "writing in the sky."

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

I would like the Honourable Minister to think in terms of what does he want to get out of his educational system. I suggest to him that he wants to get a rounded program, not only for the children, not from kindergarten alone but of the adults as well, to form part of a community, a cohesive community, one which learns together, lives together and plays together. I think that he ought to think in the terms that we suggested a year ago, that a school should be a center, not a learning alone but of living, a school for the community, a community center where you will find, not just the ABC's, not just the three R's, but also the concept of recreation together, of play together, of their parents going to school, the concept of learning their vocation.

May I ask the Minister whether there wouldn't be some value of having a vocational school alongside a junior high school or a high school? Is it good to separate people and say "Now from here on in" - Grade 10 or whatever grade it is - "You move over to Salter Bridge" - to the fish plant if I may say so, since I haven't heard the Minister object to the fish plant - "You move there," and to the other students, "You stay in this high school." Is that right? I'm wondering. I'm not saying it's wrong because I understand there are economic reasons for it, but I'm wondering whether it wouldn't be healthier for the community if they all went to school in the same direction, they all went along the same pathway; and when they came to do their learning that they then separated in their classrooms into the subjects which to them were closer and nearer. Shouldn't it be part of the school system? We speak of the Indian-Metis training, that they have their training in the fisheries section with the fish industry, in the forestry section with the forestry industry, part and parcel of their daily education.

I know that that is the idea of the Frontier College, but does that not belong in other aspects, in other segments of our educational system. Should not the recreational - I'm not talking about physical educational, I'm talking about the recreational aspects - be found in the same environment, in the same schools, so that children and their adults will find the school is a meeting place for all, this community school concept where adult education will continue, where they will all be able to live together and work together, and isn't this a deliberate thing; shouldn't this be a policy rather than something that may happen.

If you have a town that's small enough with a school that's large enough, that school may be the centre of activity, but it may be accidentally the centre of activity rather than the plan of the department. Shouldn't that be designed, conceived in that way? And if you agree that it should be, is it? Are you actually thinking in those terms? Are you attempting to bring the people together to become better educated nearer to their homes. Is it not time that we started thinking in terms of our advanced learning as being something that should be closer to home. Is not the University of Manitoba too far away for so many of the people who live in the Province of Manitoba?

What is being planned now for junior colleges, for colleges for general course graduates, who are not going to university but would still like to continue their studies? Is there something like a Sir George Williams College in Montreal, where a person with a general course can continue his education in a formal way. Are there plans for that? Are we doing enough in terms of our night schools? I understand our night schools are crowded in Winnipeg. There are just all sorts of students coming in wanting to learn, and if they are 21 years or over, I think they look down the list of the subjects and they say, "that's for me", and although that student might have a Grade 9 or 10 attainment in, let us say history, he can then go into Grade 12 history. Is he prepared for it? Is there some way that prerequisites are established for him so that he can fit into his scholastic attainment and continue it rather than flounder around?

I understand in that connection that teachers are being asked to take on night school jobs and they're being paid extra, and you can't call it "moonlighting" because it's the same employer which asks the employee to work extra hours. Is that good? Is it right that teachers should be asked to carry a load which is more than their normal load? If adult education - night school - is important, wouldn't it be better to have the same quality of teacher work a half day and an evening and put in a normal day rather than carry the extra load?

I'm told, speaking about night school, that textbooks are not provided and it is up to the student to go down to the Textbook Bureau - I think before 5:00 or 5:30 - and buy a new book for his course. Is that a sensible thing? Ought not the department consider that once a student is anxious to learn, be he 21 or be he 14, that a textbook is something that he should be loaned, that it could be returned and used again, because if you buy a book and you take a course for a year, for the rest of the time it can sit on the shelf and not serve the purpose of teaching others.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

Now I touched on teacher and night school and I don't want to deal on teacher recruitment except to say that with all your teacher recruitment experts and with all your efforts, you are not going to get teachers unless you comply with three pretty basic requirements. Firstly is money, financial recognition of their worth to the community, and incidentally I have an advertisement which appeared yesterday and it is an advertisement by the Department of Education requiring assistant supervisors of guidance and they speak of the work they will do. They will improve guidance programs, provide information to guidance teachers, assist in-service training to guidance teachers and counsellors, develop and co-ordinate the school guidance program, etc. The qualifications: University Degree in Education, post-graduate training in guidance and counselling with a Master of Education in Guidance or at least working towards it. Also, they must have teaching experience and at least four years of work as guidance teacher and counsellor. They must be willing to travel and make public appearances. Salary range - \$7,320 to \$9,120.

I was told that a teacher with those qualifications would have to be peculiar in some way to accept this job which might mean additional responsibility and about a thousand dollar drop in income if not more than that. Is it conceivable that my information is correct, Mr. Minister, that teachers with these qualifications are getting more than this person who has to guide teachers and who has to have teaching experience? Is this a practical way of bringing in, recruiting more teachers? So I said money, that's very important. A person is entitled to the fruits of his labours and a teacher, as was said earlier by the Honourable Member for Emerson, is, and I agree with him, the most important person in the community. I can recognize no other profession as standing higher than that of a teacher.

So that that type of person also should have a program which inspires him, which instills in him a feeling of a contribution into society in a meaningful way and therefore he has to have a lighter workload. When I say work, I mean the routine paper work that's loaded on a teacher, the heavy load of marking examinations, reviewing essays and all that kind of a thing. Unless you have these three things - money, a progressive inspiring program, and an elimination of all the routine workloads that's foisted onto a teacher - you will not attract them, and all that you say about the reasons why teachers have left avail very little when I'm told that just over the border - over the eastern border you can get a job at quite a substantially higher salary. Why should a teacher stay here, especially if he was here last weekend.

I would like to suggest some precise things. We heard reference to the Minister's statement that for every child there shall be an equal chance. We believe, Mr. Chairman, that every child is entitled to the opportunity of achieving his highest point of scholastic development. We believe that. I imagine that the Honourable Minister does too, but I think that he will not accomplish that purpose until certain very drastic changes are made in the policy of his department. I think that something serious must be done about the University Entrance Course, a course which invites failures, a course which is so demanding that the top one-third only can manage it. And I want to ask how reasonable is that? If you want to be a nurse, you have to be in the top rank of the graduates of Grade 9. Is it necessary for a nurse to be an expert in top marks in History, in English, in Mathematics? Is it essential that nurses have those qualifications? Is it essential that a chartered accountant must have attainment in physics and chemistry? Is that essential for a chartered accountant? Does a person who is going in for Bachelor of Commerce have to have an attainment in chemistry and physics - or a lawyer? Should there not be some measure of the purpose for which this one student wishes to go to university in determining what his qualifications are, with a flexibility that will make it possible for him to advance with a mixed General Course and University Entrance Course.

Should we not review a high school leaving course for those who don't measure up to the University Entrance or the General Course? What steps should be taken by the university to open up its doors, as I have already indicated, to those who don't attain the highest level. There are many average people amongst us and amongst society who go to the university, who acquire a certain amount of training and who take their place in society without the highest academic standing. I mentioned already the junior colleges and the idea of the junior colleges. I envision that there could be one in The Pas; there could be one in Dauphin even; where people could be prepared yet stay home and go into third year university say, and bypass living here in the first and second year. Are we really, without the intervention of the junior college type of education between high school and university, are we being fair to the student who walks out of the high school atmosphere with a rigid controlled time table that exists in the high school

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd).. where he is treated like a child, where he's told what to do; to walk into the university almost overnight where there's freedom, where there's a different method of teaching, and expect that child to adjust so rapidly from one type of discipline to another. The junior college I suggest might be just the very thing that would help that.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want again to repeat that the only way that you will accomplish an equal opportunity for every child, the only way you will give every child his entitlement to achieve his highest point of scholastic development, is to remove from him the economic barrier which exists with so many. The tuition costs, we are told, are a small proportion of the total cost, and yet for that pupil it is a substantial cost and more than that, his board and room are important costs to his family, and many children are unable to continue their education today because of their financial inability to finance their advanced courses. Until you recognize that this child is entitled to the same opportunity as the child who is financially able, so long will there be an inequity continue and a harm, I believe, to our social progress in this province.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to add a few comments under the Minister's salary. First of all, I would like to pay tribute to the people that administer the department, to the Deputy Minister, to the Assistant Deputy Ministers, and also to the directors of the various branches. I think they are doing very good work and try to accommodate the people, especially the trustees who are more closely involved in school matters. I think they are trying to do their level best to please everyone as best possible.

I have listened with great interest to the various members and speakers that have already commented on the educational program for Manitoba. I deliberately waited from commenting because I was absent for sometime yesterday when the Minister spoke and I wanted to read up in Hansard to know what he'd said in order not to contradict or repeat myself, and I find there are quite a few things that I would like to see different, things that I would like to see improved upon, and also some very definite changes that should be brought about.

A year ago we passed Bill 39 which created quite -- almost an upheaval. We certainly had loud and sparked debates on it, and it was thought that this legislation would sure catch fire and spread across this province and we would have one district divisions in no time. However, what do we see? It hasn't been as catching, and if I'm right, it hasn't been catching at all. The people of this province haven't accepted it as yet; at least I have heard of no petitions that have been presented to the Minister asking for division boards to take over the elementary schools, and I think there is reason for this. I think there are a good number of weaknesses if a division board should take over the elementary schools in the rural parts of this province. I think there are very many decided weaknesses. For one, a division board would have to have a general salary schedule which would apply to all teachers of that division, and we know that today teachers try to get to the more populated areas, to the villages and towns, and do not particularly like to teach in the outlying areas, so that here would be a difficulty that the division board would experience in trying to get good teachers for the more outlying areas. It would also rob the local people of deciding on a teacher. While we generally say, and I think it's indicated in the bill, that the local people should have some say in the selection, we know that whoever controls the purse strings naturally the -- as a result, the selection by local people will fall to a large degree by the wayside.

And I think another thing this would do, it would lose interest by local people in school matters, and I think this would be one of the greatest losses that we could experience in this province, if our local people lose interest in education because of the little say that they would have in educational matters if this happened, came about. Then, also, there are some very good reasons why our present system of administering the local or elementary schools are superior or have priority, and we just need to think of the local elementary boys and girls if they have to get on a bus and probably ride an hour or an hour and a half before reaching the destination of the school. Just today a party was in the House, or in the building here, from the western part of the province, stating that his children rode for an hour and a half on a bus. Well certainly this is tiring for these young children, and for a lot of them it would also mean missing their hot meals at noon. They would not be able to go home, have their lunch at home and enjoy a hot meal. They would not be under parental control, at least not during the noon hour, and would not have that daily contact and the interval with their parents at home.

I have already mentioned the salary schedule. Certainly a local board can pay any amount that they wish and raise the ante so that they will attract the teachers, so that they're

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... not at the poor end, or at the end of the stick that they can't do anything about in attracting the teachers. With a local administration they can do something about that. The local board can cater to the needs of that particular district. They might have some special needs; let's say it's language instruction. Certainly this can be looked after much better than if the Division Board was in control.

There is also these extra-curricular matters or subjects that they probably want to have taught in their schools. It might be in connection with religious exercises. All these things enter into the matter.

Then also, as I have already mentioned, with the local school districts at their annual meetings, the local people come to the meetings and have their say, and in smaller gatherings they will speak their mind whereas if they are now drawn into the larger centre where they will probably have to go to a Parent-Teacher meeting and be one of seven or eight hundred people in attendance, these people will not speak up as readily. They'll just sit there and whoever is in charge of the meeting can do more or less as they well please. Anyone that has conducted meetings of this type knows that this is a possibility. So that I find that this thing hasn't been as catching or else we would have seen something come about within a year.

I was also very surprised with the recent increase in grants that was made by the government, while it amounted to 5.4 million according to the Highlights, nevertheless I expected it to be a larger amount. Two hundred dollars for elementary teachers is really not something to brag about, and I'm just wondering whether the government did not reserve a larger amount just for this purpose of dangling a carrot before the electors when it comes to voting for one district divisions, and that the issue will not be decided on its merit but rather on the size of the carrot that will be dangling before them.

I would also like to touch on some other matters. I note from the Annual Departmental Report that they have one half of one paragraph devoted to the services that are provided now for the private schools. I would like to know from the Minister more about it. How has the program worked? How many divisions did provide textbooks? How many divisions did provide transportation for the schools attending private schools in their particular division? I think this would be valuable information to members of the Committee. And how are these funds handled, or the requests? Do they have to make annual requests to the Division Board once they have come to an agreement with the Division Board, or how is this worked? Do the divisions include the amount of these private schools in their budgets or do they make requests direct to the government for this? I think it would be helpful if we were enlightened on the handling of this matter. I think it is a good service that we are providing for the private schools in this way. I voted for the measure when it came up. I think the services could be extended but this probably won't come about as readily because we know of the difficulty that we encountered when this legislation was first passed.

I would also briefly like to refer to our technical vocational schools as mentioned in the government departmental report. We find here that the total expenditure in all aspects for the year were \$2,718,000 - I take it this was the year previous - with \$1,723,000 recovered from the Federal Government. Under the new Estimates this will be increased. I notice from the Estimates here that the total allotted for the Directorate of Vocational Education amounted to \$6,689,000, out of which we expect to recover from the Government of Canada, an amount of \$4,412,000, leaving 2,276,000 to be paid by the Provincial Government. I think we are spending too little in this field and, too, I think what's more wrong than that, is that we are letting ourselves be catered to by the Federal Government on the amount that they are willing to spend in Manitoba on this project. Why don't we opt out of this program and run our own show and get the funds from the Federal Government so that we can run our own show and not have these severe restrictions. I think the potential of 500 to 700 pupils for technical schools is too large. This means that we can only have a very few - I think they mentioned some figure of 10 or 11 - in the province, and because of that the expenditures of one of those schools will be much larger, and therefore the government will go very slow on the program because they haven't got the money to expend. I have asked for this on previous occasions, and certainly we would like to have such a school in our area, and while I know from Highlights that they are intending to build one, I would like to know from the Minister, where is it going to be built? Is this the one that they're referring to in the Interlake area, or will there be other areas that will qualify for one this year? I do hope that they find their way clear and expand this program because I certainly wouldn't like to have this program continued on this basis where the Federal Government will dictate to us because they will only spend so much

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... money in Manitoba on this program.

Then, too, is this matter of the technical vocational schools run by the department, or will this be taken over by the division boards? I notice from Highlights - I think it was Highlights that mentions that probably several of the divisions will have to form a new region and that these technical schools will be on a regional basis. If that is so, I hope we get busy and organize these so that we can get these schools built and get them to function. I am just wondering whether this legislation, the federal legislation, through which these grants are obtained, are not more or less designed for the provinces that have a more dense population such as Ontario and Quebec and probably British Columbia, where you have larger centres and where this five to seven hundred pupil potential is readily available. But this is definitely acting as a deterrent in Manitoba as I can see it, and I think we should protest to the Federal Government to have this changed, or ask them to improve on it and change it so that we could qualify even if we had a lesser pupil count, because we definitely need these schools and we need them badly in my opinion. I certainly would rather forget about Bill 39 and concentrate on this aspect of our educational program, and also to the point where I think we should try and set up combination schools where the technical school and our high schools could form one school, and that you could offer these various courses under the Division Board.

Then, I would also like to touch on a few more items. I notice from the report that the teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund is now integrated with the Canada Pension Plan. Are there any changes in coverage under the new plan, or has it remained identical to what the old plan was? Are the privileges of withdrawing the same? Were there no requests for stacking? Certainly many private companies have stacked their pension plans and I think this opportunity should have been given our teachers; and the school boards, wherever they wish to do this, that this should have been a privilege that should have been extended to the teachers where they wish to stack it that they could do so. And just what happened to the funds that were held by our teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund? Are they intact or what is happening to these? Do we have to hand them over to the Canada Pension Plan, or what is the situation?

I notice from the report too that they have embarked on team inspection of our schools and that this is to be extended. What are the benefits from this team inspection, and is there any change in the reporting that is being done to school boards as a result? I would like to know what the improvements are over the former way of inspection, and what we can expect from this new way of inspections where you have team inspections.

Then tonight we heard the Minister give some piecemeal information here on the proposal that they are making for the Interlake area; apparently legislation is supposed to come forward on this matter. But it seems to me that any expenditures that will go into that plan are or must be contained in the Budget, in the Estimates, and therefore I think the proposal should be put to the members of this Committee so that we can discuss it now in full detail.

..... continued on next page

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . .

It seems to me there is a considerable amount of confusion the way some of the programs are being conducted. For instance, the report talks of an in-plant training program, of adult classes under the Unemployment Insurance Program that the Federal Government has. We talk of technical and vocational schools. We talk of night classes for adults. Where can we find a program that will give us detailed explanations on these? Who is in charge -- which programs are in charge under divisions? Which programs come under divisions here in Winnipeg? Certainly the Winnipeg School Division administers more programs than our rural area divisions do, and I would like to have a clearer understanding of this. If we, as members, can't even grasp this, I don't know how people who are not as familiar and more strange to these, how they shall be able to grasp this.

I am very interested in this retraining program that they have in conjunction with the Unemployment Insurance Department. I think this could catch fire and that we could see a large number of these classes coming up in the next few years. In our home town I think we have two classes and there's applications for more, and who looks after these? Is the division board responsible? Does the department handle these or administrate these directly, or what is the situation? And are the requirements as far as teacher's certification and so on, are they the same as our public schools and division schools? I think there are too many loose ends in my opinion, and I would like to see a more complete statement on this matter.

These are a few of the things that I thought I should bring out. I notice from the Highlights the plans for the coming year, and they mention such things as "encourage planning information of consolidated districts." I think this is already happening in many areas and I certainly do not object to encouraging it where it is to advantage. I know we have a large number of very small schools where this would be advantageous, but I certainly would resist any pressure if we wanted to pressure these groups, and I'm just wondering if this matter is referred to a special board that it could probably do more harm than good. If it's just the board of reference, I think this is the one that is looking after it, or supposed to look after it, if they're just going to deal with the ones that are closed, well, that's a different matter, but if it means pressuring the districts that still want to remain functioning, I think we should stay away from it.

I appreciate getting this copy of Highlights. I think it gives us an idea of the whole department's programs in a nutshell; You don't have to go through large reports; and I certainly want to thank the Minister for distributing those. In my few remarks here tonight I have stressed the matter of the technical vocational schools, and I received a copy of the budget speech from B.C. and I know from their report that their increase in the amount of spending on provincial technical and vocational schools, in 1952 they spent \$573,000; in the year 1966-67, they propose to spend \$26,726,000. This is an increase of 4,564 percent, so that they have a terrific increase in this program and I would certainly like to see ours extended too. Our increase isn't nearly as large. Surely even if we only have half the population that British Columbia has we do not measure up to it in any way, and I think this is the area that we should be really extending.

This is all that I have to say at the present time. I will have more to say as we come to the individual items.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I know there's only a few minutes left. I certainly don't intend to try and start a long speech, but there's certain questions that I would like to have answered and I think it's probably a good idea to leave them with the Minister this evening and to hope that he will come with the answers tomorrow.

Now, as was mentioned earlier in this House, the government brought in priorities, and high on this list, in fact, the Number one priority - and this has been advertised from one end of the province to the other - has been the question of education. I would like to know first of all if by priority the government means that more money, or that a lot of money will be spent, as we are also interested in these words that we have mentioned so often of "equal opportunity for everyone" in the field of education. Now I would like to know if the government intends to take the responsibility in this field of education. I would remind the Minister that in 1963 - of course he wasn't the Minister of Education then - I introduced a bill asking for the teaching of French (it was a very simple bill) I asked for the teaching of French in Grade I. We had at the time, if you remember, Mr. Chairman, the teaching of French from Grade IV. Well, at the time, the then Minister of Education did not take part in the debate at all; neither did the First Minister; in fact, no one but the Member for Rupertsland who brought in what I called at

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) the time and what I still consider a wishy-washy amendment, patting the government on the back and moving the responsibility to an advisory board. At the time I mentioned that I felt that this was not the proper thing to do, that we were elected to take our responsibilities and that we did not -- the administration was a different thing but the responsibility and the principle should be decided by the members of this House. Nothing was said.

I also suggested that if you were going to have any proper teaching of French that you had to have qualified teachers. I brought in certain suggestions in a letter to the Premier of this province, which was never answered of course. Now I would like to challenge, a friendly challenge to the Minister of Education, to speak about this; to tell us what the government intends to do once and for all. Since I've been in this House this has never been done and I have no alternative but to place the responsibility of what's going on in Windsor Park on the shoulders of the Minister of Education and the government.

If you remember rightly, Mr. Chairman, it was felt that we should have a program of teaching of French not only for those whose mother tongue was French, or is French, but this is what was decided in 1963, and I think it is very unfair for the Minister or the government to let this adverse publicity take place - what is going on in Windsor Park now. I think that a statement should have been made a long time ago. As I said, I agree with some of the fears and some of the things that were said by the citizens committee there. I don't agree with this only now; I did say this at the time in '63. I felt that if anybody -- if you're going to take away prejudice and so on, you would have to do it through these people's eyes and not through your own. In other words, I was suggesting that everyone that wanted could have a chance to learn French. This wasn't done. The government said this will be done only for those whose mother tongue is French. Dividing a little group; separating a little group; but the government did not come to the defence of the school division, the school board, who was trying to follow the rules as set up by the government. I think that this is a question of policy. I think that we should have an answer from the government and from the Minister of Education, and I hope that we will get it soon. And while the Minister studies this subject, while he considers bringing in his policy - this is the field of education; this is an important thing. It's most important because I think this will serve either to divide, to keep on dividing our country and our province, or to try to unite and to let the people know each other much better. I think that this is that much important.

Now last year I also brought a bill which dealt with the use of French as a teaching language. I was most surprised, Mr. Chairman, when the amendment to a certain amendment to this bill was allowed, when I felt that we would have a chance to discuss this if the subject was brought up, because it hadn't been done at all in the estimate of the Minister of Education; but again, it was only a backbencher that brought in another amendment and nobody else not only talked about this or had a chance to talk, because the question of the amendment was kept in abeyance to see if it was in order or not until the very last day of the session.

Now, I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that these things, these problems will disappear by trying to sweep these things under the carpet, or by closing our eyes to it and pretending that these things do not exist. We have a certain amount of leadership to give in this province; the government has leadership to give; the Minister of Education has leadership to give; and I think that these things should be discussed. Now this bill is before us again. Maybe if the Minister deems fit to do so he might give us an assurance that this time we'll have a chance to discuss and that he will take part and maybe the First Minister will take part in this discussion. And I'm dragging the First Minister in here, Mr. Chairman, because he's been going from another province who is also interested to know how he treats his minorities, and he's been making very beautiful speeches in very good French, but I think the least he can do, the least he can do when these matters are brought up here in this House, that he should take part in the discussions so we'll know where we stand in Manitoba.

Now, on the same -- maybe it's not quite the same subject, but on another subject that I've brought out in this House before, there's been the question of separate schools and I don't intend to say too much about that, but I would like to get an assurance from the Minister that there is proper supervision in these schools. I think that this is very important that these schools, the people of these schools are getting good teaching, are getting the same kind of teaching as all the other children here in Manitoba. I would like to have the assurance that we are having the qualified teachers, because it would be very unfortunate if these schools had to be closed, but if they are getting inferior teaching I think that the law should be applied to them

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) .. as to anyone else. I think that these things -- I realize, Mr. Chairman, that these things are difficult, but I also feel that - as I said, that this is difficult - that we cannot close our eyes. And I promise the Minister that we can discuss this as gentlemen, but I think that the Minister should try to answer the questions, try to bring in the policy, tell us what the government is doing in this field; and we realize that a difficult situation exists. I'm sure that we can discuss this thing and arrive at something that will benefit all the people of Manitoba.

All right, Mr. Chairman, I will continue tomorrow.

MR. ROBLIN: I move the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, I wish to report progress and ask leave for the committee to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the report of the committee be received.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 10:00 o'clock Friday morning.