

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8 o'clock, Monday, January 23, 1967

MR. MILLER: When the House adjourned for the supper hour I had just started to discuss Page 9 of the White Paper which -- was that there was no intention to criticize the provisional services offered beyond the Foundation Program and the school divisions of Greater Winnipeg and yet, as I pointed out, this was a very queer way not to criticize by going to the trouble of criticizing. As I said, the Department of Education is in a somewhat awkward position with regard to the school boards in the Metropolitan Winnipeg area and probably in other larger divisions as well, because it is true that the larger divisions do offer services beyond what the present existing grant formula provides for, and I don't doubt - and the White Paper says this, they suggest it anyway - that these divisions will also offer services beyond the new Foundation Program.

On this point I would like to remind the House that it's a very good thing for education in Manitoba that the school division of Winnipeg in former years, and in the last few years the suburban school divisions, ignored the Provincial Government grant formulas - whether they be Liberal or Conservative - and went on their own, because it is thanks to them and the school boards that operated them that we have any sort of educational system today. I suggest that if it hadn't been for the school trustees of these school divisions we would still be at the 3-R standard of education in Manitoba, but fortunately the school trustees ignored the Provincial Government's Department of Education, introduced new concepts, introduced experimental programs and made great strides on their own.

Now I wouldn't be very honest if I didn't admit that today the Department of Education has undergone a transformation and today I think the Department of Education is doing what it always should have done. It has taken the leadership in many areas, and instead of being pulled it is now pushing towards a better educational system in Manitoba, and this is good, because they are finally giving the leadership and the encouragement toward the introduction of new services and new programs to raise the standards of education. But this is what creates the awkward position and which I think prompted the Minister to write that he really wasn't criticizing the boards in Metro Winnipeg, because I think the Minister knows that the Foundation Program of \$95 million is not really adequate to cover the varied services and the varied standards and the varied programs which the Department of Education is encouraging, programs like major work, like the retarded classes, the slow learning classes, the guidance counselling, the pre-occupational courses, the team teaching, the vocational and the ungraded classes, the remedial teaching, music, art, phys. ed - I could go on - I can't remember them all, but there are dozens of areas which are part and parcel of the basic program in these school divisions and they are there with the encouragement and concurrence of the Department of Education, so that it is through the Department of Education, through its various directorates and their inspectors, that recommend and urge the school divisions to develop these programs. They know they are good and they want to develop them and this is their function, I applaud them for this - this is good - and yet in the White Paper there is the veiled suggestion that the divisions which offer such programs are going overboard and they are spending taxpayers' money unnecessarily. After all, they refer to the Foundation Program as a normal program. That's the term used - normal program. Therefore, it follows that if you are beyond that program it's abnormal, it must be excessive. It must be . . . . boards that would go into these programs.

Now is it the intention of the Minister to disband his directorates - directorate for instance of guidance counselling - so that the Director of Guidance counselling should not urge the various divisions to improve their guidance counselling facilities, programs and decrease the number of guidance counsellors in the schools? I don't believe that is his intention, and yet you have this anomaly that the Foundation Program may penalize and probably will penalize these very school divisions that offer these varied programs. So on the one side you have the Department of Education with the right hand urging a broadening and a developing program within Manitoba which must inevitably lead to having numerous teachers on staff which the Foundation Program will not cover. On the other hand, when the school divisions respond to this urging and to this encouragement and they reach for money, they are slapped over the wrist and told: no, no, that's beyond the normal program and this we cannot accept.

Now if in fact these programs are essential and if they are good, why shouldn't the Foundation Program recognize these as authorized programs and recognize them by a paying

(MR; MILLER cont'd) . . . . a grant towards the school division that offers these services which the government approves of? By not doing this, I think in a sense they are defeating the very purpose of expanding the services in Manitoba, and also - and this is the point I would like to make - the term Foundation Program becomes a play on words. It is no longer a Foundation Program, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, it's a lump sum of money pulled out of, I'm not sure yet where, and if you can fit your program and all the things we'd like you to fit in this within that lump sum of money, well and good. If you can't, we are not ordering you to stop it, we are not even suggesting that you stop it because we want you to go ahead with it, but you are not going to get any money for it, or if you do, you'll have to get it out of your own taxpayers as a special levy.

Now no meaningful evaluation of the new Foundation Program can possibly take place without knowing the teacher-pupil ratio. Unfortunately, the White Paper suggests that there will be a revision in the present pupil-teacher ratio but it doesn't spell it out. I assume it will be a downward revision - it can't possibly go up - but until the school boards for example have access and can assess what the new ratio is, it is almost impossible for anyone to figure out what it might mean to any particular division, and I know that there are many negotiations which are being held in Greater Winnipeg today which are going to be held up pending a decision or an announcement by the government. I was hopeful that this would be forthcoming but I gather it doesn't have to be, it's not a statute. It will be announced in regulations and regulations sometimes lag considerably far behind the actual bill, so I for one will be very interested, as will I think every school board, to see what the new structure will be, because that will determine really whether this new Foundation Program is at all meaningful or whether it is simply an increase in the sum of money which this government has decided to grant towards education.

I can't stress perhaps too much how important this teacher-pupil ratio is, because the more varied the program and the courses that are offered, the more specialized and highly trained our teachers become. The more sophisticated the articulation within the school system with regard to the flexibility program, the matter of teacher-pupil ratio takes on extremely great significance. It is recognized that one of the benefits of course of the single district division would be to operate schools large enough to offer a wide range of subjects, of courses, and greater flexibility in programs. I believe I remember the Minister -- or I know I have read where the Minister mentioned that in his arguments of why we need single division districts, and there is no doubt with the small schools it's impossible to have a flexible program, so that by introducing a single district division this will now become possible. But it's the school division today who has been offering these varied programs, that the department I am sure would like to see throughout Manitoba, these school divisions are the ones that are being penalized and thwarted by antiquated regulations which state their teachers, for purposes of grants, are not teachers fulfilling an important function or necessarily a desirable function. For the purposes of grant they are simply a number to be arrived at by dividing the total school enrollment by an arbitrary figure of 30 or 25, depending on whether it is elementary or secondary, and I suggest that even if you lower that by 10% or cut out the 30 because now there is a single salary schedule and make them all divisible by 25 or even by 22, if you are imposing any sort of figure at all, you are defeating the concept whereby the Foundation Program, in my opinion, should relate to the service that the teacher provides and not to simply a head counting which is arrived at by some arithmetical equation.

What has happened in the Metro Winnipeg area, which the Minister refers to in his White Paper, and probably other school divisions as well, there are boards that do not get a nickel for many of their staff. I know one school board that employs 266 teachers and they do not get a red cent for 52 of those teachers. In other words, 25 percent are not covered at all. Now they can't go to those teachers and say to them: Now you are not covered, will you take a 50% cut in salary? Obviously they can't because they are under contract and they have to pay the same salary, and yet, as I say, they are not recognized at all, so the cost through special levies would be very very high. Now I don't know, other divisions may not run as high as this particular example that I gave, but I am sure that in every division, in Metro Winnipeg, and in every large school division in Manitoba, there are probably 10 to 15% of the staff which are not covered.

Now this is an inequity that I think has to be removed, and until it is removed we can't really talk about a meaningful Foundation Program. It seems to me this is a sort of a throw-back to the days when provincial authorities were trying to avoid their responsibility and

(MR. MILLER, cont'd) . . . . really this has no place in the grant formula of the government which claims to be progressive. As far as I am concerned, if they wish me to take them seriously then they must discard what today is an archaic system and has no relation to the contents of the program, to the value of the teacher to the system, nor to the function that that teacher is providing in the school system. If these teachers are required, and I'm sure that the Minister will be the first to admit that they are, then surely it is high time that the grant formula apply to all teachers on staff, because if a school board has on staff more teachers than it should have for the program it offers, then surely the department then has an obligation to request the school board to release these teachers as unnecessary teachers and beyond the normal, so that these teachers might be employed in other school areas where shortages still exist. I have never heard that suggestion from the Minister and I doubt if I ever will. I'll be surprised if he accepts that philosophy and he's right, because these teachers do perform the function that he would like them to perform, so they certainly aren't an excess load in that school division. They are not a frill and I'm fearful that when school divisions come up with their budget and they have to announce that their special levy is 10% or 11%, somebody is going to suggest that their school division must have an awful lot of frills if they can't operate and function within what the department refers to, or the White Paper refers to as a normal Foundation Program.

Now I come to one other matter on the White Paper. I think it was the Free Press which carried the headline or the heading, "Money By-law for Schools on Way Out." The White Paper certainly leaves that impression. I believe the First Minister made mention of that too, because the White Paper leaves the impression that since 100% of building costs would be included in the Foundation Program, then the impression is that no by-laws will be required. Now if this is correct, I for one will not shed any tears. I've always felt that it was ridiculous to go to the ratepayers, this rigmarole of holding a by-law, because under the Act the Department had to first approve that the school would be built. They had to approve the plans; then they had to approve that portion of the costs which the government would recognize for grant purposes; and last but not least, the Minister has the authority to order the school built notwithstanding what happens to the by-law. So really I for one, as I say, will not shed any tears if this is so and we are through with public school by-law.

But are we really witnessing the end of it? I'm unclear, and that's why I'm asking the question. The new proposals for capital grants is 100% of the costs up to a maximum cost per classroom as set out in the regulations and approved by the building project committee. This is what the proposal says, and it's very much like the proposal today, that they've got to approve . . . it's got to be within a certain authorized or approved cost. Now we know that the approved costs as set out in the regulations are out-dated; they have no relationship to building costs today. They have not kept pace at all, and I don't think that in the last four years any school has been built within the figures approved or authorized as expenditures by the Department of Education. So that in every case, in the last four years certainly, the cost of construction has exceeded the figures on which the regulations are based. Now does this mean, however, that after getting the O.K. by the department to construct a building today under the new proposal, up to a certain expenditure, that the board will have to put a by-law after erecting the building in order that they might finish the building by putting a roof on it, because unless the regulations are brought up to date and kept up to date to reflect the actual cost, I'm afraid that there are going to be many buildings or many boards that cannot build to the amount that the regulations state.

I'm also wondering about what happens to the existing capital debt. These are debts incurred by by-laws approved by the ratepayers. They were sold, if you want to use the term in this House that seems to be a very common term, you sell things to the public - they were sold on the basis that as much as 60% perhaps on a specific by-law would be paid by outright grants by the Provincial Government. Now the annual payment - they've got another ten to fifteen years to go on some of these annual payments - they may have \$20,000 to pay in 1967. They could expect under the old system that 60% of that \$20,000 payment would be picked up by an outright grant from the Provincial Government. Are we to assume now that this is changing, that instead of the payment of 60% towards that annual payment, that instead this would simply be thrown into the cost and the 9-33 would be applied against that and then the province would pick up the rest up to foundation grants, and then the special levy on top of that. I suggest that if this is looked into carefully, I suggest that some of the school divisions are going to take an awful beating.

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . .

Now I looked in vain for some specific reference in the White Paper, a recognition of what are the facts of life in the schools today - and I'm referring to Libraries, resource libraries, record libraries, audio-visual equipment - and I am sorry to say that there is no reference to them, they are simply lumped into the old supply grant, and for the world of me I can't understand how the Minister can commit a school building to be built and say it must have blackboards, it must have tables, chairs, chalk and paper, and it can have a beautiful library, with the barest shelves in the world, because the grants - the library grant formula is so miserly and so impossible that all you can do with it is put in a handful of books in the first year, and I suppose the policy is this, that in the first year we should buy Book A of the Encyclopedia Britannica; second year, Book B. Now eventually the students coming in there, maybe ten years later, will indeed have the entire Encyclopedia Britannica, but if the students graduating from there after the first year get into university, they may know all the questions in Book A but don't ask them anything about what's in Book B of the Encyclopedia Britannica because they can't afford to have it. Now it seems to me that if we're fitting a school with plumbing fixtures and with books, tables and chalk, surely in this day and age a library, a school library without books is nonsense. I would like to suggest to the Minister he take under consideration that just as they have to buy the textbooks, and they have acknowledged that they are buying textbooks for the students of Manitoba, that they buy a basic library for every school that is built and open in Manitoba and then let these school boards and the grant structure continue to build it up, but surely there should be something started.

Another point I should like to bring up - and this is a question I've been asked to clarify - what about the superintendent's grants and the principal allowances. Are they washed out now? Are the superintendents going to be recognized apart from the pupil-teacher ratio or are they going to be now brought back into it. Is the principal allowance going to be maintained or again does he have to simply fit into the overall new program, because if this is the case, again there may be a gain in one area insofar as the school board is concerned but there'll be a loss in these areas.

And talking about grants, I would like to ask the Minister too whether it isn't possible that the present system of the payment of grants to school boards be changed. To me it's always been a wonder that school boards have to run to the bank year after year, pay interest to the banks to finance their operations because they haven't received their cheque from the government. The cheque received in October, at the end of October, pays for the previous term January to June. In other words, nine months - the school board has to pay off the money and then wait nine months until they receive any money from the Provincial Government in the form of grants. The payment at the end of March, and I say the end of March because it has never failed in my experience, the cheque didn't come in until March 31st - I had hoped that sometimes it would appear March 30th, but unless it was a Saturday, it didn't appear until March 31st. Now the March 31st payment pays from September to December, again a lag of seven months. Now surely some system can be devised, that has been devised in other provinces, where interim grants are made. If we are going to try to be economical, then surely the most economical way is to save interest which is simply paid to the bank. The children don't benefit; the taxpayer doesn't benefit; the school board doesn't benefit; but the banks benefit. If we can avoid this, surely we should make an effort in doing something.

With regard to the teacher grant structure itself, it recognizes finally I think, a more realistic approach to the actual salaries paid. But I would like the Minister to look at PlA4, the category PlA4, why it is that in this one area they seem to be lower than they might be, because as of today, 1966, there isn't a rural division in all of Manitoba that pays less than \$5,200 as a starting salary to the PlA4 teacher, which is less than proposed -- which is exactly - \$5,200 - which is exactly what is proposed in the schedule. Now in the other categories in some cases they are higher, but it's odd that this one key category, and it's a heavy one because many of the teachers belong there, that the only rural area that pays this amount is Portage la Prairie. Every other rural school district or division pays beyond this \$5,200. So if we are going to start a grant formula, which probably will be out-dated next year, let's at least start at a figure which is realistic today. By next year it will probably be out.

And talking about grants and the payments towards salaries, it's a wonder to me that if we're going to recognize teachers' grants, teachers' salaries through grants, and so on, has the government ever considered the recognition of the cost to board of substitute teachers. In Greater Winnipeg I know it's not uncommon for a school board to spend as much as \$20,000 per

(MR. MILLER, cont'd) . . . .year - and these are not large school divisions, in a smaller school division - up to \$20,000 a year for substitute salaries. They have to spend this money because under the Act the teachers are entitled to and must be allowed 20 days sick leave, accumulated to 60 days. Now we all know that in 200 working days teachers are going to get sick. Being the kind of profession and vocation it is, the voice does fail and they can't come to class. I am wondering whether the government would consider at any time to do something in this area and recognize that this is a legitimate cost like any teacher salary and should be shared, if nothing else, by the Provincial Government.

And now - I've got I think just a couple of minutes left - and now last, as I say, but not least, is the question of the public school finance board. I read this section over a number of times and I think this is a section that has piqued more people and aroused more discussion than any other, because this new board it seems will be given the general responsibility to regulate and control financial matters related to the Foundation Program. Now are we witnessing a revival of the functions of the old Municipal and Public Utility Board? That's a terrible thought I have and I hope I'm wrong, where they must approve every cheque that's issued. I remember going down to the old Municipal Board and they were saying: Well, you can make out a cheque for your teacher for \$2,600 but I won't sign it. Now I don't think that's the case, but are we here witnessing the formation of a whipping boy or a watchdog board, someone who will scrutinize - I think the word is scrutinize - the school board budget? Now if that is the case I think we are headed for trouble, because although this particular finance board area of relationship with the school boards and the province, a lot depends on (a) its personnel and (b) its terms of reference, because if they are concerned only, and they might be, with seeing to it that the boards hold the line so they can safeguard the provincial position vis-a-vis the Foundation Program so that their 65% shouldn't hurt the province too much financially, if that is their role then I think within a few years we are going to be back where we started from where the poor old taxpayer is going to be carrying the burden again; or are we getting a board composed of people who will really be interested in seeing to it, and this perhaps will be better of course, that the Foundation Program is being constantly expanded, it's being expanded so that in 1969 and 1970 that the grant formula and the Foundation Program, the size of the Foundation Program would be realistic one, in light of the growth of the system and in light of the actual development of services within the system. Perhaps the Minister might be able to give us some more explicit details on the functions of this board and without necessarily naming who the board members would be -- I don't expect that -- I'm wondering whether he could tell us in what fields of endeavour or areas these board members will be drawn. Because if this board is going to be composed of hardened old business type auditors or actuaries of the bookkeeping type who would look at everything through red ink then I think the board is going to be defeating what I think, or hope is the concept behind a Foundation Program -- (Interjection)-- Well, I hope not. Although there are some there who are very capable. They're not here, I can be kind.

Now, Mr. Chairman, perhaps my remarks may have struck some as being overly critical and maybe they are. I hope that when the answers to some of these questions come in that my fears may be allayed, but perhaps my years spent on school boards and councils have made me skeptical about white papers and blue papers, and statements of intent, and formulas, and I've discovered to my sorrow that all that glitters isn't gold, because when the regulations come out they cut the heart right out of it and we're left holding the bag very often with really nothing to go on except next year's wishful thinking.

So with these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to close, and as I say hope that the answers I get from the Minister will cover everything I've pointed out. There will be some other areas that I'll bring up as we go through the estimates in detail and at that time I'm sure the Minister will have more information than he has now. Thank you.

**MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows):** Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish to compliment the Honourable Minister of Education for the excellent choice of deputy that he has made. I can speak with all sincerity having been employed by the Winnipeg staff for the past seven years and through my activity as a teacher and participation in Teachers' Society activity and particularly the Winnipeg Teachers' Association activity. I got to know Dr. Lorimer very well and I can say that he certainly is a man of exceptional ability, talent and energy and one for whom all of the teachers of the City of Winnipeg have the greatest respect and admiration, and witness of that fact was no doubt a function that was held in his honour two or three days ago.

Mr. Chairman, in reading the white paper on education the opening sentence was certainly very very exciting. During the last eight years dramatic and important changes have been effected in the quality of education, and I really did feel that this was a prelude to even greater things to come. Reading on the first page of the white paper a statement such as "We must continue to improve the quality of the primary and secondary school system" and then he goes on to say that part of this process calls for a revision of the administrative system. Then this of course aroused my curiosity even still more as to what the honourable minister has in mind. On Page 3 he makes reference to the Foundation Program and on the top of Page 4 he speaks of it as constituting a normal program for primary and secondary schools.

Mr. Chairman, I continued seeking through the report for some definition, for some description, of what this Foundation Program really means, what does it consist of, what does it include, and I suggest to you Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing in the white paper indicating what the Foundation Program really means. There is reference in the white paper to the fact that more details of it will be made available to us at a later time. However, here we are faced with the matter of dealing with the estimates presented to us. Here we are dealing with the matter of expenditure of money to finance, to pay for an education program in the Province of Manitoba. We are asked to finance a program, an education program for the Province of Manitoba, the details of which have not been disclosed to us. The Honourable Minister of Education is speaking of a new Foundation Program. What is it? Who is the architect of this plan? Who prepared it?

Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking as a teacher, I agree that there are certain matters that ought to fall within the realm and within the jurisdiction of the professional, but I also feel that there are matters in which the community at large ought to participate. Granted it is up to the professional to determine how a certain course of studies is to be taught, what methods and techniques are to be used, but I do feel that the community at large should have some way in what is to be taught, what do we wish our children to be taught, what does present day society demand of our children today. Now the government has gone to the people for advice and opinion. The government has been going to the people for the past year in connection with a single division board system. The government has conveyed and organized workshops and seminars for key personnel that will be involved in selling this idea to the public. The government have held workshops of this type for teachers, for school trustees and others. Conferences and workshops and a detailed research and study of what the educational needs of our present day society are is nothing new, this has been going on for decades, for centuries in other countries and in other parts of Canada. And I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that if we're going to be talking of a new Foundation Program, if we're going to be talking of something different from what we presently have, then I say to you that the community at large, the province at large should have been involved in the preparation and the drafting of it, and nothing of the sort has been done. And here we're presented with the estimates that we'll have to approve and in effect what we'll really end up doing is buying a pig in a poke. We'll have no idea whatsoever what it is that we're asking, that we're going to be asking the people of Manitoba to pay for.

Mr. Chairman, I thought that perhaps the Department of Education report which was presented to us today would give me some indication of what the Honourable Minister of Education may have in mind when he speaks of a new Foundation Program. I thought that perhaps there'd be something in the report of his deputy to him, in the report of the directors of the various departments to the deputy that would indicate what has been done, what is being done, what is planned for the future, and I certainly hope that in the 160, 170 pages of it somewhere in there there would be the answer to my question, and I regret to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Education report does not offer me the answer to the question in my mind.

I read the report of the Honourable Minister's deputy. The deputy refers to a Guidance Services Branch, refers to visual education, refers to the general course, but there's nothing there specific as to what in fact had been accomplished. Refers to an Adult Education Program,

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd)..... and there again he simply says that other programs supervised are, amongst them, one is the adult education program.

Well I felt that perhaps the deputy's report of necessity having to be relatively brief, the answer perhaps may be found in the reports of the various department heads to the deputy. One of the first items that caught my eye and the most glaring one, which is on Page 36, a report on bursaries to the students of Manitoba schools. When I looked at the figures it brought to my mind a statement made by the Honourable Member for Inkster the other day, when he said in essence this, that all of us agree that we should provide a better education, better health services and so forth for the people of Manitoba. We agree with that in principle but when it comes to implementing the philosophy that we adhere, to that we believe in, then a philosophical barrier is created, for some artificial reason the government says we cannot move ahead with this plan, we cannot make education available to all, we can not make medical services available to all, or whatever it might be. And I find the same true of education.

I notice, Mr. Chairman, that last year there were 1,345 students in receipt of bursaries and 3,447 in receipt of loans under the Canada Student Loans Plan. About a year ago, the third report of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board was published, a board created by this government, and that board stressed the wisdom of investment in education; that board stressed the importance of education in our present day society; that board pointed out in terms of dollars and cents the value to the community at large of each additional year of education that a person can obtain. Mr. Chairman, if the government had read that report carefully and analyzed it carefully they would have realized the value and the potential that there is in investing in education. And statements have been made, Mr. Chairman, by the Honourable Minister of Education, by the Honourable the First Minister and by other members of his cabinet and the backbenchers stressing the value of education in this day and the importance of providing adequate education facilities to the people of Manitoba, but I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that all that the government has been doing has been merely paying lip service to the idea and nothing more, because when a student came to the government asking for aid asking for a bursary, the government said no, and then he had to go and borrow money to finance his education, and three and a half thousand students have done that very thing.

From my own experience in the classroom and working as a guidance counsellor with students, and having done that for a number of years, I know that the usual pattern is this, that the student has aspirations of, No. 1, obtaining a scholarship which is dependent on his academic performance; failing that, he hopes that his academic performance would meet reasonable standards but coupled with his financial need would qualify him for a bursary. If he fails to get a bursary then he goes out and borrows money. It goes in that order. And when I say, Mr. Chairman, that these students who are in receipt of the government loans likely were former applicants for bursaries, there is evidence of that fact in the department of education report, three and a half thousand students had applied for bursaries and only a little better than a third received bursaries. In other words, Mr. Chairman, what this does indicate is that the government has not yet accepted the principle that education should be available to all and limited only by a person's interest and ability. We have not yet, the government has not yet discarded that proviso of ability to pay.

Reading on in the Department of Education report, Mr. Chairman, hoping to get some indication of what the Foundation plan may include, I turn to the report of the Guidance Services Branch, a branch of the department of education that teachers, trustees, the home and school federation and other groups have been clamouring for for many, many years, and it was only in 1965 that it came into being. I was rather interested in finding what did the guidance services branch accomplish during the past year. There is a page devoted to the guidance services branch and the opening paragraph says that some of the duties of this branch performed in its first year are listed below. Well I well appreciate what the duties may be, but I'm interested in knowing where those duties are executed, what were the results of the performance of the guidance services branch? The Director of Guidance speaks of initiating, developing and co-ordinating school guidance programs, but was he successful in initiating and developing and co-ordinating school guidance programs and to what extent? This I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, is what we wish to know, what we have to know, if we are going to give the estimates any consideration.

The Director of Guidance goes on to state, of helping to plan a counsellor training program; of instituting a degree course in guidance or being instrumental in participating in instituting a degree course in guidance at the University of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd)... what the members of this House wish to know is how many teachers have participated in this program; how many more guidance counsellors do we have today than we had last year, or the year before; how successful was the in-service training program for teachers? In other words, Mr. Chairman, for this report to be meaningful to this House, it must be in far more specific terms than it's written here as presented to us.

I turn over the page and I find a report from the School Broadcasts Branch. This report, the entire report deals in percentage comparisons which really mean nothing, which really mean nothing without any figures to explain, to give meaning to the percentage comparisons. The fact that there were 94 percent more students viewing television programs this past year than the year before means nothing to me if all there were were only 8 or 9 students viewing TV programs the year before. In speaking of the television programs broadcast, the report states that there were 65 percent more television programs produced in Manitoba this year than last year. This is true, this is true. In 64-65 there were 20 programs produced, last year there were 33 programs produced, so 33 is 65 percent more than 20. However, in 64-65 there were 20 out of 113 television programs produced in Manitoba which means 17.7 percent of the total. Last year there were 33 out of a total of 143, which is only 23.1 percent or not quite a 5 1/2 percent increase. So percentage comparisons I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, can be used in various ways but the members of this House want some facts and figures to back up, to explain the percentage comparisons to give meaning to them. In some instances we have them, in other instances we do not, and it makes one wonder, Mr. Chairman, why do we not have the actual figures in other cases, but just merely percentage comparisons.

The Department of Education report goes on to deal with Adult Education. For some reason or another, the area of adult education falls under the jurisdiction of the Direction of Vocational Education, despite the fact that an adult education program also includes academic instruction, also includes instruction in the academic area. Other provinces of Canada have seen fit many years ago to establish an office of a director of adult education. We do not have one. We do not have one. We do not have a co-ordinated adult education program for the whole province of Manitoba. For the past year, since an adult education program has been in existence in Manitoba, Winnipeg was the leader. Winnipeg led the way. Even the figures today, the figures shown in the Department of Education report indicate that the highest enrolment in adult education is in Winnipeg -- it's quite true, Winnipeg has one quarter of the population of the province of Manitoba, but the enrolment is far beyond this proportion, the enrolment in the evening school program that Winnipeg has, and it is only recently, only this year that the Department of Education saw fit to give its blessings and assistance to an adult day school which had come into being and which is meeting with tremendous popularity and success in the Winnipeg area. It makes one wonder, Mr. Chairman, just what is meant by, in the words of the Honourable Minister of Education "a normal program in primary and secondary schools". Just what exactly does he plan to include in that normal program? He speaks of satisfactory standards. What are going to be the satisfactory standards? The minimum standard that we may have in the schools in Manitoba? The highest standard? The average standard? This I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister has not made clear to this House.

What about many of the various services that are part of effective teaching? To what extent are they going to be provided for? What library facilities are going to be included in here, laboratory facilities, audio-visual education facilities? This is one - the audio-visual education is one area that has bothered me and continues to bother me. I'm sure that right tonight, Mr. Chairman, there are probably hundreds of students, perhaps even thousands, in this Province of Manitoba, going from door to door, virtually begging to buy additional books for the library, to buy movie projector equipment, to buy television sets, radios and the like. They are forced to do that because our grant system does not provide for those necessities of education. Now, Mr. Chairman, if they are not necessities then I suggest let's scrap them. If we accept the idea that audio-visual instruments are part of an effective and efficient education program, then let's you and me and everyone else pay for them out of our tax funds and out of other sources of revenue that are available for the operation of schools and let us not have children going from door to door selling tickets for teas and social functions and what not to raise money to buy vital and important and necessary pieces of equipment for the operation of a school.

It embarrasses me, it embarrasses me to speak to a person who may come from a community wherein there is a more efficiently run school system to have to admit to him that students in our schools have to go out on the streets and beg for an existence, beg for funds to



(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd).... operate their school. There is no room in our present day society for that type of school operation, Mr. Chairman. All I can say is that the White Paper is simply further evidence of a piecemeal operation, of a patchwork job, it's still the same old car, the same old bus, probably a tire patched, a dab of paint here and there, a new bolt here and there, but basically it is still the same old car.

What this government fails to realize, Mr. Chairman, is that we are behind the times in our education program and this has been made very, very clear to us by a man by the name of Dr. Deutsch in his report, that we are lagging far behind other countries, and the government fails to realize this and the government has failed to face up to this problem and to come up with a long range plan. I realize that we may be so far behind that we cannot possibly hope to catch up within a matter of a year or two, but let the government come forth with a plan for updating our education, for bringing it up to proper standards within the next five years or ten years or whatever time may be necessary, whatever time it may take us to finance and pay for an updating of our education program; and let the people of Manitoba know what plans the Department of Education has, not just for this year, but for the next 2, 3, 4 and 5 years; then I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that we would be in a position to sit down and take a look at the financing of it and come up with some satisfactory solution to the problem.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I think I'll start at the beginning while my blood pressure subsides a few notches after that last talk. However I welcome all the constructive criticism and observations from the learned opposite. I appreciate them and certainly in developing our system I commend them for their observations. I see there is going to be no lack of interest.

Normally when the Minister rises to speak on his estimates, he has a word or two to say about the general activities of the department during the past year, and the other morning when I rose to address myself to the White Paper, as a matter of priority in view of the fact that we are all endorsing the new single district division concept and wish to lay the fiscal proposals before the people as quickly as possible, I didn't get around to saying a few words about the people in the department in the past year.

Reference has been made to the appointment of Dr. Lorimer as the Deputy Minister of Education, and of course, I join all those who've expressed their sentiments. We are very proud and happy that he has seen fit to join us and lend his efforts in the provincial interest at this stage in the evolution of education in Manitoba. I would at the same time like to pay tribute to the activities of Mr. Scott Bateman who for such a long period of time, I believe since 1954, has served as Deputy Minister of Education when he replaced the former deputy Dr. McFarlane. In Mr. Bateman and in the top people in the department, the three former assistant deputies Messrs. Davies, Dalton, Lightly, serving with Mr. Bateman, have formed a very excellent team in the Department, been extremely hard working dedicated sincere people to whom the province and I know all of you join me in expressing these sentiments. I can't speak too highly of their dedication to education, to the plain hard work day in and day out that they have put into such — and especially in the past years as our system in changing so rapidly, I am very pleased that, while regretfully losing the services of Mr. Bateman, I am pleased that he is happy in his work, that he made the personal decision to serve in the youth and Manpower Division of MDA as a further challenge in areas of great interest to him. He has served admirably and we owe him a great deal. And I know that in Dr. Lorimer we have another top educator in Canada and will maintain our system at the forefront. Because despite what all we may say in this House, I think all of us should show some pride in what we have accomplished in Manitoba...politically we have as good teachers as you will find anywhere. We have as good staff people, and educators, and professional people as anywhere in Canada, and as I go across to other conventions, and meet other people, see other systems, I say that man for man, Manitoba takes a back seat to nobody. We should be proud of our system that has evolved and will continue to evolve.

But I do want to say that the White Paper introduced the other day is really the blueprint of legislation which is to follow. The Public School Act would be amended to include the basic concepts of the White Paper, namely the 65-35 division of costs that we placed out in statute, the grants as amended and presented to you in the appendix, would be part of that piece of legislation, and once that's past of course, the regulations follow. But the point to remember is that this White Paper which was presented the other day is a frank, candid statement of intent of policy which we intend to press forward upon. It is a statement which states that this is the kind of program we recommend to the House; the kind of division of costs to maintain and enhance the quality of education in Manitoba and to bring about further equalization of education and make equal opportunities available to all of the people of the Province. We commend

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd).... this program to you. I think basically all members of the House feel that the philosophy behind it and the statement of intent is excellent and that we should follow through on it for the benefit of all our people.

I would like to deal with some of the points brought up here. It's been a far ranging debate; there may be some points I missed which we can hopefully pick up during the course of the estimates. But I'd like to start with the first speaker today and congratulate all those who endorsed this principle. I think the point is we want this Bill to be introduced shortly and passed, this bill incorporating what we have stated in broad terms in the White Paper. We want it in this year, because if we believe in single district division concept as we do, and as the government has announced its firm support of such, that we must give the necessary financial support to the divisions we are asking to do the job we know has to be done. Felt it should be introduced this year in order to support that referendum and we must be positive about it if we believe this is the proper kind of foundation or basic program that we should implement across the province, we should introduce it immediately and make it retroactive to the first of this year, and that is why it has been done in this way. We have been working, I would say to the Member from Emerson, on the principle of this with the Manitoba Association of School Trustees and Teachers, with informational meetings throughout the Province, but intensive campaign was advised only after the complete financial picture had been put before the people to complement the educational benefits which we are trying to tell them about.

I think that one of the things he brought up was boundaries. We thought, I think it is fair to say that all those who have been engaged in the publicity committee with me over the past month or two have come to the same decision as we came to originally, namely, that the first principle was to get the concept of single district divisions across, and the boundaries are something we can adjust in the light of the research that's going on in the Boundaries Commission and can look at from time to time in the future. There's nothing to say they're sacrosanct.

I would point out to the Member from Emerson that remote districts get the same grants. There are very few of those of course. But the program, with the increased provincial support, hopefully will encourage the people at the local level to accept it more so than they would have did if we had to sell it on principle alone. And nothing I have heard today would indicate that it will do other than pass. I would point out to the Member from Emerson I didn't quite get the point he made during the debate but I would point out that the new salary schedule is a combined schedule for both elementary and secondary teachers. There's the odd correction in there that I will bring to the committee's attention later, some typographical -- I know in one salary schedule there is a little mistake, but I will give the new sheets to the honourable members as soon as that's corrected.

The Honourable Member from Emerson dealt with many matters that we have debated from time to time and rather exhaustively over the years, and I'd be happy to debate them again if he wishes, but I do feel that members want to talk possibly more about the White Paper.

The White Paper is really, as I say, a blueprint to put into legislation and spelled out by statute. The program will include of course, provision for the supernumeraries that the Honourable Member from Elmwood was talking about, while boards will be given the power they should have to determine and direct policy. Provision will be made for boards to engage specialist teachers, guidance, physical training and music, handicapped, as he pointed out and a lower enrolment formula in all categories from the public school, high school students, mentally, physically handicapped occupational entrance courses and so on. And provision in the over-all formula for supervisors, principals, and other personnel.

I understand that the formula will provide grants for approximately 98 percent of the teaching force in 1967. The paper is very candid. This paper -- and you say the Foundation Program's a dollar sign -- it's really a combination of both. As we say candidly, the total costs last year were about 90 million. In working out a program of lowered number of pupils per teacher, and in working out the lowered numbers for the special categories I have mentioned, mentally handicapped, the provision of guidance teachers and so on, we have -- a Foundation Program is a combination of all these factors plus reviewing all the budgets as we are aware of them and noting trends and needs and developing a program that we thought would be absolutely necessary to enable a single district division to put on the kind of program, as I say, that we visualize. These new pupil-teacher ratios will really provide many of the teachers that the Honourable Member for Elmwood was talking about. Beyond that, boards can provide for additional teachers. They have this right. The new figures, as did the old, include all teachers really, guidance, counsellors, etc., so they all will be covered. The new formula

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)..... will be so much more generous and the boards will have much more freedom.

In other words, the new Foundation Program is much broader in scope than the previous one. I would also point out to the honourable member that there's flexibility built into this program for determination of policy, for example with a more flexible system of determining the number of authorized teachers they can hire these specialists, and greatly enhanced grants for instructional supplies as noted in the paper tabled the other day should give divisions money for testing materials and other instructional supplies used for research in other areas, and the increased administrative grants will allow for engaging of more non-teaching personnel, also possibly including research staff. As you know, this is dealt with by regulation. We have a pretty good idea of what, in developing the program, what the numbers will be that are recommended, and as the legislation is passed these figures will be made available. I think I might be able to indicate what they are, but, in short, it will cover a lot more than was ever covered before. As I say again, in the comparison of the present and proposed Foundation Program, at a glance one can see for one's self that they allow for a great deal more leeway in the kind and variety of teaching aids.

I would like to deal further with research during the course of the estimates. I would say that the Foundation Program as devised here, how did it come about? It came about because of the experience in dealing with budgets by the senior people in our staff, their recommendations concerning raised ceilings and the kind of program they thought should be enforced in the coming year, upgrading it in this way to give the kind of incentive we feel is necessary and at the same time assisting the existing divisions who have been getting quite far ahead of the old Foundation Program in meeting a great deal of their costs.

The honourable member also mentioned that it maybe doesn't meet all costs in a particular division. I think we are frank and candid in the paper before you - or the White Paper - namely, that we believe that the Foundation Program in a majority of divisions, I would say in a majority of many divisions, would cover actually 100% of the costs; in other divisions it will cover, we think, possibly practically all of the costs and go along ways towards covering many of the costs the divisions are now bearing entirely by special levy. We do point out that even with this enhanced program there are certain divisions, a few, who would also carry a special levy. They would still be over the grants. The blanket grants for teachers and equipment again to enhance teachers salaries and the increased grants per teacher in these various categories as outlined under Administration, Supply and so on, give the division more freedom in picking their priorities within their division.

I think the White Paper also points out that educational costs are rising. It says so candidly and points out that in certain areas certain home owners may not receive any direct relief, but it is very borderline. The vast majority, we think at these rates, are going to be paying - local home owners - possibly much less, and really it is providing the school boards with a total of \$23 million more than last year for their operation of education, and again admits the costs are rising. We think after the closest examination, and reviewing as I say all the information available in the department and recommending this to the government, that it is a realistic program for this year and we think divisions should have the democratic right over and above what we consider a good program to levy for special needs.

The honourable member for -- there are so many points here to cover it's like trying to cover the waterfront. The Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain asks if this is a realistic program. We think it is. We think in many of these divisions it will cover practically 100% of the costs. In others there may be, as we said in the White Paper, very small levies, but we are guesstimating, as you know with the total cost \$90 million last year and building this program up to the \$95 million level, to give the kind of support we think these divisions will require. It is just possible small levies will be needed but boards, I must say, have an enviable record in this province. It might be the time to commend the trustees for their resolutions which we went over with them just a few weeks ago, and at this point I might say when people say who devises the Foundation Program, the community isn't brought into it, well surely the government is elected by the community as a whole, this government is in office, put here by the people who are the community of Manitoba, charged with the responsibility of bringing forward a program of action to the people for their consideration. We have involved in all our developments, as the member from Burrows well knows, many hundreds of teachers in our program and they have responded magnificently in curriculum and other areas. We listen to the combined recommendations made to us by the Teachers Society and the Manitoba Association

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)..... of School Trustees, and while we may not always agree to the nth degree on certain matters, we do come by and large I think in this program to a meeting of minds that has been closer than ever before to what's really needed at the local level.

I would point out to the honourable member with respect to the finance board, as will be proposed in the legislation that comes before you - and we will have another opportunity to examine it here of course - the concept being that you needed an instrument such as this in order to pool all the incoming monies from the 9 and 33 mill levies and then this would be matched by the provincial 65% share. This would be set out by statute, and covering another point at this juncture, we would hope to try and improve the timing of the payment of grants to the boards. This has been a continuing problem coming up year after year, and as the annual report has always showed, in global terms there is roughly over \$5 million usually outstanding and \$5 million in the way, and when some members say it would save an awful lot of interest for the province to pick up all the interest charges of each individual board, it really works out that, on balance, probably in global terms around the province, money is saved under the present policy and the boards receive payments four times a year, but we are looking at this with respect to the finance board and possibly better arrangements could be made re payments. However, as we said there, it's an instrument to accept the revenues, to match them by the government - its share - and paid out to the school boards to carry out their duties.

I do agree with the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain that while he mentioned that point about industry, I also think that possibly, as the White Paper says, from the best estimates we can make on this, they probably in this current year for example wouldn't be paying more than they would have paid if nothing had happened, and in high tax areas there'll be possibly some relief for them, but again there is some stabilization in this kind of a formula for industry considering coming to this province. There is no doubt in my mind that when you pour large sums of money into your educational system that quality doesn't increase overnight, but certainly there is no other way in the long run of raising the standard of our educational system without pouring more effort and more good people into it.

With respect to transportation in rural areas and the points brought up by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, I would be happy to talk this over with the chap who checks our school buses and the transportation branch to see what comments and information I can receive in that regard.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks covered the waterfront in examining the Foundation Program. I would tell him as honestly as I can that we are not trying to read something into this that isn't there, and I think as the legislation regulations unfold he will take some comfort. I think that -- do divisions pay more than they do now for capital. I think under the program, as outlined in the White Paper, the full cost of capital expenditures for schools will come not directly from the local property in the school division but in large part from provincial taxation, and to a lesser degree from the province-wide pooled property tax. The concept is to absorb the amortization of those all outstanding debentures through the Foundation Program and to set up a -- I would point out that the concept has been this, that we would enhance our school building projects committee which is within the Department of Education at the present time, and have already hired an architect who is busy at work reviewing modern school buildings and all the new concepts that are going into school buildings, and undoubtedly by regulation would have to set realistic figures as to the actual costs today. Then the school boards would in the normal course of events write a letter of intent to the school building projects committee as they have done in the past, where you checked the nature and the number of students approved, and this approval would go to the school finance board for payment. I think the Minister must remain the one on behalf of the government expounding in this House and to the Legislature the nature of that support and the nature of the Foundation Program.

I think that the school finance board also -- I think in this way we can better assess those things which from time to time should be absorbed into a Foundation Program or increased within the program, and as we see special needs becoming universally adopted throughout the various divisions, you might well absorb it into such a program, but the concept is quite straightforward with respect to capital. When the grants are paid I think that all our studies, as I said in the previous sessions - this has always come out and we have examined it again and again - the department tell me - and we have been working with my colleagues on this new board. We have examined this further and hope to make certain improvements in that payment schedule.

I think in general terms there is nothing in the statement that has been made in the White

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd).... Paper that means other than what it says, if I can put it that way, with respect to the program. This program is really the sum total of the efforts of the department, the government, the cabinet and the caucus, in examining the alternatives and in looking at the departmental program as recommended, and of course we are most sensitive to the resolutions we received from the educational bodies. We have in the department top professional people in many fields and they have all been consulted, so I think that by and large the community is represented in this way to a large degree and will certainly be represented in making any suggestions which many of you have made today on behalf of your people.

With respect to the regulations, I recognize that the regulation detail is something which has been worked out in determining the Foundation Program and in building the Foundation Program, and I would be prepared to give some of this detail to assist honourable members, but it is something which, once the legislation is passed, you would then draw the regulations based on that legislation which gives you the authority to do so, but the idea would be to devise a general formula for determining the number of authorized teachers in the division.

As you know, at the present time it is 30. The idea would be to divide the enrollment by 28 and add one if the remainder is 14 or more, and then for kindergartens of course you add one-half the kindergarten enrollment to the elementary enrollment. In the field of the mentally retarded and the physically handicapped, the emotionally disturbed, the visually handicapped, you have 8 to 13 pupils, one grant; over 13 you divide by 13 and add one. This give you a much lower ratio. The occupational entrance type of course, from 15 to 23 students, one grant; 24 to 40 pupils, two grants; and over 40 you divide by 20 and add one if the remainder is one or more. At the secondary level you divide the enrollment by 23 and add one. Now for principals, assistant principals and supervisors, you divide the total number of teachers determined in the formula aforementioned by 10 and add one, and with the superintendents you would get one authorized teacher grant and an additional \$4,000.00. The grants toward salary have been mentioned. Also, additional grants towards salaries for principals, the plan would be to give \$100 per classroom up to \$2,500 in the elementary; \$100 per classroom for 11 rooms or less in secondary, or \$150 for 12 or more classrooms to a maximum of \$3,000 under secondary; and for assistant principals and supervisors you would add another \$800; and superintendent, \$4,000.00.

Now these are the bare outlines of some of the ratios which have gone into the development of the Foundation Program, the idea being to -- there are other -- the grants towards supplies, administration and maintenance you already have, and transportation -- of course the grants up to \$175 were necessary, and of course you know during the past year we made transportation grants available to the visually handicapped, retarded, emotionally disturbed, physically handicapped in urban areas.

Now when you examine this kind of a regulation or when you examine these ratios I have given you, you will see it gives a large number of supernumerary people to the individual division to allow them to pick their priorities. It gives them considerable flexibility in picking whether they want guidance people or want to emphasize a particular area, and this I think they should have, but I don't know how else you could devise a Foundation Program other than to give boards, as the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks suggested, a blanket authorization to go ahead and hire who you want and how many you want. That has never been sprung on me before, Mr. Chairman, and certainly an interesting observation, but one which didn't come into our calculations during the devising of the new Foundation Program.

Now this idea was to give this increased number of supervisory and other people, and instead of spelling out X number of - one guidance teacher - this gives X number of people to the division to hire them on the priorities which they may set. And in examining this whole program, in working these ratios and these teacher ratios to pupils, adding the supernumeraries, extra specialists in different fields, and examining the kind of costs that we think boards -- it's not the highest but it's near the highest, about the highest costs incurred in the province -- we think that it's a reasonable program. It's certainly well above many of the costs experienced today, but the idea being if you're going to really provide the single district division boards with the kind of program they should have, you really have to have this kind of program in order to develop a good standard of education in all the divisions across the province. I'm convinced that, all said and done as a result of our research and of the kind of thought and deliberation that's gone into this, as I say it isn't perfect- that'll be the day - but I feel it's a tremendously enhanced program in keeping with the best that we could come up with at this time. Certainly we'd be happy to -- we have heard these observations in the House today, and

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)..... certainly in drafting the legislation which will be before you, we will have further opportunity to discuss some of this in more detail, following which these regulations would come into being, but in rough terms, in broad terms, this is really the broad outline of the nature of the regulations in this area.

With respect to the Member for Burrows, I wouldn't classify this White Paper as it contemplates a bill or a change in The Public School Act, and this enhancement, I personally couldn't call it - I don't think it justified the title "a pig in a poke" - but certainly I feel it's the kind of program that will commend itself to the vast majority of our people in the divisions of the province as we ask them to consider the educational advantages of the single district division system. I know he's in favor of that system. I know he feels it's a necessary step at this time. I hope we can count on his support to get on with the job of translating that White Paper into legislation, getting our regulations drawn up, and in the meantime going to our people with the nature of the change.

With respect to the departmental report, I would like to look over some of the matters he has brought up and try and get some more definitive answers for him. I note his great interest in the Guidance Branch. I'd like to look further at some of the points he's made in that regard. I know he acknowledges it's a step forward. I think he's aware of the guidance division set up at the university last year. I think my estimates reflect, but I just don't know the number of bursaries given to encourage teachers to go back to the university and take the guidance program. It certainly is an area where a great deal has to be done. I do think our present staff under Mr. Banmen are making an excellent start. I think the brochure they're putting out, the circular of the Guidance Newsletter is an excellent document. I think they're recognizing problems and will go forward.

With respect to the School Broadcast Branch, I spent quite a bit of time in this area this year there with the staff. I understand we were the first province in Canada to get into radio. Outside of Toronto, we're the only people that's ever produced a spectacular on TV. I can assure my honourable friend that if we can get - we're working hard with the CBC right at the moment to get more time and more help in producing more programs of the kind that have been going out over this network. I'm happy to say in comparison with other provinces we seem to be well ahead, despite all our drawbacks, seem to be ahead of the pack in production and production savvy under Miss McCance in the excellence of our programs, but I'd like to get more detail on that for him if I could. Certainly I'll have more to say on adult education.

When my honourable friend refers to what is a normal program in the primary and secondary schools, well when we say a normal program devising the Foundation Program is a method of bringing together and translating into dollars the accumulated savvy and knowledge in the department after years of experience and in trying to bring forward a progressive program. We call this Foundation Program a good standard program of education which we're prepared to support in this way, 65-35, and we think this year it's a \$95 million bill. I think on balance there's no limit to what we can put into that program as we develop it and enhance it, and I would hope that we would maintain our standards. I think the honourable member will realize that with the increased amounts of money available for materials, supplies and so on, I would hope that divisional boards would have more resources now in this new program to purchase more of the kinds of supplies he was alluding to. I also feel that in the -- I believe I have a report here somewhere in my estimates concerning the Library Branch. We have now a Director of Library Services and I have more to say on that with respect to more money being appropriated for library services.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that unlike the Honourable Member from Burrows, I don't feel that we're patching an old tire. I'm one of those who believes that in the history of Manitoba, as in other provinces, I think our people have had opportunities in the past. I think other provinces have had the same problems as we had. As I go across and talk to other provinces, we all seem to be having the same problems. I do think though that we're behind in our single district division concept. Other provinces have grasped this before us. I think we must get out and sell this divisional plan. I think we must put the best interpretation on this White Paper - I think it is a new car out of the garage - it's a lot better than anything we've seen around here before in Manitoba and I would hope that we would have enough faith in this program to get out, all of us, and bring to the attention of our people the need as we see it to get on with the job of making available to the boys and girls throughout the province the progress that is going on.

Never before in the history of this province have so many professional people been involved in a continuous basis in the examination of curriculum, in advising the department in so

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd).... many areas, and they're doing a yeoman's job. Never before have we had more teachers in training. Never before have we had a higher percentage of qualified teachers, albeit I'll never satisfy my Honourable Member from Burrows and Elmwood, or Seven Oaks, that we're doing enough, but the department is fairly exploding with activity at the Curriculum Branch, in vocational education, in all aspects of its activity, and if we're going to bring these new developments effectively to the local level throughout the province in a more equitable fashion and develop more opportunities educationally for these people, I think this Foundation Program as outlined on the White Paper would be an adequate financial resource to make it possible for the people to adopt the new system, and certainly we must get out and do that. I would hope that while we get into some pretty free-swinging debates here and talk of these things in very round terms and use many adjectives, I think on balance we are going to have in some areas, despite all this, a job in selling these opportunities and this program to some of our people.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Minister could clarify one point for me. In mentioning or referring to the pupil-teacher ratio, I am wondering if I heard him correctly. The present one is 25 and 30 - 25 secondary, 30 elementary. Did I hear him to say that it will be changed to 28 - from 30 to 28 - a drop of two in the elementary. And what else, because the secondary is presently 25.

MR. JOHNSON: Secondary, you divide by 23 and add one - the enrollment in the school; and the elementary you divide by 28 and add one if the remainder is 14 or more. Then you have these lower enrollments for the mentally handicapped, the occupational entrance; and then you have the supervisors, principals, assistant principals, divide the total number of teachers determined above by ten and add one; and then a superintendent gets another authorized teacher. Then there are these additional grants towards the salary for the elementary and secondary principals, assistant principals, superintendents.

MR. MILLER: Yes, thanks very much, Mr. Minister. The point, the one I was interested in mostly was the 28 -- 23 which is instead of the present 30-25, so that by and large it's less than a 10% drop in the elementary pupil-teacher ratio and just about perhaps a 10% drop in the secondary. This I gather is what you said. Thanks.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin my remarks by asking the Honourable Minister if he would supply us with copies of his statistics since not all of us were able to jot them down as he read them, either - perhaps for tomorrow morning, because I think we would like to look at them as soon as possible.

I was unable to finish my comments on the White Paper when I spoke the first time but I intend to do so now and also to reply to some of the comments that the Minister has just made. If we examine the first appendix to the White Paper, on Section B on financing, it refers to the present system and also of course to the proposed system, and under 1 (b) there under the present system it says that government grants are to make up the difference between the total grant and the general levy, and then it gives examples of how much the government will pay, 65-35 and so on. Of course that is very impressive and of course the government is going to give more money for education, but again we get to the same old problem and that simply is how much is the government going to cover out of the supernumeraries or how much of the total cost of education.

Now the Minister suggests he is going to cover 98% of the teachers and I know he is not trying to be misleading there, but I think again this is in fact misleading for this reason, that probably that figure may be true, or that figure could be true in the sense that he may be looking at the whole province, but I know what is going to happen. When we come to the progressive divisions, the divisions that have single districts now and have all sorts of supernumeraries and so on, they are certainly not going to get 98% of their costs. Maybe it will be 80% of their costs or 85% and the others will be 100%, and if you add it all up and divide it then perhaps you get a figure in the 90's, but I know what's going to happen. I know that in Winnipeg, for example, and in certain suburban divisions, for example Seven Oaks which is one of the most progressive, and St. James and so on, I know what is going to happen. There we are going to get into the same old problem. We are going to want additional people; we are going to hire additional people and the government will not pay for these people because they are not in the basic foundation grant, and then the government will say, as it did under the present system of financing 1 (b), the government grants are to make up the difference between the total grant and the general levy.

Well we are going to be riding that same old horse again, because eventually these

(MR. DOERN cont'd)..... additional services will cost more money, assessments will rise, for example in the City of Winnipeg, and the City of Winnipeg taxpayer as an example will pay more and more and more and the government will pay less and less. This situation is so ridiculous right now that the Provincial Government pays 3.6 million I think out of Winnipeg's \$28 million budget. Now if that's supposed to be a big contribution, then I don't know what the word big means. Every year it gets less and they are paying right now one-seventh - one-seventh of the costs in the City of Winnipeg - and of course they are now going to pay, they suggest 65% of the costs, and this seems to mean that in Winnipeg they'll pay 65% of total costs but it's not. It's starting with 60% - its 60-40 - and I suggest that in the future it is going to get smaller and smaller and eventually it will be 40-60 and then who knows, maybe eventually we will get down to the good old rule of thumb of one-seventh.

Now the Minister in his White Paper talks again about his Foundation Program, and it's the same old problem. I made this point - I'll make it very briefly again - these divisions, certain divisions at present, mainly urban, but in the short future with the assistance of the government rural divisions as well, they will be leading in experimentation and then when they want to experiment further they are told, "go it alone". Now the government can't have its cake and eat it. If it thinks these programs are advisable, in general, then I think the government should pay a portion of those costs. It's no use telling us, for instance, have guidance counsellors and then say go it alone. Now I know that they are going to make some contribution there, but there are other things as well, like say art teachers and music teachers. If you really think these are good, and I certainly do and I think the teachers do and I think the trustees do and I think the parents do, if you think they are really good, why don't you make a contribution towards them. You can figure out the percentage - I'll leave that up to you - but you should give some contribution. Don't say do it on your own, raise your own levy.

I read the Free Press this evening and I see a statement from Dr. Lorimer, the new Deputy Minister of Education, on Page 3 of the Press, and he says, "One way to keep abreast of change is more and better educational research programs at all levels." True, and that "Since educational problems are similar throughout the country, Canadians should combine their educational research." He called for more support for the Canadian Council for Research and Education. Well, if the Minister goes to a conference and talks about research and tells them what we are doing in Manitoba, I think he'll get absolutely laughed out of the Chamber. I would be the last person to encourage him to go to a conference and to tell these people about all the scientific research and all the scientific pilot studies and all these dozens of researchers in the Department of Education, or is it hundreds, or is it two, that are doing research. We are spending \$100 million, and how many million of that is going for research? Is one percent going for research? No. One tenth of one percent? Maybe. What are we spending on research? I'm going to hammer this point quite a bit in the next few days. I'm going to spell it out more specifically.

Now I think that when we look at libraries, and this has already been mentioned as well, up to now - up to now the library grants have been as follows: The government has given in elementary education, if a school division wants to spend \$40 for a room for books in elementary, they will pay half per authorized classroom. It has to be authorized or else you don't get anything. In an authorized classroom at the secondary level, they will pay half up to \$65. Well you know that is not a great deal of money - not very much at all. I suggest to the Minister that he go out and look at some of these dandy libraries in rural Manitoba, because I have. I have taught at Emerson and I have taught for example at Stonewall. --(Interjection)-- The best one is at Gimli? Well I wouldn't doubt it. I saw what I thought was the best one in a suburban area and it was at Transcona. It is a specially designed library and it has one of the finest collections of books - I don't know how they manage it - but I have seen some of these dandy libraries in rural Manitoba. Let me tell you what they consist of. It looks like the Vaughan Street Detention Home Library. There we have a dozen books and a few magazines, and in rural Manitoba we have hundreds of books and this is what they look like. They are donations, 1927 Tarzan stories, old books that nobody wanted and threw to the library, encyclopedias from 1913. That's the kind of library that I have seen. That was six years ago. Now maybe there has been a tremendous increase since then, but remember you were the government then in 1960 and I wonder - I wonder - the grant formula didn't change either. I wonder how good they are now - still Tarzan books?

MR. HILLHOUSE: No, Batman.

MR. DOERN: Batman - we've moved up the ladder.



MR. CARROLL: How were they in 1958?

MR. DOERN: Well I am sure they were pretty bad in 1958 and we know why. But the government is willing to spend right now — the government has been willing to spend up to now 70 cents for an elementary student, where authorized for library, and about \$1.25 or something for the high school student. Now what can you buy with 70 cents? You can't even buy one book per student. An average book costs about \$5.00, so in other words if you are going to buy \$20 worth of books for the elementary school, you buy four books. That's not much of a library.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this might be a convenient place, somewhere between Tarzan and Batman, to move that the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Springfield, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Tuesday afternoon.