

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 7, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the Investors Group praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Investors Syndicate of Canada Limited.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, there is great urgency for this petition and the bill to be completed as soon as possible with regard to the Investors Syndicate of Canada Limited, and I would request leave that the petition be now read and received.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? Agreed?

MR. CLERK: The petition of the Investors Group praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Investors Syndicate of Canada Limited.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion.

I would like to make a comment or two, if I may, at this time. When the House arrived at this point late last week, a situation developed which required research in depth. Consequently, I wish to make comments of my findings. On Thursday last, the Honourable Member for Gladstone tabled a document addressed to the Clerk, purporting to call together a special committee on automobile insurance rates, the meeting to be held on Tuesday, April 8, 1969. Research in this regard suggests that the honourable member in fact has no authority to put forward such a request. The appointment of the committee and the date in which it or they will sit is the exclusive responsibility of the Leader of the House. . . . , information reveals to me, that should this procedure persist would develop into a chaotic conduct of the business of the House with untenable ramifications. In view of these circumstances I ordered the Clerk to refrain from printing the request of the Honourable Member for Gladstone as a form of notice.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could give us a little guidance on this point. I agree with the sense of your finding. I am wondering about the basis for the House Leader having authority because I haven't been able to find that, and I've asked before and have been told that some Minister is responsible. If we could find that it would be very helpful.

MR. SPEAKER: I found that to be a problem, too, but I carried my directions to Ontario and Ottawa and this was the opinion I accepted and made up my ruling accordingly.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask if the Minister of Finance by any chance would intend to challenge your ruling in view of the fact that he established the other rule in the first place in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think it requires any further debate on this matter and I feel we should proceed with the business of the House.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we introduce the next item I'd like to introduce our young guests in the gallery. We have 25 students of the 4H Club of St. Alphonse. These students are under the direction of Mr. Delichte. This club is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

We also have with us 7 students of Grade 6 and 7 standing, of the Rolling River Indian Day School. These students are under the direction of the Rev. W. Donovan. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the First Minister.

We also have with us today 19 members of the 4H Clubs attending the Annual Leadership conference. These members are from various parts of the province and are accompanied by two members of the Department of Agriculture staff. The group is under the direction of Dr. Jack Nesbit.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 49, an Act to amend The Optometry Act.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina) introduced Bill No. 34, an Act respecting The Town of Morden.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James) introduced Bill No. 51, The Dental Mechanics Act.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, because of the urgency that I've already mentioned and because it's largely a matter of form, I request leave of the House and I move, seconded by the Honourable member for Pembina that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 48, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Investors Syndicate of Canada Limited.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave to present this bill at this particular time? Agreed?

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, it's not usual to ask for an explanation at first reading time I know, but on the other hand it's not usual to ask for leave in this way either and I would think that if expedition is requested in this way it might be advisable for the honourable member to give an explanation of the contents of the bill.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): ... be prepared to give leave to the honourable member to do that because for him to do it would require the leave of the House, contrary to having a debate on first reading, but we're prepared to give the leave.

MR. CAMPBELL: I would point out to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, that it's not contrary to the rules for the proposer of a bill to give an explanation on first reading if asked.

MR. LYON: Oh, yes it is.

MR. CAMPBELL: No. No. Maybe it would be well for us to leave it to Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave of the House? (Agreed)

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, the urgency connected with the passing of this amending Act is not merely a decision of the Investors Group but rather a decision of the underwriting firm that is going to make a public offering of a large number of preferred shares in this corporation if the corporation is successful in acquiring a majority of the shares of the Great West Life Assurance Company. The Investors Syndicate have made an offer to the shareholders of the Great West Life, which offer expires on April 17th, and the investment dealer is convinced that the preferred shares must be offered to the public immediately after the Investors Group has gained control of the Great West Life. It is felt that these shares must be issued as soon as possible after that date for two reasons; the first reason is that there is a better chance for a successful public offering in terms of topical investment interests; the second is that the Investors Syndicate has arranged bank financing for the interim period and the interest cost on this amount is extremely large even on a daily basis, and before they can get ahead with the sale of the shares they must have a prospectus approved by the various security boards, including our own Securities Commission of Manitoba, and they cannot obtain that approval until after the necessary law has been passed by this Legislature. If the Investors Group are successful in acquiring control of the Great West Life, it will mean that the control of the Great West Life will be in Canadian hands as 97 percent of the voting shares of the Investors Group are held by Canadians and it will mean that the head office of the Great West Life will remain in Winnipeg because here is where we have the head office of the Investors Group as well.

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

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare. In view of the resignation of Kenneth E. Calmain, Probation Officer, Winnipeg Juvenile and Family Court, I wonder if the Minister would care to make a statement on the reasons given by Mr. Calmain for his resignation, and whether or no the Minister would also be prepared to make a statement as to whether the transferring of Probation and Correction Services from the Department of Attorney-General to the Department of Welfare was done on the basis of a consultant's report or on what basis it was done; and if it was done on the basis of a consultant's report, would the Minister favour the House with copies of that report?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I'd be prepared to explain the reorganization of the department at probably more length during my estimates. Suffice it to say that on being shown the article this morning I checked with the Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of this position, who assured me that on four occasions he met with this gentleman and probation officers concerned and, as you will see in the

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . reorganization, the probation team in the Greater Winnipeg area is merely transferred to the Department of Social Services with no interference, no -- using them as a separate team in that division within the city, and I have no further comments because in response to this statement I have asked my staff for further information and I'd be prepared to discuss it later if that's suitable to the honourable member. As I say, it's a little difficult for me to understand this statement in the context in which I have read it, and I'd like a further report from the Deputy Minister in charge.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Will the Honourable Minister furnish the House with more information as and when he makes his investigation?

MR. JOHNSON: Pardon?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Will you furnish the House with more information as and when you have made your investigation?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): May I ask one supplementary question on that point? As I read the statement, it seemed to me that there was some danger of further resignations in the department. Is the Minister able to assure the House that there are no further resignations or that there is no danger of further resignations on account of the conditions complained of by Mr. Calmain?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, there is no change in the conditions of work of these people except to try to bring about more integration of the whole of the Welfare Division, and I have no way of knowing what the personal matters may be. I have no indication whatsoever that there's any contemplation of further resignations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, in relation to the same topic, but I wish to direct this question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance. May I draw his attention to an Order of the House moved by the Leader of the New Democratic Party called for on March 5th, and I believe that it may deal with matters related to the problem under debate now. Could the Minister inform us when we could expect to receive the Return to this Order?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge): Not the exact day. I expect to table a paper in connection with the operation some time within the next two weeks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): I wish to direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has he replied to the request of the Vegetable Growers Association of Manitoba, asking for assistance to growers that have sustained crop losses last year?

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture)(Arthur): No, I haven't replied, Mr. Speaker.

MR. USKIW: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister know when he'll be able to make a decision on that particular request?

MR. WATT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think I can inform the House today that I will be announcing crop insurance for potatoes possibly tomorrow. I had intended making a little more detailed announcement on it tomorrow, but at the moment it is not the intention of the government to pay crop losses in the potato area for 1968.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Transportation. Oh, he's absent. Who can answer his stead? The Minister of Mines -- or possibly the First Minister. In western Manitoba in particular, due to the very heavy snowfall, a good number of farmers have been unable to move grain off their farms. Will there be any extensions or assistance given insofar as the road restriction for the transport of farm products in that area in particular, so that they can either move feed grain or move grain to elevator positions? As it stands now, many of them are very concerned.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa): Well, Mr. Speaker, from experience I think, probably I could say that assistance in the terms of attempting to find alternate routes where the least damage to roads would occur, would be carried out by the department. As we all know, there is a big investment in particular surface roads in the province of Manitoba and it's a matter of concern to the department, and I can't readily say offhand but I'd be happy to take the question as notice for the Minister to check into when he returns.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, my question was to be directed to the Minister of Transport. In his absence I will ask the First Minister if he can reply. In view of the fact that the Motor Carrier Board were to make a recommendation to the government regarding the truck rates by March 31st, can the First Minister tell me, this being April 7th, when the report will be made?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, no I can't.

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . in the United States that a paper is circulating amongst Congressmen suggesting the placing of anti-ballistic missiles on boats on the Great Lakes waters as an alternative to the ABM plan proposed by Nixon, to give better cover from snooping satellites, as they say. Now in view of the fact that these waters are used for the benefit of the Western Canadian economy, and in particular Manitoba, does our government propose to either directly or through the Federal Government take any action to put an end to this war-like campaign.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder at the advisability of that question, but if the First Minister wishes to answer, of course that's his privilege, but . . . The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the First Minister. Does the First Minister intend to announce his policy and that of his party on the issue of bilingualism and biculturalism during the course of this session? And a subsequent question: Is it his intention to support the stand of the national leader of his party who has proposed to lay his leadership on the line rather than see the party go in quest of emerging backlash in part of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe that question is somewhat out of order at this particular time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Could I know on what grounds, Mr. Speaker? I'm not obligating him to answer, but I think I can . . . . Why not? This is certainly something to do with Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the opinion of an honourable gentleman in another House should be discussed at this particular time? However, the question has been put.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is it the intention of the First Minister to answer these questions?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, matters of policy will be announced when policy is formulated on all aspects of government activity.

MR. DESJARDINS: In the course of this session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, may I rephrase my question to the First Minister? Will the First Minister take whatever action necessary to ensure and protect the safe movement of Manitoba grain on the Great Lakes waters?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is it the intention of the Government to supply the report of the Commission on Targets for Economic Development to all of the mayors or the secretary-treasurers of the various towns and municipal corporations, and to the ag reps in the province? They all want to borrow mine. That's why I'm asking the question.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C., (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice and answer that tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Last week when he was out of the House I asked a question relating to the new policy of the Ontario government relating to the development of secondary industries for resources mined in Ontario. I wonder whether the Minister has had an opportunity to acquaint himself with that policy and whether it will have an effect on Manitoba's position?

MR. SPEAKER: I question the advisability of that question. A reply is being asked for something that was said outside of the House of which I have no opinion whatsoever and . . .

MR. GREEN: I am merely asking whether it will affect Manitoba's policy. I also advised the Minister personally that I would be asking him this, and if he does have an answer I would like to get it from him.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for Inkster for advising me of this question. I should point out to him that we presently have on our statutes legislation similar to that which

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . was announced recently in the Ontario House. I have subsequently been in contact with my colleague in Ontario, Mr. Lawrence, and have asked him to forward me further information regarding their announcement. I pointed out to him that I would hope that he would take a national or Canadian view with respect to that statement in the sense that it would not be provincial, that indeed it would be -- it's a most desirable kind of a policy, and for that reason we have that provision in our Act. It becomes, of course, a question of when it can be applied. We have, as I am sure the honourable member is aware if the honourable member was watching the news media last night, the exemptions -- there are exemptions made to this kind of provision in the Act. It's always a question of attempting to arrive at the right decision in these matters. There can be no question as to the desirability of the principle that's involved.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet might I take this opportunity to table with the House an Order for Return No. 27 dated March 31, 1969.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. Could he tell the House whether any contracts in connection with the Nelson River project have been given out on a cost-plus basis?

MR. EVANS: Well Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any, but then the Hydro runs their own affairs and I'm not in direct charge of them. I can make enquiries, and if I find any information on the subject I'll let my honourable friend know.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows:

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I understand that there was a meeting of representatives of a number of states and provinces in connection with the promotion of the Old West Trail. Would the Minister be good enough to tell us what route it follows through the province of Manitoba? Because, according to this news item, Manitoba was represented at this conference.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Tourism and Recreation)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to get that information for my honourable friend. My understanding is, of course, that there are a number of trails that are involved here that would link both Manitoba and Saskatchewan with the states immediately south, the idea being to promote the greater use of some of our historic tourist trails, many of which are already incorporated into some of our provincial maps, but we would like to be able to jointly promote the travel on these trails and thus mutually benefit from increased tourism, in both Canada and the United States.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Education.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education)(St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House Return to an Address for Papers No. 2 dated March 3, 1969, and Return to an Address for Papers No. 14 dated March 10, 1965.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education. Does he know of any plans, or has he been approached with any plans for the division or the splitting up of the Tiger Hills School Division?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I advise the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that I have had a delegation from that area with a request of this nature.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Has the Minister made any decision in this regard?

MR. CRAIK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture. Has he had the opportunity over the weekend to check into the matter of grievance raised by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie; that is, in respect to the sale of fertilizer, etc.?

MR. WATT: Well Mr. Speaker, you couldn't do very much checking over the weekend because everybody was on holidays, and I wasn't in the House when the honourable member raised the point of grievance on the price of fertilizer in Manitoba as compared with United States, but I had done a little prior to that, and I think the figures that the honourable member gave to the House on Thursday were pretty well in line with figures that I had obtained myself some time ago - that is, in December. The figures that he quoted I believe on 11-48 was

(MR. WATT cont'd.) . . . . \$103.90 per ton in Manitoba and \$85.00 in the States - am I correct on that? - and these are consistent with the figures that I did find back in December. But I have been informed that the reason for the lower price in the United States is because of over-production in 1968. I think the question came up as why 11-48 manufactured in Manitoba and sold in the United States should be sold for less than it was being sold in Manitoba, and the information that I have is that no 11-48-0 is manufactured in Manitoba and shipped to the United States. Now I don't think this holds true with the other types of fertilizer that he mentioned here - that is 34-0-0 and 23-23-0. Now I am not sure about these types of fertilizer but the information that I have is that the reduced prices in the United States was because of over-production and that when dealers renewed their supplies that the price would be increased. That's about all that I have to offer in answer to this question at the moment. I understand that the price has changed in the United States but I haven't got the factual information on this.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Is my honourable friend aware that presently a group of farmers, after making a deal or a contract with a fertilizer agency in the United States, can now pick up fertilizer at the Simplot Plant in Brandon at the U. S. price?

MR. WATT: No, I am not aware of this, but if Simplot in Brandon's price would come down to be consistent with the United States, it's a good thing.

MR. SHOEMAKER: My honourable friend has misunderstood my question. My question was: Is he aware that the Canadian farmers, the Manitoba farmers in particular, can now obtain fertilizer by dealing through a dealer in North Dakota but picking it up at Simplot in Brandon rather than taking delivery in United States as they have been doing. Now maybe it's a good thing for the farmers, but the whole thing is that you've got one group of farmers buying it at one price and another group at another.

MR. WATT: I'm not aware of any particular case, but I'd say that if anybody can pick up fertilizer at Simplots right now at the lesser price that is now applying apparently in the United States, I say it's good.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. In view of the recent change in the weather conditions, has there been a revision of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers flood forecast for the spring?

MR. ENNS: No Mr. Speaker, there has been no revision in the forecast that I have already announced to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Some weeks ago I asked him a question relating to the amount of fertilizer produced and the amount of fertilizer exported. I repeated my question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder whether that information is going to be available or whether it just isn't obtainable.

MR. WATT: That information is pretty difficult to get because actually fertilizer that is put together in Manitoba is partly from ingredients that are shipped from Trail, B. C., for instance, and from different places in Canada, that is put together as a fertilizer in Manitoba, and whether it is a Manitoba product or not is another matter. I haven't got the answer to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, last week the Minister of Agriculture undertook to provide for members of the House all the various position papers and material that was presented at the recent farm congress in Ottawa. I wonder whether the Minister might indicate whether we will have the benefit of those papers prior to the introduction of his estimates, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WATT: Well I'm not sure that it will, because actually I'm not in possession of the position papers that were presented by the Task Force. Actually, the Task Force were the only ones there that did present position papers. There were official papers presented by two or three of the provinces and mostly farm groups, but I am trying to get copies of these presentations.

MR. USKIW: A subsequent question. Would the Minister undertake, then, to at least provide the House here his particular presentation, or copies of the presentation made on behalf of Manitoba at that conference?

MR. WATT: No. At that conference, I think I indicated the other day that Manitoba did not present an official position paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to table a Return to an Order of the House No. 8 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, and if I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to a question put on Thursday last by the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie, concerning the visit of the Chairman of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation to the World Hockey Tournament in Stockholm, and he did not make that at the Corporation's expense.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Education. Over the past number of months, advertising has appeared in the newspapers announcing a fast or a quick reading course which citizens are able to take and apparently benefit by it. Does the Honourable Minister know whether this course fulfils the promises that it seems to be giving in the newspapers, and if it does, is there any thought of introducing it into the high schools of the province?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I haven't any knowledge of the particular course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a subsidiary question to one asked previously by the Member for Hamiota to the First Minister, regarding the report of the committee studying highway truck rates. The Minister said he did not know what was going on. Will the First Minister find out when they will be reporting?

MR. WEIR: I'll be happy to take the question as notice on behalf of the Minister of Transportation. Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have been asked to remind members of the annual Pea Soup Night next Wednesday, at St. John's College at 8:30, put on by the Society of St. John the Baptist, and all members are urged to go. Those who have been know what an enjoyable evening it is. Those that haven't been, I assure you, you are missing an enjoyable evening. Next Wednesday at 8:30 in St. Boniface.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it a week Wednesday or the day after tomorrow?

MR. STANES: The day after tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs. This week, when either he or his department is represented at the Conference of Ministers of Consumer Affairs, will he undertake to look into the matter promised by the Honourable Minister of Health re the sale and provision of hearing aids which he, in a debate on this matter, said he would attend to?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, this item has already been raised with the federal minister and other western Ministers. Presumably there will be continuing discussions along these lines. I can't say that it is presently on the agenda for this meeting but certainly I will have it in mind as we discuss, and if there is an opportunity perhaps we can pursue the matter further at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to apologize for and correct an error which I had made last Wednesday on Page 942 of Hansard. When I was speaking about the Land Appraisal Commission I had said that they had made an offer of from \$20.00 ranging to \$250.00 per acre. I was in error, and it should have been from \$20.00 to a high of \$550.00 per acre.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I'd like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Whose responsibility is it to revarnish or repaint the signs that are put up by the Province of Manitoba in respect to -- for instance the Pelly Trail or any other trail -- you know the various signs that are throughout the country?

MR. CARROLL: You're referring to highway traffic signs or historic sites? Historic sites? I'll take the question as notice. Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I'd like to take a moment and remind the honourable gentlemen of what I said the other day. This period seems to be developing into a period of debate rather than a question and answer period, and I would ask the honourable members to bear with me in that respect and see if we can't improve.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Carillon that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: from October 31, 1968 to March 31, 1969:

(a) The number of applications for sales tax rebate on materials for granaries and the amount of money claimed;

(b) The number of applications rejected and the amount of money.

**MR. SPEAKER** presented the motion.

**MR. EVANS:** We have no objection to this Order, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER** put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Speaker, before I move this Order for Return may I ask for clarification and rectification? The Votes and Proceedings for March 31 on an Order for Return that I put in then state that it was agreed to excepting sub-paragraphs (d) and (e). Hansard records it as being agreed to excepting paragraphs (a) and (e). My understanding was that the government's exception was (a) and not (d). Now if Hansard is correct then I propose to move this Order for Return. If the Votes and Proceedings are correct, then there is really not much point to my proceeding with the present Order for Return.

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, by leave if I may. My understanding is that (a) and (b) of the current Order of Return that you have on the Order Paper today is answered, has been replied to in the Order of Return I just filed with the House, this afternoon, and I would have to inform the honourable member that in any event the other paragraphs are either of a confidential, privileged nature or information that we do not have and would not be in a position to accept the Order.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that, an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following for each of the years 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1968:

(a) The name and description of each mine.

(b) The name and address of the operator of each mine.

(c) The quantity of minerals and mineral products, or both, shipped or sent from, or treated on, the mining premises during each year aforesaid and shewn in the following manner:

(1) per mineral and mineral product per mine, per year.

(2) per mineral and mineral product in total for all mines per year.

(d) The name and address of the smelter, refinery, or mill, to which the minerals and mineral products, or any part thereof, were sent in each year aforesaid by each miner.

(e) The cost per ton for transportation of the minerals and mineral products to the smelter, refinery or mill for each year aforesaid by each mine.

(f) The total and average cost per ton for transportation of the minerals and mineral products to the smelter, refinery or mill for each year aforesaid for all mines.

(g) The actual, proper, and necessary expenses, if any, of selling the minerals or mineral products or any part thereof, incurred by each mine, for each year aforesaid, and the name and address of the person by whom the expenses were paid or borne, and the total amount for each year aforesaid of the actual, proper, and necessary expenses, if any, of selling the minerals or mineral products or any part thereof, incurred by the mines.

(h) The cost per ton for smelter, refinery, or mill charges and the name and address of the person by whom they were paid or borne for each mine, for each year aforesaid.

(i) The total and average cost per ton per mineral and mineral product for smelter, refinery, or mill charges incurred by the mines in each year aforesaid.

(j) The total cost and the cost per ton, of quarrying or underground mining for each mine for each year aforesaid.

(k) The total cost, and the cost per ton, of quarrying or underground mining for all mines for each year aforesaid.

(l) The total cost, and the cost per ton, of quarry or underground development work, for each mine and for each year aforesaid.

(m) The total cost, and the cost per ton, of quarry or underground development work, for all mines, for each year aforesaid.

(n) The operating costs of the mine for each ton of minerals or mineral products treated



(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.) . . . . by each mine for each year aforesaid.

(o) The average operating costs of the mines for each ton of minerals or mineral products treated by the mines for each year aforesaid.

(p) The quantities of minerals or mineral products, or both, treated on the mining premises by each mine for each year aforesaid.

(q) The total quantities of minerals or mineral products, or both, treated on the mining premises by the mines for each year aforesaid.

(r) The value of the minerals or mineral products, or both, shipped after deducting the amount of the charges for making sales, and for transportation, and for treatment for each mine, for each year aforesaid.

(s) The total value of the minerals or mineral products, or for both, shipped after deducting the amount of the charges for making sales, and for transportation, and for treatment, by the mines for each year aforesaid.

(t) The value of the minerals or mineral products, or both, treated on the mining premises by each mine, for each year aforesaid.

(u) The total value of the minerals or mineral products, or both, treated on the mining premises by the mines, for each year aforesaid.

(v) The capital employed in processing the output of each mine from the operation of which income is derived for each year aforesaid.

(w) The total capital employed in processing the output of the mines from the operation of which income is derived for each year aforesaid.

(x) Various expenses, payments, allowances, and deductions that may be deducted under subsection (2) of section 2 or under subsection (3) of section 3 of the said Mining Royalty and Tax Act by each mine for each year aforesaid.

(y) The total various expenses, payments, allowances, and deductions, that may be deducted under subsection (2) of section 2 or under subsection (3) of section 3 of the said Act for all mines, for each year aforesaid.

(z) The gross revenue and the total amount of the expenses, payments, allowances, and deductions aforesaid, and the net profit from each mine for each year aforesaid.

(aa) The total amounts showing the gross revenue and the total amount of the expenses, payments, allowances, and deductions aforesaid, and the net profit, from all mines for each year aforesaid.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the information requested under paragraph (a) and (b) of this Order have already been supplied to the Honourable Member from Burrows. The remaining information is either of a privileged or confidential nature.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I can hardly hear what the Minister has to say.

MR. ENNS: . . . or requesting such information which we do not possess, and I refuse the Order.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the government indicates a refusal to accept the Order that it's one's privilege to ask for right to debate and I would so do.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . be laid over for the Tuesday orders.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CHERNIACK: This should be stood over for the Tuesday Orders of the Day for Private Members. Therefore I think there is no question.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not hear the comments of the Honourable Member for Burrows. Would he kindly repeat what he said?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Those are my comments. In view of the fact that the government is refusing to accept the Order, I would wish it to stand till Tuesday, at which time I wish to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed). The Honourable Member for Inkster. I take it that . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thought you were calling me because I was on my feet. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. Particulars of contracts to keep the banks of the floodway free of debris including:
  - (a) names of persons to whom contracts were awarded.
  - (b) portions of floodway covered by each contract.
  - (c) rate of remuneration for each contract.
2. Particulars of manner in which said contracts were awarded.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there's been no indication as to whether the Order would be accepted or not. The Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm calling for the ayes and nays and we'll record it accordingly.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

The total assessed value of land other than that used for schools, hospitals, parks and cemeteries not subject to Real Property Tax in each municipality, categorized as follows:

(a) Enjoying an outright, unconditional exemption:

1. Federal Government Property
2. Provincial Government Property
3. Church property
4. Industrial property
5. Other property not included in above categories

(b) Paying grants in lieu of taxes and total amount of grants received from each category named above.

(c) The assessed value of buildings and other structures in each of the categories in (a) above.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to accept this Order insofar as the availability of the information within our jurisdiction is available.

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

#### GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second readings. Bill No. 12. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I stood this for the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, the one concern which I have about this bill is, the way it reads, is would it not in fact or -- yes -- would it not in fact lead to situations putting County Court Judges into a position of passing law, of making regulations of a type that may be beyond their powers, that may in fact constitute substantive law and not merely procedural rules. Now if that is not so, or there is some protection against that, that that could not conceivably happen, then, Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the second reading of this bill.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the question put by my honourable friend is really impossible to answer in this sense, that judge-made rules are always meant to be rules of procedure in the court. The court has no more power to make rules than did the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council under the existing section before amendment. I don't foresee any danger. If any danger does develop it can always be corrected by legislation. It just puts the County Court, as I mentioned at second reading, it puts it on the same footing as the Court of Queen's Bench.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Transportation, Bill No. 18. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

Is it the wish of the House it should stand in his absence? (Agreed.)

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Youth and Education - General Administration. (a) . . . The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go back to a question that we have dealt with to

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . some extent but apparently which has been misunderstood by the Minister of Education, and that is the question of university tuition fees. One of the indications that the Minister gave for not agreeing with the proposition that was put forward by several members of this party was that, first of all, the New Democratic Party is advocating the elimination of tuition fees and it's not advising as to where the money is coming from; and secondly - and I can't remember his exact words in this regard but I read them in Hansard and I'm going to paraphrase them - the Minister indicated that he is old-fashioned, that he believes that people should work for the purpose of getting their education, and he believes that this is good for the education process, and, as a matter of fact, when I heard the Minister say that this was his view and it coincided almost exactly with my view, I wondered what the difference of opinion was between us, because if he is suggesting that he believes that people should work for their education, that it's good for people to have to give some personal initiative in order to get an education, then he was really, Mr. Chairman, saying exactly what we are saying, and if he was saying as well that there has to be a controlling cost factor to the problem of university education then he was also saying what we are saying, and therefore there should really be no difference of opinion between us. But apparently there is; and I would like to indicate that the real difference lies in the fact that the Minister's proposals, the Minister's beliefs, the Minister's views both with regard to it being desirable that people work in order to obtain an education, and secondly, that education costs have some rationale of control, are not fulfilled by the Minister's program to implement that policy, and I'd like to deal with, firstly, the question that people should work to get an education, and that somehow there should be some commitment by the student in order to show that he is a deserving student.

I would like to quote, Mr. Chairman, from a report that was issued by the Manitoba Association of Students. It was compiled by Allan Peter Simmie, a graduate in Economics of the University of Manitoba. Mr. Simmie has held executive positions with the University of Winnipeg Students' Association and the University of Manitoba Students' Union, and served as Finance Commissioner of the Canadian Union of Students, so I can't presume that this fellow is adopting any political posture, that he has any political axe to grind. He is dealing with an objective situation, which he outlines in his pamphlet and from which I'd like to read several very important clauses which I think should be brought to the attention of the Minister because he is interested in making sure that people have to work for their education - No. 1; and secondly, that education costs in some way be rationally controlled.

Well, what does he say, Mr. Chairman? What does this report say? First of all, it says: "It is a common fallacy that students pay for their education. Only the poor pay." This is the statement that is made in this report. So if the Minister has up until now, if he has been labouring on the conclusion that everybody who goes to university has somehow worked for it; then I would like to indicate to him that this fallacy, that this error in his understanding - and I'm sure that once he realizes that it's an error he's going to change the system - is dealt with by this report, and I believe that the Minister could verify this report by any statistical information that he could get, that there is no refutation of what is said here. This says that it is a common fallacy that students pay for their education; only the poor pay.

The report starts, Mr. Chairman, with a very interesting statement: "It is clear that there does not exist equality of opportunity in higher education for citizens of Manitoba. Students are denied access to university not only on the basis of academic or intellectual qualifications, but on the basis established . . . financial ability and socialization of universities to select groupings within the province. The university student populations come from the middle and upper income classes, from parents previously having been associated with the university system and whose fathers comprise the managerial, entrepreneurial and professional classes of the labour force."

Now this is not being said by any New Democrats or any people who the Honourable the Attorney-General says, "the reason we disagree with this is that we are not, we don't agree with your levelling socialistic philosophy." Well, this has nothing to do with any levelling socialistic philosophy. It's a statistical, objective report which says, "All of this has been said before and proven before, but we feel it must be said again, for the nature of the student population hasn't changed significantly over the last decade to warrant our satisfaction that all aspects of our community are fairly represented in the universities."

Mr. Chairman, the report goes on to say, and somehow this sounds familiar, but again, it's not coming from our group: "Although nearly 80 percent of the Canadian families have

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . income of less than \$5,000, the percentage distribution of university students within that income category is 32 percent, 54 percent, 44 percent, 26 percent, 35 percent, 34 and 46 percent of the total enrollment." and these different percentages are for different faculties. "On the other side, whereas families with yearly incomes greater than \$10,000 comprised only three percent of the population, their sons and daughters comprised a quarter of Arts, Science and Medical students, a third of Law students and a fifth of Dentistry students. The medium income of students' families is significantly greater than that of the total labour force, exceeding it by as much as \$2,802, or at least 30 percent." So, an additional statement, Mr. Chairman, which maybe the Minister is unaware of. Maybe this is the first information that he is getting which may convince him that the qualification for entering university is not that you have had to work for it - although I know he would like that, but that apparently is not the case. What we know is that 80 percent of the people earn less than \$5,000 and that a significantly less number of that group's children is able to attend university than that percentage of 80, whereas three percent earn over \$10,000 and they comprise 30 percent of some faculties and various other percentages of others.

Now one other significant fact, Mr. Chairman, which I think that the Minister should take cognizance of, is that taxes are collected from the total population and the total population, that is people earning less than \$10,000 a year, pay a significantly higher proportion of the taxes than the top three percent, and therefore what you are advocating - and I know that you can't really want to do this because I've read what you have said in your remarks and this certainly isn't what you desire, so I suggest that you are immediately going to set about to change this policy - what you have now is a system whereby the wealthy and upper income groups are significantly subsidized by the people who can't make use of that taxation themselves because of the financial barriers which exist and which do, whether the Minister likes it or not, do prevent them from attaining an education.

Now Mr. Chairman, the Minister will say, well, any individual student could, if he tried hard enough and if he was intelligent enough, any individual student could overcome all of these barriers and obtain an education, and he'll probably point to some who have done it, and he doesn't have to cite individual cases. The members of my party know of such cases and the members of the government know of such cases which they will use to perpetuate a situation which doesn't exist for all but which merely gives them an example to deal with, but that's not the point. The point is, does this government believe that as far as possible, and we can never be perfect, but as far as possible it should be the objective of the government to equalize opportunity? And does he not also agree that eliminating the university fees, while not spending a cent more in dollars - and I want to make it plain, Mr. Chairman, that we in this party in this respect and only for his purposes, not for our purposes, are not advocating an increased expenditure in money.

We now have the Minister's figure, \$43 million. We may think it should be more. We may think that more should be educated, but we're going to reserve that for the time when we solve this argument. But let's take his figure of \$43 million. We would be prepared to say if the Minister wants to, and gathering what I do from the rest of the programs of this government he may well do it, we may say, chop off \$3 million. Go to 40, or go to 37. Do what you want, but then decide that that \$37 million is going to be spent to educate the people who can most benefit from that education and from whom society will therefore get the greatest reward if they are permitted to take that education. And this could be done, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister wants the formula, by eliminating the tuition fees and spending the balance of the money to educate, as we've indicated, those people who by academic qualifications have demonstrated that they're in the best position to make use of that education.

But Mr. Chairman, the Minister, although he hasn't given real reasons for objecting to that kind of an assessment, has pretty well indicated to us that he won't accept it, and he repeats his principle, and that is that people should have to work for an education. Well, Mr. Chairman, let him implement that principle. We'll consider it. We may even go along with it. We may even vote for it. But let him implement that principle. Let him say that university qualifications or entrance to university will be contingent on a sweat test or, if he likes it better, on a callus test. I think that that's probably a word that would be more acceptable to that minister, that we're going to give you a callus test. If you can demonstrate that you have worked to provide yourself with the tuition fees, if you can bring to the university a certificate indicating that you have spent five months at a lumber camp or five months at a fisheries or

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . two months in a coal yard, or any other sweat test which the Minister wishes to devise, that that will be the basis upon which you are permitted to enter university.

Wouldn't that be more consistent with the Minister's own ideals - and he has expressed them and I sympathize with him, I agree with him - wouldn't that be more consistent with the Minister's ideals than to perpetuate the existing situation which says, Mr. Chairman, if you can lay \$650.00 down on the line then you can go to medical school if you have the otherwise academic qualifications? Isn't that a better test, not from my point of view particularly, although I certainly would have that point of view, but isn't that a better test from the Minister's point of view, because the Minister's old-fashioned and he believes that people should have to work in order to do their education. He believes that it does something for their character. Then let him apply it, Mr. Chairman: Let him apply his sweat test; let him apply a callus test, or if he wants to call it, let him call it a mean test, but let him apply a test which would be consistent with his principles in those connections, because with both principles we have a great deal of sympathy. What we are saying and what this report is saying, is that those principles do not exist; those principles are merely used as an apology for this government not to do what is right, and that is to provide for equality of educational opportunity, or at least to strive.

I heard the Minister say it over the air yesterday, "We can never reach perfect equality," and I agree with that. Even if we eliminate the university fees, Mr. Chairman, we're still a long way from equality, because there are many many homes in Manitoba - and the Minister knows of these - where the concept of one of the children obtaining a university education is not even within their frame of reference. It's just impossible to conceive. That they will either be required to fend for themselves or to contribute to their families, and the notion of university education is lost long before the time of graduation from high school. The entire upbringing of the children is done in an environment whereby they know they're not going to go to university, so we're never going to establish perfect equality, and we sympathize with the Minister that if he is sincere in striving for equality then surely he can do it entirely within his own frame of reference without increasing his grants to university education by one cent, without increasing them by one . . . . I know the Minister likes that because he has given in this House an indication that he doesn't like to spend money and, Mr. Chairman, whether he believes it or not I don't like to spend more money than is necessary either. We may have differences of opinion as to how much is necessary, but let's take his figure. We don't want to spend one cent more; secondly, we would like him to do something about this venerable principle with which I agree; that we are both old-fashioned, the Minister and myself; we both agree that people should work for their education. Let him somehow make that the qualification for university entrance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--passed; (b)--passed; (c)--passed; (d)--passed; (e)--passed; (f)--passed; 1--

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Chairman, before we get past the Minister's salary - I see he doesn't want to answer the Member for Inkster - I thought possibly we could get some more indication from him as to what we are going to do in respect to educational policy. I listened attentively in the last two or three days of debate as to what new policy we were devising, if any, and I am sorry to say that I just can't seem to hear any from the other side of the House, from the Minister. I hear about patchwork here and a patchwork there, and to me this is all to some extent like trying to patch a sieve. Put a plug in here and the water runs out the other hole, and you're just plugging it here, there and everywhere.

To get to the basic thing that I'm trying to say, Mr. Chairman, it is that in respect to education we've had a system here now for some hundred years or so, teaching the basic three "R's" as they used to be called. Oh, we've got some new sophisticated names for it but we really haven't done anything in essence to change the system. We're in a year of technology, accelerating change and evolution is constantly altering the society we're in, yet we are still basically using the same system. We have added a wee bit of technology to it in some areas but, as I said, it's just like trying to plug a sieve - here, there and every place else. We've got a problem in respect to drop-outs, we've got a problem in respect to people that go on to higher education, but we really haven't done anything to change the climate for this.

Now basically I'm saying to the Minister, when is he going to come up with the real recommendations of some new educational policy? I am asking, and yesterday, or the day before,

(MR. FOX cont'd.) . . . . my colleague from Elmwood mentioned the fact that some children had learning disability. I'm of the opinion that our system is not going to be able to do much with that either, even if we do have a few graduates come out of the University of Manitoba in respect to this. The reason I state this, Mr. Chairman, is that it's still a patchwork effort. We provide a few extra teachers that are capable of looking at the total educational process, and yet they are too few and the problem is too great.

I am trying to say to the Minister of Education, Mr. Chairman, that our educational system in this technological age is topsy turvy. We have the best educators at the top and we have the poorest ones or the weakest ones at the bottom, and the system of Foundation grants has perpetuated this. The system of progression, of moving ahead, of getting yourself moved up in the educational system into the administrative ranks, also works against putting the best educators at the bottom, and at the same time you can't blame the teachers for wanting to upgrade themselves and become administrators and come out of the educational scheme as such, and consequently, Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid that our educational system is going to have its problems and its ills for a long time. I had hoped that the Minister of Education would come up with some basic philosophy in regard to education, and some leadership, so that we would get some of our better educators at the bottom of the ladder where we could put in to the young people entering the educational system and engender that is the idea that education is something that is valuable, valid, and to create it, so that they have the initiative and the ability to go on, and then utilize our technicians in the later years of education, but apparently this is not to be, and I certainly would like to have the Minister's comments in this regard.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, last. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have already spoken twice on the Minister's salary. Have you something different to offer than what you have already. . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes I do, Mr. Chairman. Last Thursday, Mr. Chairman, we in this House had asked the Honourable Minister to outline the guide lines followed by the Public Schools Finance Board in assessing proposals placed before it, to indicate on what basis or what factors are taken into consideration in determining whether that proposal will receive the blessings of the Schools Finance Board or will be rejected by it. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that last Thursday we did not receive a reply to this question from the Minister; the Minister wasn't able to tell us on what basis that is done; but on one or more occasions he did state that school boards have to learn to live within their means and that school boards should only go as fast as they are able to.

Well, in Friday's newspapers, the position of the Minister became abundantly clear, and I think it's very evident on the basis of this Minister's attitude, his handling of a request put to his board, put to the School Finance Board by the City of Winnipeg. Now I feel that this is a very important issue, Mr. Chairman, because in areas of educational research I think it is admitted by all, it will be admitted by the Honourable Minister, that the City of Winnipeg does take the lead, and the Winnipeg School Board came to the Honourable Minister with a request to use a \$1 1/2 million reserve fund to build a major addition to its administrative offices on Wall Street. Now this seems to indicate that the purpose of this expenditure is merely to expand the administrative offices and I am not saying that that is not in any way related to the provision of education. It does, but assuming that a line of distinction can be drawn between the provision of administrative offices and the provision of other services related to education, even assuming that that line can be drawn, which notion I do not accept. Well here's some of the background on what's happened in the City of Winnipeg, what led up to this, and how the Honourable Minister disposed of this matter.

Earlier in the 60's - and this is as reported in Friday's Winnipeg Free Press, and if this is incorrect the Honourable Minister will have an opportunity to deny this statement in the House for the purpose of our record - "Earlier in the 60's the Board spent three years charging Winnipeg taxpayers an extra mill on their taxes, to finance the addition which will house an instructional media and data-processing computer center to serve all 80 city schools." In this there were to be some conference rooms included and some other facilities which I'll mention later on. And I'm quoting again: "The board is prepared to spend its own money on the addition but required government authorization to do so and Mr. Craik has turned the project down. The school trustees have requested a hearing." Listen to this, Mr. Chairman: "The school trustees have requested a hearing but the education minister has replied he is too busy in the House at present to meet with a delegation." There's no mention here as to any indication of a time when

(MR. HANUSCHAK Cont'd.).... the Minister will be prepared to meet with the Winnipeg School Division. "The Board submitted notice of intent on the addition early last December." So you can see, Mr. Chairman, that this wasn't something which had come up on the spur of the moment, last night, last week type of thing - this goes back to last December. "It was aware government construction grants apply only to schools but hoped the Department of Education's Building Projects Committee would consider the instructional media and data-processing computer facilities as direct school services."

Now here are some of the school services that were to be included in here, Mr. Chairman. A library service area, which will permit the school division to purchase library books at cheaper rates in bulk order; receive, process and catalogue them themselves, and break them down into individual school lots for distribution. An audio-visual area would house facilities for preparing and processing such classroom aids as charts, transparencies and film strips. A permanent home for the division's science center would also be provided, along with facilities for developing science programs, material and supplies for city schools.

These, Mr. Chairman, are just some of the services that the Winnipeg School Division hoped to include in this addition, and it's rather ironic, because I feel certain that if a school division were to approach the same finance board with authorization for the capital expenditure on the expansion of an existing facility or building a new one, and the plans called for a little corner of some room, or the end of some blank hall to be partitioned off to provide a little cubicle for the librarian to work in, to provide storage room for some teaching aids, to provide work area for the preparation of teaching aids, some limited space a couple of hundred square feet or so, the Schools Finance Board would likely have approved, but intending to operate more efficiently, and with that intention in mind consolidating similar activities under one roof, offering the same service, or of a same nature but much better in quality than could otherwise be offered, on that basis the Schools Finance Board sees fit to reject the Winnipeg School Division's proposal. Now surely, surely, Mr. Chairman, that is not the purpose for which the Public Schools Finance Board was instituted. And if that was the purpose for which it was instituted, then I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that he take immediate steps to disband that board because of it not serving any useful purpose, any useful function for the education of the people of Manitoba.

Last Thursday I had made reference to the fact that the education picture hasn't changed appreciably over the last number of years in this respect: in terms of the percentage of elementary school students who enter secondary schools and who proceed therefrom to post-secondary institutions of learning, be it university, schools of technology, that sort of thing; and I would challenge the Minister to indicate differently, because if he examines the figure he will find that, proportionately speaking, for the last five or six years there hasn't been any more than a one or two percent fluctuation one way or the other. In other words, the percentage of students who find their way to university today isn't that much higher than the percentage of students who found their way to university five years ago. The fact that the university enrollment is higher, that's correct, that's true, because there are more students to draw from, and there are more students to draw from not solely because something had happened which attracted more students into the schools - this has happened to a degree too, I admit, but that's not the only factor. There was also a population increase factor which had occurred in this province over the last number of years. In other words, because of the increase in the population, hence you find more students at the doors of the university and our high schools, but not solely because of devising a program that has become more attractive to the students and devising a program whereby it has become that much easier for the student to obtain that higher knowledge. So the Honourable Minister, Mr. Chairman, cannot ignore the fact that there has been a general population increase which brings with it an increase in the number of students.

Now, further to that, the Honourable Minister did not comment on this point and I feel that it is very much his responsibility now because I believe that the department is not now known as the Department of Education but it's now known as the Department of Youth and Education, and every person who falls into the category of youth unfortunately is not in the school. The Minister's own report indicates that there are many thousands who are not in the school. He will find, if he studies the report, that from each grade, particularly commencing at the Grade 9 level, there is a very significant drop in the enrollment from Grade 9 to Grade 10 and so forth. If you examine the Grade 9 enrollment in one year, the Grade 10 enrollment the following year, from which the vast majority of Grade 10 came, you will find quite an appreciable

(MR. HANUSCHAK Cont'd.).... drop, and a similar drop again in Grade 11 and again in Grade 12. Now it is those thousands that I'm concerned about, Mr. Chairman. What is the Youth branch of his department doing about those individuals? Those individuals who, for some reason or another, are not in the secondary school system? What provision is being made for upgrading them? What is being done with a view to assisting them in finding the most profitable employment for them, the most gainful employment, the type of employment most suitable for them? What if anything is being done for the school drop-outs? What if anything is being done to reduce that number of school drop-outs, Mr. Chairman?

This is a question which the Honourable Minister has not dealt with and has not answered, and all this, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you is part and parcel of the basic question which I put to the Minister last Thursday, to outline the philosophy of his department. What are his aims and objectives? Is it simply a machine grinding out education and wrapping it up in little bags and boxing it and making it available at a supermarket, and let the people have their pick and buy what they want? Or is our program geared and aimed toward a certain particular purpose? What are his views on technological education? What are his views on instruction in the arts as opposed to instruction in the sciences? Does he feel that they are at a satisfactory, at a suitable level, or does he feel that one is being neglected at the expense of the other, and if so, which? These, Mr. Chairman, are the answers which the people want, which the people deserve, but, instead, the Minister chooses to hide behind the Public Schools Finance Board. That is the group that is going to solve all the problems. They are going to hang on, they are going to control the purse strings, and by controlling the purse strings they are going to provide the people of Manitoba with the best form of education that he feels they deserve.

Now if this is true, Mr. Chairman, then may I remind the Honourable Minister that there is another source of revenue which the people of Manitoba have, which was established for the purpose of assisting parents and providing their children with an education, and that is Family Allowance. Now, would the Minister say that the recipients of the Family Allowance cheques, namely the parents, do not have the ability to dispose of that money for the benefit of their children? Would the Minister suggest that perhaps we should set up a board for the paying out of Family Allowance to parents. Maybe it's unwise to pay them the cheque directly. Would he suggest that all the money be paid into one fund, administered by a Family Allowance Board set up by this Minister and let each parent go to this board and prove its case of need for receipt of this money? Now surely the Minister wouldn't say that, but he is saying that about school trustees. He's saying that the school trustees don't know how to manage their financial affairs. He's saying that they are living beyond their means, and he says that he's got the people who have all the answers. He's got the people who have all the answers, a board which he has set up, a board against whom the voter does not have direct recourse as one does against a cabinet minister, and he knows that. And one further comment, Mr. Chairman, about the board that I would like to make. I feel that it's unwise putting a civil servant in a decision-making capacity on a political board of this type, because many issues of this type from time to time do become political issues, and a civil servant is put in the embarrassing position of having to make decisions which not he, but an elected member of the government, should be making.

Now I hope, I sincerely hope and I ask of the Minister again that he do give us some outline, some indication of the guidelines used by the Public Schools Finance Board in assessing the applications presented to it. You may recall last Thursday that when the question was put to him that if a need arose to cut certain programs, to trim them down, which ones would the Minister tackle first, and music, art, guidance, physical education, and such were mentioned. Somebody mentioned, probably with tongue in cheek at that time, reading, writing, arithmetic. Well, this may sound like something that could never happen but it's rather interesting that in another school board faced with a financial problem, in the state of North Dakota, in the city of Minot, they were faced with a financial problem - problems, I suppose, common to school divisions, school districts in every state and every province wherein there is a taxation system or sources of revenue for it similar to those that we are saddled with, and the City of Minot was faced with a similar problem, and in order to live within their means, as the Minister puts it, they reduced their staff. In the process of reducing their staff, they cut out some of the programs, and which programs did they cut out? The reading, writing and arithmetic programs. Which else? They cut out all third and fourth year Languages, advanced physical education, Drama II, Russian I and II, Debates I and II, architectural drawing, music history, Journalism



(MR. HANUSCHAK Cont'd.)... II, Shorthand II, and a number of shops courses, furniture making, cabinet making, carpentry, sheet metal drawing, printing. That's what they cut out.

Now I'm sure that the people in the state of North Dakota are no different from the people in Manitoba, and if that happened over there it could quite conceivably happen over here if the Minister puts the school board in a predicament of that type, which this board could well do. In other words, what I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is I don't think it really matters which course they eliminate. The fact is that they did eliminate some courses, and I believe that all courses are valuable, all courses are important, and I think that when it comes to that stage, when the Minister says, now look, you fellows, you have to live within your means, they may just as well put the names of the courses in a hat and mix them up and pull out a sufficient number to reduce their operating expenses down to the level that the Minister suggests, and it could perhaps be language, reading, writing, arithmetic, science, who knows. Now is this the way - is this the way to allow the educational system in Manitoba to grow and to flourish and to become one to provide the people of this province with its present day needs? Perhaps the Minister thinks that it is, but let me assure him that the people of Manitoba do not think that it is.

As I have indicated earlier - and on this point I'm sitting down, Mr. Chairman - I suggest to the Honourable Minister that he consult with the other members of the treasury bench, that he point out to them the sorry plight that education finds itself in, and that he impress upon them the need for an immediate revision of our taxation structure and the need for immediate implementation of tax revenues from more equitable sources. And we're not going to make a speech on that point alone. If the Minister cares to - if he's forgotten, all he has to do is remind us and we'll be glad to remind him what the other sources are.

But you can't deal with one aspect of education without considering the others. You have to consider your source of supply of funds and the provision of education services. I agree this is very important. But let's consider all sources of supply of funds and not just one or two that the Minister chooses to consider, and then when he exhausts the source of supply of money from those areas then say, well we're going to extend the powers of the School Finance Board and we're going to impress upon the school divisions to learn to live within their means. In other words, to insult the school boards, insult the school trustees by telling them, you fellows don't know how to spend your money but we know and we're going to tell you how. If he's going to tell us that how, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that he tell us in this House on what basis, what factors he takes into consideration in making those decisions in determining what the limits of expenditure should be of any given school division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: General Administration - \$2, 332, 211. Resolution 103 -

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is first of all on his feet, but I'm going to raise a general objection, Mr. Chairman, to your just looking at your estimate sheet before examining to see whether there are members in the House who wish to speak. I know that you're anxious to get down this list, but we conceive our responsibility in this House to bring forth the points that our constituents have sent us here to talk about, and I would ask, Mr. Chairman, with great respect, that when a member has finished speaking that the Chairman look at the House to see whether other members wish to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I can say that I have looked around, but when the honourable members start speaking three times on the same subject it's about time to call order in here and that's what I've -- I'm here to get through the whole book of estimates in 80 hours and we're already up to about 33 hours.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, then let me disabuse you of your responsibility. We are not to get through this whole book of estimates in 80 hours. We have 80 hours within which to discuss the estimates, and members here are entitled to get up, and if they feel a point has not been properly presented they have a right to present it. If you feel they're out of order, then with the greatest of respect you are entitled to call them out of order, but when a member has finished speaking, I think that the courtesy of the Chair is to see whether any other member wishes to speak. In this case you cut off the Minister. I'm not that worried about the Minister, but I am worried about the members on our side of the House.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I think it's very good of my honourable friend to be teaching the House how to conduct its business. He's a comparatively new member here, he's learning quickly, but he has some distance to go. It certainly is the duty of any chairman to see, as far as he can, to the expeditious discharge of the business of the House. If my honourable friend had been here any length of time he would have been well aware of other chairmen who

(MR. EVANS Cont'd.)... have been a good deal more insistent than my honourable friend in the Chair at the present time concerning the conduct of business, and I suggest my honourable friend retain as courteous an attitude as he can towards the Chair.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I tried to make my remarks with the utmost of courtesy, and let me advise my honourable friend that if that's the way he thinks things have got to go, that if he thinks that I'm supposed to do things the way he did them for the last ten years, then I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we have to have a new experience in this House.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, I guess maybe...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member — does the Minister wish to — The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Chairman, I realize that you have a responsibility to fulfill in trying to be as fair and partial to all members of this committee; however, I would like to impress upon you, Mr. Chairman, that during a question period, as you have probably noticed by now, many of the members who pose questions are denied or there is no response from the Minister, and I believe that at estimate periods this is one time when the Minister should be obligated, at least to a certain extent, to provide answers to all the questions posed by the members of this side of the House at least.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Ethelbert has put his finger on the very reason sometimes why I hesitate to get up, because I don't like answering questions three times in a row, and particularly the Honourable Member for Burrows here has been asking these ponderous questions that go over and over and over again the same old ground and he harangues away at them and you still don't know what the question is when he's finished asking it. Now how many times do you have to try and answer for him. That's the basic question.

Now there are two or three points here. First of all, I could have saved him a lot of his discussion if I'd pointed out to him again, as I did last day, that the Public Schools Finance Board was not involved in the decision involving the problem he refers to as the City of Winnipeg — it's the School Division No. 1 and their administration building. If he reads the legislation he'll find out that they require the approval of the Minister for the expenditure of the reserves that they have built up over that three year period. The Public Schools Finance Board is not involved. He spent a great deal of time there going over this. Now I would assume that in his capacity, in his private capacity he'd be closer to the educational field than he appears to let on he is, and he should know this before he goes on his way...

MR. HANUSCHAK: The Finance Board behaves differently from the manner in which the Minister behaves. Is that what the Minister is trying to say?

MR. CRAIK: Perhaps I should have pointed this out to him on a point of order or some other...

MR. HANUSCHAK: It don't really matter, which is which.

MR. CRAIK: I would also point out to the honourable member that at the same time that that decision was made another decision was made in favour of the School Division No. 1, which was money out of the Public Schools Finance Board though, and that was for the construction of the wing — the experimental work that is going on at Gordon Bell and has been going on for several years required additional capital facilities and \$400,000 was expended at the same time out of provincial sources to finance that extension at Gordon Bell. So maybe he'd like to put that in his pipe and smoke it at the same time.

Now with regards to the Honourable Member for Kildonan, I think it's very opportune that he has risen to his feet to speak about education in the technological age, because the program that is going on in his very constituency is getting under way and we're now in the midst of expanding a facility there that will bring the most modern educational facility in the Province of Manitoba to his very own constituency and he appears to be unaware that that's happening in his own constituency. Maybe he's been sitting too close to the Member for Burrows.

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. I didn't say I wasn't aware of it and I think the Minister didn't understand my question.

MR. CRAIK: You gave no evidence of it.

MR. FOX: I was saying that we were in a technological age but the system of education hadn't caught up with it. Now my specific point, and I'll make it again and I'll make it slowly, is that we are utilizing the most and the best educators at the top of the system when we should be utilizing them at the ground — at the base. I think that many educators agree with this but

(MR. FOX Cont'd.).... they just haven't been able to get around with it because the system of remuneration, the foundation system and everything works against him. Now I would suggest - and I think the Minister can debate the point when I make my point - that if we could inculcate and get the young people when they are first starting the learning process to like it, to have the capable educators at that time to analyze what their problems are, if there's any disabilities or dislikes and so on, and eliminate those at that time, then we would have no dropouts or anything else at the top end of the scale. That's the point I was making in this technological age.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd be very willing to spend a little time with the honourable member to tell him exactly what is happening in his own constituency, because I feel that if he was aware of it he would know that what is being done there in the development of the new comprehensive facility that is being developed for his own area, he'd find out that we're providing everything from university entrance course through to occupational entrance course under one roof in a \$3 million facility that is probably one of the most comprehensive facilities that will have been provided in the Province of Manitoba.

Now as far as the topsy-turvy relationship he's concerned about in terms of remuneration, he might have a good point here. I don't know whether it's one that we -- he knows himself, I think that these forms of remuneration are under the jurisdiction of the collective bargaining system of the school divisions themselves - if that's the specifics he's talking about. The other age old problem of promoting your best academic people to administrative positions is one that has never been overcome anywhere and doesn't apply just in the field of education, it applies in the field of research and probably production and in any other field of endeavour where somebody in a highly qualified technical capacity, because of this, finds himself in line for administrative promotion that takes him out of the system. I suppose that's the second part that he's referring to here and I would agree with him that this is a problem. But in terms of the educational system itself, if he wants to get a bird's eye view of the approach of this government to education, the school that is presently under consideration for his own area is probably the best example there is in Manitoba.

The Member for Inkster had some points that he wished me to comment on with regards to the university tuition fees, and I think I've made most of the points there. The statistics that he refers to, he would leave the impression that you have this situation of the low income groups not having a proportionate number of students solely because of the ability-to-pay factor, and this of course is where he and I part ways. If what he's saying is that this inversion of factors takes place because of the ability-to-pay factor, that those in the low income brackets don't go to university because they haven't got the tuition fee to get there, that's where we part ways because this is not the primary reason for this happening.

MR. CHERNIACK: What is it?

MR. CRAIK: Well, we talked about it the other day, and again if you want to rediscover America, if we want to go over it again we can. I made the point at that time that the motivation factor is a far more important factor in this day and age than the matter of being able to finance your own way through university. Now he says we can point examples to both sides to prove the point. This I'm sure is true. I can tell him about one family of four children, a family of a fellow who is a truck driver and who made an income of less than six or seven thousand dollars a year and had great difficulties in his own home, all four of them went through university on bursaries and went completely through. They're all through now and we could use this as an example. I don't question for a moment there are cases of hardship, and I have made the point that I would like to see our bursary fund reinforced further still and that I know there are cases where we don't catch them all. But basically the principle is not a bad one.

There is one other point in this regard that I think is important to the structuring of higher education. I feel that the students, regardless of how they are going to pay for their fees, their fees do work to the well-being of the total structure of higher education in that it leaves the student feeling that he has a part in the university process when he has paid his fees. I think it is good for the institutes of higher learning to feel that -- and know, and have to rely on fees for part of their existence. I think that the universities will tell you themselves. I read an article the other day from the university -- a professors' group from Toronto that wanted the fees concept maintained because they don't want to be completely reliant on government for their financing. I think that there is a latent philosophy there than can be explored to quite a great extent and you would find a great many people, who have thought about this, feel strongly that the concept of the user fee is a good one at the university level. Certainly university

(MR. CRAIK Cont'd.).... students in organizations have their impact on society and their impact on government, and they likewise have an impact on university staff people. I think that their total impact serves democracy well all the way around. I may question some of the statistics, incidentally, that are in that report which he was quoting from, however I haven't gone into them in great detail. I have seen it, I have it and I'm having it examined. I think that's all the comments I have at this point.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I take it that the Honourable Minister missed my question with respect to dropouts and the program dealing with that issue within the Youth portion of his department.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, there are a number of reasons why the fall-off between grades 9 and 10 is high. As you know, they reach the school leaving age at this point and there are any number of children do drop out of school as soon as they reach the school leaving age. But it's primarily because of the outside influence. You must remember that a large part of our province is still an agrarian community and there's a large number of the young people that leave school at this point still to go to work on the farm. Now that's one reason you have the dropout at the school leaving age. You have other areas such as the Hutterite colonies, where the incentive is actually there for them to drop out as soon as they reach age 15. Their society, by and large on the average, does not promote higher education amongst their own people - another reason. That's why you have the high dropout rate between grades 9 and 10. On the average in the province, you'll find that about 15 percent of your dropouts occur in those grades. In the following year though, you look between 10 and 11, those who have decided to go on for education's purpose, the dropout rate is 7 percent; and if you look at between 11 and 12, you will probably find it is 10 percent.

..... continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, there are a few points that I want to cover, and one I think is quite important in this day and age where it is so popular to cause a bit of trouble and have not so quiet revolution in certain universities. I think it would be well to focus the attention of the people and the public at times on people who are working for the good of the community, and I think that we are very fortunate here in Manitoba in having people at the university who are by and by so serious and sincere. I think that we don't spend enough time thinking of these young people that are doing such a good job. Maybe it's not as colorful, and at times I think that our newspaper, the reports and the television and radio would seem to encourage, by giving so much publicity, encourage some of these things that you see at different universities and lately at universities here in Canada. I think that we should realize that we are very fortunate in the type of students that we have in Manitoba, and I believe that it should be a lesson to us to also let them have a voice in education, treat them with respect when they have suggestions and so on, and on the same hand, I think you should be firm, that we must give full confidence and full backing to our university president and chairman and so on whenever they are dealing with the students and dealing with the discipline of these students. I am not suggesting that everything has been perfect here in Manitoba. We have had some incidents, but I think that if the students by and large remember that we aim to be firm on certain things - I don't think that we should tolerate any abuse - there is no reason why a very small percentage of students, of troublemakers, should take away the freedom of the larger group to get a fair education, and I think that if the students know that we will be firm and strong on this point, that by and by the responsible ones will have more to say and it will be a better climate at our universities.

Now the Minister, Mr. Chairman, when you tried to speed up the committee awhile back - and I think that maybe you were right in trying to speed up the committee, and I don't think that it is your intent to muzzle anybody here or to prevent anybody from bringing out any points or trying to get some information - but the Minister quite strongly seemed to condemn some of the members to my left for the way they have been acting or operating in this committee, and he stated that he doesn't mind answering questions but he doesn't want to have to answer them two or three times in a row. I think that no one should be asked to answer the same questions two or three times in a row, but I think that the Minister should be careful to give the proper information and the answers, the correct answers, and when I say correct answers, not necessarily the answers that we want to hear from this side of the House but the full answers.

Now I know because, especially in this department, I've had an awful time trying to get even recognition of certain problems in the past. The Minister said that he was always ready to give the approach of this government or his department in this field of education, but he is not doing this. He is not doing this. I asked him some questions that I think are pretty important. I asked him some questions last Thursday - I asked him to give us a report on how this system, or this new Bill that was passed establishing or making French a teaching language, how this was working out. I'm not satisfied with an answer, "we're doing everything possible". This to me is not an answer. I asked the Minister to comment on the possibility of having French Schools in the Metro area because it was impossible for all the different school districts to make it possible to have some classes where the French would be accepted as the language of instruction. I haven't heard anything on that and I think that this is quite important. For a number of years I have been saying that we were not developing the teachers who would be capable of teaching in French. I have asked the Minister what was being done on this and I haven't heard anything on that at all.

Now before the Orders of the Day it is true, like the Honourable Member said awhile ago, that sometimes we are not given -- the Ministers will not even recognize our questions. Well this is their privilege, but during the estimates of different departments I think that we are entitled to receive this information. I am asking now because I think it should be under this department. I want to know the policy of this government and the Minister on biculturalism and specially bilingualism, because this is a field that should be covered in education. Bilingualism comes under this department and I think that the Minister who has made different statements outside the House on different occasions, on television and so on, I think that he owes it to us to give us this policy, clear-cut policy of this government on this.

I expect, after everything that was said on this subject, those famous words that the Minister or his leader has coined about gradualism, I want to know; I want the Minister to explain

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . his policy of gradualism in this field. I think it is very important that we should know, and I'm not satisfied for the First Minister to say that that will be said in due course. What is in due course for him might not be in due course or in the right time for the rest of the people of Manitoba, and in due course might be after an election. I'm not satisfied with this. I think we have the best example of somebody that is working for the unity of this country in the person of the Leader, the National Leader of the Conservative Party - and I might say that I am very pleased to congratulate this man openly and publicly for the stand that he took. He feels that this is important enough that he doesn't want to play politics or to try to get the help of the backlash on this question in the prairies or any other section of Canada.

And in the Throne Speech, Mr. Chairman, I think you might remember, the Minister would remember, that this is what I was saying. I was accusing the government of doing just this. Well it was said awhile ago that we don't have to announce the policy now. This is what was said in Ottawa, but in the House you have to announce the policy. We are certainly entitled to ask to know your policy, that you make your policy known, your principle on this question. It is a very important thing.

All right, you don't have to answer the way we want or the way we would like you to answer; this is fine. If you want to play politics in this, well say so; and if you feel that this is not important, say so. If you don't want to do anything about it, say so, if you feel that the government should not recognize this, but tell us what this policy of gradualism is, because a lot of us are very interested and I think we are entitled to know. Now I expect the Minister, before we leave his salary, to give us his ideas on this subject to see what can be done, to see if the government is right in its policy of gradualism. I don't want the government to say, or the Minister, we'll tell you this in due course. I want to know if we are progressing and I want to know if they are satisfied with this Act. As I said previously, if there is something that the members of the opposition or we on this side can do to help the government or to help the people of Manitoba to go in the right direction, we stated then, and I think we have proven in the past that we would not approach this in a partisan approach. I think that we have proven this. We want to know, but we have to know what the government intends to do. This is too important a subject - we have debated this - this was a Bill that was brought in a few years ago by the government and the then Minister of Education, I think, could tell you that he received nothing but co-operation from all the members of this House. We want to know now - is it asking too much to know how this is progressing; what could be done; if the department is satisfied. I have asked quite a few questions on Thursday about the textbooks, about the development of teachers who would be qualified to teach French and in French. I want to know if the government is satisfied that 50 percent of the time is good enough and if this is being used, in many schools that are taking advantage of at least this 50 percent as allowed now by this Act, if this is being done, or in general, is it just maybe 25 percent or 10 percent.

We feel that this is something vital for national unity. We feel that the people should have a chance when at all possible, when there is a sufficient number of students, where French could be used as a teaching language, and we feel that this will make it better for all Canadians if they can come in, and instead of building a wall around a certain province or wanting to separate from the rest of Canada, if they could feel at home in all the provinces. Now this is one thing that I think for to establish, I guess to take advantage of this backlash, I think that purposely the people are being kept in the dark, and I fault the Federal Government in this who have not explained this language bill enough, but I also feel that it is the responsibility of this government to give leadership and to explain it. Now if the government is against these things, tell us why, but tell us.

I don't want to belabour this any longer, Mr. Chairman, but I certainly hope that the Minister will co-operate in this. This is not a question of trying to fault him or fault his policies, I want to know his policies, and I would like the Minister, before we leave his salary, to give us a clear-cut statement of the policies of his department and the government and I would also like to see him answer some of the questions and comment on some of the suggestions I have made.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I just was wondering here -- when I replied to the honourable member's questions on Thursday I don't think he was in the House. I don't know whether he has had an opportunity to read through Hansard or not to see if possibly some of the answers which he is wanting here possibly aren't contained in the reply which I made after he had asked

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . his previous questions. I indicated at that time that the government was attempting to do what it felt was right in terms of the promotion of the French language in the national interest and in line with the interests of the community. I can't give you exact figures on how well the policies have worked out resulting from Bill 59 of two years ago, but I could give him statistics, probably could get him some facts and figures on the student enrollment in these various courses and the numbers taking French and the numbers involved in the Francais course, which is a much more intensive French course directed at those people that actually speak the French language. I indicated in my reply the other day that we were exploring the possibility of schools in the French milieu which we thought had considerable possibility, particularly in the larger urban areas, and I mentioned some other factors with regard to this which he may wish to look at.

With regard to French teachers, there is a shortage of French teachers and this poses one of the real problems. We have looked at other possibilities as well. There is French in the lower grades being taught very effectively through television in other parts of the world. I personally had a look at this and think that it has some good potential as far as Manitoba is concerned because again our aim here is, if we are serious about promoting bilingualism in Canada, we must teach French in the lower grades and we must teach French as a language of communication orally and not just the traditional French that has been taught in the schools. I think probably that some real potentials lie in the use of television for the teaching of French to the lower grades and this is something that we'll be exploring further. We know now that we can do a great deal more with it than we can from the traditional approach of attempting to teach trained teachers to teach it on an individual basis. So I would say that, in total, we embrace the concept, the philosophy that French language instruction should be expanded and that we are looking at means by which this can be done.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is right, I was called out while he was making his reply, but I wish to state that I checked with many of the members and before leaving I asked some of the members to pay attention to see if he was giving me the reply. I have also looked at Hansard and the Minister did say a few words but I think it was more wishy washy and good intention, just saying we are all in favour of this, like the statement we are all in favour of motherhood or anything else, but we haven't gone into actually what the government wanted to do. The Minister said - and I have it in front of me now - that he wanted to see more French taught in schools. I want to see that too, but how will this be done? The Minister said also that this costs a lot of money and he left it at this. Well what kind of priority have we got in this? This is it. I mean everything costs money, and if we say, well we would like to have this but this is going to cost money, what does that mean, that this will never -- we'll start improving this when there's no longer a question of cost? I think that this is something that is vital here. Sure it costs money, the teaching of anything costs money. I think that the Minister could have been a little more direct, and even today, I think it's fine we are studying now the possibility of having more schools in the French milieu - and mind you I won't forget this - I'll ask you next year what you have done on this, if you have been progressing. And I don't want to get the same thing - we are continuing to study it. It's all right to study but sometimes you have to act.

This does not give me the clear-cut policy of this government on this question of the accepting the French fact. This is not telling us what the government means with gradualism, especially when the Minister finished by saying, well don't forget that this costs money. Well what does gradualism mean? Are you going to spend \$5.00 or \$100 a year on this gradually, and eventually hope to have something? I think that the Minister owes it to us to tell us what they mean. I mean they used this, they're the ones, the Minister and the First Minister are using this word "gradually". It's their word, it's not mine, so the least they can do is explain what they mean by this. This is so vague when you say we want to do this gradually. They've talked about the colored problem in the States and you can't do some of these things gradually. These prejudices are -- there's nobody born with prejudices, those are given from generation to generation. It's got to be stopped somewhere, and those things are difficult. We have to have leadership and this is the only way that we're going to arrive at this, is get the leadership. And I think we have the perfect example now, as I said, the story that's in the Tribune today I think is a terrific example and should certainly go to the credit of Mr. Stanfield who is ready to resign. He feels that the national unity is more important than anything else and he wants to resist the temptation of those that are saying, well let's take advantage

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . of this backlash because the Liberals and the New Democratic Party are committed to this. So where are they? They've got nowhere to go so let's take advantage of this, and this man says no, and I think that this is to his credit.

This is what I was saying a while back, these things should be -- when you're talking about the national unity of a country, and a country such as ours, if we've got anything, any sincerity at all, I think that this is what we've got to do, put this above our personal victory or victory of our Party, and this is what I'm asking this government to do. This is what this government hasn't done in the past, and I'm talking about now since we have this new Premier. Is this what the government wants, to stay vague on this, wants to straddle the fence on this, wants to be able to say, well no, I didn't do anything, we haven't announced anything. Do they want to do like the Conservative meetings did in Ottawa not too long ago and say no, we're not going to come in with any clear-cut policy on this because it would be suicide, we have nothing to gain. This is all right for a political party to do, I agree with this, but now I'm talking to a government, to a government that has certain responsibilities. The government doesn't have to agree with me, but I think we're entitled in this House, and the people of Manitoba to get a clear-cut policy on this. And this is what I'm repeating, I'm asking the Minister to tell us what he means by gradualism, give us some idea, not just platitudes and window dressing and say yes, we want to see this, we want to see that and we hope it's going to be done. I want a little more than that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to deal with a new subject. I know you'll be pleased to hear that, so you won't complain of repetition. Before I do, I'd like to just tail off from where my honourable friend the member for St. Boniface left off. I wonder why his Prime Minister didn't congratulate Mr. Stanfield for his position on the English-French question during the last federal election because the position hasn't changed that much, it hasn't changed at all.

MR. DESJARDINS: You ask him that, I don't know.

MR. GREEN: Well, I have the answers, I have the answers. However, as I say, I'm going to deal with a new question and I don't want to debate with my honourable friend.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to deal with the question of how this government is resolving, or otherwise dealing with the problems resulting from the situation of the native peoples of Manitoba, because I believe that the educational feature of this problem is most important. We have just been dealing, Mr Chairman, with the question of English-French and the rights of these various ethnic groups in our country. I always think that problems are most sensitive when they relate to ethnic consideration, and I think that when any group is forced into a position where it becomes almost impossible to otherwise identify the problem without relating to the question of the ethnic origin of the people, then the problem is indeed one which is vital to the interests of the entire society and extremely vital to the interests of the particular group itself.

Therefore, when we are forced, Mr. Chairman - and I submit to you that we don't like to get into this position - but when we are forced to deal with a problem as relating to a particular ethnic group, then I think that we should all stand up and take particular note of that problem because it can be explosive in many many ways and I think that that is the situation which has arisen with regard to our native peoples in the Province of Manitoba.

We had a very small introduction of the type of remedy that should be forthcoming in this area with the Minister's announcement following the resolution put by our Party that the native peoples who are living on reservations be given both the right to vote as part of their educational responsibilities and to sit on school boards as part of their educational responsibilities. But, Mr. Chairman, as I said at that time, that was a very very small measure of progress, a baby step forward if I may put it that way, and I just wonder - and we haven't heard anything in the Minister's introduction of his estimates - whether there are any other giant steps which this government is taking to deal with this question. And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if we look at the situation regarding the native peoples, we can see that they are distinguishable - and I say that this is a problem - that they are distinguishable within our society in almost all basic sociological factors.

They're, first of all, distinguishable economically. They happen to form, Mr. Chairman, as a group, almost in overwhelming proportion of their numbers the lowest rung of the economic scale, and I will not, Mr. Chairman, as the Minister appears to do, accept this as



(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . meaning that somehow this group is not motivated, that somehow this group lacks initiative, but they happen to be, statistically speaking, in overwhelming proportional numbers the lowest rung of the economical ladder.

They are also, Mr. Chairman, in the terms of formal education itself, in a very very distinct position in terms of their ability to continue within our educational system. I have statistics, Mr. Chairman, which were prepared by the way in 1965, which indicate that the native peoples formed roughly three percent of Canada's population. Now I don't have the comparable statistics of Manitoba's population but I think that the situation is not much different, and the 1965 review from the Indian Affairs Branch, which gives a survey of Indian children's school leavers, is as follows: In Grade One, the percentage dropout is .14 percent; Grade 2 - .36 percent; Grade 3 - .66 percent; Grade 4 - 1.45 percent; Grade 5 - 3.51 percent; Grade 6 - 6.9 percent; Grade 7 - 10.84 percent; Grade 8 - 17.82 percent; Grade 9 - 24.08 percent; Grade 10 - 26.85 percent; Grade 11 - 36.54 percent; and Grade 12 - 65.43 percent. Now, Mr. Speaker, that 65.43 percent of the Indian students dropout in Grade 12 is compared with 38.7 in the entire community, and the figures are equally at variance through all of the other grades, and I haven't bothered to read them because I think that members of the House will be satisfied that there is a much greater proportion of dropouts of our educational system by Indian students than is the case by the students of the community generally. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that I've indicated that from an economic point of view, from an educational point of view, we can come to a positively defined ethnic group, and I say, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat, this is a dangerous situation. I think that the same situation, the same distinguishing feature can be looked at in our social and economic life generally.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to read some excerpts from the "Public Eye" program on which one of the magistrates of our province spoke, and I ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether the remarks that were made could be made other than the fact that they referred to our Indian population. In other words, would it have been acceptable for any magistrate - and here we are talking about one of the highest embodiments of our system of justice and of our social system generally - would these remarks have been acceptable if made with regard to any other than the Indian population. The questioner: "Are you convinced, Magistrate Rice, that the Indian has some kind of congenital health problem that doesn't mix with liquor or what?" And the answer: "Well I am not a biologist but there is something lacking in their blood, so the way I see it, they take one drink, they can never stop at one drink, as I see it, but apparently liquor or any other kind of alcohol in their blood just doesn't mix."

Now, Mr. Chairman this is a condemnation not of an individual, not of a group of individuals but of a race, that apparently liquor or any kind of alcohol in their blood just doesn't mix. And then question: "Of the 84 drunks, how many were Indian?" "I would venture to guess 70 to 75 percent." Could that remark have been made about Ukrainians? Could it have been made about Jews? Could it have been made about any other ethnic group without arousing a storm of protest on behalf of society generally that you just don't say these things about an ethnic group? You can talk about the individuals but you can't condemn a group on the basis of this information. Could they be said by anyone, let alone a magistrate of one of our courts?

"Now again, Magistrate Rice, in the last while you had an epidemic of mugging cases in Winnipeg."

"I don't know exactly how many, I don't have a statistic. From those that appeared before me I would say that 99 percent of them were committed by either Indian or Metis." Again, Mr. Chairman, could this be said about an ethnic group other than the Indian without a storm of protest?

"Larry Zolf: How are the Indian and Metis involved, the girls in the prostitution problem. Do you want to cross that as a situation?"

"No, I just don't think there is any prostitution. I guess it's they just don't charge, I don't know. Or the way they live, you know you can get -- they are always living common law. One day you will get the fellow living with this woman and the next day you'll get the same, you send him to jail and the next day you get someone else who is living with her. I don't think they have any, the ones that appear before me, have any morals, I don't think I ever came across a married couple, maybe I did."

Again, Mr. Chairman, from the same program, and this is national television: "I would suggest that they give them a course on how to keep house, cleanliness, how to cook, how to use modern appliances, teach them responsibility, to look after their children. The

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . people don't know how to live decently, or a nice home, they don't know how to keep a home." Again, Mr. Chairman. And then somebody brought up the question of abortion which they are trying to legalize. "One of these regular attendants of mine came up before me and she said to me, 'She's an Indian woman or a Metis, I don't know the difference.' And she asked me before court, she says, 'tell me, Magistrate Rice, may I ask you what is the difference between abortion and sterilization?' So I explained it to her and she says, 'I'm all for sterilization, because with an abortion a gal would have to have an operation every morning.' "

Now, Mr. Chairman, the point that I'm trying to make by reading these excerpts is that I rather suspect that our society is more willing to accept this kind of easy-going comment, flippant comment, when made with respect to this group in a way completely other than they would accept it if made with another group, and I think, Mr. Chairman, the greatest indication of all that we are dealing with a special situation, and one which I say I don't like to be a special situation, but it is, is that the magistrate then said that he was astonished to learn that some people regarded these remarks as indicating some discrimination on his part on the basis of the Indian and Metis. He was astonished that these remarks could bear that interpretation.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think that he doesn't realize that the situation has developed whereby every Indian child that is born is born with the stigma that has been attached, both within the educational system, that they are dropouts; secondly, within the economic system that they form the lowest rung of the economic ladder; and thirdly, with regard to the general attitude that the highest people in the community, the most respected people in the community think of their activities as a group rather than as individuals, because it may be statistically possible to prove these things, but each individual child, because of the statistics, is stamped with that kind of image, and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that our educational system is required to deal with this as a special situation. I regret special situation, but I think that a special situation has arisen.

I think if we look at our population that are serving in institutions resulting from crime - and I'm quoting from a 1967 Canadian Corrections Association statistic - there are three percent of the population is Indian or Metis; 22 percent of the people in Headingly at that time were of that origin, 59 percent at Brandon, 78 percent at Dauphin, 100 percent of the females in The Pas, 84 percent of the males in The Pas, 22.2 percent in the Stony Mountain federal penitentiary, the Manitoba Home for Boys - 37 percent, the Home for Girls - 33 percent, and the Marymount School for Girls - 31 percent.

So the situation, Mr. Chairman, as I put it before, is I believe an explosive one. It's an explosive one not only in that it potentially can explode all of the potential personality development which are available to a young child of Indian origin - and that's certainly something of which we should all be concerned, but it's also potentially dangerous, Mr. Chairman because I think it can explode society generally, that in the enlightened self-interest of the people who are not of the Indian or Metis origin, who are not of our native people, something has to be done to separate this group of statistics as being able to be established concerning one group which is ethnically identifiable, and I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister is doing anything with regard to these problems in his particular department.

I refer particularly to the situation as it presently exists in the Frontier School Division. My understanding is that the Frontier School Division would be a division where many of our native peoples are attending school. I understand that that division is still an administered division, that it is not a division like other divisions in that the people there do not elect their school trustees, they do not participate in the total educational process. I wonder if that is still the case. The fact is - I think the Minister is nodding his head - that the Frontier School Division is administered just as the Town of Thompson was administered by a resident administrator before there was a local council. What steps, Mr. Chairman, if any, are being taken to recognize that the maturity of the people themselves is conditioned upon us accepting the fact that they are mature and can govern their own school system.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether there is anything done within the school system to counteract the years and years of propaganda which each of us has grown up with regards to our Indian population. What do people who are not of Indian origin, what do they learn about the Indians and how do they learn about the Indians? We know that as a result of the movies and the books and the magazines and the other reams and reams of material which children

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . are subjected to, that they learn that the Indian is somebody who fought wars with the white man, was defeated, who had no positive values to his culture whatsoever, who was someone who was on the verge of savagery, who had to be maintained on a reserve after the organized system of government came to Canada. Is anything done, not for the rest of the population so much, but is anything done for the Indian children themselves to teach history in a way which will show the positive values which were the characteristics of these people as they were indeed the characteristics of all other peoples that form part of the Province of Manitoba.

Is anything done, Mr. Chairman, particularly with reference to language? I'm not one who thinks that every language should be taught within the school system on the same basis. I admit here and now that I believe that there is a special place within any Canadian educational system for the teaching of French and the teaching of English, that these are the two official languages of our country, that they must therefore have a status which is different than the other languages. But, Mr. Chairman, I see no reason whatsoever for not teaching any other language on an optional basis in the schools, and I think that the very recognition of the teaching of a language on an optional basis gives some respect and integrity to the people who speak that language. I think that one of the important things about teaching Ukrainian in the schools was that it had demonstrated to the Ukrainians that we in this society place some value on their heritage as Ukrainians. The same would be true of the teaching of Hebrew, of the setting up of a Department of Hebraic study. I'm not sure as to how many people come out of that department being able to speak Hebrew; I venture to say that they couldn't carry on a good conversation. But it does demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, that our society has a regard for the classical contribution that the Hebraic culture has made to our society. We teach Greek; we teach Latin - Latin, a language which is not even spoken - but it gives a prestige and a positive identification of oneself to those peoples whose language stems from the Latin. Is there a similar pride that an Indian student or a child of Indian origin can take with regard to his own language? Is his language of value? Is it given a status in the Province of Manitoba, even in schools in which he is presently being educated? Is it of some value to citizens, for instance, to be able to know that Cree is a language that they can optionally take in the schools? Is it of value to the children of Cree origin who then see that their language is not something to be discarded or to be ashamed of, which is the corollary to this proposition, and is it of some value to society generally to say that we recognize that these people have positive values which they are able to contribute to society?

So I ask, Mr. Chairman, whether there is anything done first of all to democratize, to further democratize the situation in education vis-a-vis our native people. I ask the Minister whether there is anything in our curriculum which will act as a counterbalance to the years of vilification and slanderous propaganda which every one of us, Mr. Speaker, has been subjected to regarding the culture and the historical significance of the native people. Is that being done in the schools or are our children to get their education about Indians and what they stood for from the cowboy movies that are produced by Hollywood, because I think that's where we have received it up until now. If the school system had anything in it when I was a child, then all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that it was so badly done that none of the positive teachers of this group of people have come forward.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I started my remarks by saying that I believe that the situation is an explosive one and I believe that it's an urgent one. I think, Mr. Chairman, that in our particular situation we have an advantage. I don't believe that any group of people -- because I believe that if anything distinguishes all human beings it's a demand for dignity, a demand for freedom and a demand for justice, and that demand is not going to be any the less expressed on behalf of the native people, especially when they become so identifiable in all the sociological aspects of society as they are now. And when that happens, Mr. Chairman, and I believe that it is happening now, I don't expect that they will docilely accept this position. And we can do one of two things. We can proceed as the United States proceeded. We can say that the battle is between the mighty and the weak and the mighty are going to retain all the powers that they have and that they are going to resist any encroachment on these powers by those who are less mighty.

And that's what happened basically in the United States. In the United States the Negro problem was recognized years and years ago but there was no apparent willingness on the part of the population to do anything significant about that problem. There was many many attempts to pay lip service to the problem but there was no attempt to do anything significant,

April 7, 1969

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . and as a result, Mr. Chairman, we have in the United States - and I'm not asking you to regard this as a positive or a negative development, I'm asking you to regard it as a factual development, it's happening - what is happening to the United States is that the Negro people, the people of black origin are now striking back at the years of injustice which they had to endure under a system which refused to do anything significant about their problem.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we are perhaps ten, perhaps fifteen, perhaps another unidentifiable number of years behind the United States experience, but we are moving, Mr. Chairman, in the same direction, and I say that we have an opportunity now of following the pattern of the United States, in which case I suggest that we will wind up with the same type of racial strife in Canada as is now occurring and which we are now able to witness in the United States. We have the advantage, Mr. Speaker, of looking at the future, and we have looked at the future and it doesn't work, and we have as a result of that observation, as a result of being in that vantage point, the opportunity to take a different direction. I suggest that I'd like to see something within the Minister's Department, because I believe that his department is perhaps the most significant department where we should see some change and some significant development to see that we don't follow a path which will result in damage to ourselves, Mr. Chairman - and when I say to ourselves, I include the entire population - in damage to ourselves, which I say will result, on the basis of the present indications, the present statistical information, the present general attitude with which our native peoples are regarded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. CRAIK: I think I could elaborate on this first but my concern is here that the -- one concern I have is the Honourable Member for Inkster is possibly tying too much to the educational system in attempts to solve racial discrimination. Whether we combat racial discrimination or not, it is not likely to be education of our Indian youth, it is more likely to be a problem of accomplishment in educating the adults as well as the youth, but mainly the adults of our country and of our province, and not possibly so much the Indian people as the white race itself.

But in terms of what we are doing in Indian communities in the way of curriculum and administration, just to give him a few figures, there are about 3,300 Indian children in our public schools now. We do have as a special sub-committee of our Curriculum Branch a group of well recognized Indian and Metis people who do advise us on the curriculum content in our schools and we consult with them regularly. They advise us regularly and we make every effort we can to make sure that our history is taught in a fashion that first of all is not objectionable to them; and then secondly, does portray their point of view in keeping with the other points of view that make up history as it's written.

In the administration of our schools, particularly he referred to Frontier Division, he's correct in that the Frontier Division is a direct responsibility of the provincial government with an official trustee, but we do use an advisory committee and committees that are made up partly of native people and representative of the various communities. The significant communities in which we have responsibilities now are Norway House and Berens River and Wanipagow, and we do attempt to keep in touch. The real problem in overcoming the barrier of education for native people is one of involvement of the community and of educating the community at large that education for their children is worthwhile. This is the first battle that has to be won before you do anything in the way of getting them to take education seriously and being able to educate the young people. This is the first thing that has to be done. On the staff of the Frontier Collegiate, which is the collegiate at Cranberry Portage which offers secondary education as well as elementary but it's aimed primarily at the native population, the supervisor of the elementary program is a native girl herself who is in direct charge of the curriculum that is taught to the young native people.

So I think you can see from this that the department has been taking as many steps as they possibly can to make the curriculum in Manitoba acceptable and not objectionable to the native people, because we know that there has traditionally been a problem and we frequently do get textbooks still that are objectionable to the native people. But steps are being taken, both from a curriculum point of view and the administrative point of view, including the proposed changes in the Public Schools Act to allow Indian people from reserves to go on school boards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, if the work of this committee is not proceeding as rapidly as you would like to see it do, you can't blame it on me because this is the first occasion on which I have taken the floor since we entered the Education estimates.

MR. GREEN: ..... I thought he was on the same subject, but if he's not, if I could just ask a question of the Honourable Minister.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Sure, go right ahead.

MR. GREEN: I wonder if you could deal with the situation with regard to the Frontier School Division. Do you see the possibility of making that a school division like other divisions?

MR. CRAIK: The difficulty is one that I mentioned two or three days ago with regards to Frontier, that geographically it covers over half of the Province of Manitoba and there is nothing in common between the various areas. So it's probably better to do it through an advisory board than it is to make them administratively responsible, because for one thing they'd have difficulty in getting together from the far flung regions on the regular basis that is required from an administrative point of view. The system of having representation in an advisory capacity in the various communities to advise the administrator works quite well, but to take and form it as a regular division would be very difficult I think.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, the point that I want to raise is simply this. Back about three years ago the then Minister of Education did assure the people of the province and the House that ten vocational schools would be built in Manitoba. I mean there's no question about it that that statement was made, because on several occasions it was made during the referendum and several times before that. And he said too that by reason of the fact that these ten schools would be built, it could siphon off - that's the words that were used - up to 40 percent of the high school population, and having done that, then this would certainly affect the building program for the province for the future, that it simply would mean that you may not need the facilities, the high school facilities that first appeared evident, because 40 percent may not be attending the high schools. So with that in mind they built temporary schools all over the province. No doubt you have some in your area, Mr. Chairman. The thing that we don't know is how temporary they are. We do know that they're building them and they're continuing to build them all over the place.

Now last year - I think it was last year or two years ago - I introduced a resolution in the House, you will recall it raised quite a storm, but I said that in light of the statements that were made by the Minister, both during the referendum and before and after, that they should remove from the jurisdiction of the Boundaries Commission the location of the schools. I didn't say in the resolution that they should disband completely the Boundaries Commission. I said "remove from their jurisdiction the location of schools," and said that anyone that would put up a map of Manitoba on the wall, you could nearly decide overnight where the ten vocational schools would be built just by looking at a map. Of course that resolution was defeated.

But to support what I had said, that the government would likely decide and not the Boundaries Commission where the vocational schools would be, I read to the House what the Member for Dauphin had to say. You will recall the Minister -- (Interjection) -- read it again. Well there are four new members that probably don't know anything about it. But this article, not from the Neepawa Press, Mr. Chairman, but from the Dauphin Herald, a good paper - it is a good paper - "Dauphin MLA answers bypassing charges emanating from council." And what were the charges emanating from the council? They were the fact that they were accusing the Member for Dauphin of bypassing Dauphin, bypassing his own constituency, and letting the Boundaries Commission decide where the schools were going to be and this was wrong; and so the Member for Dauphin and the present Minister of Transportation went out to a council meeting there to answer the charges, and I just will read the one paragraph: "In direct answer to the mayor's statement that 'We can no longer sit and wait for a decision by civil servants located at Winnipeg,' Mr. McLean emphatically stated, 'Let's be quite clear the decisions on vocational schools will be made by the Cabinet of Manitoba as they have been in the past and will be in the future.' "

Well the question then, Mr. Chairman, is simply this: What is my honourable friend's attitude in respect to this clear-cut, crystal policy of two or three years ago? Is it still the same? That's what we want to know. Or has it changed with the advent of the new Minister?

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . . I think it's a pretty important question that needs to be answered because is it fair, Mr. Chairman, to say to the 40 school divisions in rural Manitoba, "We are holding up your building plans because we do intend to build 10 vocational schools, and when we build these 10 vocational schools, you may not need to proceed with your high school building program." Now that's understandable and sounds to me like logical thinking and planning, but to say on the other hand, "You've got to wait ten years or so for a Boundaries Commission to recommend where these vocational schools are going to be built, and in the meantime we will authorize you to build some temporary units," it doesn't seem to me to make much sense, unless we have some announcement soon - and I mean at this session - of what Phase II, III and IV is going to be. That's the terminology my honourable friends like to use.

Have we passed Phase No. I? When are we going to enter Phase No. II and III? So that at least the trustees in the rural divisions will know what to do in this whole field of providing accommodation for the expanding enrollment.

I think this is the question that needs to be answered now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, the Boundaries Commission has done valuable work already in providing the background information that's necessary to decide on the location of schools. The ultimate decision for the location of the school, the ultimate decision for the location of vocational schools, though, does lie with the government and they must work out the location with the school boards involved. However, this doesn't negate what is done by the Boundaries Commission. The information, background information, which they do supply through their analytical techniques in providing the necessary data on population trends and on time-distance factors, are the primary consideration that have to be taken into account in deciding the location, so there is no question that it is a double-barrelled decision that has to be taken. We use their information. I think the pattern that has emerged from the Interlake study is fairly self-explanatory. The final decision in the location of the schools in the Interlake area lies with the government and the local school board. As far as the establishment of ten schools is concerned, there are three of them now on the road and hopefully, in the not too distant future, we can advise you of further progress.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I take it from my honourable friend's remarks that there will be seven more built; that is, you do intend to keep the promise that was made but that there will be seven more built, probably not in the immediate future. Does my honourable friend believe that with the building of the ten promised schools that it will seriously, or greatly - seriously is not the right word - but greatly affect the high school enrollment, because it was envisaged three years ago that it could quite conceivably siphon off 40 percent of the high school students? And I think I will wait to get an answer for those two before making another comment.

MR. CRAIK: I'm not sure offhand whether -- presumably your statement means that ten schools would offer education to 40 percent of the high school population. That could well be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: General Administration \$2, 332, 211.00.

MR. CHERNIACK: I just wanted to know then, Mr. Chairman, what item are we on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: General Administration. Resolution 103. Item 1. . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: It's the first resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I called (a) to (f) but I haven't passed the resolution yet, so it's still . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: So we're still on (a). I just wanted to know.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well Mr. Chairman, I didn't get an answer to the first question that I put. It is the intention of my honourable friend, then, to make good the promise that was made; that is, eventually we'll have ten vocational schools in the province here. Would he say in the next two years or three years, or when can we expect Phase II to be carried out?

I'm quoting from as reported by the press, courtesy of Manitoba Association of School Trustees, "Dr. Johnson said he didn't see an immediate rush by division boards to construct new high schools. The Boundaries Commission was now studying possible sites for eight to ten large regional vocational schools throughout Manitoba and boards were likely to make temporary arrangements until vocational school sites had been chosen so facilities wouldn't overlap." Now that, as I said before, sounds like a sensible statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5.30 and leave the Chair until 8.00 o'clock.