

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 20, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker:

PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Stephen Juba and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Seven Oaks General Hospital.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the Investors Group praying for an Act to amend the Act to incorporate Investors Syndicate of Canada Limited, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by Standing and Special Committees.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have with us 70 Grade 6 students of the Robert H. Smith School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Brown and Miss Boyd. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights. And 50 students, Grade 6 of the Buchanan School. These students under the direction of Principal Mr. Carney and Mrs. Breckman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. And 40 students of Grade 11 standing of the Selkirk Collegiate. These students under the direction of Mr. Miller and Mrs. Sharp. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister for Municipal Affairs. And 20 students of Grade 11 of the Windsor Park Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. J. Macfarlane. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): I beg leave of the House to let this matter stand. (Agreed).

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel), in the absence of the Honourable Member for Arthur, introduced Bill No. 48, an Act to incorporate Souris Golf and Country Club.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. Is he in a position to tell us when we might expect the budget?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Cultural Affairs. Could he explain the thinking of the Manitoba Centennial Commission in their obvious lack of support to the Manitoba Centennial song composed by Gordon Watson?

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs) (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has reference to the song that was awarded a prize earlier? I don't know that there has been any neglect.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation to have this song recorded or distributed around the province for sale?

MR. PETURSSON: The honourable member asks whether it is to be recorded. The latest information I have, Mr. Speaker, is that the Portage la Prairie Indian School Choir and the Daniel McIntyre High School Choir of Winnipeg are to record that song towards the end of this present week.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A final question, Mr. Speaker. What methods are going to be used by the Centennial Commission to promote Mr. Gimbey's activities in the province?

MR. PETURSSON: I don't have that information, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs. Has he an answer to my Friday morning question?

MR. PETURSSON: That has to do with the musical rides, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it. Is that right? There was to have been a meeting in Winnipeg today with delegates from Dauphin, but because of the weather the delegation was not able to come into the city and therefore there was no meeting and there's nothing further to report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. MCKENZIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister advise has the meeting been re-scheduled?

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (Dauphin): Perhaps I can answer that question if I may. As the Minister already pointed out that the meeting which was to have taken place this afternoon or earlier this afternoon was postponed because of weather conditions and road conditions and the people from Dauphin could not be here. However, the meeting will take place as soon as the delegation from Dauphin is able to arrive.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I have a question for the Minister of Transportation. I wonder if the Minister is aware that because of rising waters along the Red River that the 200 Highway will be impassable tomorrow morning, and unless something is done about it 200 high school kids will not be able to attend school tomorrow morning.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the situation; I've had a report from our district this morning. I understand that the bus will go through tomorrow but that will probably be the last time until the flood waters recede. There's two things we can do: have the school buses re-routed about 30 miles north which is impractical because of the time involved. The other thing that we can do is get the Army to ferry them across. And the last item we're looking into is to put planks across the Letellier Bridge where the beams are missing. I think we can construct a walkway, bus the kids to the bridge, have them walk across and another bus pick them up on the other side. We should know in a day or two which of the three alternatives we're going to use.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions and the first one is directed to the First Minister. I wonder if he could inform the House if Mr. Nolvert Scott, an appointee to the Centennial Corporation, is a Canadian citizen?

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that off-hand, and if the member wouldn't mind I'll let him know as soon as I find out.

MR. CLAYDON: A supplementary question to the First Minister. Could he inform us tomorrow as to whether he is a Canadian citizen?

MR. SCHREYER: I should think so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if perhaps -- I'm sorry.

MR. CLAYDON: I had a second question and it's directed to the Minister of Cultural Affairs. I wonder if he can tell us if there's been any change in the thinking regarding the Sir Hugh John Macdonald House?

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, so far as I know there has been no change.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a supplementary question to that asked by the Member for Wolseley to the Premier. I wonder if while he is giving his information concerning Mr. Scott if he would also give us some information as to his qualifications for his particular appointment.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I find that a very strange question, in fact quite silly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources could indicate to the House the situation with respect to the Portage Diversion and the Red River Floodway. Are they in operation at this time?

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Yes, Mr. Speaker, both are in operation. And while I'm on my feet, I've just had handed to me the latest Flood Forecasting Committee report which, as members will anticipate, is not as favourable as the previous one, although there is -- well, I think I'll let the report speak for itself and honourable members will get copies of it. The situation has changed from the reports that were issued previously.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Cultural Affairs could tell us if he has given consideration to giving some form of recognition to a song called "Moody Manitoba Morning" as well as to the one that has received the approval of a committee. The song seems to be very popular with a large segment of Manitobans.

MR. PETURSSON: It's a very pleasant and interesting song and I have enjoyed listening to it. I personally have given no other consideration to it than that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It has been brought to my attention just recently that Mr. Gerald Hector of Radio Oil Limited has made an attempt recently to state his case or the case on behalf of his company before Metro Council and was refused to do so. Now I am aware that this is nothing new; Mr. Hector has had his difficulties with council before, but nonetheless I ask the Minister whether or not he would not consider the use of his good office to look into this situation. I believe that no matter what a person's problems are with any elected body, he should always have the right to speak before that group. Would the Minister entertain looking into this situation?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Of course, as has been pointed out, the matter is a Metro matter. I have received an interchange of correspondence between the parties involved, but if the honourable member would like to discuss it further with me he may do so, but it is a Metro jurisdictional matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Some days ago he indicated he would be making a further statement with regards to pollution and to the fishing problems in Manitoba. Could he tell the House when we'll be getting that statement?

#### STATEMENT

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have the statement with me now. I was waiting for the question period to proceed, but I'll make the announcement that the honourable member's anticipating.

Further to my statement of last week relative to mercury content in fish, I have now heard from the Federal Government relative to the questions raised. As a result of my communication with the Federal Government, the Provincial Government has decided that the following action is warranted:

- (1) The Saskatchewan River, Cedar Lake and Lake Winnipeg waters will be closed to commercial fishing during the summer-fall season.
- (2) All waters normally open in Manitoba will be open for sport fishing, but sportsmen will be warned as to the danger of eating fish containing above tolerance levels of mercury in the areas above mentioned, including also the Winnipeg River.
- (3) The Government of Manitoba will participate in a program offered by the Federal Government whereby compensation will be paid to commercial fishermen affected by the closure, on the understanding that monies paid to the fishermen will be refunded to the province if recovery is made from the agencies which are the source of pollution.
- (4) The government will provide the necessary legal personnel and will actively pursue recovery of monies from the agencies which can be identified as the source of pollution.
- (5) The government will examine the possibility of natural resource projects which can offer employment to those fishermen who are unemployed by virtue of the fishing season being closed.

In order to implement the above policy the government intends to maintain a close liaison

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . with other levels of government and with the representatives of the fishermen themselves. In particular, we will be meeting with federal officials very shortly to discuss details of the compensation program. We are also meeting with the Manitoba Federation of Fishermen to discuss this aspect of the program as well as the program relating to alternative employment.

It should be emphasized that the government will be required to institute a comprehensive information program relating to the sport fishery remaining open. It is intended that all fishermen in Manitoba will be advised to endorsements on their licences, through the fullest use of mass media and through all other available mechanisms, as to the danger involved in eating fish taken from the affected lakes. In permitting the sports fishery to continue the government is cognizant that a great deal of enjoyment can be obtained by sport fishing in the catching of fish without consuming. The government feels that the denial of this enjoyment is not warranted. It is expected of course that sports fishermen can be relied upon to preserve their own health by heeding the warnings of health authorities relative to the eating of affected fish.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this statement is made on the - I think on the well expected assumption that the sports fishery is something which the Federal Government will not object to. I want to indicate that the Manitoba Government concurs in what is being done. There's no argument about whether the fisheries should or should not be closed, but with regard to the sports fishing this is a decision that we have arrived at which I don't think will be objected to, but nevertheless I do make that qualification which I don't expect will cause any problems.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the Minister's remarks, certainly not from the point of view, and I'm sure he'll agree with me, that they are the kind of remarks that he enjoys making in the House, a very serious statement indeed that will affect the lives of many many Manitobans and undoubtedly possibly many visitors to this province in this our Centennial Year. There are just one or two things that I would like to speak to or reply, and having you read the statement verbally, I will look forward to seeing the statement shortly and perhaps have more to say on it at that time.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, there should be no encumbrance placed, you know, with respect to the fishermen receiving their due compensation. If there's a failure here, a responsibility of corporate entity or governments, then that's a question between governments and companies to fight, and as indicated, they will use the resources or legal help available to them to fight this out. But I want to make it very clear - it wasn't quite that clear from the statement read by the Minister and I don't have the benefit of it before me - but I just underline the point that I would hope that there would be no encumbrance placed with respect to the fisherman who is surely the most innocent party, entirely innocent party here, that his compensation be in any way tied in with the successive or successful legal process of obtaining monies or compensation from companies that perhaps were the polluters, who in turn will pay governments who in turn made the initial payments or payments to the . . .

MR. GREEN: If my honourable friend will let me read that portion of it again, because I think it should be clearly understood. "The government of Manitoba will participate in a program offered by the Federal Government whereby compensation will be paid to commercial fishermen affected by the closure, on the understanding that the monies paid to the fishermen will be refunded to the province if recovery is made." Now there is no inhibition whatsoever on the compensation program which will be a 50/50 sharing program between the Federal Government and ourselves.

MR. ENNS: Fine, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just in the initial reading of it, I read the "if" to mean that there was perhaps an encumbrance placed with respect to the compensation to be paid to the fishermen. I await on another occasion to hear precisely what type of compensation payments the governments have in mind, and would of course be most concerned that these be somewhat, somewhat within the range of what the fishermen have a right to expect. I particularly implore - and I'm sure the Minister does - that this is happening at an occasion at a time where we are just starting off with a new marketing scheme within the prairie provinces, namely the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Board, which needs every good thing going for it rather than something like this happening to it.

The other point that I wanted to raise, Mr. Speaker, in response to the statement read by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, is the responsibility that this places on the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, and I would hope that very shortly we'll hear from the

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . Minister of Tourism and Recreation just what steps he has taken with respect to the people immediately under his jurisdiction, that is the tourists and the lodge operators. As the Minister must surely know, so much of their promotional work is done five, six, a year or six months, a year in advance, particularly to the south, to the American states from which we draw so many visitors, that all steps possible are being taken by his department to not necessarily counteract the warnings, the dire warnings that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources finds himself in a position to issue on the fishing licences and angling licences, but to indicate to them with an equally positive program that Manitoba is still, and particularly in this Centennial year, a most suitable place to come up and enjoy the sport of angling and a most suitable place to come and spend some of their tourist dollars to help out our economy here and enjoy themselves in this province.

I would ask that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources give us at his earliest opportunity some indication as to the status of the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Board, particularly in view of the supplies of fish on hand or inventory of fish on hand. Does this mean that Manitoba may lose any relative share or portion of markets hard fought for and hard gained over the years by being the major producer within the prairie area? And perhaps at some later date some further information about the situation, the inventory situation that the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Corporation has. I respect the fact that this is a Federal Board not directly under the jurisdiction of the Minister, but it's a matter that is of such immediate interest to so many Manitobans and to this Legislature that I would assume that the Minister will be keeping us informed on this matter. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Minister very much for his statement on this very serious problem for Manitoba. I am pleased to learn that he will proceed on a compensation plan for fishermen not based on if, as and when we might recover from elsewhere, and pleased that the Federal Government has offered to participate 50/50 with Manitoba in this regard. I wonder if the Minister could give us some further information however as to the effect of the mercury pollution. How long is the mercury pollution likely to last? How long are the fish that are presently polluted going to be polluted; will they clear or will they not? There seems to be a great deal of confusion at this time as to the effect of mercury pollution and I think it would be very important to get the information out to the public.

Now, the Minister says he is going to compensate the fishermen. There is a group in Manitoba, the Manitoba Federation of Fishermen, who are not a wealthy organization by any means because they represent basically the fishermen, who have not been amongst the more wealthy of our population, but I think have done an excellent job for the fishermen. I understand that this group has taken upon itself to work in this area, to hire some biologists and some economists to do some special studies for the Federation. I wonder if the Minister would consider some assistance to the Federation as well in this regard, technical assistance or dollars to assist them to do this kind of survey. I think here that the action taken by the previous government with regard to South Indian Lake for example, where the local population was not in a position to protect itself, and government stepped in and gave them legal counsel so that they could do the job. It seems to me that here is another case where the fishermen are not in a position to, on their own, get the technical information and the advice, and if the Federation is prepared to do this, as I understand they are, then I think the government should consider compensation to them in this regard.

I'd like to know as well what studies the government has undertaken to trace any possible mercury pollution within Manitoba. Are there plants in Manitoba or are there sources of mercury pollution within our own waters?

Then I would like on the matter of the sport fishing, if we can get a very clear statement as to which areas are considered hazardous and which are not. I understand from the Minister that three lakes, or the three areas to be closed to commercial fishing are the Saskatchewan River, Cedar Lake and Lake Winnipeg, and that in addition to this, insofar as the sport fishing, the Winnipeg River is considered as hazardous. So that would mean those three areas plus the Winnipeg River. I think that this should be made very clear so that people will know exactly what they're dealing with because many of these streams have connections. What exactly is connected with the Winnipeg River for example, what other areas, tributary to, could be affected?

And then, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know from the Minister what the situation is going to

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . . be now with regards to Lake Manitoba, because so far, and in his statement of some 10 days ago, the Minister indicated that Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipegosis were not affected. But the situation has now possibly changed with the opening of the Portage Diversion, because the Portage Diversion is now taking water from the Assiniboine system and putting it into Lake Manitoba. Now this is a decision taken by this government and I would like to know what studies have been undertaken to ensure that a non-polluted area will not now become polluted by virtue of the diversion. Have we the facts and figures as to pollution within the Assiniboine system and are we certain that we are not now going to pollute a lake by our own actions which has previously been cleared?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, can I have leave of the House to make a statement on mercury in the Assiniboine River which is being questioned now. So far as it flows into Lake Manitoba some concern has been expressed by mercury pollution of the lake, and I would like to state that the latest test results from the Hygiene Laboratory of the Department of Health and Social Services show that there are only slight traces of mercury in the Assiniboine River, so slight as to be almost negligible. Thus when relatively small flows of diverted Assiniboine River water enters into the larger Lake Manitoba, these slight traces will not make any appreciable difference. The current mercury pollution standards we are accepting, and which the United States Public Health Services accept, are those established by the U. S. S. R in which the allowable acceptance of mercury in drinking water is .005 parts per million. Tests made on the Assiniboine River in March showed less than .0005, which is thus considerably under the acceptable level.

Furthermore, the two upstream chemical plants at Brandon, that is Simplot and Dryden Chemicals, do not use mercury in their industrial processes. Consequently, there is not even the risk of discharge of mercury from these sources. With respect to the other waterways tested in Manitoba, none approached the .005 per million set again by the same standards that we have, which are the only ones in the world, the U. S. S. R. We are continuing and expanding our testing program on those waterways which might contain some mercury.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his clarification of this subject. Now when he speaks though of drinking water and the amount of mercury, is there not a different situation when we're dealing with the fishing situation? Because is it not correct that fish do assimilate larger numbers, and can assimilate over a period of time and become contaminated even though from a drinking standpoint the water may be satisfactory? Now are we sure that we are not going to cause troubles in the fishing industry on Lake Manitoba, and because of its connection with Lake Winnipegosis, on that lake as well?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, could I answer that question by saying that our department has tested the water - and you're quite correct when you say that the count is quite different in water than it is in fish because mercury has a tendency to accumulate in fish - but at no time when we tested the fish in any of the waterways in Manitoba that we came close to the limit, and we still stand by the statement that we made two weeks ago regarding one meal per week that any person can eat and still be safe.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Member for Lakeside wished to . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, dealing with the same subject, I thank the Minister of Health and Social Services for his further statement, but a supplementary on the same matter. He's indicated to us that there is no mercury pollution coming from the plants upstream on the Assiniboine. Has he any idea where even the miniscule trace of mercury in the Assiniboine comes from? It seems rather an unanswered question at this moment.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot at this time spell out exactly the whereabouts of the mercury that we're getting into our waters without specifying companies that could be responsible right now. We are still looking into the matter.

MR. ENNS: I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the Minister not necessarily having this information at his fingertips, but it's a question that I think puzzles all of us. Would he consider to take the question as notice and attempt to indicate to the House or give the House the information as to where even the small amount of mercury pollution that exists in the Assiniboine River does in fact come from.

MR. TOUPIN: Most definitely, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, may I just suggest that perhaps before I ask the question that fish may have come from Lake Winnipeg and were swimming up-stream as fish do in the spring. My question is to the Minister of Mines and Resources. He has dealt with the problem of commercial fishermen but he has not dealt with the problem of the large number of people on Lake Winnipeg and on the lakes who depend on fish for sustenance. What compensation is in this for these people? This is a very serious problem.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not able to deal with my honourable friend's problem at this stage. As I've indicated, the compensation program that we are going to be engaged in will be the subject of discussion between federal officials and provincial officials and I'll be able to clarify it more fully at a later date. As with any compensation program, it's liable to involve differences of opinion between those who seek compensation and those who are offering it.

I do want to mention to my honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose that with regard to the waters flowing from the Assiniboine River into Lake Manitoba, that the statement of the Minister of Health is our justification on this particular procedure. There aren't answers to every problem with regard to mercury, with regard to when fish clear or how long it takes, and that's why we've not been able to give answers. From time to time we've been given different opinions.

The one thing that we are doing with regard to the Floodway is that we are allowing as little water as possible, and this is an abundance of caution and in accordance with the best information available to us. We are still going to operate the Portage Diversion only on a critical basis as to when it's necessary, and there was a critical situation yesterday. If the situation clears a bit we will stop the water. If it becomes critical again, then on the best possible information we will open it. We have the dilemma that if we don't open the diversion we will assuredly be involving destruction and damage to thousands of acres of land; if we permit it to open, then on the best information available we will not do any harm; and on that kind of juxtaposition of statements we have decided to permit the diversion to open. However, with an abundance of caution we are going to operate it on a crisis basis.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister who just gave us the answer. In his statement, I didn't notice any possible compensation for other than the primary fishermen. If tourist camp operators can demonstrably show that their operations are down in this coming season because of the poor publicity and because of the mercury contamination in the sports fish, would they be able to look for compensation from the Provincial Government?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, not under the program that I have just mentioned, and this is one of the reasons that the sports fishery is remaining open. I'd like to concur with the remarks that were made by the member for Lakeside, that there are many many lakes in Manitoba where sports fishermen can come. I recognize that certain operators will be affected but this is something that we have to impress upon the public, that there is a good tourist potential in Manitoba for sports fishermen. There are only certain areas that will be affected, and even these will not be closed.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: On the related subject, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services who is responsible for pollution control. Can he assure the House that either the Clean Environment Commission or some other such body have checked all possible sources of pollution in the province and that there is no mercury pollution entering any of the waterways in the province from within the province?

MR. TOUPIN: No, I can't say this, Mr. Speaker. They are still looking, trying to find other sources of pollution.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

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

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the First Minister. In view of the press release on the Flood Forecasting Committee, can the First Minister indicate as to whether or not compensation will be paid to individuals or municipalities in the event that emergency measures have to be taken because of high water?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I should think that if the nature of the damage is such that we should consider compensation, we will look to past practice and precedent to see what would be reasonable scales of compensation to be paid.

MR. HARDY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I can appreciate the comments of the First Minister inasmuch as damage to property is concerned but there is also another aspect of this, the amount that may have to be expended for the protection of tangible property.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have the necessary organization and organizational capability to take adequate measures in the event that the flood problem becomes acute.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gimli.

MR. JOHN C. GOTTFRIED (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, this question is directed to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and expresses the concern of mink ranches along the shores of Lake Winnipeg who catch fish and use it as feed for their minks. They've informed me that they have noticed no ill effects on their animals . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Would the honourable member please put his question, if he wishes to.

MR. GOTTFRIED: Well, one of the effects of closure would be that these people would be forced out of business.

MR. GREEN: I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, referring to this very important announcement made by the Minister a short while ago covering Saskatchewan River, Cedar Lake and Lake Winnipeg, I'm sure he's aware of the fact that many people -- (Interjection) -- in their daily diet catch fish. I wonder if they're being informed as to the seriousness of the situation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Is this side of the House going to get the same type of treatment as the other side, or do we have two sets of rules here?

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I felt I had a legitimate question and I didn't require to be interrupted in the manner I was. I want to be no part of a three-ring circus.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we have tried, by means of information releases, etc., to advise people as to the lakes that do have a problem and as to the levels which are dangerous.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, I think he's the proper Minister. Will the government provide similar arrangements and services as the previous government did should flooding occur in the Red River basin so that farmers might be placed in a difficult situation. On a previous occasion they were able to deliver their grain under special quota. Would this service be provided by the present government?

MR. GREEN: I think the First Minister has already dealt with that question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Resources referred in a statement to agencies on the Saskatchewan system responsible for pollution. Has he established what agencies are now known to have been sources and are there investigations into other firms that may be doing the same?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the source of the pollution on the Saskatchewan River was identified. I don't recall whether I've mentioned the firm name, but it is to our satisfaction identified and will be dealt with by the solicitors who have been instructed to act on behalf of the Fishermen's Federation, in answer to my honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. CRAIK: Just a subsequent question. I believe the Minister used the term "agencies". Are there more than one?

MR. GREEN: If I did that, then it was completely accidental. My understanding is that it's an identifiable firm.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, a subsequent question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Has the Flood Forecasting Committee considered or reported on the Marais, a tributary to the Red? The Marais River, it's a tributary to the Red. Have they considered the flooding of that as well?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend has the report of the committee. I'll



(MR. GREEN con t'd.) . . . . . now go back to them and ask them whether they've considered the river that he's talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, on a forecast of a different type, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister and ask him if he can -- this has to do with a forecast of a different type and I direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, and ask him if he can confirm a report which seemed to be attributed to him in Saturday's Tribune that the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose will be going to the Senate in three weeks' time?

MR. SCHREYER: I couldn't think of it happening to a nicer guy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to table in the House a reply to Order for Return No. 5.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could he inform the House if he has any knowledge of whether the Halifax General Insurance Company is still proceeding with plans to build a head office in Winnipeg?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I hope I won't be transgressing the rules but I want to thank my honourable friends on both sides for their obvious interest in my welfare. But coming back to pollution, I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources would like to talk to us about the Fishermen's Federation again and their work, where they have gone ahead with biologists and economists. Is the department willing to help them out in that regard?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I met with the Federation, I believe it was approximately a week ago and I believe I complied, or as nearly as possible complied with everything that they asked of us. With regard to the hiring of a biologist, this is not something that I have considered at this point except I've indicated that all of our people and all of our information would be discussed with them and they have been meeting with us regularly in that respect. We will, and have made available, the Department of the Attorney-General's services to them at no cost because they indicated that they would require a lawyer, and some three weeks ago I indicated that we would be prepared to finance litigation on their behalf - or it may have to be the province that sues the lawyers will have to answer that one - but we would be prepared to be the initiator and the financier of the litigation with regard to this matter.

MR. MOLGAT: I thank the Minister. Would he also consider then the possibility of assistance in the case of an economist and a biologist?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, or the First Minister, and I put this to him because I feel that in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member please state his question rather than offering us the reasons for it.

MR. FROESE: Yes, it's a subsequent question to the one whether delivery quotas, special delivery quotas would be made available. I think this has to happen before the flooding takes place. The Honourable Member for St. Vital's problem is after the flooding, so my question is whether special quotas would be opened up for the farmers that will be flooded because this has to happen prior to flooding.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I indicated to my honourable friend that the First Minister had said that we would look to what has been done and what can be done and see just what steps should be taken in this connection, and the question you put is a valid one.

MR. SCHREYER: I think I could advise my honourable friend that the Minister of Agriculture would be involved here. It's a case of making application to the appropriate Wheat Board authorities and they will be in a position to act; they'll know what past precedent has been.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to the problems on Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipegosis. In view of the action of the government, and the Ministers both have

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . . said that they do not think there will be any harmful effects but they cannot but they cannot be sure, if at a later date Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipegosis were to be declared polluted, would we be assured that the fishermen in that area would get compensation in the same way as . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The member is asking a hypothetical question.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask another question of the First Minister. In view of the need for proper Manitoba representation in the national Capital, can the First Minister advise the House as to whether negotiations are going on between his government and the Federal Government at this time with a view to filling any of the other Senate vacancies existing in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SCHREYER: Is my honourable friend preaching for a call?

MR. SHERMAN: You can't win them all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. Is the government committed to the proposition of equal pay for equal work for men and women in the provincial Civil Service? By way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport last week made quite a point in that he was hiring ladies to work on the highway and they were going to receive equal pay. So my question is to the First Minister, is this government policy that there will be equal pay for the same kind of work for men and women in the Civil Service?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the pay scale and wage agreements between the Civil Service and the Government of Manitoba is based on function, and in accordance with the agreement arrived at in negotiation between the Manitoba Government Employees Association and the government, there is no differential based on sex and my honourable friend I think is aware of that.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Not even for MLA's.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health and Social Service. Are the custodial officers of the Women's Jail in Portage and the Custodial Officers at Headingley Jail on the same salary scale?

MR. TOUPIN: I'll take that question as notice.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . should it be left over for Private Members' Day? It's open, but as I understand it, the government indicated that it wished to have it put over.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the intent that it be held over for Private Members' Day? The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, could I have this stand over till Private Members' Day. I intend to speak on it. (Agreed).

#### GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call the adjourned debates on Second Readings. No. 32 and No. 34.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence to have the matter stand. I'll have it ready tomorrow, I hope. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate on this Bill the other day just to give me an opportunity to verify the question that the Honourable Minister of Labour already spoke to in explanation of the Bill, that this was in fact a matter that had been thought about for some time by his departmental people and indeed one that was to be brought forward under the previous administration, and not that I had any reason at all to doubt the validity of that statement but simply to assure that the principles of change that were envisaged by this Bill were not substantially different to those that I was familiar with at the time that we were in government. I'm satisfied that this is the case and commend the Bill further to the House and have no further objection.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: "R. S. Bowles, Lieutenant-Governor. The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba estimates of sums required for the service of the Province for Capital Expenditures and recommends these estimates to the Legislative Assembly. Government House, Winnipeg, April, 1970."

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, together with the estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the Clerk will have distributed to the members of the House the Schedule, the proposed Schedule for the Supply Bill as material for Committee of Supply. I might say that I am still waiting, but expect to receive today, a breakdown to some extent of the requirements, and I propose that when we go into Supply either tomorrow night or Wednesday that we could then deal with the capital supply so that members will have had an opportunity to look at it. I would expect that by Wednesday we should have it and I hope -- well, I expect to deliver this afternoon some time or other a greater breakdown of the general purposes portion of what is now being distributed, which is the Schedule.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, just before we move forward, a clarification. The Minister of Finance indicated on Wednesday that we'd have an opportunity to -- will we be raising the question for it on Wednesday?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I will distribute today a breakdown of general purposes and then when we go into Supply we could deal with this today, tomorrow, Wednesday, but I am suggesting Wednesday as being a suitable time. I wouldn't do it today because that wouldn't be enough time. Tomorrow, it's only the evening that will be available because of Private Members' Day and I don't frankly plan to be here tomorrow evening, so I thought if it would be acceptable then on Wednesday afternoon we should be able to deal with this unless there is objection of some . . .

MR. ENNS: No objection, perhaps just one further question of the Minister. I don't know whether we're in order, Mr. Speaker, but is there any particular urgency attached to the deliberation of these additional supplies that he refers to Wednesday as being the day that he wished to have this proceeded with?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the normal course has been that supply is brought in as soon as it's available, or the bill is, and then it's discussed, and the honourable member will recall there's usually not much time spent on it. As to urgency, the only point I'd make is that there are various departments making plans for the expenditure of capital supply and I consider it a matter of not immediate urgency but expediency to proceed as quickly as possible, and I would hope that we could deal with it Wednesday so that we could process the bill and be able to go ahead with whatever work that may be held up. I'm not claiming that it is that much of an emergency but I'm sure that members of the House will want to co-operate to put it through as quickly as possible.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minnedosa): . . . reply just momentarily. Certainly I think we'd be prepared to proceed with the discussions, whether or not it could be completed on Wednesday depends on the kind of an explanation we get at the time it's presented. I don't think we can commit ourselves on that but we would certainly be prepared to proceed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't ask for a commitment. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, may I now move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education, 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 Elmwood in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of Youth and Education. The Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Chairman, as we finished off last Friday, I was just about to complete a brief explanation of why I thought that the decision the Minister had made to decrease the general levy was going in exactly the opposite direction that he should have been going. I explained very briefly that there were two principles involved. One was that education ought to be supported more heavily, more abundantly from the Provincial Treasury; secondly, that equalization ought to be brought about by depending more heavily on the general levy rather than putting school divisions in a position where they must obtain a good portion of their money through the special levy.

I would just like to point out that by lowering the general levy we are going in the direction of promoting a less equalized base to support education, that is, you're levying different areas at a different mill rate in order to obtain this money, and based on the assessment per student in each division, comparatively difficult situation arise in various parts of the province. I would like to see the Minister acknowledge that this move does exactly that and tell us that the future steps of this government will be in the other direction, that of getting more funds from the Provincial Treasury and that of getting more funds from the equalized assessment rather than the special levy that the divisions have to levy in order to obtain their needs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, there is one point that I wished to raise before we leave the Minister's salary, and that has to do with the education tax as it forms part of the total municipal tax. We find that many farmers today have to borrow the money to pay their taxes, and we know the situation that if the taxes are not paid within a specified time these lands are then sold for the amount that is owing in taxes. I feel that this is very unfair, and I just wonder whether the government has not considered bringing in legislation that this could be changed, because I feel that it is really improper and unwise that a farmer's property should be sold for taxes only in order to clear up what is owing in taxes. I feel that there should be some provision in which way we should be able to protect the farmers' rights, the farmers' property for a longer period than the three years. Surely this should not be the case, and as it is today, farmers today will find it difficult to borrow money and if things go on the way they are now this could become more and more difficult, because how can they promise to repay it in a certain period of time if they are unable to sell their wheat, if they're unable to sell their crop, and yet be subject to losing his property because he was unable to pay his taxes.

I feel that there should be something brought forward in the way of legislation to prevent this, to prevent a farmer losing his life savings which he has invested in his property, in his land and so on, just because he is unable to meet the tax payment, and which is mostly school tax, because as I pointed out the other day there are quarters, farm quarters on which the taxes run to six, seven and eight hundred dollars and about 75 percent of this is school tax. So we can see the situation that it is placing these farmers in. Right now many farmers have borrowed money to pay their taxes, and we don't know how long they'll be able to carry on and we don't know whether the banks are going to cut down on credit more than they have in the past. If this situation should get worse, I think we will have to move in and provide for this situation. Has the government given consideration to this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Before we leave the Minister's salary, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose a question to the Minister with respect to the value of open area schools. This concept has been in use now for a good many years in certain areas of the United States. We have one in the Town of Thompson that appears to be operating satisfactorily by way of giving an education to the children. Recently there was one constructed in Portage which is in use, and there are others in the province, but some people are wondering if this is the right method of education. For example, the Denver School Board in Colorado have not programmed any open area schools in their upcoming budget because there has been a change in thinking down there as to their value.

It was assumed at one time that a child's learning abilities were based on a 20 percent capability from the genetics in the child and that 80 percent of the learning capabilities were due to environment. I understand that the open area school is based on the proposition that the environment of the school will do more for the child and will overcome any genetics which may be at question, so I would like to ask the Minister if he can give us a statement that will

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . . clear up the doubt that exists in the minds of some members of school boards across the province should they be looking at this type of construction, not only from the point of view of the child and the teacher but also from the cost element, and if the Minister could give us a message on this I'd be very pleased to hear it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, at this time I'd like to bring a few things to the attention of the Minister, and one is in respect to the new school, the composite high school that is at the present time being contemplated and will be started quite shortly in St. James-Assiniboia. As you know, at the last couple of sessions I brought this matter to this House that we needed either to expand our present high schools in there, to have additions to them and to expand the vocational sections in each one or have a composite high school built in there. I'm sure the Minister is aware that the composite high school has been approved, but the problem that we have at the present time, and it's been brought to my attention from many people in the area, and that's in respect to either ramps for the handicapped people or elevators in that school I know it's an area of 160,000 square feet and it'll have many vocational facilities, including such things as drafting, graphic arts, business machine repairs, business education, and the school I understand is a two-storey structure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this school, at least in the vocational section, will probably serve the St. James-Assiniboia city, will serve some 70 to 80 thousand people, and I think that the Minister should definitely look into the matter if there can be an elevator installed in this school, if there can be some ramps provided, because it's not an ordinary school - and I've had some conversation with the Minister in respect of this school - but it's not an ordinary school where we can say we can't provide the elevators because the costs are too high or we can't make provision for ramps. It is a different school; we're going to have many courses for many handicapped people, and these people at the present time, if the elevator is not installed, will be restricted to take these courses and much of the rehabilitation program that's going on at the present time, the money may be wasted and spent not on its proper use.

I've mentioned it before, Mr. Chairman, that the Canada Sickness Survey which was made showed that 7.1 percent of the population reported permanent physical disability and that 3.1 percent listed severe and total disability which largely necessitated confinement to bed or wheel chair. The National Research Council in its supplement, "Building Standards for the Handicapped, 1965" stated that one in every seven Canadians had a permanent physical disability or an infirmity associated with aging. Surveys have also shown that the majority of those with permanent disabilities are in low income brackets.

Now on one hand we have demonstrated quite clearly at the present time the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg is considering making mandatory provisions for removing architectural barriers and approving one of the supplemental codes in respect of construction; and on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, in the instance of St. James-Assiniboia where this school is going to be constructed which will serve such a tremendous population, and not only the young people but it will also serve probably adult education as well which may have to be in wheel chairs, and at this time I cannot bring it more forcibly or any stronger to the Minister that some provision should be made. I know if it is a two-storey structure that costs of the elevator as compared to the cost of the whole school is going to be a very small cost, very small in that respect, so I would hope that the Minister will definitely see if anything could be done in this respect. The point is that this school will provide extensive academic and vocational opportunities for many of the physically handicapped people, and for this reason, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see that consideration should be given to proper facilities that handicapped people in wheel chairs and so on can use.

The other point I wish to raise at the present time, I wonder if the Minister has given any consideration to provide in high schools in the political science courses a study on conservation, because as you know at the present time everyone is concerned in respect to conservation, such things as clean air, clean water, clean environment. I know many of the European countries have such a course in their curriculum and perhaps it's time that we here in Manitoba have done something in this area as well. I don't believe at the present time there is anything within the present high school programs, and with the great concern of all the people in respect to this area, perhaps the Minister can tell us what he intends and perhaps the Department of Education should be encouraged to provide to school boards or to different areas some kind of a new program in respect to this area.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.)

The other point that I wish to raise at the present time - and some of the members have already raised it so I will not deal at any length - but there has been some great concern in respect to the present teachers and the school board situation. It is not the most friendly situation, and I'm sure that the Minister can perhaps do something to resolve this problem because I don't think this is good for our children. How long can it continue I don't know, but I understand - and I've had an opportunity to meet with some teachers quite recently and as well meet with some school boards - and I understand it's not improving, and from information that was related to me that it's getting worse and that was not what I believe the Minister mentioned in his introductory remarks. There were such things as deadline dates for collective bargaining. Has the Minister any opinion of his own in that area or not? And perhaps the regional bargaining unit that was requested by the school board, has there been any negotiation in that area or not, I don't know. Perhaps the Minister is waiting for the Boundaries Commission's report at least in the Greater Winnipeg area, but if that's the case I think he should at least tell us what his department's view and his course of action will be. I know there were some other matters at the time that were of great controversy between the teachers and the school boards, and perhaps the Minister in some respect can resolve some of these matters and perhaps we can improve the present situation that exists between the teachers and the trustees.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, I know our members and some of the others in the House have raised this problem in respect to education taxes that affect the property owner, the home owner in this province. I know many of the government members are sort of hiding behind and saying, well we've shifted the load on medicare. Well this is true, Mr. Chairman, and we on this side, the Liberal Party as you know had requested this, recommended it to the House, and in fact we were the ones that had the resolution that the shift should have been taken on medicare. But the Medicare has been dealt with last year and that's been finished -- (Interjection) -- That's right, five months ago and that's been resolved.

But the thing we're dealing with now is the property tax and I'm sure it's serious to many people, because the amount of publicity that's been generated by one of the resolutions in the House here in respect to the \$2,000 assessment I know has been of great interest to many municipalities across the province of Manitoba and to many people. In fact, I haven't got any with me but I have a tremendous amount of correspondence in my office that came from older people as well as young people and saying what a serious situation, what a problem they have, particularly senior citizens where they're saying: we've saved money all our lives, made sacrifices to retire in our own home and now we're forced out of it.

So I feel that the Minister should -- it may not be good enough for the government to say we're going to appoint a committee to deal with assessments. An assessment is a pretty serious study that will have to be taken and it will not be resolved in one session. I think it will probably be a study that will take maybe a year or longer, and I feel it will probably be longer. It's easy for the government to say well, where do you stand on property tax? Do you believe in the principle to pay basis? I think that we on this side of the House, it's our job to ask you where you stand and what your course of action is going to be, not to ask us what the opposition is going to do, because really pretty soon what's going to happen, we're going to kill the goose that laid the golden egg by saying all the time, you know we believe in the ability to pay principle, because sooner or later you'll reach an area where a taxpayer will not tolerate any higher percentage of tax than he would pay in many of the other provinces. I'm sure he'll tolerate some differential, but when it reaches the point where he'll say that's too high, he will not.

So I say it's the responsibility of all the members in this House not only to consider this problem as a very serious problem, where we can generate more revenue for education purposes, where can we get involved with the Federal Government - and maybe the Federal Government must be responsible for some part of our education costs - because it doesn't matter how you're going to tax the people you're going to reach an area where the people are not prepared to pay any more personal tax on education.

And I have, Mr. Chairman, right before me, for instance just not only the tax on the home owners, when the homes went out of proportion but as well on small businesses. I have one here in 1965 where the property tax was \$1,473; 1966 - \$1,694; 1967 - \$2,200; and 1968 - \$2,400 in a matter of five years. This four years it went up by \$1,000. Now these, Mr. Chairman, these are, you know, figures that a small businessman just can't accept. Now I

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . have another business in a different type of an operation and it's in the St. James-Assiniboia area, where in 1959 the assessed value on this property and the tax was \$4,400 and in 1966 it was \$16,000. This is the assessment; and the property tax in 1963 it was \$614.82; in 1968, again some five years later, this man had to pay \$2,045.87; and these are really staggering increases.

So it's an area that I think the Minister cannot dodge and say, well look what we did five months ago. I think that we're dealing with a completely different problem today and it's not an easy problem I agree with him. I don't think a committee on assessment will just be able to solve it that simple because it's not an easy problem. I think that the government must have some kind of a program itself. They must have an idea which way they are prepared to shift the tax from the home owner, and I would like to hear from him because I would quite well accept that it's a serious problem, it's not an easy problem, but I'm sure the Minister has some idea of his own, because if all he can tell us is that municipal committees will be dealing with the assessment and this is going to be solved, I think this is sort of dodging the question.

So I would hope that the Minister will deal with some of these problems, and getting back, I hope that he will really give it serious consideration because, Mr. Chairman, it is a serious one, and that's not only the property tax, but at the present time where we have a new school going up, that's a composite school where you're going to be teaching many vocational trades, and we have to teach not only our young people who are physically handicapped but certainly some senior people, older people that will have to be retrained. At the present time I understand that approval was given that they can't accept that an elevator should be put into a two-storey building or a two-storey school. Well, I would accept that if it's an ordinary school but this is not an ordinary school. It's a school that will be serving in a couple of years some 80,000 people for vocational purposes at least, and a portion of it will be for vocational courses. So I hope that the Minister will give this his serious consideration. I know I've talked to him about this previously and he was quite receptive, so perhaps he can explain in more detail at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): In response to the Member for Assiniboia, I share with him the concern he has with regard to access into public buildings generally by those who are physically handicapped, and the problem is one that he puts his finger right on, it is a problem of costs. Now it is my understanding in speaking to the people in the department that insofar as access to the ground floor is concerned, every attempt is going to be made to have ramps so that those who are handicapped, or in wheel chairs in particular, will be able to enter into the building. The problem is in the two-storey, the second storey level, and the problem is one of cost. Ramps are not the answer because the angle of incline, although it can be quite gradual, they can't be steep as stairways. Elevators, as the member well knows, are extremely costly and there is a ceiling on costs in here. A ceiling is established. It's a federal cost-sharing program but the costs of the total construction is predetermined and we have to work within those costs.

He stressed the fact that this is a vocational school, but it's a composite high school, it isn't a state vocational school. A composite high school is simply a high school which has the regular academic subjects plus the vocational. It's an attempt to make available in one school all the possible programming and to avoid the separation of having technical vocational students in one building and the academic in the other. We feel it makes for a greater flexibility of programming. It prevents the kind of segregation and separation of the student body. As I say, we recognize the problem; what we can come up with I don't know. The department has been made aware of this problem and we will try to come up with an answer. I can't guarantee him however that an answer will be made.

MR. PATRICK: Pardon me. Perhaps I can just ask a further question. Is it not true that this school will probably have more vocational courses than the other high schools in the area? You know, this particular one. I know it's a high school, composite high school, but it will still have more vocational courses perhaps than the others in the area.

MR. MILLER: I'm not sure of that. The member may be right. I'm not sure whether that is the program that St. James-Assiniboia envisages for this particular school. The member may have information of which I am not aware. The school is still in the planning stage and I can't give him that information.

He asked the question with regard to what, if anything, is done in the way of preparing

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) . . . . our young people through studies in conservation and pollution. It's a good question and it's one that I'll bring to the attention of the Curriculum Committee. If there isn't too much in that area, perhaps there should be more emphasis as people generally are becoming more concerned with this problem and it's certainly a problem where young people should start from the very beginning to be concerned with this. As a matter of fact, I think in some instances the young people are way ahead of us, because within the last month or two this very matter has been brought to my attention by the students in high schools who have formed committees regarding pollution, want to know more about it, have been seeking information on it and have been writing letters both to the editor and to the department stressing the fact that something be done on that area now. It is a matter, as I say, that I'll refer to the Curriculum Committee. Whether it means incorporating some things within our present programs or perhaps some material to be made available through the schools as reference material or ancillary programs, I think that can be worked out.

The member of course brought up the question regarding teachers, school boards and the problems which are perennial but which in the last two or three years have been even more severe, the question of negotiation and the stresses and strains that develop during the period of negotiations annually. I answered the question last time, in fact last week, and I think that for the present the position I've taken is one which I hope personally will perhaps help to resolve it, and that is to use the machinery which is there and I feel has never been properly used before. For the first time there are many boards who have gone to conciliation and even more boards who have gone to arbitration. I think if the machinery were used, the machinery that is in the statutes and was put there for that reason is used, then I think some of the shadow-boxing that goes on perhaps unnecessarily might be eliminated if both bodies, the teachers on one hand and trustees on the other, know that the Department of Education and the Minister's office certainly will not be in any way reluctant to order conciliation or arbitration and will respond whenever requested. And that has been my policy this year. So for this year, this is the first time really that that many have gone to conciliation and arbitration and I'm hoping that it'll have a salutary effect.

The question regarding Metropolitan Winnipeg, of course the member is right. We don't know yet what the Boundary Commission will report and how that will affect and if it will affect school boundaries, and depending on what happens there of course it may change many things, but that of course remains to be seen.

The matter of property tax, I tried to make it abundantly clear last week - and I'm not trying to be cute about this - the member said that medicare is long gone and now let's look ahead. Sure it's long gone, since last November, but it wasn't possible within the short space of time to undertake and to shift taxation at the level which the member is requesting. Some of the figures he showed about the increases in taxation in businesses and so on in the last four years sound very drastic. Since I don't know the individual cases, I don't know the businesses concerned, I don't know whether this tax is in any way reflecting the ability to pay of these people. For all I know, these particular firms may find that the business tax they pay may be very very small -- not the business tax but the property tax that they pay may be a very very small percentage of the cost. I do know that it's not out of line with other provinces as far as businesses are concerned.

And again I say if you shift taxes - I think he himself made the point - there's a point perhaps at which people say that there's a limit rather to which people can pay taxes whether it's paid in one form or another. So if you shift it from one area to another it may not necessarily resolve the problem for some people; it's just a matter of shifting into a more equitable manner. And this is what we're trying to study. I am not and never did say that I am waiting for the Committee on Assessment to come up with the answer. The Committee on Assessment I think is dealing with a different problem entirely. Whether it's buildings or land and so on, I think really is secondary to the problem of the question on how to pay for education. Is it a service to people, their property, and if so, what percentage should be paid by property and what percentage should be paid through other forms of taxation.

So I'm not waiting on the Committee on Assessment at all. I can only say to the member and other members that have spoken on it that I am quite aware of the problem, that we are working on it, that it's a matter of concern to me, that I hope we will come up with a solution which will be acceptable to all sides of the House when the time comes to make this shift and that I myself would not be satisfied to just continue on the present formula or the present basis



(MR. MILLER cont'd.) . . . . indefinitely. I've made that clear, as I said before, and I can't say any more at this time.

The House Leader of the Liberal Party - unfortunately he's not in his seat again but he'll read it in Hansard - he asked about the open area classroom and that some people are wondering whether this is the best approach even though it is a very modern, if you might call it that, approach to education. I know that there are many people who have reservations about it. In some areas it's been accepted enthusiastically and other areas there's some doubts. And like every other new concept or new methodology - I think the Member for Emerson will probably bear me out - it takes some adjusting to, not just by the pupils but very often by teachers, by parents, and very often by teachers themselves who perhaps have spent 15, 20 or 25 years in a certain structure, in a certain environment, have suddenly found themselves teaching under new conditions, new circumstances which they find difficult to adjust to.

Now I'm not saying this is the answer, it just goes to show really the fact that in education nothing ever stands still and that you no sooner come up with what you think is the best method then suddenly you find that perhaps somebody is coming up with better ideas, or the methodology is changing or the techniques are changing or the demands on the pupil are changing so that other techniques have to be developed to meet those demands. The school system is such a state of flux. I know that in some areas though these open area classrooms are working very well; in other schools there is still this ambivalence about them; they're not sure. I don't think we'll ever get a black and white answer on this. I don't think you'll ever get 100 percent concurrence. The indications are that they have great value. The children in many areas do respond in these open area classrooms, that it frees teachers in many cases to concentrate more time with those who need special attention while others in the class can go ahead at their own pace, and it ties in very well with the whole concept of unlocking the school system in the sense that they'd be getting away from the "lock-step" program and letting children go at their own pace depending on their abilities and their interests. So I can only say to the Honourable Leader of the Liberals that the program is successful, and although I'm not suggesting it is the total answer, most areas are quite happy with the experiences that they've had with the open area classrooms.

I don't know what more I can say to the Member for Rhineland with regard to his particular plea with regard to the taxes to be paid by farmers. I realize the farmers are in difficult straits this year; on the other hand, I'm not sure we're at the point yet where they have been under this handicap for three years. I don't know the extent to which people, or farmers are faced with this threat that he says of losing their property on tax sales. To suggest that there should be more time given to farmers than the three years which is allowed under the Act, more time that is to somebody who lives in the city and who finds himself in an economic bind either through loss of a job or other reason, I don't know if that's the answer necessarily, but at the present time I'm not sure that the situation is quite as grim as he makes it out to be. It may be for certain individuals. Although I haven't seen the figures for this year, I believe that last year the amount of unpaid taxes was not out of proportion or was not alarming.

The Member for Emerson completed the remarks he was making, and the fact is that in a sense I'd be repeating what I said to the Member for Assiniboia. We are looking for other ways and means to finance education. Equalization is an ultimate goal, certainly. Whether you can get total equalization throughout a province, I don't know, because there's many reasons for inequality in education. It isn't just the assessment. There are many problems dealing with education as members are well aware, where some areas need special inputs - nothing to do with assessment - but need special inputs to overcome cultural differences, cultural handicaps which are unique to that area and which have to be zeroed in on with special programs over and above everything else.

If honourable members wish to continue the argument we started last week on the old question of the Finance Board and how they operate, I'll be glad to do so. I thought I had made the position pretty clear. They operate on a budget which is predetermined in advance based on their estimate of what it would cost, 30 percent of which is to be raised on the municipal levy. It is an estimate, and in some cases a guesstimate. Last year it was obviously a guesstimate because it was wrong; they raised more than they needed. They were left with a surplus and the surplus was the money raised through a levy on the municipal taxpayers, so the money is returned to them. They couldn't spend more than what the Foundation Program called for. They can only pay out what the Program entitles them to pay out and which is laid down pretty

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . . specifically. So I have to say this, that the Finance Board operated within the framework, within its terms of reference, within the framework of the statutes. After having spent the money, or paid out the money that it could pay out under the Foundation Program, it was left with this surplus. They couldn't pay out any more than that and the question was, What do you do with the surplus? The decision was to pay off the old debt because eventually it's got to be paid anyway, and to simply turn back to the local rate-payers the moneys that were left in surplus by the reduction of one mill. And even though there is a reduction of one mill, there's still going to be, hopefully, enough money raised to pay for the increased amount necessary to operate the system in 1970. If there aren't then they may end up with a deficit, in which case they'll have to borrow it from the bank. If they're right, then hopefully they'll hit it on the nose.

I believe I've answered the various questions that were put to me this afternoon and that the Member for Emerson had started last week when we left my estimates. If there are any I've neglected to answer or forgotten, perhaps members can bring it to my attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I posed two questions the last time and the one in particular that I gave the Minister was: Could he indicate the value of one mill on the foundation levy, the value in terms of dollars, of one mill in terms of the Provincial Government's corresponding amount into the Foundation Program? I dictated it the last day; I had it written down as a matter of fact and I think the Minister recorded it. The point in question of course is when the Minister introduced the reduction of the foundation levy by one mill, he indicated that this meant that 1.8 million dollars less would be collected from the foundation levy. It may be 1.9 because I think you indicated that the provincial assessment was up \$100 million for this year which meant that you were able to collect another 100,000 at one mill, roughly. I think that if I recall correctly you said that one mill then meant that the amount collected through the foundation levy was 1.8 million.

MR. MILLER: Yes. In unitary divisions, I think that's right.

MR. CRAIK: For the unitary divisions. Now, correspondingly, the question I wanted the answer from either from you or the Minister of Finance who is not here now, how much money does that mean that the province in its 70 percent obligation to the Foundation Program was able to withdraw from the Program? If we could have had that answer, Mr. Chairman, about five days ago, we could have saved a lot of time because this is the basic question I've been trying to ask of the government all these days.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member well knows - and I'll be glad to spend a half hour on this if the honourable member wants - and the honourable member well knows, and perhaps better than I because he was the Minister of Education for a few months, how the Program works. Once the Foundation Program is established, and once the amount of money that the Finance Board feels it requires is established, they establish a levy as I mentioned earlier - and I won't go through that one again - and then they require 70 percent from the Provincial Government and as they require that money they draw on it. They can't draw what they don't require. They don't get it in one grand sum. As they need it they ask the Finance Minister to make the money available to them. If the amount is underestimated for example and they need more than they anticipated, then the Consolidated Fund would still have to pay them the moneys that represent 70 percent; the 30 percent which would be coming from the municipalities would have to be borrowed from the bank. When the Finance Board over-estimates or when the expenditures are less than anticipated, then there's a surplus. That surplus is money from the municipalities. There is no money from the Consolidated Fund because there's no draw from the Consolidated Fund. There can't be; they can only draw it as they need it and to meet the needs of the Program based on a formula which was established some time ago and under which they operate.

This year for instance there will be an expansion in that because the Program has been expanded. The Program for Special Education, the program for the technical-vocational additional inputs will mean that there has been an enhancement in the Foundation Program. If their estimates are right - and again they're just estimates because it's the first year of operation in this particular field - if their estimates are right then the levy that they've established, the 9.9 should raise enough money to cover the 30 percent municipal or property tax share. The 70 percent is called upon when needed from the provincial coffers, and I said "when needed" because it's not paid to them in advance or in anticipation; it's only paid as the money is required by the Finance Board. If they don't need it then they can't call on it, and just as when

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . they don't need as much municipal money as was raised, they can't on their own simply change or alter the Program. They have to keep the money there and decide to give it back eventually to the property taxpayers or leave it in there as a surplus, but they can't certainly on their own in any way alter the Program as it is specified under the Foundation Program.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, can I not get - again - a straight answer. We get this snow job every time we ask the question. I'll just use an example. A year ago in this House there was a terrible storm blew up from this side of the House because it was accused that there was \$2 million in the premium structure for Medicare that honourable members on this side thought shouldn't be there. This was well established; well isolated; the point was made. Now, I'm trying -- it's almost an analogous parallel situation, it's almost exactly the same thing except it's twice as much money. What is being done is that the Foundation Program, by virtue of lowering the mill rate, has been reduced in value by a little better than \$6 million according to my calculations, maybe 6 1/2. Of that six, 4.2 thereabouts - again on the safe side - 4.2 is money out of the Provincial Treasury. Had that been left in, your grants and your fortification of the Foundation Program would have run to about the eight percent that is necessary to establish grants to school divisions at about their natural growth rate, probably a little under, but the government has pulled that out by lowering the mill rate on the foundation levy.

Now all I want them to tell me is how much money less out of the Provincial Treasury was contributed to the over-all program by the move which the government has made. And I think we're entitled to that answer during the estimates on the Department of Education. I don't think there's anything complicated about it. We don't have to talk about introducing special programs or doing this or doing that. The Minister has discretionary power as to what goes into the Foundation Program. It doesn't require an Act of legislation; what is required by legislation is changing of the proportions. Now what he does within that is his decision so you can't get around it on that basis. All we want to know simply is if you reduced the foundation levy by one mill on the 1970 assessment, how much money does this account for in the Foundation Program; what portion of that comes from the property taxpayer; what portion would have come from the Provincial Government? And you can isolate it down to the one, by lowering that by one mill, how much would the Provincial Government be able to save from going into the Foundation Program? How much did it not put into the Foundation Program by that lowering of one mill?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that we're going to be able to get on the same wavelength. You know, he gives the analogy of last year when the Medicare program was introduced and about the \$2 million. The difference is this, my friend - and the two are not entirely analogous - what happened last year was certain services which had formerly been provided in other programs of this government were taken out and placed under Medicare and so there was a shift.

MR. CRAIK: It doesn't matter about that. All that matters is this year.

MR. MILLER: It's all the difference in the world, my friend, and if you don't understand how it operates, that's not my fault. But let me tell you this. The end of the fiscal year is the end of a fiscal year, and I announced quite clearly there was no changes in the Foundation Program outside of those I announced the very first day and I said it clearly. We're talking about last year, the 1969-70 year. For the 1969-70 year the Foundation Program was set. The Finance Board operated under those terms. They distributed the money under those terms. They ended up in a surplus position. They returned the money from whence it came - to municipalities. The Province can be called upon by the Finance Board to put in whatever is required to cover its share which is 70 percent. They cannot ask the government, the Finance Department, for any more than what is required under the Foundation Program. They can't ask for money that they're not going to distribute. At the end of the year it lapses. This year there will be more money required and they'll simply, as in this fiscal year they'll make call upon the Provincial Treasury for whatever money is required. And as I said, if they've underestimated, if the 9.9 doesn't raise enough for instance for the 30 percent, they may have to borrow money to get out of that hole; and if what's estimated that they're going to need from the Provincial Government is low because of that, then the province is going to have to find the money because the province is committed to put in 70 percent, and they're going to simply have to call on the Treasury to make that money available to them. If they've underestimated then it means a deficit position, but it's within this fiscal year and only within this fiscal that we can operate. That's the only way I can answer it.

MR. FROESE: Just one question. This surplus that the Public Schools Finance Board had of 1.8 million, does that constitute just out of the 30 percent that was contributed by the -- so I think that's the . . .

April 20, 1970.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the key question is this: will the draw from the Consolidated Fund be the same, now that the Foundation levy has been reduced by one mill as it would have been if that levy had not been reduced by that one mill?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, yes, because the Foundation Program is still the same Foundation Program and so, you know, if we had left it at 10.9 they'd have ended up with a bigger surplus this year; that's all. The draw would have been no greater because they can't draw more than they need to draw, or they must draw in order to make payments to the school boards under the formula established by the Foundation Program. That will determine the draw on the Provincial Government.

MR. CRAIK: Would the Minister indicate what the surplus would have been.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): This pedestrian debate is rather incredible. What we are speaking about here is education and the program of the Minister of Education for educating the people of Manitoba, the students of Manitoba, and what we have, instead of a discussion of policy on the way in which the money is being spent, we have an incredible haggling over whether the Member from Riel understands the Foundation Program better than the Minister of Education and I find that, as I say quite incredible. We're discussing education as if it was a program to instal a number of dog-catchers in a couple of municipalities. We're discussing education as if it was a program for garbage collection instead of what it is, a program which is designed to educate our young people, a program which is designed to enlighten them, to bring them to some realization of what our civilization and democratic way of life is all about.

Now it would seem to me that instead of this haggling, which the Member from Riel is so good at, about a mill decrease in the Foundation levy, what we really should be getting at is the effectiveness of education in Manitoba. We have the members of the opposition quibbling and haggling about whether a \$1.8 million reduction, which was achieved through a lowering of the mill rate by one point, is really effective or not; whether the taxpayers really saved money or not, and I don't really think that that is the issue, or if it is the issue perhaps he should allow the Municipal Affairs Committee to look at municipal assessment including the whole problem of school financing, and from the deliberations of that committee we might come up with something a little more reasonable than what's going on here today.

Now it would seem to me that, in looking at the effectiveness of education in Manitoba, there are two critical areas that should be considered. First of all, it would seem to me that there is really necessity to bring those people who are the recipients of education into the decision-making process in some way. And secondly, it would seem to me that we should be finding out what's happening in education in Manitoba. We shouldn't be finding out any more than we are already doing, we shouldn't be finding out how much money we're spending and whether we're spending it the right way or not. Now, in order to find out how effective education is in Manitoba, I think that what the members opposite should be calling for instead of all this haggling is a Task Force in Education.

Now I want first of all to go back and bring myself... (Interjection) -- well, I hope it's not you, Harry. The first point that I raised was bringing the recipients of education into the decision-making process. Members opposite and members on my own side might wonder why I would raise such a point, and I raise it for this reason, that up until March 11th I was in education - I'm no longer in education - and I found that there were many young people in the schools, many young people, not all but many of them who found the curriculum irrelevant and found the teachers not perhaps as informed as they might be, in public issues in particular. They found the schools in many cases authoritarian and really unresponsive to change.

Now, we've had some mention by the Minister of Education, I mean the present Minister of Education, of some possible ways of changing this, some possible ways of bringing those individuals who are getting an education in the schools into the decision-making process. We have the announced policy of advisory councils, councils of, as I recall, parents, teachers and children in the school system. I would think that that really will not be a very effective method of involving the recipients of educational services in the decision-making process. Quite the contrary, I think it would be no more than a stall, a placebo, which would not really change things very much, and I do believe that there is need for change. How do you bring the recipients of education into the decision-making process? Well, I think the answer is quite simple. We have changes in legislation which will enable young people who are over 18 to vote

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) . . . and, hopefully, to be elected to public office if the electors, that is if the adults in the community or the school district, see fit to elect them. Now, I don't think that that's a very likely possibility somehow. Adults have a habit of thinking that anyone younger than them really doesn't know very much - and I feel that maybe the Member from Fort Rouge is one of those.

However, there is, I think, a simple way of bringing these individuals into the decision-making process and that is allow those students who are in school and who are under 18 years of age to sit on the school board, to sit there and see how our adults are deciding how the educational programs of Manitoba will be developed, and I think that would be really an education for them.

Now I feel that there is every need for this kind of practical education. We've heard exchanges between the Member for Elmwood and the Minister of Education about the need of some kind of curricula developed which would improve the student's knowledge of political processes, of democratic processes, of electoral processes in particular. I think that in many ways, if you want to turn off a good segment of the school population, the best way to do it is to set up a course; I mean as soon as you set up a course the students want to do something else; and I would think that if students under 18 who are actually in the schools could sit in on the school board meetings, that they would get this practical education, that they would see how the great decisions on education are made in Manitoba. Now there are certain legal problems involved here, of course. I understand that school boards are required to enter into contractual arrangements, and as a result of that possibility these students sitting on the board could not presumably have a vote. They could not, in other words, contribute to a decision which would bind them to a legal agreement, but they could still sit there and they could still listen to the way in which educational policy is debated and formulated in Manitoba in the various school divisions; and I think that that exercise in itself would be worthwhile and the members of the school board would soon know just how interesting their meetings are, just how vital their discussions are when the students stopped attending.

Now the other matter . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, would the member permit a question?

MR. TURNBULL: I'm just trying to mull over in my mind whether you've submitted to questions that I've -- yes you have, so I'll permit it.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Does the member who's speaking not realize that school board meetings are open to the public and anyone can attend them?

MR. TURNBULL: I think that if a school student tried to sit in on a school board meeting which is in camera when the school board is considering some discipline case that he would, as I say, be prevented from sitting in. A school board can go into camera, in camera meetings at any time, as I understand.

MR. MILLER: Would the member permit a question?

MR. TURNBULL: Certainly.

MR. MILLER: Well, with all due respect to the member, the suggestion that the school board trustees sit in camera, does he really think that the members are in camera more than they are in public meeting?

MR. TURNBULL: Yes, I think the question has been answered, that if there was a possibility of school students attending those meetings that the board would find all of a sudden that a lot of their decisions had to be made in camera.

The other proposal that I was going to mention was one related to finding out what is happening in education in Manitoba. Now, the debate that I've heard this session and last session has been a debate primarily on where are we going to get the money from, and that of course is a very critical matter, and I think that it deserves investigation, and I think that the government has said that there will be such an enquiry into the whole problem of municipal taxation, and from the investigations of that committee we presumably will have some direction, some answers, some greater knowledge on the part of all members on just what the problems of municipal finances are. But - and I'm amazed at the members opposite - but there has been no mention that I've heard, of exactly how the money is being spent; there's been no mention of how effective our educational system is; there's been no mention of the ratio of administrative cost to pupil enrolment, and, you know, the whole question of cost benefit analysis has not really been raised by members opposite.

Now there have been, particularly in Ontario, investigations such as the Hall Commission

April 20, 1970.

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) . . . Report which, although all may not agree with it, at least lay down certain guidelines, at least make some attempt to come up with answers to the questions of how effective is our educational system. Now, depending where you sit or stand, you can say that education is or is not effective, but I know many people, parents and students alike, who think that the educational system in Manitoba is not particularly effective, and there are many students in Manitoba who don't feel that either the academic stream, if you want to call it that, or the general stream, if you want to call it that, or the occupational stream, are streams for them. They seek some other kind of education in the schools and I can tell you that they don't find it. I'm not talking about all the students, but many of the students don't find what they're seeking in the educational system, and then when they try to express themselves in this matter they are labelled as trouble-makers or hippies or skin heads, or whatever happens to the typical terminology that is existing.

Now, I think that a Task Force on Education would be one effective way of involving, not only legislators, not only civil servants and officials, not only school board trustees, not only teachers, but the parents and the students, because the Task Force could be constituted in such a way as to be representative and it could look at how effective our educational system is in Manitoba. And there are a number of areas that it could look at. It could look at whether the traditional subjects curricula that are now laid down, generally laid down anyway, are really effective, or whether we should go into some other type of curricula arrangement where the students studied, say, social sciences and physical sciences, or some other more simple arrangement than that which now exists. Or the Task Force could look at the cost benefit advantages of a different type of curricula that had been introduced.

Now as far as I know, Mr. Chairman, there has been very little evaluation of the existing programs that have been introduced in Manitoba schools in the last few years. Certainly any queries that I've raised have not been answered. I would like to know just how much more effective in terms of enlightenment of the student population are the new courses in social studies that were introduced. I would like to know why it is that if you want to teach a new physics course in the school the teacher has to get special training before they can teach it, but if they want to teach a new social studies course in the school well then, anybody at all is apparently capable of teaching that.

I think, really, the lack of evaluation of our educational system is an area that needs considerable examination and I really feel that that examination could be most effectively carried out through a Task Force, and I think it would get us away from this whole problem of considering only the cost. Certainly the cost has to be considered. When I looked at my tax bill recently I can just see how much it should be considered, but where is the money going? How is it being spent? How effective are the programs it's being spent on? And although there may be answers, I would like to see a relatively impartial group have a look at education in Manitoba through the medium of a Task Force. And I think really that these two areas that I've raised, the involvement of the recipients of education in the decision-making process by allowing them, electing them to attend board meetings, all board meetings, and the appointment of a Task Force, would get at these two critical areas and perhaps we can move away from this consideration of only how much it costs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, we may have been having a little trouble getting through to our Minister of Education, but I for one am glad that he's the Minister of Education and not the Member from Seven Oaks, because some of the things that he has been saying has been bordering on stupidity, bordering on stupidity. He's talking about . . .

MR. TURNBULL: You're twisted, that's the trouble.

MR. HENDERSON: I'm sorry if I've got them twisted because this is the point I didn't want to make. He's been making remarks that have been bordering on stupidity. Earlier he said in there we should not be concerned about the amount of money or how it's being raised. Now what kind of a statement is that? We should not be concerned about the money, he said, earlier, or how it's being raised. Later on he rambled off on some other parts but this is what he said, and he was saying that we have to involve the children in the decision-making process, and this is the thing that's wrong. Well, if they have a chance and they are represented in different ways, but the trouble is we've been bending over backwards to meet their demands and we've been going too far. I, for one, am more worried about the demonstrations that these children are carrying on and the wilful damage they're doing, and that they're not being

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) . . . punished for it or being expelled, and I would like to see our Minister of Education do something to see that people at the University, the administrators, could do something about putting out these rebels that are doing wilful damage.

MR. TURNBULL: . . . submit to a question?

MR. HENDERSON: Yes.

MR. TURNBULL: I was wondering if you'd like to spank them.

MR. HENDERSON: Pardon?

MR. TURNBULL: I said I was wondering if you'd like to take these university people and spank them.

MR. HENDERSON: There's a certain bunch of them that need more than a spanking, and if I was in charge of it I'd see they got it or they'd be put right out. I'd like to have charge but the trouble is we have men like him, with the stupidity of him, that makes remarks like he does, that influences them.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, I don't want to be too harsh on our friend from - what constituency? - Osborne, because I can remember not very many years ago that I used to think like he's thinking now, and when I did get involved into school administration from another point of view, when I did participate in decision-making as far as expenditures and budgeting and so on, I soon realized that his arguments were fine, and I think creditable from his point of view, but he's only seeing part of the picture.

I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that we have yet received a satisfactory answer from the Minister and I want to go right back to the point that we were trying to make a little while ago. It involves something a little deeper than the Member from Osborne has realized. It involves a matter of principle that concerns me deeply. The lowering of the one mill on the general levy is not a simple matter. It means that we are moving away from financial help being granted school divisions from either the general levy which is equalized over the whole province or/and the first provincial contribution, and I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, that this is exactly the opposite direction in which we should be going and I'm convinced that the Minister himself realizes it, the only thing is that he does not want to accept the responsibility of saying, yes, this is so, and we're going to go in the other direction because we've been talking in the other direction for many years.

I think that if the Minister were to answer us as frankly as he could, that the debate wouldn't be prolonged the way it is and that we would have satisfaction that we will be changing directions and going the other way as soon as possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 101. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting listening to the debate. I would like to say to the Member for Osborne, I, too, am concerned about the type of education we give our children, and I don't think that we are here criticizing the Minister of Education at the present time on that; in fact, I think he's doing the best he can with the problems that are involved in education today. But I would like to just briefly touch on the other points. My colleague from Riel mentioned there was a debate on this side of the House last spring - the Minister said it came from the other departments and it went here, but the real issue was that you ended up by putting the load on the taxpayer. Now here we have a situation where 100 percent -- something is 100 percent. If somebody says your share is 30 percent and your share is 70, and you lower his share by 1.8 - which is \$1.8 million or \$1.9 million - that means your share is lowered by \$4.2 million, Mr. Minister, and really, if that is the case, that means there is \$4.2 million less for the education Foundation to draw on, and that means that the public, the school boards, have to raise that extra money by putting on special levy and this is putting it on the taxpayer.

Now, we are saying that there are \$4.2 million less being given by the government this year to the education of this province and we are not getting an answer to that, and yet I can remember the then Leader of the Liberal Government during an election saying a man went home and did his homework, sharpened his pencils, and caught you on \$2 million. I can remember the First Minister, during an election campaign, saying "You fellows, you weren't honest," and what have you. Now here we have a situation that's exactly the same. There is \$4.2 million going to be required to be raised by school boards on special levy from the taxpayers, and that is the answer we're looking for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I don't know which one to answer first. Perhaps I should

April 20, 1970.

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . comment on the remarks from the Member for Osborne. I have to tell him that I share some of his concerns and I expressed them the other day when I thought that the proposal that I'm thinking about I put forward publicly, that every school at the junior high school and high school level have a council formed of parents, teachers (not administration but teachers) I have to say that for the Honourable Member for Emerson's benefit - and students, so that there can be some sort of dialogue develop where students' desires, interests and particular problems can be brought can be brought forward, and I put it, as I say, I brought this forward as a proposal and I'm hoping that it will be picked up by schools in Manitoba.

With regard to the question of students sitting in on school board meetings, I have to tell him that students do sit in on school board meetings - that is, in my experience. Now, how long they stay there, of course, depends on how interested they are, and too often they leave because it's quite boring. But no one is preventing them sitting in on it. On the other hand, I can tell you that there is a school division in Manitoba which has made it its business to set up monthly meetings with representatives from high schools in order to develop the kind of dialogue that the Member for Osborne feels is necessary, and which I agree is desirable, so there can be the feeling of participation on the part of the students which too often is lacking.

With regard to curriculum, I have to tell him that the curriculum and the books being issued in the new curriculum are not issued simply through the department deciding unilaterally that this shall be so. There are curriculum committees on various subjects. They are made up of teachers who are professionals; we look to them and they are the ones who, in the final analysis . . . forward. Certainly the Advisory Board has to approve it and so on, but basically they are the ones who do the screening; they are the ones who come up with the new textbooks, new programs, and so on.

Last summer, in July, there was a seminar in which the students were actively engaged, in which the whole question of courses at the high school were discussed, the relevance of those courses, what could be done about making the whole program of the high schools more flexible and meet the various needs and abilities of the students. That committee has made a preliminary report; another report will be forthcoming shortly. That committee will continue to sit and, I want to stress, it has students on it. As a matter of fact, it is a result of that committee's deliberations that it has been decided to eliminate the High School Examination Board, the Board exams. It's because of that committee's recommendations in which students were sitting, that there's been some changes in the number of subjects required under the General Course, and I can tell him that because of the work done by that committee on which students sat, there will be greater loosening of the course structures at the high school and the designation of courses so that there can be even more flexibility than we have today; it's how to break down the stratification that we have lived with for many years in Manitoba and which I think have outlived their usefulness.

So far as a Task Force is concerned, I think it might have some value but I'd like to suggest that in a sense there are Task Forces going on all the time. They may not be the broad, sweeping Task Force that the member has in mind, but they are a Task Force in the sense that they are groups meeting constantly, dealing with various aspects of the system, and more and more it is my hope and my desire, as it is his, that students will become more deeply involved in these studies and these deliberations.

Now there were other comments. I think mostly they were directed from the Member for Osborne so I won't remark on them, but we have to come back - and I'm prepared to - I think there's still about 35 hours left; if you want to spend that time on it, I'll gladly do it - on the question of the input into education, and I have to say to the Member for Emerson, no one is trying to hide anything. If I was trying to hide it I would tell you, even though I might not tell you where I was hiding, but I would tell you I was hiding it. I'm not hiding it. I tried to say to you very honestly that the end of the fiscal year showed a surplus of the Finance Board's operations. That surplus was returned to the taxpayers from which that surplus came. This year we're going to be raising more money with 9.9 mills, and therefore more money will be needed from the Provincial Treasury. The 70 percent this year we anticipate; instead of requiring about \$72 million last year, I think it was, they're going to require about \$77.5 million, and that money is going to have to be forthcoming from the Provincial Treasurer as the Finance Board needs it. In other words, the draw on the Treasury will be made as the Finance Board requires the money to be sent to the various school divisions. So there is going to be an increase over last year on the Provincial Treasurer. Now these are the facts.



MR. GIRARD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would entertain a question at this point? Did you not, at the time you made the decision to lower the general mill rate by one mill, did you not have an alternative of using the surplus and increasing the grants to the school divisions and using the surplus to pay this increase in the grants that is really overdue and hasn't occurred yet?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, again, I made this statement before and I'll make it again: it was the decision of this government that for the fiscal year '70-'71 not to change the Foundation Program with the exception of those two changes which I announced in the House on the first day.

MR. GIRARD: That doesn't answer the question.

MR. MILLER: The government could have said to the Finance Board: Keep the money in surplus for 1970, for the '70-'71 year. We could have changed the Foundation Program, but to have kept the surplus I felt was wrong because that surplus is not provincial money; it's municipal money, and it should go back to them. When we raise the Foundation Program, we will then have to raise - if we do it by the same percentages - we may have to raise the municipal levy, if we stick to the same Foundation Program or the same formula of 70-30. If we change the entire program we may come up with something entirely different, but to sit there with a surplus and an unpaid debt on which interest is being paid at today's rates, I think couldn't be justified.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed, I'd like to remind honourable members that we have now spent nine hours on the Minister's salary. At least six of it have been on this question, and I would ask members to bear that in mind because some people I think have spoken repeatedly. I don't know if the Minister will ever satisfy some of the questioning, I would just mention that to members and ask them not to repeat the same point ad infinitum.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Chairman, one last question. Will the Minister agree that, had he decided to increase the grants instead, that this would have been equalizing the burden of taxation and shifting it to the province and to a general levy which means equalized, rather than putting it on the very inequitable situation of divisional levies?

MR. MILLER: I could almost answer that question by asking another: "Have you stopped beating your wife?" Mr. Chairman, that's not the point at all. We're dealing with this fiscal year, not last year. The moneys that were in the surplus were last year's moneys. We're dealing with my estimates for this year. If the member is asking me the question: would I like to see a new method of paying for education in Manitoba? the answer is yes. If he's asking the question: is that my desire? the answer is yes. If he's asking whether we're going to look at that and try to find an answer, the answer is yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister said a few moments ago, in answer to a question of mine, that the draw from the Consolidated Fund will be the same as a consequence of the one mill reduction in the Foundation levy as it would have been had there been no such reduction, so I'm satisfied with that answer, and I hope we can move on after this, Mr. Chairman. Could I just add one definitive follow-up question to that and ask the Minister, in the light of his answer, therefore can it be said that there will not be an additional \$4.2 million burden such as was described by my colleague the Member for Sturgeon Creek, imposed on real property taxpayers through the special levy or whatever? Can it be said that there won't be an additional burden of that magnitude or any similar magnitude imposed on real property taxpayers?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the special levies are. Some areas have gone up; others have stayed pat - I have no idea. One I know has gone down; so I don't know what the impact of the special levy will be in Manitoba. We really don't know that. We lowered the levy so far as the taxpayer is concerned which was imposed through the province. What happens at the local level still remains to be seen. I know some have gone up considerably. Others - one I know, I've read, if memory serves me correctly, has gone down; others have held the line. It varies from area to area because of this -- the one mill lowering has made a difference in some areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, we did get one definitive answer from the Minister on Friday. That was that the Foundation Program covered 77 percent of the cost, the total average cost of the public school system in the province. From that, we know that a special levy has

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . to carry the balance. The points that we're trying to make here - and obviously we're not going to get an answer from the Minister now and I don't intend to burden him any longer - but I'm going to make the statement which he can refute now or at some time later or during concurrence when I'm sure this will come up again. It is by the lowering of one mill on the Foundation levy the province had it within its power to change the grants structure ~~live up to~~ the Foundation Program and the money that was in there; by the lowering of one mill, saved the province 1.8 to 1.9 million. It saved the Foundation imposition on property tax 1.8 to 1.9; it allowed the province to siphon off out of the program 4.2 to 4.4 that is now in lieu of that being shifted on to property taxation through the special levy. If the Minister wishes to refute it, there'll have to be more specific answers than we've had.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I can't let that pass. The government siphoned nothing off. I have to repeat again: The Treasurer can only pay out to the Finance Board the monies required to finance the operation of the Finance Board. The Finance Board can only pay out monies under the Foundation Program; it cannot pay more. The Foundation Program was established for 1969-70. They couldn't pay out more than what was required. The draw on the Treasurer, therefore, was whatever was required to pay their share. And so I repeat, they had a surplus and they gave it back to the people from whence the surplus came. To have kept it would have served no purpose except to have added to a surplus which was not the government's surplus, but the Finance Board's surplus.

MR. CRAIK: A final question then, Mr. Chairman, with the answer then. Would the Minister confirm or deny that that program that he refers to is set by Cabinet decision and not by legislation?

MR. MILLER: It was set by Cabinet decision for 1969-70, and it is being set now for 1970-71, and the Foundation Program is remaining basically the same with the exception of the two changes I announced.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 101. 1 (a) --passed; (b) 1 -- passed; The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think I have one final question and that is that from all the discussion here this afternoon and also on previous occasions, if I understand correctly then, the government never lived up to its commitment. It never did make its full contribution under the 30-70 percent arrangement last year. Am I right? They withheld . . .

MR. MILLER: No, the government met its 70 percent commitment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The balance of Resolution 101 was read and passed, and Resolution 102 (a) to (c) was read and passed. (d) - 1 passed. The Honourable Minister for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Does this reduction refer to the vocational schools, the Red River Community College?

MR. MILLER: Pardon me, I'm sorry, I can't find my estimate book. What number are we on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on 102 (d).

MR. CRAIK: Well, I don't want to hold it up. Perhaps you could get it, the answer. Could you indicate how much money is left in the -- I'm sure this item refers to the commitments for vocational construction. However, maybe it doesn't, but could the Minister, when he finds an answer, indicate how much money is left in the Federal contributory program and what cost-sharing arrangements we are at now on the building of vocational composite schools?

MR. MILLER: I'm not sure of the -- I've been trying to get that information for myself, as a matter of fact, the other day. I'm not sure of the total amount still left. I believe the 75 percent money has all been allocated and from here in we'll be working on the 50-50 portion. But I'm not sure of the dollar amount.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The balance of Resolution 102 was read and passed.) Resolution 103. (a) passed. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure if the Minister has stated in his remarks how this total grant was broken down between the universities of Manitoba, Winnipeg and Brandon. I looked rather quickly through his remarks and I didn't find it, but if it is not already in the record, perhaps he could read it in for our benefit. One other question. The Minister has ratified in recent weeks some changes in the membership of the Senate and the Board of Governors at Brandon University. I wonder if he'd just briefly explain what those changes are and what additional memberships they do involve at the university?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in reply to that question. The changes consisted of expanding or increasing the size of the senate at Brandon University to allow for eight student members to sit on the senate. Prior to that there was -- I think the Board of Governors had one member added to it, a student member. This was at the request of the -- as a result of a meeting which took place between representatives of the senate, the Board of Governors and the Students' Union. A meeting was held of the three bodies, representatives of the three bodies. They came up with the proposal that eight members be added and I concurred in that request. If that's the information the honourable member wanted -- unless there's more detail that he's interested in, I'm not sure.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I just wondered if these changes in the senate membership was this on the recommendation of the Board of Governors?

MR. MILLER: It was on the recommendation of the committee on which the Board of Governors appointed two members, the senate appointed two members, and the students appointed two members, and I'm told that this committee of six, two from each, were unanimous in their recommendations. Now the question asked of me with regard to the breakdown as between the three universities, I'm afraid I'm going to have to take that question in a sense as notice. I haven't got the detail here, the breakdown. Perhaps I could give the member the information later on, or if we're still on my estimates I could give it to him privately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Before we leave the universities, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate when the vacancies might be filled on the Board of Governors of the University of Winnipeg. I believe there have been three or four more vacancies and they've been there for at least nine months, probably more. Is there any indication as to when this will be completed and they'll be back up to their full complement.

MR. MILLER: I believe there are only two vacancies - the others are still serving. There will be -- we've been -- frankly I've been just too busy and one of these days we'll get around to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 103. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, just what do the additional monies that we are allocating to the universities -- go for. Is it for increased students? Is it per student increase, or just on what basis are the increases -- what are the increases based on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you talking about student loans?

MR. FROESE: No, no.

MR. MILLER: Well, the increase is as a result of enrollments generally in the three universities. They are on the rise, and of course the chief amongst the reasons is the accelerating participation rate of students going into university. There's a greater enrollment all the time. There's also an enrollment in the post-graduate levels, as well as a substantial enrollment in part-time student enrollment. I suspect that in a few years there'll probably be a greater enrollment of part-time students than of full-time students. By part-time, I mean the evening classes, the extension courses and so on. So it rises mostly for operating, to reflect increased cost as well as increased enrollment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 103. (b) (1) -- passed; The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under (b) we still haven't got the report of the Public Schools Finance Board. I don't think this item should be passed until we do have that report, because I would like to know the basis on which these grants are arrived at. How many budgets were returned last year to the various schools for reconsideration? How many were accepted? To what extent are the present request - the \$83 million - to what extent are they based on last year's request. Is it just worked out on a percentage basis or this amount, is that based on actual requests by the various divisions?

MR. MILLER: The school board submit their budgets. I forget the date on which the budgets have to be submitted. March 15th, I think, or March 1st - March 15th I believe it is. The Finance Board goes over the budget. They may call in a school board to discuss it with them. They may send it back for further study. If everything is in order they simply approve the budgets and determine the amounts that are payable under the Foundation Program based on the budget of the school division - that's the approved, the authorized budget of the school division. I can't tell the member how many were rejected. There's no such thing as rejection; there may be considerable discussion back and forth but there's no rejection of a budget as such. --(Interjection)--Oh no, on a first count. I don't doubt there are a number of meetings held. School boards I know come into Winnipeg, and I know a great deal of correspondence goes

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . on between the Finance Board and school boards questioning certain items in their budgets at all times. But, in the final analysis, all boards get their budgets approved and this is the way it stands. As to how many were sent back and how often, I really don't have that information. It's just part of the work of the Finance Board and I'm not sure if they even keep an official total or record of that.

MR. CRAIK: On this item, Mr. Chairman, the school trustees have indicated that average budgets are going up on the eight to ten percent range, and this item (b) (1) actually indicates that the grants are only up by four percent or 4.08 percent. Does the Minister not agree that this is only about half the natural growth rate of the costs in the school divisions?

MR. MILLER: That's the assumption that he wants to intimate, which if perhaps he wants to make he can. This is the amount that the Finance Board estimated is going to be required to meet the needs of the school boards, authorized needs of the school boards, under the Foundation Program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 103 (b) was read and passed. (c) -- The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Under subsection (c) of Appropriation No. 3, it seems to me there are two or three specific programs that are conspicuous by their absence. One of them which is not mentioned here is the student job program, the student employment program. Another that comes to mind is the academic upgrading program for adults and mature students as distinct from vocational upgrading training programs, the whole field of adult education, particularly those people who are working and supporting families by day or by night and going to school at the other end of the clock to try and upgrade themselves academically and pick up their junior and senior matriculations as a means of improving their salary possibilities and potential. It seems to me that when this question came up a few months ago, when a number of students who were involved in this kind of responsibility went to see the Minister about it, that they had received a very sympathetic and satisfactory hearing, and the Minister at that time, Mr. Chairman, pointed out that specific steps were being taken to assist such students. I haven't been able to find any specific reference to that in these estimates and it seems to me that in this particular subsection there should be some reference to that program, if in fact it does exist. Also, as I mentioned at the outset of my remarks, there's the whole question of student job programs - job location programs. What kind of money is being spent on those programs and where is that listed? Or are they included under the munificent sum of \$7,100 listed under Number (2) as Other Expenditures?

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Chairman, they're not listed under that munificent sum of \$7,100; they're listed under the munificent sum of \$2,654,500 in comparison to \$1,247,100 the year before. What we've done is this. We have recognized the very problem the member mentioned. Those students who are at Adult Education Centre, for example those students who are considered what is known as mature students, that is they are not in a full program at university but they are over 21 years of age, they don't necessarily have their academic standing in the regular sense, but they are permitted to enter university and could only enroll for two subjects. Now they could not qualify, up to now, for bursary or student aid, because in order to qualify they have to be enrolled in a full course of the five subjects. That is now being changed and we will recognize mature students for bursary aid. It's difficult to, from looking at the estimates, I recognize, because we have changed it, but in rough figures I can put it to you this way. The aid insofar as bursaries to students is concerned is about a million dollars more. Out of the 2.564 million there, which is about 1.3 million over last year, 1.35, we have in there aid for the mature student who are going into the community colleges for technical vocational training. The student aid program, or the work program, the \$100,000 is part of this as well - it's in there; and in addition there is a program of approximately \$250,000 which will be used, as I said, for experimental programs similar to the one that I mentioned the other day where we're going to try to make possible bringing into the teaching stream the native students who require more than just textbook help or tuition fees to help them through. They're going to require special input, special attention, and it is this money that will go into that kind of program - that's one of them. There are other programs we hope to develop in an experimental way and that will prove beneficial. They are, in one form or another, they are student aid, and they're zeroing in on particular problem areas as they arise. But I recognize the difficulty the member has in equating the two figures because there is a substantial rise and it isn't broken down. Perhaps it would help somewhat if I try to use a comparative method of doing it for, let's say, post secondary

April 20, 1970.

1095

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . which includes the university entrance, the postgraduate, technical technology - last year, \$949,500, this year \$1,748,000. For Special Opportunity which included such things as guidance, special education, teacher training courses, there have been increases. Mature students last year was nil, this year it is \$145,000, so this is where these extra monies are and, as I say, it's difficult to see it from the figures here but there is a breakdown and I could read it into the record but it's quite lengthy. If the member wants to see it, I'll gladly show it to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I know that the Minister would appreciate at some point a relief and to slide back into the Agricultural estimates for a moment, but not quite. I asked a question of the Minister last fall during the session. I appreciated at that time he had little time to do anything about it. I ask him of it again and I find no better place than here to ask that question, namely, has the department considered, in an effort to make it more equitable for rural students attending university, to accept grain as payment for their fees? I make this suggestion not lightly, Mr. Chairman, because we understand that the program has worked very well in Saskatchewan and in fact, if I'm not mistaken, the Saskatchewan universities have considerably expanded on that program for the coming year, and while I appreciate that the Minister, if my memory serves me correctly, indicated to us last session that firstly, this was something that he was prepared to look at but secondly, I believe he came back and indicated to us that at our universities here we had probably sufficient grain on hand, you know, raised by the University Experimental Farms to suffice the needs of the university.

Be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, the fact still remains that the agricultural economic situation hasn't improved any, and if we are serious about attempting to equalize the opportunities across the province and certainly also in the field of higher learning, then it concerns me that we somehow cannot seem to adopt a program that has obviously worked with some satisfaction and certainly obviously worked for some considerable personal satisfaction in our sister province of Saskatchewan. I see little or no opportunity of the agricultural situation being much improved this year from last. Certainly the numbers of dollars available to parents in rural parts of Manitoba are not going to be any more this year than last, and I would hope that with the lead time that the Minister would now have, the Department of Education would now have, that they could in effect think very seriously about a program of accepting grain for fee situation at the University of Manitoba and as well at the other universities, even if it meant that they retailed the grain to other users and outlets as is being done by some of the dealers or other people in business that are meeting the money squeeze in rural Manitoba in a like manner.

So, Mr. Chairman, I simply -- the Minister need not respond at this time. I particularly just wanted to draw to his attention the fact that the situation is unchanged in terms of money supply for many rural parents that would like to see their children seek the higher level of education at the University of Manitoba, or Brandon or Winnipeg for that matter. The program seems to work with marked success in Saskatchewan and I fail to see any real stumbling block or real reason why we cannot apply it here. I appreciate that the general application may not be as wide as it is in the wheat-growing province of Saskatchewan but nonetheless, if it helps out ten, fifteen or fifty or a hundred rural students who find the cash very hard to come by - I personally know of four students in my constituency that will forego a year of higher education. My information is that they are not foregoing it forever but that they'll have to skip one year to join the labour force for a period of time to help their Moms and Dads out in trying to pay the bills, and very often it's these same students that are faced with the additional cost of board and room while they're attending university so that in their case the bill is not simply the three or four or five hundred dollar tuition fee, but in fact the very substantial sum of board and room that goes along with it. I would think that, together with his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Education could put their heads together on this particular matter and arrive at some program that they could offer to the students of rural Manitoba for the coming year. Obviously it's not something that could be applied in this year.

Mr. Chairman, those are a few remarks that I wished to make at this particular point in the estimates with respect to student aid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this matter was brought up last fall. The universities were contacted; they couldn't see their way clear to do it. I don't know what the situation is

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . this year. I could, of course, ask the universities again. Perhaps the member might volunteer to take his indemnity in wheat, or we might all do that, in which case there may be more money available for everybody, but on the other hand I would point out to him that one of the reasons for the increase in the Bursary Aid Program is because we recognize there is a need, and these students that he mentioned who are having problems, financial problems, I hope we'll be able to meet that need this year, and it's reflected, as I say, in over a million dollars in extra monies available, not just to cover the cost of tuition, but to cover the costs that rural people have to come into Brandon or Winnipeg, and they have got board and room costs which city students don't have to bear. This is taken into account in the Bursary Aid program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolutions 103, 104, and 105 were read and passed.) The Department of Youth and Education passed.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . call it 5:30, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand the next department is Government Services, which we will begin this evening. It is now 5:30. I am leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 p. m. this evening.

continued on next page . . .