

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, April 8, 1975

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would honourable members turn to Page 18 of their Estimates Book, Resolution 46 (a). . . The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, before the supper hour there were two or three questions that I posed to the Minister. One related to the number of personnel who had transferred into Planning and Research during the past year. The Minister said there was some problem with that because there also had been a number transferred out, so I was asking him if he was able to supply me with the number of people who have come into the department in the past 12 months, the number who had left the Planning and Research division in that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, of the 23 staff man-years that we had approved there was one staff man-year transferred to Colleges and Universities Affairs, and one transferred from this branch to MEDIA, which is within the Department of Education, which deals with the computerized statistical analysis and records that is kept within the department.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, that gives me the number out, now how many came into Planning and Research during that 12-month period?

MR. HANUSCHAK: The staff man-year approval was not increased.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister about innovative projects that have been introduced by teachers and how many such projects had been approved by Planning and Research during the past 12 months, and what was the cost of those projects?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I must admit, Mr. Chairman - innovative? I want to be perfectly clear which the honourable member is referring to because there are demonstration projects, that's true, or may the honourable member be referring to the school initiated . . .

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I was referring to teacher initiated innovative projects within the individual schools.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm still not clear because there are no teacher initiated projects. Not unless the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell could come to our assistance. He seems to create the impression that he can. If he can I'd appreciate his help.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I understand that it's possible to have projects initiated and approved by your department coming from individual schools. How many such projects were received and approved and what was the cost?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, those projects are not approved by Planning and Research but by the Curriculum Branch of the Department of Education. The number of them - I did deal with them a couple of weeks ago. There are approximately 100 school initiated projects and about 150 student initiated projects.

MR. MCGILL: What was the cost, Mr. Chairman?

MR. HANUSCHAK: There is no cost to the Department, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MCGILL: Then I understand, Mr. Chairman, from the Minister that when these projects are approved that they don't require any funding of any kind?

MR. HANUSCHAK: There is no provision for funding for them from the Department of Education. It's on the understanding, Mr. Chairman, that school or student initiated projects would be of a nature and would be established in a manner that would make use of available resources without creating a necessity for any additional expenditures. And any that there may be, my information is, are really minimal.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, the other question which remains from the previous session was the matter of program evaluation for which the Minister has an appropriation he's asking this year of \$125,000. My question to the Minister was how many programs were evaluated by this particular division of Planning and Research, how many were discontinued or how many were proceeded with. In other words, I'm anxious to know specifically how many programs were completely evaluated by your Planning and Research Department.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, as I tried to explain before the Committee rose at 4:30, and I will take a second run at it again. The \$125,000 appropriation for program evaluation, or what I had referred to as \$125,000 for program evaluation is not for the evaluation of the other programs that I have listed. This is a special project with the evaluation of those matters that I had referred to that are contained within it, the evaluation of the over-all school system

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . in the Province of Manitoba. In brief that's the way I could describe it. As opposed to the evaluation of the specific projects which we fund and in which we are involved in their direction. Because as far as projects such as REAP and School Nutrition and so forth, there is an on-going evaluation mechanism built into it, that's incorporated into the costs of the program. But this is a special project in which the teachers and the trustees and we are participating to devise a mechanism for the evaluation of the entire school system, really.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I just don't quite follow the Minister. If there is an appropriation of \$125,000 surely the Minister is able to give me some specifics as to the programs which were evaluated and which cost that much money or are going to cost that much in the coming year. And, you know, I would like to know if a specific program was evaluated and discontinued, if it was evaluated and considered worthy of continuance and so forth. Isn't that what program evaluation is? I understand how this department of Planning and Research innovates new programs, I don't understand how they are evaluated during their currency in the school system. I would simply like to know in specifics how this is done, and how it has been done in the past 12 months.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we could - I would wish to debate the matter of program evaluation with the honourable member, but the \$125,000 has nothing to do with the evaluation of the specific programs which I had mentioned yesterday, the eight or nine of them. There is an evaluation mechanism built into those programs. This deals with what the department calls the Systems Evaluation in general, so it doesn't lead to a discontinuation of any program. It's an evaluation of the entire school system where the trustees, teachers and the superintendents are involved in this and it's both an internal and an external evaluation, where for some of the projects they do retain outside evaluators and in the process of evaluation they'll be looking at matters such as student achievements, student attitude, student development of thinking skills, a variety of teaching methods and how they are related to student performance, cost effectiveness, a community assessment program involving local school committees in evaluating educational outcomes, and so forth. That's in its broadest sense. Then within that broad over-all program, there are a number of smaller programs which are parts of it where in certain areas, certain parts of the province, they may address themselves to specific, very definite matters related to education such as immigrant study, and this, of course, would be in urban Winnipeg, which focuses on the special educational needs of the three recent immigrant communities in urban Winnipeg, namely the Portuguese, the Filipino and the Chilean. At David Livingstone School there's an open school evaluation. And not only will this assist the Winnipeg School Division in evaluating the David Livingstone open school operation, but would also devise a design in mechanism that other school divisions would be able to use to evaluate their own open school situations.

A study of Canadian content in the language arts curriculum, I believe I'd mentioned that yesterday. And this of course deals with the language arts curriculum, and kindergarten to Grade 12 and they'll be looking at the extent and diversity of Canadian content in the present language arts curriculum, documentation of Canadian materials now available, but which may not at the present time be included in the curriculum materials documentation of the perceptions of parents, students, teachers, regarding the improvements in more Canadian materials, dissemination of information to the public regarding the status of Canadian materials now included in and which could be added to the language materials.

Then as part of this there's also an individualized instruction project. And it was this particular project specifically that the Manitoba Teachers' Society responded to in the letter which I had read into the record earlier this afternoon, which is part of this broad evaluation program.

And in the individualization instruction project, and while this evaluation will - there'll be workshops conducted for teachers on a group as well as individual basis. And then the effect of individualized instruction on students' performance will be assessed and then models will be documented for potential implementation in other schools.

There's also an open area evaluation as part of this evaluation project, in the Kelsey School Division, and this was at the request of Kelsey School Division, that it wanted to evaluate its open area schools. The evaluation of preparation time in the Winnipeg School Division, and this I would - yes, at the elementary level, Grades 2 and 3. Recently an experiment was

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . authorized in the Winnipeg School Division to shorten the day in a number of schools to allow for this experiment to take place and tied in with it will be this evaluation, research on para-professionals - I'd mentioned some of these earlier. A research handbook on school organization is being developed as part of, which is included in here, evaluation of special needs project in Brandon, namely, the Linden Lane School.

Now, as the Honourable Member for Brandon West may know, this is a pilot project supported by this department in which children with multiple handicaps are placed in regular classrooms, and the program is relatively inexpensive, comparatively speaking when one takes into account the fact that a meaningful education program for multiple handicapped children can run well in excess of 4 or 5 thousand dollars per year per student, because as the honourable member would appreciate the classes are small and you need your ratio of professional staff to pupils this high. In Brandon, it's somewhat different at Linden Lane School, a somewhat different approach is taken where, I believe, it's a couple of children or so are placed in a regular class with the aid of a para-professional, and a program is being developed along those lines. This is being evaluated to determine, firstly, the extent of success the children with multiple handicaps may experience during their interaction with normal children in the regular classroom as opposed to being segregated into a class unto themselves; and secondly, tied in with the measuring the extent of success the cost of integrating handicapped children into the regular classrooms.

And while at the same time not only being mindful of the welfare of the handicapped but being mindful of the welfare of the entire class, that we would want to satisfy ourselves that a program of this type, that not only is it a benefit and assistance to the handicapped children placed therein but that the rest of the class is also reaping maximum benefit from it intellectually, socially, emotionally and physically.

So that, Mr. Chairman, in brief is what the \$125,000 evaluation project is all about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I want now to pursue a slightly different subject in respect to planning and research. I was surprised when the Minister indicated that the efforts and the interest of planning and research in respect to teacher training was not properly discussed in this department but should be in colleges and universities. Now it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there's a great deal of support for the premise that the teacher is the key to the quality of education in our system and it seemed like a very artificial sort of a situation where we couldn't discuss one of the major factors in the education equation, that is the qualifications of teachers, and the evaluation of teachers, and the training of teachers, and the certification of teachers, under the department which relies, I think, and which probably admits that the teachers themselves are the key to the kind of quality that we are looking for in our system.

So this led me, Mr. Chairman, to look at the organization charts, to see why this sort of artificial situation should have come about, and I have the annual report of the department and I find that there is no organizational chart in this report. I am unable to determine exactly how Planning and Research fits into your chart of authority in your department. There's no such problem with last year or the year before, or the year before that. Quite clearly the organization is set out so that the Minister is the top of the department and under him is the Deputy Minister. So that everybody presumably in his department clearly understands the line of authority and knows exactly where he stands.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm surprised that there is no such organizational chart included in his report this year and I would like to ask the Minister if he has one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do know that it always had been the practice to include an organizational chart within the annual report of the Department of Education. If there is not one, and I would have to re-check the annual report to satisfy myself that it is not written, that maybe the organizational chart is not there but there could be something written in there in lieu of an organizational chart. If there is not, then I would be quite ready and willing to provide the House with one, not tonight but at a later time and as soon as one could conveniently be made up.

In response to the first matter that the honourable member raised and that is the question that teacher training does not come under the Department of Education but rather that of Colleges and Universities. You know where it properly belongs is a question that I suppose has

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . never been resolved and probably never will be. You know there was a period of time where teacher training really came under two jurisdictions in a sense because a portion of the teacher training came under the, or within the jurisdiction of the university, within the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba, and there used to be a Manitoba Teachers College; prior to that it was known as the Manitoba Normal School which was operated by the Department of Education, and in that sense the Department of Education was responsible for a portion of the teacher training program. Now all the teacher training is at our universities and we no longer operate a school for which we are directly responsible, although the Minister of Education is still responsible for the certification of teachers, the teacher's certificate is still issued by the Department of Education. In other words, merely a diploma from a Faculty of Education at either of our universities per se does not qualify its recipient to teach. He presents that diploma or statement of marks which in turn, you know if satisfactory, it yields him a teaching certificate which is issued by the Minister of Education.

But with reference to the involvement of the Planning and Research branch within teacher training activity, the Brandon University and Native Teacher Education program, IMPACTE, the Winnipeg Centre project, and others, those are operated in conjunction with our university. The majority of them are with the University of Brandon and this is the reason why I mentioned earlier that it will be at least simpler and easier for us to deal with those programs when we come to Colleges and Universities rather than now, because the appropriation for those programs is within the Colleges and Universities Affairs Estimates and there is a closer tie-in with them.

But philosophically, I cannot strongly disagree with the honourable member that the matter of teacher training can probably, you know, just as strong a case can be made out to place the matter of teacher training within the Department of Education as could be within the Department of Colleges and Universities Affairs except when it comes to the practical end of things, when one realizes that teacher training is being offered by university and the universities have their budgeting problems, and so forth, and that this has to tie-in with their over-all operations and hence it ties in with the university.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I understand the Minister will have an organizational chart for us, and I have no difficulty with Colleges and Universities because there is in the last report we had an organizational chart and it shows that the Deputy Minister is the man who is in charge of all of the affairs within the department so that there's no confusion about the lines of authority.

Now, I would like to ask the Minister if, in his department, are all departments, including Research and Planning, responsible to the Deputy Minister? In other words has he one Deputy Minister who is responsible for the administration of all of his department?

MR. HANUSCHAK: As I am sure the honourable member will well know that there is an Education Department Act, and this is one of the few departments that does have a specific Act which deals to a fair degree with its structure and how it operates, and in this department, as in any other department, there is one Deputy Minister and, of course, the Deputy Minister is in charge.

MR. MCGILL: I understand then from the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that the Planning and Research division is responsible directly to the Deputy Minister and not directly to the Minister.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, the Planning and Research branch; there are Deputy Ministers, there are Assistant Deputy Ministers, Associate --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon?

A MEMBER: How many?

MR. HANUSCHAK: To the honourable member who is asking a question not from his seat, but I'll answer it. At the present time there are two Assistant Deputy Ministers, one Associate and a Deputy Minister.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't quite understand the answer. My impression is that he has in fact two departments within education. He has a department of Planning and Research and another department within. Now, if that's the case, that may account for some of the dissension and the state of morale within the general civil service within the Department of Education. I think that nothing could make a civil servant more unhappy than to not be certain exactly what the lines of authority are, and it was for that reason that I was looking in

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) . . . the report to find whether there was an organizational chart.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not any specific people in mind but I would like to be able to get from the Minister the clear assurance that he has one man who is responsible for all the administration in the Department of Education and that there is no division of authority directly underneath him because if there is then he might be introducing, without really intending to do so, some problems for the people in that department who perhaps prefer to work in an ordered and structured department rather than in one where there is confusion as to the lines of authority. I think for instance, Mr. Chairman that in a department of research and planning one might have a very superior person in respect to innovation, in respect to research and to new ideas generally; that is usually the kind of personality that one needs and certainly we need innovation, we need research, we need planning. But I would expect that it would be very unique if you were able to find within such a person who was peculiarly gifted in that respect any real interest in administration. That would be a very unique combination within one person. I believe it's safe to say that your department has a person who is very gifted in innovation, in research and in planning. He may not be very interested in administration. If that were the case then it might be the cause of some problems in respect to people who work in the department. So, if the Minister was putting two such key people in his department in that position, I think it would be perhaps introducing a real problem into his department. I would like to hear him comment on that.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is one Department of Education with numerous branches within it, and within the branches there are numerous sections within it, and perhaps we could do a bit of tidying up job on the terminology that we . . . if name tags do mean anything that are assigned to any particular branch, if they do mean anything then maybe we should do something about it and standardize the terminology that is used.

But there is one Department of Education, I repeat again, consisting of numerous branches which is headed . . . the man responsible to me for the over-all operations of the Department of Education, is the Deputy Minister of Education. There is an Associate Deputy Minister of Education and the division of duties, of responsibilities in brief is this, that the Associate Deputy Minister takes onto himself matters primarily related to program and curriculum and those Assistant Deputy Ministers responsible for it report to him, and matters either totally or in larger part related to finance go through their Deputy Minister and through their Assistant Deputy Minister and through the Deputy Minister. Now, I have mentioned earlier, and if a chart would help, a chart could be prepared but the directory of personnel and services which is listed at the beginning of the annual report in Roman numerals VII to X, do list the various branches and sections of the department under their respective Assistant Deputy Ministers.

So that may clarify it to some extent but I would certainly have no objection on this side, not that I would have no objection but as I have promised the honourable member, I will have an organizational chart prepared.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is because I am concerned about the state of things in his department that I must pursue this matter, and he can give me the assurance I need very quickly by simply telling me that the Associate Deputy in charge of Planning and Research reports to the Deputy Minister and not directly to the Minister.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make some comment. I think the Member from Brandon West has opened an interesting line of investigation in basically asking a question of who's in charge, but I must confess that my concern about who's in charge and who's giving direction focuses much more directly on the position of the Minister, rather than those who are responsible to him in the Civil Service, because I think that that is ultimately where the obligation resides in terms of directing the Planning and Research and policy-making of the department. I think that that is certainly the focus that I feel is the important one to ask in the examining of this particular aspect of the Department of Education's activities, that certainly it would appear to me that the priorities should be set by a minister, that we heard the Minister this afternoon expound with great pride and with a fair degree of partisanship that after all the reason why he got elected in Burrows, and why the government, I gather, was by and large elected, was the fact that the people of Manitoba knew exactly what he was planning to do in the area of Planning and Resources I assume then that if that was the case then

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . certainly the responsibility, either for its direction or misdirection, should fall very squarely on the very broad shoulders of the Minister of Education and should not necessarily . . . and while I think it's interesting to find out what the organizational arrangements may be, certainly the case should be made as to whether in fact the Minister and his Cabinet colleagues are at the present time providing this province with the kind of educational planning that's required to respond to the conditions that it must face.

In this case, Mr. Chairman, I find myself somewhat disturbed by some apparent verbal camouflage that the Minister has been engaging in pretty consistently through his remarks, where he seems to be deliberately evading the kind of question that has been put to him concerning whether and how the planning and policy-making of his department is facing up to perhaps the most serious question in the whole arena of education at the present moment, which is the degree to which the changes in the population and in the enrolment and the school divisions are radically changing to the point where many school divisions are losing large numbers of students, and that this is having major ramifications in the area of the supply of teachers, in the financing of schools, and the provision of quality education, and the development of new curriculums. The only answer we've been able to receive so far, which I grant, Mr. Chairman, came somewhat late in the evening last night when the Minister probably was somewhat tired after his rapid thumbing through his Estimates Book, so that it was probably just a matter of inadvertence more than anything, but he appeared when the question was posed to him about, what in fact was the Department of Education doing to cope with the problems of changes in the school population and the major shift of students in different divisions, seemed to indicate with a fair degree of smug satisfaction that in fact it wasn't a problem, and indicated to this committee that in fact the number of teachers, from 1968 I believe his figures were, have increased by 2800 and therefore that proved in unalterable fashion there was no problem. And if there was no problem there was no reason for his Planning and Resource and Policy Division to do anything about it. And so the whole thing was just sort of dismissed out of hand on the strength of that one statistic which he provided.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think it's important that we dig a little further into the kind of information the Minister may possess concerning that statistic and whether in fact that really is sufficient cause for totally ignoring certainly what is in my opinion a major area of concern in the field of education and one which is causing a great deal of consternation both by teachers and by parents in school divisions, teachers because they're having to face the very significant problem of the deterioration in the quality of education and the possible elimination of jobs, and the parents because they're having to foot the bill for trying to keep up with extra costs in those school divisions which in fact are experiencing a very sufficient decline.

Now let me suggest, Mr. Chairman, that I hope the Minister could provide us with somewhat more detailed answers concerning the situation so that when he produces that one grand aggregate figure which he pulled out of the hat or off the paper last night, where he could provide us more specifically with the kind of explanation that would accompany the kind of situation where the Winnipeg School Division has had a decline, I gather, between 1968 and 72, which are the latest figures, 73, of close to 15 percent in school enrolment, and that he'd be also able to tell us what the same effect would be in the School Division, for example, of Rolling River which experienced close to a 12 or 13 percent decline in enrolment, or say the same thing is true in the Norwood School Division which was close to a 10 percent decline. And what impact that kind of decline in enrolment has had for example upon the complement of teachers.

Again the Minister attempted to camouflage those facts by saying well the aggregate number of teachers is okay, we're still further ahead than we were in 1968. But I would suggest to the Minister that he doesn't really provide an explanation for what in fact are the kind of responses the school boards are being compelled to make in order to compensate for those declines in enrolment. Could the Minister tell us for example at this stage in 1974-75, how many teachers have not had their contracts renewed in those divisions in which enrolment is declining? Does he have those figures contained in his paraphernalia there that he could exactly tell us what in fact is going on, because I think the misleading aspect of his remarks last night was that while it is all right to pose the problem of the decline or change in school enrolment in an aggregate figure and average it out, what it doesn't say is that some school divisions are having very serious, are growing and expanding, certainly for example in some of the suburban areas of the city, but that in other school divisions in the central City of

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . Winnipeg and in rural areas, the school division is sadly declining. And how are these transfers being made? What happens to questions of seniority in school divisions of teachers; what happens with the kind of specializations that have occurred? To what degree has there been an increasing teacher load placed upon teachers in those particular divisions? Are they now being compelled to teach additional classroom time, and take on additional tasks? I think that comes down to the heart of the matter really in the Department of Education, and that it's primary concern must be the quality of education that the student experiences. And if all of a sudden we're having to start climbing up or doubling teacher's times, and adding to tasks in those areas, or in fact because the tax load in a particular division is no longer capable of supporting through a special levy specialized teaching functions in areas like drama and music, and physical education, and guidance counselling, and these other kinds of positions which provide really the quality of that special education, the total learning experience, how are those divisions themselves being affected by it?

And so I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister really requires, that he give more specific answers to this House concerning these problems that are being faced by those divisions which are in decline, and to demonstrate what kind of leadership he personally, or his government, is trying to provide in terms of adapting or trying to provide some way of coping with those problems.

I think it's important to point out, Mr. Chairman, at the same time that one of the curiosities or eccentricities of the populations situation in schools is that while we are going to probably experience close to a 30,000 decline in the student enrolment from about this period to about 1983 or 84, that after that period the school population will then begin to grow as the demography of the province changes, and as the large number of post-war babies who now will be reaching family stage, as they are now, that their children will be coming to the school division, at that point there will now be another pressure. I would hate to see us respond, Mr. Chairman, as we had to do in the 50's and 60's where we had crash programs and wild budgets, and all kinds of uncontrolled expenditures simply to catch up with that change.

I think that the very difficult and very serious problem of the Department of Education must be doing something about it, is to find some way of providing a transition period between the situation we now face where there is a decline in school enrolments, with subsequent serious pressures upon teachers, upon financing, upon boundaries and how that will then be able to, how that transition will be able to be stabilized and the school facilities and the teaching body being maintained, so that in the mid 1980's when the pressure is on again we will not have lost school facilities, or not have lost valuable experienced teachers simply because there has been no planning, or no research, or no analysis, as the Minister has confessed to this House, he's not doing at the present moment. I think that that is the kind of issue that the Minister should have provided us with answers last evening, instead I am afraid glossed over very quickly and somehow assuming that if you say a thing isn't a problem, it isn't a problem, and therefore he doesn't have to apply or devote any of the kinds of resources of his department to finding answers.

I think that that also, Mr. Chairman, brings to issue another statement made by the Minister this afternoon where he said well after all, what is the Department of Education? I mean, after all isn't most of the responsibility with school boards? I think, certainly from the words that we have heard from the Minister over the last day or so, I would hope to God the school boards are taking some action in this area because it's obvious this Department of Education isn't. But it does indicate to me, Mr. Chairman, that while there are many things the Department of Education is engaged in, which I'm not sure is its responsibility, the kind of trifling that it's doing, that it is not in fact applying itself to more serious problem. It's a curious kind of topsy turvy situation where here is the most important thing it could be addressing itself to in terms of the total totality of an education problem which affects the whole province and which requires the Provincial Government to take activity because it transcends different jurisdictions, it's not something that one school board can apply to, that problem itself the Minister has said, we're not doing anything about, but in those areas where there may be opportunity for more selective kind of innovation on the school board level undertaken by individual teachers, or school boards, or principals, or individual schools, dealing with certain specific problems, whether it's inner city problems or rural problems, that's where the Department of Education is sort of interfering, and rather than simply then transferring

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . funds back into those teachers and those school boards and say, okay you have a problem coping with employment in the inner city, or declining enrolments in these areas, work out solutions to your own problems, that's where in fact the kind of junior G-men move in and provide some answers to it. And so that seems to me kind of a Catch 22 situation, Mr. Chairman, that I find very hard to fathom, and it seems to me it comes back again to the question that I tried to raise last evening about who really is determining priorities for this department, and is the Minister at this stage taking the resources of his policy planning department, which I personally think is an important thing to have for any modern up to date Department of Education if it's doing what it should be doing.

And what seems to me very clear, Mr. Chairman, is that what we've heard from the Minister so far indicates that he frankly, and I put the onus of responsibility on him because he, as he says, he was elected to do the job, that he has simply misinterpreted or misjudged the priority and is simply allowing his planning department to apply themselves to tasks which they probably shouldn't be doing and in fact missing the real issue. I would hope that at this point the Minister might be able to at least give us some indication that over the next year by the time the estimates appear one year hence, that he will have shown his Planning and Priorities Department or Research Department to have undertaken a much more serious investigation into the whole question of the declining enrolments and the impact it has upon the supply of teachers, the quality of education in the school divisions and the very serious problems of financing that that declining enrolment is going to pose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge stated that in replying to him yesterday that in some fashion or another I did not give him the answers to the questions that he put to me but rather showered him with some verbal camouflage, and that I'm misinterpreting and misjudging the role and function of the Department of Education, particularly in the light of the fact that we are presently faced with a declining enrolment on an overall basis, but as I had indicated to the Honourable Member, and to the House last night, that coupled with the over-all declining enrolment, we're also faced with increasing enrolments in some school divisions, or in portions of some school divisions. So it's not just a general across the board decline. But it varies from school division to school division, and in fact it varies from one area of a school division to another, as I had indicated to the Honourable Member last night about the Winnipeg School Division itself, about three or four years there was considerable concern about the declining enrolment within the schools in the downtown area, and the predictions that were made at that time would have indicated that there would be, would result in countless numbers of classrooms being closed by this year. Well, the decline did not occur to that extent because of some of the recent immigration which had occurred over the past couple of years or so, and many of those people settled within that area and their children are attending school. So therefore any statistical analysis, and on the basis of which one may wish to do any scientific prediction, cannot be done with that extreme accuracy. But that does not mean that that type of analysis and research ought not be done and some prediction ought not be made for the future. Of course that has to be done, and that is being done to the best of our ability.

The Honourable Member also said that - and I will read Hansard very carefully when it comes out and I'm quite certain, I'm absolutely certain that at no time did I make any confession of my department not involved in any research. If there was some comment that I had made which the honourable member may have interpreted in that fashion, I would appreciate clarifying it if the honourable member had misunderstood it. Now at no time did I say, that after all what is the Department of Education, isn't most of the responsibility in the hands of the school boards? I did not say that, I said that there is a dual responsibility, and the responsibility of each is very clearly defined within the Public Schools Act and the Education Department Act, the role and function of the Department of Education, and that includes mine as its Minister, and the role and function of the school boards as prescribed to them by statute passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba. And of this we're always aware, and I'm certain that the honourable member is not suggesting, and if he is, well, now - no, I shouldn't say that I am certain because I can't be that certain of what the honourable member thinks. If the honourable member is proposing that we do away with the school boards and run all the schools directly by the Department of Education, well let him say so. But he hasn't said that, so I

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . really don't know what he thinks.

Now, the Honourable Member indicated that the predictions are that come '83, '84, the population decline which we are presently witnessing, may reverse itself, and well it may. And he goes on to ask me, how are we preparing for it? In brief, insofar as the existing school facilities that we have are concerned, one effective way of preparing yourself for it is to encourage and assist school divisions to operate such a school system that would be sufficient, that would have the flexibility built into it to adjust itself to meet the changing needs, and this is why we have been concentrating to a large extent on demonstration projects dealing with educational alternatives, with various styles and methods of delivery of an educational program, and with such that could be quickly and readily adjusted to meet the changing needs.

Then going back to his earlier comments insofar as the question of teacher over-supply is concerned, and well, is there really a teacher over-supply? Now the answer to that question is yes and no, and I'll explain that; I don't want to leave the impression that I'm trying to avoid answering the question. What happens, and this happens during the first few months of each year after the graduation of a class of Faculty of Education students, you will find an over-supply in the Winnipeg area. The teachers who may be unemployed at that particular point in time, may be resident here, but at the same time there are vacant classrooms or school divisions advertising for teachers in other school divisions of the province. One of the areas of the province that normally finds a greater measure of difficulty in attracting teachers are the school districts and divisions of northern Manitoba, and some of the more remote rural school divisions, and many of them were in a recruiting process, attempting to recruit teachers until very early in the commencement of the school year. There is also a short supply at the present time of specialists in various areas. One example that I could give, the field of special education. There is a shortage of teachers in that particular area, as well as in other specialist areas some school divisions do find difficulty in obtaining teachers for music, art, and so forth. Now as of September of last year, our information is that even in the City of Winnipeg there were only a handful of 1974 graduates of teacher training faculties which were not yet placed.

Then if I may go back to a sort of a general comment or criticism that the honourable member made with respect to the over-all operations of the Department of Education from a point of view, you know, does it have a unified thrust and a determination to act in a certain particular direction with certain specific aims and objectives for that particular department? I want to assure the honourable member that in matters of policy decision, or policy recommendation for my approval - and when I use the term "policy" I want to be very careful that I'm not talking about policy decisions that are made at the Cabinet level, but related more perhaps to administration, to the operations, to the over-all operations of the department. There is a policy council within my department headed by the Deputy Minister, and also the other members of it are his Associate and Deputy Ministers, and if there are matters dealing with any significant change in the operation of the department, or the implementation of any new course of action, or whatever, the decision or agreement on that has to be arrived at by the policy council consisting of the four or five key men responsible for the administration of the department. And then, if it's one that requires my approval, or requires Cabinet approval, then it comes to me for my consideration and my approval, and it either ends there, depending on its nature, or if I approve it, then I recommend it on to Cabinet for its consideration.

So via the policy council, and that probably is the key to the unification of all the branches within a department, not only Planning and Research but curriculum and all others within it, that gives it the unification in its thrust, in its general operations, and thus the unified and co-operative effort to deliver a one single co-ordinated program dealing with all the phases, all the facets of education, attempting to meet all the needs of education in all the areas for which we are responsible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Chairman, I don't think it's any accident we're spending a great deal of time on Planning and Research, because there's no one branch of the Department of Education that's caused such a degree of consternation in the whole public schools' educational system as this one branch has created since it's come into being. And undoubtedly many of the programs that it wishes to undertake, and so on, are credible objectives, but there has to be an awareness that the method by which the Public School System operates is such that

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . the Department of Education has vested responsibility with the school divisions of Manitoba to operate their affairs and to fulfill the objectives of the general curriculum set down by the Province of Manitoba through its Department of Education. But to a very large extent, what is happening, is if you have this multitude of programs that the Planning and Research seems to feel are important as far as they're concerned, but they don't appear to have any realization or any real grasp of how the system functions, that it's not good enough to spot a program or a problem and outline a solution to it, cast it onto the school divisions, and then walk away from it and look at another program. Now as a result of this, what is happening is you have the school divisions upset, not just with the educational programs but these programs wanting more statistics on teachers, and on the divisions, and the administrative staff they're required to look at to provide this information to the department, and all the rest, which are your administrative people, you also have the teachers in a state of reaction, I would say in the majority of cases, against the programs that you're turning out; now mainly because there seems to be a breach in the understanding of how the school system in Manitoba works, that the responsibility for making things run lies with the school divisions, and that there seems to be a complete misunderstanding of how you in the Department of Education level get the liaison necessary and the co-operation necessary to try some of these things out.

Now, furthermore, you can go to almost any school division in Manitoba and they'll tell you where the problems are and what needs to be tackled first to improve the educational system. All of the school divisions have always been under the burden of trying to do the things they want to do but doing them with inadequate funds, and rather than putting the funds into the school divisions, they're going into the Department of Education. If you look at the statistics alone, the number of school children have fallen off in the last five years; they're down about five percent in total of what they were in that period of time. The number of teachers has basically stayed fairly constant, very little change in the numbers of teachers, which is fine. But if you look at the Department of Education and you combine the Department of Education and the non institutional colleges and universities, you've gone in two years from 546 employees to 646, an increase of 100 employees, non institutional employees in your department. Now all of these aren't in Planning and Research granted, but you've gone up by a factor of 20 percent in the increase in your number of employees, at the same time as the school divisions are fighting the battle of trying to adjust numbers of students in classrooms - they're going down but not to the extent where they can amalgamate them to form other, to make two classrooms out of three, or three out of four, and this sort of thing, and they're caught in the bind. But you seem to be falling into this trap of Parkinson's law where the size of the admirality grows inversely proportional to the size of the navy; you're growing at the top, you're shoving these programs on to the school divisions with no follow-up, and no budget to carry them out in the school divisions. And I don't think there's ever been a degree of unrest in the Public School System of Manitoba as there is right now, and a very large portion of that lies right in the activities of your Planning and Research Department.

Now let's recognize some of the good moves you've made. The Child Development Service move and the support that's gone to that in the last few years and this year included, is a good strong move, but it's something that was always known was needed, it was a matter of providing the budget to do it. Now it doesn't come under Planning and Research, it comes under Curriculum in your budget. So Planning and Research, or Child Development Services in total this year gets a million dollars, a million one. That's a total budget to look after all these particular problems, and there are problems in every classroom with children that can't cope with regular curriculums, either through a physical handicap, a mental handicap, a cultural handicap, or some other sort of a handicap. But that particular group is going at solving those problems, and they're doing a good job, because the school boards have known and the school system, the Public System, has known for the last decade that a particular problem existed there and they could never get at it. Now what you're taking, and you're building up this staff at the top, not so much in the area where you can actually get at the problem, building it up at the top, you have a Planning and Research Branch itself that has a budget larger than Child Development Service, whom all of this whole system is supposed to benefit, cranking out these programs and not getting at the problems as they would be defined by the school divisions.

So in conclusion, out of all that has been said in this debate, there is less to justify the activities of the Planning and Research Division than there is to justify it. Listening to this

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . entire debate one can't help but come to the conclusion that there is not sufficient argument put forth to justify the type of budget that you have shown here in Planning and Research, and it isn't alone, there's part of this in Colleges and Universities evidently too that you're adding into the total staff. So, Mr. Chairman, there is a real fundamental basic problem in what's going on in Planning and Research, and at this point there is not sufficient justification to support the budget that's before us in these estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Honourable Member for Riel was here for the entire debate which has taken place up until now in my estimates, or not, but it doesn't matter. Whatever has been said on either side of the House will appear in Hansard.

He started off by saying that the projects, or rather that the Planning and Research Branch has caused such consternation amongst someone or another, I don't know who. And of course he goes on to say that although many of the programs appear to be credible, but he is critical of the method by which the Planning and Research Branch operates. And he reminds the House of the jurisdiction vested in the school boards, which I do not dispute, which was a point which I had made less than four or five minutes ago in response to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

But there's one point that he overlooks, accidentally or otherwise I do not know, or perhaps he is not fully aware with how the Planning and Research Branch operates, and if he is not, and for his benefit and that of the other members, I would like to take a moment or two to inform the House, and impress upon the House, that insofar as any demonstration project is concerned in the schools of the Province of Manitoba there is no project, absolutely no project that has been established in any school, school division, in any school, without the school division's approval, absolutely none. Every project has had the approval of a school division. There isn't one where someone from Planning and Research has marched in and said to the teaching staff, okay, move over, make room for me, I'm coming in to do whatever. All such projects have been thoroughly discussed with the school boards and their administrative staffs, their teachers, prior to their institution. So therefore there's absolutely nothing has happened that would create an impression that somewhere within the Province of Manitoba there are schools or portions of schools, or some programs within schools, run by the Department of Education. That just does not happen, and it hasn't happened anywhere.

Now that refers to projects which are limited in scope to a particular school division, or in some cases it may be to one, or to two or three school divisions, if it's some project that's operated on a co-operative basis. But even then, there's agreement with all the participating school divisions. On the other hand, if it's a project which perhaps is of a research nature, either to design a model for the evaluation of a school program, or if it's to design some management system, or whatever, then in that case we work in very close liaison in co-operation with those organizations that may be involved in that particular project, be it the trustees, or the teachers, or the superintendents or the school business officials, or any number of them. So it is in that manner that demonstration projects are launched in the Province of Manitoba, but not as the Honourable Member for Riel may want us to believe, that Planning and Research staff simply march into a school division and say, this is what we're going to do within your bailiwick, that does not happen. Nor do we simply, as the honourable member indicates, simply identify a problem, design a program for it and cast it in a school division and walk away from it. That does not happen either. The funding that is provided for demonstration projects, here again the budget is arrived at, working in close liaison with the participating school division, or the . . .

MR. GRAHAM: Hogwash. Pure hogwash.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. If the honourable members wants to express his views, I'd be happy to hear the honourable member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've listened to the Minister, and I say again, it's pure hogwash what he's trying to tell us. We have seen in the school divisions exactly what he tells us, is not happening, and for him to stand up here and tell us that this is done only with complete approval of the school boards and everything. I tell you again, Mr. Minister, that is pure hogwash. I can tell you when Pelly Trail, with your REAP program, and

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) . . . you ask why Pelly Trail would not accept the REAP program, go and talk to them, go and talk to them! Pelly Trail would not --(Interjection)-- talk about contradictions. The Minister is the one that is contradicting. --(Interjection)-- Yes, but you instituted it first and then they wanted to know what it was all about. So then they said they would have no part of it, after you had put it in there.

MR. HANUSCHAK; Mr. Chairman --(Interjection)-- No, I will respond to the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. I yielded the floor - no I didn't yield the floor because there is no yielding of the floor in Committee of Supply. Honourable members can speak as frequently as they wish to.

When the REAP program was instituted, there were discussions and plans and preparations and exploratory measures to determine the need for REAP program and how it could be brought about, and this was entered into with many school divisions, and some school divisions, after examining the program, examining their own needs, said "No, this is not for us." Pelly Trail happened to have been one of those school divisions. Eight other school divisions said, "Yes this is what we want." And the honourable member, if he was here this afternoon, he would have heard me read letters into the record from two school divisions commending the program, one from White Horse Plains and one from Turtle Mountain School Division. However, the honourable member . . . I don't have to answer the honourable member's question - I thought that he had put a question to me - because he contradicted himself by saying that plans had been under way and Pelly Trail School Division did not enter into the REAP program, and this of course bears out with what I had said earlier, Mr. Chairman, that any programs that are entered into are entered into with the consent and approval of all participating parties.

The Honourable Member for Riel also made reference to increase of staff within Planning and Research, and he quoted the figure of 20 percent. Earlier this afternoon I had gone through our staffing and figuration in complete detail, and I may be out by two or three percent, Mr. Chairman, but the honourable member may recall that a large portion, if not the entire portion of this 20 percent, is the establishment of the Native Education Branch this year, which is within Planning and Research, and that would account for the 20 percent.

Then he made reference to Child Development Services. Now there will be opportunity to debate the Child Development Services at a more appropriate time when we reach that item on the Estimates, but at this point in time, as it relates to Planning and Research, I would just simply want to point out - and this accounts for the difference in staff - in recent, during the past years, many school divisions have indicated a desire to operate their own Child Development Services program rather than simply have our staff come into their school division from time to time, and in rural Manitoba this is done on a co-operative basis. One of the most recent groups of school divisions which entered into such an arrangement were east of the Red River: Agassiz, Lord Selkirk, Red River, and there was a fourth school division, I believe. It could have been Seine River, I would have to check on that. But there were those three, which entered into a co-operative arrangement for the delivery of Child Development Services on the understanding that. . . So what we will do is we'll provide them with the necessary funds to hire whatever staff they need, and their staffing needs will be determined by careful and close study. So therefore that staff will not show up in our Estimates, neither the funds for them. It will show up in the way of grants somewhere in the Estimates but not as part of salary for staff.

Another group of four school divisions which have entered into a similar co-operative arrangement for the delivery of Child Development Services are in southwestern Manitoba; Antler River, Souris Valley, Fort La Bosse, and Turtle Mountain School Divisions, which have worked out a similar arrangement.

So therefore, that being so, some of the Child Development Services is still being delivered by the Province of Manitoba through its Department of Education and some at the school division level on a co-operative basis. Therefore one cannot make a direct comparison in terms of staff.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister on that point, how many people would those four school divisions then employ on that program?

MR. HANUSCHAK: On the Child Development Services program?

MR. CRAIK: Yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The east one is three, that I've mentioned; Agassiz, Lord Selkirk and Red River, and I believe it was Seine River, and I'm advised two in the southwest.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister then is underlining the problem. You're solving the Child Development Services area with two people over four entire school divisions.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, those two people will act as resource personnel in a co-ordinative capacity, and this is merely the start of the development of a Child Development Services program, which no doubt, as the program grows and develops, as the school divisions, which the honourable member himself emphasized and stressed in his remarks to the House earlier, that this is the responsibility, if the school divisions wish to assume it, to take on upon themselves, we're prepared to give them that, and it's in this fashion, at this rate, that they wish to develop their own Child Development Services program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to ask the Minister, did I understand him to say today that the Planning and Research Branch salaries of \$333,000 cover 60 people, approximately?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Chairman, I never said that.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON: Could you tell me how many there is at the present time in that particular figure?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Approximately 30, as I had indicated to the House earlier. I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, I could check back on my notes, but as I recall, it was approximately one-half in the Planning and Research Branch and one-half that are connected with specific projects.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON: I'd like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, and I only have the Public Accounts, as you know, to 1974: In 1974 the Other Expenditures for the department were \$431,263. Of that figure, the first line of the item (b) in the 1974 accounts is Wages and Other Assistance is \$203,184, and you've got a professional fees in here of \$16,757, which is close . . . Well, it's \$220,000, which is half, which is half of the Other Expenditures. Now, in this budget we have before us, the Estimates, you've got \$1.3 million in Other Expenditures, is half of that money in wages and other assistance and professional fees.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Chairman, the bulk of that is in the form of grants to school divisions, as I had indicated to the House yesterday, and I had given an itemized listing of it.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give us some idea of how many people, other than the people employed by Planning and Research, will be paid under the item Wages and Other Assistance in this year's budget.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, not a single one other than those employed by Planning and Research will be paid out of this appropriation.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON: Well, in that case, Mr. Chairman, you have dropped the program of Wages and Assistance to Others in this year. You have no appropriation for wages or assistance to others as far as research is concerned.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Wages and assistance to others? Whom? I'm not quite sure whom the honourable member means by others.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I said, the only thing that I have to refer to, we don't have the year ending '75, we have the year ending 1974, and the Other Expenditures, as I said, was \$431,000, and that is all broken down in the book. The first line says Wages and Other Assistance \$203,000, and I'm reading from the Public Accounts book that was issued to us this year. Now, you don't have anything in your . . . What the Minister is saying then, you have nothing in your \$1.3 million for Wages and Other Assistance.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Just let me double check to make certain that I . . . Yes, the \$1.3 million, as I had explained to the members of the House yesterday, \$1,118,800 is in the form of grants to various school divisions, as well as some of them would be to the Association of School Trustees, I suppose, and the Teachers' Society. The bulk to school divisions, of course, of \$1,118,000, and \$213,700 is the Native Education Branch. Now, I must confess to the honourable member that I and my staff would have to cross check the manner in which we have

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) our Estimates Book set up with the manner in which the Provincial Auditor reported, and in fact would have to compare that with the Estimates Book for the fiscal year on which the Provincial Auditor reported, to reconcile one with the other and be able to answer the honourable member's question more specifically. Perhaps if he could rephrase his question in some other fashion, I would certainly do my best to attempt to answer.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll just refer the Minister to it and he can write this down. Page 93 of the Public Accounts, year ending March 31st, 1974. It's No. 2, and it says Other Expenditures, which is there, Wages and Other Assistance \$203,000, and that's over and above the wages, the salaries that are shown.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 46. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, while the Minister is finding that information, I just am saying it would appear that wages and other assistance appears under Other Expenditures in the Estimates we have here, and the \$1.3 million, I was wanting to know what would be in that particular figure for wages and other expenditures, or will we expect not to see it in the Public Accounts when they come out the next time?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I really do believe that one would have to check with the Provincial Auditor's office, because after further thought and listening to the honourable member, it would appear to me that it's conceivable - and I don't know; I would want to check - but it's conceivable that the Provincial Auditor, in reporting in Public Accounts, may have gone through the grants that were paid to the school divisions and lifted out the salary components that they had contained within it for Planning and Research staff, and therefore that figure may read high. But I regret that I do not believe that I will be able to get the honourable member the answer to his question today. Or perhaps in Public Accounts.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's kind of hard to understand that the . . . he had gone through looking for grants, because Section (c) of those same Public Accounts shows Research Grants of \$643,955. So that's a separate item.

Mr. Chairman, also regarding the grants, we show it in 1974 as \$643,000, and when we take a look at our 1974 Estimates it was \$400,000, and if there was an over-expenditure, fine, but an over-expenditure would be covered by warrants and the only warrant I can find in 1974 is in December, 1973 for \$150,000 for Planning and Research, so we still haven't got up to the \$655,000. But then when I come across to the 1975 Estimates that were presented to us, I see Research is \$293,000, and then when I get the Estimates that were presented to us this year, I would assume that the 1975 column would be the same as the 1975 Estimates we received, but Research Grants are \$43,500. I would have assumed that those two figures should match up.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, while I'm getting the explanation why \$40,000 instead of \$43,500, I want to make one further comment that here we are comparing Estimates whereas the Provincial Auditor does not audit estimates but rather he audits actual expenditures, so therefore I would like to impress upon the honourable member that to obtain that type of a comparison and an analysis, I would not be able to do it in the House here during the debates on estimates. However, going to the items shown as for the Item 2(c), Research Grants of \$40,000; last year \$43,500. Really, it's retaining the research programs that we fund with various other national organizations, four, six, five thousand dollars and the like; and the level of support is the same except for the fact that there was SACU, which was the standardized test for admission to universities - what's the full - Standards for Admissions to Colleges and Universities, SACU, which is a program which we had supported and it's on the decline, in fact being eliminated across Canada; and we used to support it to the extent of 3.5 thousand dollars a year, and that is out and hence the difference between 43.5 and down to 40,000.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am looking at a column that says year ending March 31, 1975, \$293,500 for Research Grants. I'm looking at a column here that says the year ending 1975, March 31, 1975, \$43,500.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I really would appreciate the Honourable Member's assistance. I do not see the \$293,000 figure. --(Interjection)-- Oh, for the year ending March 1974.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well it must have been.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could we just have one honourable member on his feet at one time, and the recorder can accurately record each member's remarks? The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the estimates ending year 1975 right here says \$293,500 in Research Grants. On the estimates that I have received here for the year ending 1976, but on this column here, 1975, I see \$43,500. Now that is in no way close to what the estimates in 1975 said. Where have the large amount of moneys for research grants gone?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I understand the question the honourable member is posing. My Deputy Minister is . . . So it's \$250,000 less, that's the point that the honourable member is making, if I understand him correctly. --(Interjection)-- No, it's not that it's nothing, it's very significant, and I'm sure that this can be accounted for and it must appear elsewhere in the estimates.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I just would like to make some comments regarding the - I would like the answers to where that money now appears because other expenditures are now up to \$1,332,000. This would seem like - my leader had mentioned today of people being brought in and paid on contract to be running all over doing research and surveys, and this money as far as I can see should be channelled back into the school districts for research under the . . . Let the School Districts research the problems within them and I think . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: If the honourable member will allow me?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes. The \$250,000 which was included in the 293 - or let me put it this way, \$293,000 shown in the previous estimates book included \$250,000 REAP grants. As I had indicated to the honourable members yesterday, they show up under Other Expenditures.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was saying that the money that is being placed for what I call other wages and expenditures, I believe, shouldn't be going to make the department top heavy but should be going to the school boards to let them do some research on the real problems that they have. The Minister has listed many items of research that has been carried on but, quite frankly, the ones the Minister has been discussing are not the ones of concern to people that have children in the education program. First of all, Mr. Chairman, you know, I would really like to see some research done on why boys and girls in Grade 10 and 11 can't read or spell. And that is one of the severe problems when you check with teachers today and you find a child having trouble, one of the first problems that they come up with, is they cannot read or spell, and there is no way you can do school work if you can't read or spell - and I don't see anything in there for research on that type of thing.

The other area as we have been told, that there have been more people, school rolls are down and I said last year, Mr. Chairman, that the boys and girls in the school system today in the high schools are bored, they're bored stiff. And one of the main reasons is that you cannot have good education without discipline. Education without discipline is education for a few, because the boys and girls that don't need discipline will work hard at any time. But believe me, the average boy or girl, and mainly the boys, will figure out ways, figure out ways of how not to do their school work. I think there might be some of us in this room that did the same thing. --(Interjection)-- Yes, that probably is. But I don't see any research being done on this. On the program that you've presented to the school boards on the basis of pick your own curriculum, do your own thing type of thing in school is having boys and girls get bored and coming out of school not prepared for public life, and I don't see any research being done on that. The semester system is one that a lot of people enjoy and like. But I'll tell you one thing, I have seen boys and girls that have taken the semester system and worked out for the first part of the year, they worked out that they had one class a day and then they'd cram the rest in because they only took one subject up until the end of December and then took some more after December. I don't see any research on the semester system. And on the semester system where you can go to school at 2:00 o'clock and come home at 4:00 o'clock and sit in the poolroom when you're not at school or sleep in in the morning when you're not at school is something that is not good for education, there is no discipline in that. (Hear. Hear.)

So, Mr. Chairman, I really have to agree with my colleague from Riel when he states very clearly that your research - and I won't call it hogwash - is full of bunk. I think your

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) research program, your program without discipline in schools, you should be researching that to see if we need a little more for those students who will not discipline themselves. And you don't have to be a student that has a bad mental problem or a physical problem to not want to do work in school. The average boy or girl will outsmart the teacher or outsmart your system, and your system is built to be outsmarted by the students and they will do it without some sort of discipline in the school system - and I don't see any research on that. Mr. Chairman, the research that I have had presented before us today is basically a waste of money compared to the concerns of parents about their children in school. And the Minister just believes, firmly believes that the boy or girl will go to school and happily carry on day after day studying, well he's dreaming. He may think that they should, every boy or girl should go to school and work hard. But you try and convince them of that when they're 15 or 16 years old, without some sort of discipline, and those are the concerns of the people in the school, of the parents with children going to school - and I don't see anything being done for it in research in his estimates.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The Honourable Member had better check to see what the majority of the kids of that age are doing, to see whether they are in fact in the poolrooms. Now maybe the kids that he knows are, but I can tell him that the vast majority are not. That if - the honourable member will have his opportunity . . . No, not unless if he hasn't concluded his remarks. I've heard, yes, I can recall having heard this speech last year.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You sat down for the Member for Birtle-Russell. I'd be very prepared to sit down and listen to more of your doubletalk.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Why can't kids read and spell? Why did the business community ask the same question when you were going to school? Why couldn't you read or spell? Or I?

And I could bring in evidence to show the honourable member that the same question has been raised probably since Day One of this world, the complaint that kids aren't taught to read and spell. And back at the turn of the century the same criticism was levelled at students even then, even before the honourable member was born, that kids weren't taught to read and spell. You know, it's very easy to stand up and, you know, make this wild accusation, why can't kids learn to read and spell? Now what evidence does the honourable member have that they can't learn, that they can't read and spell? I would suggest to the honourable member that probably they can read and spell a hell of a lot better than kids in yours and my generation were able to.

And then, the second paragraph of the honourable member's speech from last year, that kids are bored. Which ones and how many? And for every kid that's bored I can show the honourable member 25 kids who are not bored. Maybe that's the extent to which the honourable member knows the younger generation of this province. The two or three that he sees hanging around a poolroom, and I don't know who they are, and he assumes that all the rest of them are the same type. And I would like to suggest to the honourable member the vast majority of the kids are busy home tonight doing their homework, and they're going to be up doing their homework a hell of a lot later than after this House rises, at work on an assignment for tomorrow. And that's how kids work in school today. And that's how they work. If the honourable member doesn't believe it, just go up and check to see what the kids are doing today before he gets up in the House and makes, you know, these wild accusations; kids are bored, kids can't spell, can't have education without discipline. But the honourable member is very careful not to define discipline. What does he mean by discipline? I suppose he means by discipline, the rod. But I would like to --(Interjection)-- Yes. Or the honourable retired member of the RCMP, or the Northwest Mounted Police, or whichever police force he served with. The strap, that to him is discipline. What about teaching self-discipline? What about teaching a little bit of self-discipline? What about teaching a little bit of responsibility? Maybe that's what's being taught in the school system today. Now the honourable member probably isn't aware of that. And maybe that's what the kids have learned, and hence there's no need for the use of the rod and the strap to the same extent as the teachers may have had to use it during the days when the honourable member was enrolled in school.

The semester system. The honourable member says, oh, he knows that kids have worked out a way to beat the system. They enroll one class a day for one semester, then cram the rest into the second semester. Impossible. Absolutely impossible. It is absolutely impossible because the timetable just does not permit it. Not unless they're enrolled in day

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) school and evening school, then they end up working 24 hours a day. But during the normal school hours that is just absolutely impossible. If the honourable member doesn't believe it, take a look at the timetable of any student enrolled in the semester system, and with an elementary knowledge of arithmetic he'll be able to discover that.

And kids outsmarting the system. I would suggest to the honourable member as I mentioned to him last year, perhaps he had forgotten that in his day and mine, that's how many kids got through school. Yes, they learned how to outsmart the system. You know, they learned to pass exams, fooled around all year long, hung around the poolroom perhaps and then figured out the odds, what the likelihood was of being asked a question on this topic or that one or the other come June and they took their chances, prepared themselves for that, wrote their exams and I suppose on the law of averages, the majority of them passed. That's what happened to them then as opposed to devising a system which is in effect today, where students work day in and day out, where they're marked on their assignments that are given to them on a weekly, bi-monthly basis, or whatever, or related to each chapter or unit of their studies, a far more effective and meaningful way of studying and learning than the old system that the honourable member for Assiniboia bemoans the loss of.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's very obvious . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: I do apologize, I do apologize to the Member for Assiniboia, I ought to have referred to the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I didn't hear any apology to me, Mr. Chairman, but we'll leave it out. Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister and I certainly don't agree, that's obvious. But where we talk about discipline, he uses the old adage which everybody brings in when you talk about discipline, oh you want the strap back. Nobody mentioned the strap. I said discipline in school, to attend classes and be there when you should be there. Right. And there is no real discipline on that basis right now. The Minister says, go out and see. The Minister, I don't know, I'll tell him - I've got a boy 16 years old, I've got a boy 18 years old and a daughter 16 years old, and they've all got friends. And I see those kids walking around, all of their friends, bored to death to go to school. Now he says, go out and see it - why the devil don't you get off your butt and go out and see it? Now . . . passing. He talks about passing, beating the system by writing an examination. Can you tell me what's better to know that if you have any knowledge you're not just to be examined to see if you have any knowledge or not? It doesn't really matter how you get the knowledge, whether - so you got to have an examination! Now he turns around and he says, because he writes a certain amount of essays, because he does this during a year or because he does that during a year, he passes. The kids are making patsies out of your system and you're just sitting back and watching it. And I don't care if you do get up and get mad about it, because it's absolutely true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, I only have one, and I'm not too sure that this is the right section to ask the question under, but I'd like to ask the Minister if confluent education comes under Planning and Research. If it doesn't - confluent education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BLAKE: What section would I discuss that under?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Child Development Services, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Chairman, I want to pose some questions to the Minister in regard to the REAP program that has been discussed so much here today. I will apologize that I wasn't here yesterday, unable to be here, and I hope that I'm not posing questions that may be repetitious. However, I would like to ask the Minister how many divisions in the Province of Manitoba were approached by his department to accept the services of the REAP program. I understand in the report there are eight that have now a contractual agreement, and of the total numbers how many turned the program down?

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, when did the REAP program commence? I don't know whether that's too difficult; if they all started the same time across the province, or maybe they varied at different times. How much money was involved in the first

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) contract for those that have accepted the contractual arrangements? Also I would like to ask, when are these programs completed? In other words, how long is this REAP program going to continue in the various divisions that have accepted that program? And I would like to know the total cost to each division, that is the total amount of money, the grants being appropriated.

Also, I would like to know how many people are employed directly and being funded by the Department of Education in each of the eight areas that I see here that do have the contract. Also, I would like to know who appoints the co-ordinators of the respective divisions to have those contracts.

Those are some of the questions I would like to pose at the present time to the Minister, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I should firstly tell the honourable member that the guidelines for the REAP program was that this was to be a program of assistance in attempting to identify alternative methods of delivering educational programs in those school divisions where a majority, I believe, or at least half of the schools were small schools. The honourable member is correct, there are eight divisions. Then there were three other school divisions approached. One school division, as the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell had indicated, had rejected entry into the REAP program; two other school divisions, instead of going into the REAP program, have undertaken another type of project, one of a co-operative sharing of services amongst themselves.

Now, the honourable member asked when the program commenced. I can tell the honourable member just off the top of my head that six of the contracts were signed about a year ago, a year ago about now, a year ago last month. So therefore those six are really in their first year of operation and two must be in their second year of operation. The funding for the current fiscal year is \$275,000, for the previous year \$250,000, as I had mentioned earlier in response when we were dealing with another matter. The co-ordinators are appointed by the school division where the co-ordinator is located. In other words, each school division has its own co-ordinator and that division appoints the co-ordinator. There are four staff in Planning and Research, four professional staff, who are assigned to work with the REAP program.

The grants on the first school division basis for the current year would be somewhere in the order of, well, roughly \$275,000 divided by eight, but the amounts aren't exactly equal, neither are all school divisions the same in size, so they would range from \$35,000 to \$45,000 per school division. The Tiger Hills REAP program would be the first to terminate in November of 1975, and the others would terminate in March of 1976. Just a minute now . . . yes, in March of '76 because it was in November of '74 that Tiger Hills entered into a REAP agreement and then, as I indicated, the other school divisions, it was about a year ago about now, some time in March, it will be in March of 1976.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for the information he has given me, but there are a few clarifications. He mentions Tiger Hills. Would he double check on this? He says the second contract, I believe I understood him to say, expires in March of 1976. Is it not June of 1976? Secondly, he mentions four co-ordinators. Is that four co-ordinators to cover the whole eight divisions? Or is that four per division?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Chairman, that's four from the departmental staff, but each program within each school division has a co-ordinator of its own, which is hired by the school division. The honourable member may be correct that instead of March, right, that it may well be June, because the school year ends in June and it's only a matter of three months and . . . You see, we had thought in terms of a two-year program, two years on the assumption that all arrangements could have been worked out in time to set the program in motion on September 1st. Now, this didn't work out that way. Tiger Hills was quite anxious to move in on this and they were ready in November, they entered into the contract in November, but before the program really - and that was the first one, so we're really pioneering the whole program in Tiger Hills, so therefore it was felt that it would be best to continue with until June of 1976, because even though the contract was signed in November it didn't really get under way until some time later in the year.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, then I would like to ask the question, just to make

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd). . .

certain that I'm clear on this matter, when the whole program was first approached to, say, Tiger Hills - and I'll use this one as an example - was it the intention, or was it the understanding by the school division, when the officials of his department went out, that they were going to provide a co-ordinator of their choice, or was that definitely made understood to the school division board that they would have that choice to decide on themselves and not the department? This is one thing I wanted to get clear as far as I'm concerned.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I could double check. There's an agreement signed by the school division and ourselves. Now, my recollection is - I don't have a copy of the agreement with me, but I do know that the selection of the co-ordinator is by the school division and there may be a provision in there that their choice of co-ordinator has to meet with our approval, and after all, we're funding for that, you know, that portion of the operation.

MR. EINARSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make sure that I understood the Minister and that it would come from him saying this, and this is very ambiguous the way his response is coming up until the present time. And so the other thing I wanted to ask him, now, and we'll use Tiger Hills again as an example, and he says the contract expires in 1976. What happens after that?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, as I have indicated to the honourable member I do believe that the contract will be continuing until June of that year because of the fact that it started in mid-term and I wish to repeat again that the selection of a co-ordinator is by the school division, subject to the approval by the Department of Education. In other words, we don't hire him, the school division says we want so and so, and because he's co-ordinating a program funded by us, then naturally I think all of us would expect us to give our approval to the hiring of that person once that is done, but there has been no problem in the hiring of co-ordinators.

. continued on next page

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 46. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I've waited quite patiently and I would like to ask the Minister a few questions regarding the REAP program. Is the cost of the co-ordinator born entirely by the school division, or is it covered under the grants on this special program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The co-ordinator I suppose for all intents and purposes could appear on the payroll of the school division but the payment of his salary comes out of the contract funds that we provide. They support the hiring of a full-time project director or co-ordinator and support funds to organize community school groups, to train staff and community people, initiate and test locally developed alternatives, improve division-wide and inter-division co-operation, communication and action. So the grant covers all of those items that I've mentioned.

MR. GRAHAM: Another question to the Minister. Of the four staff members, if through the year their attendance is required in one of the eight school divisions under this, is the cost of their services charged to the school division?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GRAHAM: In the travel of the four staff members, are Manitoba Government Air Services used to any great extent?

MR. HANUSCHAK: It would be quite unlikely, Mr. Chairman, because Government Air Services is primarily for transportation in Northern Manitoba and in the southern regions - I'm sorry - and within this part of Manitoba, most of the places are just as easily, if not more readily, accessible by automobile.

MR. GRAHAM: If members of the staff did use government air services, would that require the approval of the Minister, or of the head of that department, before they could use Government Air Services?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I don't believe so, Mr. Chairman, I think that this branch, as any other branch, uses its discretion in the use of Government Air Services. And while I don't want to, and I don't have to speak for the Minister responsible for Government Air Services, but I do know that he is responsible for Government Air Services, as anxious as he may be to see to it that Government Air Services is paying its own way, but at the same time he would not wish to see the service abused.

MR. GRAHAM: Could the Minister indicate to us the total cost of Government Air Services up to date by members of the REAP program?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I think that may be more appropriate that the honourable member were to file an Order for Return for that type of information because it's unlikely that our travel expenses would be categorized on that particular basis. But even if they were, I could assure the honourable member that if there were any charges for Government Air Services, which I doubt very much, but if there were they would be negligible.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister then if when two of the staff members visited Pelly Trail School Division by Government Air Services, then the Department of Education was not billed with the cost of that flight?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, the cost of that would be born by the branch of course. Now, on that particular instance, if there were two members who had to use Government Air Services to fly to Pelly Trail School Division, at this point in time I cannot tell why it was that those two staff people had to fly Government Air Services. I would suspect that probably the reason was that there must have been a meeting date set up in Pelly Trail for a given time and they had some other commitments which kept them in Winnipeg up to a point in time that would have made it impossible for them to drive up by automobile and they flew Government Air Services, or else the other way around, they had to return to Winnipeg, or to proceed to wherever else at a faster pace than an automobile would have carried them.

MR. GRAHAM: It's quite within their power then to, when they're out there for say two days, to rent a motor vehicle for their conveyance within the school division while they're there. That would be quite proper would it?

MR. HANUSCHAK: If they did not have a vehicle at their disposal, and if there was not a Provincial Government vehicle available for their use at that point in time, at that location, and if their work made it necessary for them to visit a number of points and the automobile was

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) the way to get around to visiting those places, those people, then I would think that that would have been a proper expenditure. For them, as for any other member of Civil Service, they are governed by the same administration manual, same provisions in the administration manual as any other member of the public service.

MR. GRAHAM: And then again to call the Government Air Services to return them to Winnipeg, that would be a logical charge to put through again, would it be?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, the same response to that question would apply as the one to the question put to me with respect to flying Government Air Services to Pelly Trail School Division.

MR. GRAHAM: . . . the Minister indicate what the cost of the Government Air is, the cost per mile for a flight of that nature?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I would suggest that would be a question more properly directed to the Minister in charge of the Manitoba Government Air Services.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I raise these questions just to be sure in my own mind that the money that we are allocating to a program such as REAP, that the money is spent wisely, that the cost of travelling by car from Winnipeg to Pelly Trail School Division for a couple of days and then returning, would be comparable to the cost of getting a government plane to fly you out and then renting a car for a couple of days at probably 75 to 100 dollars a day; and then getting a government aircraft out again to bring them back. I would assume that that cost would be very comparable to that of driving a car out from Winnipeg and return. If it is not, then maybe the Minister would be checking into it to make sure that we are getting the most economical use of the money that we are appropriating here for programs of this nature. I would suspect - and I'm not an authority on aircraft and charges - but I would assume that it would probably cost about \$500 for an aircraft to go to Pelly Trail and return, and then you add \$150 for the use of a car for a couple of days, and then another \$500 to get it back out, I think that's rather expensive.

And when you could probably use a government car and travel out and return for \$75.00, then people in the Province of Manitoba begin to ask questions about the cost of some of these programs. And that, Mr. Chairman, may just be one of the reasons why some of the school divisions are a little reluctant to enter into programs such as the REAP program, when they see extravagant waste of money, authorization, which the Minister says he doesn't know who authorizes it but he's sure they can get it if they want it, whether it is needed or not, Mr. Chairman, these are some of the questions that people are asking. And so I ask the Minister that when some of these programs, and some of the activities within his department, are allowed to go on in this manner, then perhaps there should be a check made to make sure that we're getting value for the dollars we're spending. And this is the only reason why I ask, raise the matter at this time, to ensure that we are getting full value for the dollars that we are spending. And so, Mr. Speaker, that is why I raise it at this time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister previously said that all these programs are thoroughly discussed with school boards before any activity goes on at that time, sir, I said "hogwash", because we know on many occasions that the school boards do not know what is going on under the REAP program, that there is activity going on there that they know nothing about, there is no consultation, and this is why the school boards in this province are somewhat reluctant to become involved. The Minister said there was eight programs. He said that was a year ago. There are still only eight. If the program is that good, I would suspect that most of the school divisions would have signed up for it by now, but he has told us that there has been no further contracts signed in the past year.

When the Member for Brandon was talking about evaluation of programs, I wonder if this program has been evaluated, in the light of the fact that the school boards don't seem to be interested in accepting it any more. Perhaps that is one of the programs that maybe should be evaluated and re-assessed. So I would like to hear what the Minister has to say in that respect.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes. Mr. Chairman. Before I respond to the honourable member's remarks, I'd be interested to know whether the first question that he raised with respect to the use of Government Air Services, was that merely a hypothetical question he was putting to me, asking me to express my opinion how we would handle it, or was this actual fact that occurred?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest the Minister check into the activities of his department.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

A MEMBER: Ah come on, document your accusations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: It becomes quite obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable member is putting forth a hypothetical case . . .

A MEMBER: A figment of his imagination.

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . something that either he has created himself, or someone else had created and relayed it to him, but of which he has no knowledge whatsoever, no proof, doesn't know who the people were, when they came, why they came by Government Air Services, if they came at all, and you know, and then he gives this --(Interjection)-- oh! If the honourable member is prepared to give some documentation or some proof of these facts, I'd be prepared to sit down. If he is not, then I would rather carry on. If he's prepared to give some documentation, I would sit down.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister these questions. I'm asking him . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education on a point of order.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I yielded the floor to the honourable member for a specific purpose. And if it was not his intention to respond to the question that I put, then I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that I still do have the floor.

Well, Mr. Chairman, here we were listening for the past, I don't know how many minutes, to a long speech about some alleged misuse of Government Air Services, and even at that only presenting half the story. Even if Government Air Services were used for whatever purpose was necessary, not taking into account the time factor, the other commitments that those two staff people may have had, either prior to a meeting with the Pelly Trail Board, or whoever it was that they met with at that time - and I don't know, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell doesn't appear to know who they met with, because he wouldn't tell us. I don't even know when this occurred. Now the honourable member tells me, he tells me to check the records. I've been Minister of Education for four years, so he wants my staff . . . Now I think if he would check the Rule Book and he will find what the Rule Book says, even on Orders for Return of that type, you know, in effect what he is saying to me is, would I check the records that goes back over the past years to seek out a plane trip via Government Air Services from Winnipeg - and I don't know whether it was from Winnipeg, because I don't know where those two staff people were at that time prior to going to Pelly Trail, I don't know where they were. From somewhere to somewhere in Pelly Trail, at some point in time unknown to me, unrevealed by the honourable member, the cost of renting a car from a rental agent at a time unknown to me, unrevealed by him, for a period of time unknown to me and unrevealed by him, from an agency unknown by me and unrevealed by him. Now if the honourable member thinks that I'm going to fall for that and get up and say, "Yes, I would gladly check into that and provide the honourable member with the information," well my answer is, No, I will not. No, I will not. If the honourable member is going to be more specific and give me some particulars that would assist me in checking this out, I'd be glad to do it, I'd be glad to do it; but on that basis, the answer is no. No more than he would if I were to make a similar request of him.

Now. Acceptance, evaluation, there is an evaluation component as I have repeated at least two or three times during the day. There's an evaluation, there's a provision for evaluation built into the agreement, the REAP agreement with every school division, and insofar as it's acceptance, I don't know if the honourable member was in the House this afternoon when I read a letter from Tiger Hills, from Turtle Mountain, endorsing the program; in fact one of the letters, Mr. Chairman, you may recall, was from . . . --(Interjection)-- No, the honourable member didn't hear me correctly, because what I had quoted from Toronto was an article written in a newspaper, that I'm sure is not a supporter of ours, the Globe and Mail, which the honourable member thought was a letter. It wasn't it was a press clipping. I'm sorry if the honourable member misunderstood me at that time. But there were letters, one from school trustees, and that is evidence, I think tangible and real and meaningful evidence of acceptability of the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure if there are any outstanding questions directed to the Minister, he will have the opportunity, the members have the opportunity

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) of hearing him. I move the committee rise.

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

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

IN SESSION

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Urban Affairs, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.