



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison





THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 30th, 1962.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.  
Reading and Receiving Petitions.  
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.  
Notices of Motion.  
Introduction of Bills.

HON. STERLING LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 101, An Act respecting the Sale of Goods under Time Sale Agreements.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne) introduced Bill No. 110, An Act to provide for the Disestablishment of The Municipal School District of Elton, No. 2360.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 107, An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James) introduced Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (2).

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk), in the absence of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, introduced Bill No. 109, An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953 (2).

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the proposed resolution standing in my name.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution, recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Highway Traffic Act by providing, among other matters, (a) for an increase in the maximum amounts payable from The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund; (b) for authorizing the Provincial Treasurer to pay certain legal costs from The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund; and (c) for authorizing the Provincial Treasurer to pay from the Consolidated Fund out-of-pocket expenses incurred by members of The Motor Carrier Board and, if approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, certain remuneration for their services.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution be adopted?

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, one question -- (Interjection) -- Oh, you want to explain it first.

MR. LYON: Yes.

MR. GRAY: Well, you were sitting quietly there, I didn't know whether I should interfere or not. Go ahead.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, the resolution is largely self-explanatory. It provides for an increase in the maximum amounts payable from the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. I should just mention that it is required to be brought in by way of resolution because the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund forms a part of the Consolidated Fund of the province, although, as all members will realize, the contributions to that fund comes from the motorists of Manitoba and the annual levy that is made upon them when they purchase their registration.

The second portion merely permits monies to be paid from the Fund for legal services provided to the Fund. At the present time the legal services for this Fund, or up to the present time, have been provided from the Attorney-General's Department. If in the past it was thought desirable to have outside counsel act, the payment for outside counsel would come from the Department of the Attorney-General rather than from the Fund. Under the proposed amendment, the Fund will be authorized to pay solicitors' fees or costs for those matters that are handled by solicitors outside of the Department of the Attorney-General. I should mention that very probably, with the increase in the work that is taking place with the Fund, this

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . procedure will be resorted to rather than the traditional procedure that we have followed heretofore.

The third matter deals with the Motor Carrier Board and the provision whereby that Board will be increased in size. What is in contemplation is the fact that the Board, which is now composed entirely of members of the government service, may now be permitted to have on it members other than members of the government service, who would be entitled under this resolution to receive travelling, out-of-pocket expenses, etcetera, and could also be paid some remuneration for their services to the Board.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I -- oh, I'm sorry.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I understand fully (a) and this is important. It should be discussed. With regards to (b) and (c), I cannot see for the life of me why those who are interested in this should pay out to others expense for attending. I mean, after all, it's their own business. Do we have to pay everybody, every delegate that comes here before the Law Amendments Committee for carfare if they come here by bus, or by taxi. I cannot -- and let me tell you something -- if I would have the brains of the Ministers I wouldn't ask the question, but the question is being asked because, to me, it's very, very strange. (b) and (c) deals with expense paid to those who come to meetings. In my opinion it's ridiculous.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not opposing the resolution but there are certain questions that I'd like to ask. In connection with (a), I believe that Manitoba has a reciprocal arrangement with other provinces in respect of what we call the pink card, or motor vehicle liability card. Now how is the increase going to affect that reciprocal arrangement? Are we going to recognize the cards from other provinces where the amount of their statutory insurance is less than ours?

The second point that I'd like to raise is in connection with (c). I have no objection whatsoever to the members of the Motor Carrier Board being paid out-of-pocket expenses nor have I any objection to their being paid a certain remuneration for their work, but quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I don't approve of the method that is being used, that is, remuneration for services, if approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I think that this Legislature, if any remuneration is payable, it should be fixed by this Legislature and not by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to raise one or two points in connection with this resolution and, of course, I'm not going to oppose the matter being proceeded with, to have the bill before us. But I would like to know from the Minister at this time, on what does he base his judgment that we require an increase in the amounts payable from the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund? It appears to me that, unless the Minister can fully justify this, that the net effect of this will simply mean an increase in the amount that the automobile users in the Province of Manitoba are going to have to pay into this Fund. As the Minister is fully aware, as far as we in this group are concerned, we think that there is a better method by which we can protect those involved in accidents, and particularly those who are unfortunate enough to be injured by virtue of automobile accidents.

In regard to Section (b), I would ask the Minister why he feels that this is necessary. It has been stated, and I think with a considerable amount of truth, that a considerable portion of the relatively high insurance rates that we're paying at the present time is because of litigation and arguments before the Courts in respect of one insurance company against the other, as to who should pick up the tab in the event of an accident. I'd like to hear from the Minister as to what degree the Attorney-General's Department, in the past, has had to pay for legal fees in respect of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. I can see, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, the possibility of increased costs again to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund if the payment for lawyers fees is to come out of the contributions of the automobile user here in the Province of Manitoba. Quite frankly, I think those costs are high enough at the present time, and I would like the Minister to explain to the committee the real basic reasons for this other than the fact of the legal fees coming out of the Attorney-General's appropriation. May I say transversely, that if the automobile users directly are going to pay for these legal costs, are the taxpayers in general going to have a reduction in the amount of legal fees that they have to pay in the ordinary estimates of the Department of the Attorney-General.

Now I have no objection particularly to clause (c), but I do also agree with the point

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . raised by the Honourable Member for Selkirk that, if salaries are going to be paid or remuneration is going to be paid to the members of the Motor Carrier Board, we should know what they are, at least in the first instance when the matter is introduced and proposed to this House.

That is the only comment that I have to make at this particular time in respect of the resolution, Mr. Chairman. I anticipate there will be a few remarks that either myself or members of my group will make when we deal with the matter when it is in the form of a bill before us, but I think, Mr. Chairman, the points that I have raised are valid points that require a more detailed answer from the Minister than what he has given us on the simple introduction of this resolution.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I'm not quite sure that I understood the Honourable Member from Inkster on the question that he put. I can only assure him that none of the proposals here involve the payment of amounts, whether they be fees or anything else, to persons appearing before the board in question or persons dealing with the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, other than lawyers who might be employed to act on behalf of the Fund in certain actions. I am not sure -- (Interjection) -- this would permit the lawyer who acted on behalf of the Fund to be paid out of the Fund, not the other lawyers -- not the other lawyers.

With respect to the point raised by the Honourable Member from Selkirk on the question of reciprocity insofar as pink cards are concerned, that we can discuss when we get into the bill, but I think I can assure him at this stage, from what information that I have, that there will be no appreciable upset in that arrangement at all. As to the question of the remuneration for the members of the board, I think honourable members, on reflection, will recall that this is the customary way in which a remuneration is provided for part-time members of commissions or boards set up under the various acts of this Legislature. The one that comes to mind most readily of course is the Liquor Control Commission, where the remuneration for the part-time members is provided on approval by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I suggest that there are a host of other examples in the same way whereby part-time people can be appointed to boards for usually -- shall I say usually a relatively nominal remuneration that is paid in connection with these part-time duties.

The Honourable Leader of the NDP Party raised the question about the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and why the limits were being raised. I can mention to him that this is a companion section which will appear in The Insurance Act raising the minimum limit of insurance in Manitoba, which was forecast in the Speech from the Throne. It has always been customary, and I think very practical, that the minimum limits for insurability should correspond exactly with the maximum amounts which are paid out under the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. He also dealt with the question of remuneration and I believe I answered that with respect to the question of the Honourable Member for Selkirk. The amount that users are paying into the Fund is not involved in this matter at this stage because, so far as we can see at the present time, that will not be affected although these are only projections of figures that can be made on the basis of past experience. It is, of course, all tied in though to the number of actions which will be brought against the Fund for amounts of damages that will have to be paid out of the Fund, assuming that the pre-conditions have all been met. So one can only project past experience into the future, but at the present time I can't see anything in that regard coming up, although as the honourable member will see when the bill is before the House, the date that this is to take effect and so on will have some bearing upon that.

As to the question of (b), authorizing the Treasurer to pay certain legal costs, this again, and I emphasize this point, this refers only to a solicitor, one or more solicitors who might be appointed in different cases to act on behalf of the Fund. In the past, the bulk of this work has been done by a solicitor in the Attorney-General's Department. However, from time to time agents have had to be appointed over the past number of years to take cases in Dauphin and The Pas and so on when it was impossible for this one man, because of other commitments, to do that. Now with the volume of work increasing to the extent that it has, it may be thought desirable to have counsel retained to act more or less steadily on behalf of the Fund and, in order to do that, this section is provided in order that the costs for that counsel may be paid out of the Fund itself rather than out of the general revenues of the province.

MR. PAULLEY: I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable the Attorney-General but I

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . don't think he has answered the questions that I directed to him. I appreciate very much the fact, as he states, that this increase in the payments out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund are in line with those as announced in the Throne Speech of the general increase on the amount which a person must carry in respect of Third Person Liability. But the question that I directed to my honourable friend, notwithstanding a companion bill coming in, is on what basis do they justify the increase? Correspondingly, if not this year, eventually it will mean a further increase in the amount that the persons have to pay into the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

I appreciate also his remarks in respect of the question of the legal fees, but he again did not answer my question as to the degree that it was in the past, and how much it might possibly mean in respect of payment of legal fees out of the accumulated revenues by virtue of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. These are the points that I think that are important.

MR. LYON: I probably misunderstood or I didn't hear -- I must put it that way -- my honourable friend when he questioned as to how much was involved here. Quite frankly, I can't tell him how much is involved because I don't know how many times recourse will have to be had to outside counsel. I can tell him that on the basis of past experience, the amount involved would be a few hundred dollars or a few thousand at most. In relation to the size of the Fund, to give him an over-all picture, I can say almost categorically that the amounts involved in (d) item are very fractional amounts as to the amount of the Fund which runs in the area of a quarter of a million dollars, that is the Fund itself. The servicing of the Fund would run at a few thousand dollars or something like that in terms of legal costs, and assuming that all of the legal work was done for this Fund outside of the government service, I can't tell my honourable friend what the charges would be because these would probably be based on a per case basis, but I can see them as only being a fractional amount and certainly not sufficient to cause any drain on the amount of the Fund at all, so I don't think he needs to worry about that point particularly.

Insofar as why we increased the amounts payable out of the Fund, I think my honourable friend will agree, and he is probably aware as most people who have dealt with the Fund, that reasonably often there are cases where the present limits on the Fund, \$10,000 and \$20,000, for multi-party injury, do not meet the actual awards in damages which the Courts hand down. By increasing the amount as is suggested here to correspond with the increased amount of minimum insurance, one ensures that cases of this kind are -- there is less chance of them occurring. If a person gets a judgment for an amount say above \$20,000, or two people do, and they have no recourse against an insurance company and they meet the pre-conditions that must be satisfied before the Fund can be attacked -- or attached, then these larger amounts will be payable to them. I don't think my honourable friend would disagree with that principle at all. If the minimum limits of insurance are going up, then it stands to reason that these limits should go up as well in consonance with them in order that the Fund will be pari passu or on the same basis as the minimum limits of insurance.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I accept the explanation at this time of the Honourable the Attorney-General. I feel at the present moment as though I will be asking similar questions on the consideration of the bill itself, and I ask him now if he would be kind enough to have information available at that time as to the number of judgments that have been given, say in the past year, in respect of accidents that have exceeded the present limits of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. I think when we have that information, Mr. Chairman, we'd be in a better position to assess the necessity of the proposition of the Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, insofar as that is an item of consideration, and I'll explain that later on, I can have that information available. I think the most recent figures I saw indicate, and I am just going by memory, some two or three cases under the Fund where the maximum amount was paid out but more would have been paid out had the maximum been higher.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . point, Mr. Chairman. One reason why I raise the points that I do at this particular time is because I have a fear that with a general raising of the limits, then we're likely to be in a position where general awards will likewise be raised as a result of that and, consequently, additional costs either in insurance or payments to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would give us some more information. Could he tell us who are the members of the board at the moment? The Motor Carrier Board.

MR. LYON: Yes. Mr. R.B. Baillie is the Chairman; Mr. McDonald, the Chairman of the Public Utility Board, is the Vice-Chairman; and the third member is either the Deputy Minister of Public Works or a person nominated from the Department of Public Works by the Deputy Minister. At the present time, I believe it's Mr. -- I'm sorry -- his name escapes me just for the moment, but he's a member of the staff of the Department of Public Works.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, it isn't the intention of the Honourable the Attorney-General to discuss the amounts of the increase at this time but rather when you introduce the bill?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister introduces the bill then, and he'll be discussing the amounts, will he have available for us the information as to the other provinces?

MR. LYON: Yes, I hope to have it officially by that time. Some of it is coming through by press statements. I have other private information at the present time but I am not authorized by the other provinces to release it at the present time.

MR. MOLGAT: We would like to know at that time, the relationship between our levels and those of other provinces; any reciprocal arrangements; and also, if there are with any of the American states.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted a certain resolution, directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the report of the Committee be received.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. LYON introduced Bill No. 99, An Act to Amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Is it your intention to invite members of the press, radio and television to accompany the members on the conducted tour of the Vaughan Street Detention Home?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I had understood that the members themselves wished to come along. If others wish to come along, I presume they will make their wishes known in the usual fashion.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Utilities. Will the Minister of Utilities or the government appear before the Board of Broadcasting Governors to be held in Winnipeg, commencing April 3rd, in reference to the increase in the effective radiated power; a change in channel; and a change of camera site of Station CBWT, Winnipeg, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; recommending that the station should be built north of Winnipeg to facilitate the Interlake country rather than in Starbuck. The people in the Interlake area circulated petitions and all the organizations are backing them up, such as local Chambers of Commerce, different municipalities, Rockwood, farm organization and others from Interlake area. Just to facilitate, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister, I was questioned by some of the people, and also by some officials of local Chambers of Commerce, whether or not our provincial Minister would take part and support the people to have the station north of Winnipeg.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, if I may direct a supplementary question to the Attorney-General. If the members of the press, radio and television do express the desire to accompany us on that conducted tour, will you meet their request?

MR. LYON: I will communicate my answer to them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities going to reply to the question raised by the Honourable Member for Fisher?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Member for Fisher for giving me partial notification, shall I put it that way, of his intention to ask this question. I wasn't

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . aware of the nature of the brief to which he referred in a prior notice, which he was kind enough to leave at my office. I now understand, from his fuller explanation, that it is with respect to the relocation of CBWT and CBW transmitting facilities. My only answer with respect to that at the present time is that there are no present plans to appear before the Board of Broadcast Governors.

MR. WAGNER: . . . . . question, Mr. Speaker. Was the Minister approached by these people from the Interlake area by — actually Chambers of Commerce in the local area?

MR. LYON: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might discuss the proposed Order of Business for the rest of today.

I understand that the members have consulted among themselves and that there appears to be general agreement that we might proceed with government business. If that is the case, if there is general agreement along that point, I might say that His Honour has consented to attend the Chamber and consent to bills -- assent to bills. If that met with the general wishes of the House that we are to proceed with government business, we would ask His Honour to attend us as the first order and then proceed with the estimates. I wonder if we could ascertain that that meets with the general agreement of the members.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, that is the wishes of our group and, I believe, the wishes of the members of the New Democratic Party and the Member for Rhineland.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may on the point raised by my honourable friend, and he omitted this, I think the undertaking is on the understanding that the House adjourns at 5:30.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that no detail of such a bargain as that would escape my honourable friend, and if I forget to mention it, I can always count on him on checking me up.

Therefore, I wonder, Your Honour, if it would be correct for you to call the Orders of the Day and then allow a moment's pause while I invite His Honour to attend?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I have received from the President of the University of Manitoba, the President's Report for the year 1960-1961. This is not a statutory report and is not tabled in the ordinary sense, but I have asked the Clerk to have a copy given to each member.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for the Day.

MR. JOHN A. CHRISTIANSON (Minister of Welfare) (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to lay on the table of the House, a Return to an Address for Papers dated Friday, March 16th, on motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe it would be well to cease business until the Lieutenant-Governor attends.

MR. CLERK: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour: The Legislative Assembly at its present session passed several bills, which, in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour, and to which bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

MR. CLERK:

(No. 2) - An Act to amend The Expropriation Act.

(No. 6) - An Act respecting Legitimacy.

(No. 7) - An Act to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act.

(No. 8) - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Brandon Golf and Country Club.

(No. 9) - An Act respecting Capital Funds (I. A. C.) Limited.

(No. 10) - An Act respecting Coronation Credit Corporation Limited.

(No. 11) - An Act respecting Laurentide Financial Corporation Ltd.

(No. 12) - An Act to amend The University Act.

(No. 13) - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "Les Clercs Paroissiaux ou Catechistes de St. Viateur".

(No. 15) - An Act to incorporate Russell Golf and Country Club.



- (No. 16) - An Act to amend The Manitoba Evidence Act.
- (No. 17) - An Act respecting Survivorship.
- (No. 18) - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Union of Manitoba Municipalities.
- (No. 19) - An Act to amend An Act respecting Insurance Institute of Winnipeg.
- (No. 21) - An Act to amend The Election Act (1).
- (No. 23) - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Middlechurch Home of Winnipeg.
- (No. 24) - An Act to amend An Act respecting "The Western Savings and Loan Association".
- (No. 26) - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Trafalgar Savings and Loan Association.
- (No. 27) - An Act to incorporate Assiniboine Golf Club.
- (No. 28) - An Act to amend The Medical Act.
- (No. 31) - An Act to incorporate The St. Boniface Club.
- (No. 35) - An Act respecting The School District of Transcona, No. 39.
- (No. 36) - An Act to incorporate The St. Boniface College Scholarship Fund.
- (No. 38) - An Act to amend The Loans Act.
- (No. 39) - An Act to amend The Public Works Act.
- (No. 41) - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "The Winnipeg Better Business Bureau".
- (No. 42) - An Act to incorporate The Missionary Oblate Fathers of Keewatin.
- (No. 44) - An Act to amend The Health Services Act.
- (No. 45) - An Act to amend The Mental Diseases Act.
- (No. 46) - An Act to amend The Private Hospitals Act.
- (No. 47) - An Act to amend An Act to amend Chapter 91, 46 and 47, Vic., intituled "An Act respecting the Winnipeg General Hospital".
- (No. 49) - An Act to amend The Department of Health Act.
- (No. 50) - An Act to amend The Hospital Debentures Guarantee Act.
- (No. 51) - An Act to amend The Business Development Fund Act.
- (No. 53) - An Act to amend The Civil Service Act.

MR. CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

MR. SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these Bills:

(No. 88) - An Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1963.

(No. 89) - An Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Further Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1962.

MR. CLERK: His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to these bills in Her Majesty's name.

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department No. V. Resolution 22, 1. Administration.

MR. WAGNER: I am going to be very brief on this item. Yesterday we had such splendid speakers and harangues, so I'm not going to use no statistics and I'm not going to talk very high. I would like to go to ground level, as I'm always at the ground level.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the Minister and his staff because, as far as I'm concerned, I'm one of these rural members and I ask too many questions sometimes, I feel myself, but the staff or the Minister don't seem to exhaust their patience with me and they try to give me the information as close as possible, and as clear as possible. I must admit though, Mr. Chairman, that you have to work with the tools that you've got, so

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) . . . . the job is just as good as the tools you use. It reminds me of the Second World War when the Prime Minister of Great Britain stated: "Give us the tools and we shall finish the job." So possibly this department needs better tools, or whatever is necessary to do a better job than they are doing now.

However, I would like to mention a little bit what has been taking place in previous years. Before the division was formed, I must admit, that it by-passed. We shouldn't repeat the history, but possibly by repeating the history maybe we can iron out those kinks, or gimmicks, as I would refer -- especially on the vocational training. I believe I asked a question, it was in 1959; and the Minister told me the vocational training shall be, or will be conducted in 1960 in Lakeshore division; and it's not there today. As far as shelters were supposed to be built for students in the different points, that the students could hide from wind and the cold, and the equal opportunity of education and attendance to the schools shall be equalized to the farm pupils like in the city. However, that is not the case. As far as the road conditions are concerned -- and the Member for Swan River likes to say, "poor old Fisher" -- the Minister probably, of course, claims the same thing, "that poor old Fisher never has no roads, ditches and bridges." I am not embarrassed by these remarks, because it's true -- because it's true -- and it has been in the past. Naturally, I must admit this government is trying to catch up, but somehow recently, in 1961 particularly, it slowed down. Man oh man -- the election might be quite a distance yet as far as the provincial deduction is concerned because they really slowed down in building roads.

However, my argument is -- and it's not my personal argument, it is the people that I represent -- that as far as students are concerned, if there is three students, four students in certain schools, the road shall not be built; the road shall not be maintained. The snowplow or the road construction is going to be built and maintained to the point where there is five students, and even if it's a half a mile to school or a mile, it's stopped at the five point. It's going to travel 10 miles; it's going to travel 15 miles, but that last half-mile it wouldn't go. This is just a little minor matter and it's an inexpensive matter, just a few dollars I would say, and the snowplows sometimes go low flying -- I generally refer 15 miles an hour -- so how much would that cost? It would facilitate all concerned. The worst thing, and I cannot figure it out, that the students are waiting at the five point for a bus to come to pick them up, and the bus may be late; may have a flat tire. They would sooner wait a mile further in the school, in the shelter, in a warm place, than shiver in the cold, but oh no, we can't do that. The policy reads that it's five point pick-up. However, when we were voting for the school division system, it was never mentioned that a five point pick-up shall be -- oh no. I have attended, in Lakeshore, division meetings, and I've heard speakers speaking there. Furthermore, I went in as far as Glendale to see how the people are taking it there. I approved the school division but I never realized that we were going to be faced with such a minor matter, such a little gadget, yet out in the country it creates hardships for the students and the people concerned.

It's surprising to me that this year in that particular school can be three students -- the road is not going to be constructed or built, or snowplowed or maintained. Next year in that same school could be six or seven, then the Public Works starts building that road and not before, but after. Always behind in building roads. Wouldn't it be better to build that road and the local school trustees, even the teachers know how many students going to that school are going to attend the high school next year, and somehow we cannot get this across. Now the Minister surely will argue that the bus can go because the School Division Board can send the bus. Fine -- but on what road the bus is going to go? And how is it going to get if it is not snowplowed in the winter? Surely then, the Minister's going to backfire and say: "on 50-50 basis -- get the plow and plow and get your students to school." There's another gimmick, I would say, because once the plow is enroute, what's the difference? Get these school students out; give this equal opportunity of education, as was said.

As far as taxation is concerned, I don't need to talk about taxation. The taxes went up and naturally I can name these factors. Some Ministers were out in the area and they were writing on the blackboard saying that taxes cannot go up, but they're bound to go down. However, I'm going to be the middleman -- neither up, neither down -- but at least on the level, but they're up, not on the level. That's what we were told and I, for one, would suggest that the province has at its source more power, should take more responsibility in this giving

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) . . . . grants to these schools.

We in Lakeshore division are going to have -- and some schools are under construction today -- seven new high schools. That's a large sum of money to pay out. However, I must admit that the government is, in my opinion, pretty lenient. They understand that we are on the marginal land and they are giving us as good assistance as possible. But what I want to draw to the Minister's attention at the moment, at Fisher Branch there's a 12-room school being built, and naturally it qualifies for 75% construction grant. But at the same time there is a need for a sidewalk to get these students to the school, and it does not qualify for the 75% construction grant. Well, in my opinion, one without the other is no good. Naturally, I would call upon the Minister to revise his decision and add the 75% construction to the sidewalks, the same time as the school is being constructed at the moment.

I understand that the provincial government is giving grants to the university; the federal government is giving grants; and I also understand that the tuition fee in university went up, and I would like to have clarification on that, to the amount of \$100.00. I wonder if I'm right or wrong. Now if it's so, at the moment we have a hard time getting our students to the university due to the financial burden, and when it was announced, or it was in the paper that this tuition fee went up -- even I understand the degree of marks was supposed to be up -- this will curtail the people that are financially low, will curtail their students to attend school. It caused a lot of interest in my area because next year I've had some people come to me and they are having two or three students that they feel are going to attend university. Now, how are these people going to finance that university? Are they going to be treated on the financial policy; or are they going to be treated from the educational point of view, whether they have the ability or capability; or they will have to stay home; and we are not going to give the equal education, equal opportunity to the rural people, or those people that haven't got the finances to put them to school.

However, I have a clipping here and I am rather surprised that the university -- this is the Comptroller-General report to the Board of Governors -- shows total income for the year ending March 31st, '61, was \$8,103,193.00. Of this amount, \$4,172,243 came from provincial government grants; \$949,188 from federal government grants; and \$5,214,451 from students fees. Now it seems to me that we are far from it, supporting the educational policy in the university. The students carry the highest burden and, in my opinion, it's not fair, if we are going to educate our people to a higher standard of education.

Teachers' pension -- well we are going to be talking on the other occasion. One item that was brought to my attention, and I have the experience because my boy went through that, when a student writes "supps" during the summer holidays, we have to pay for these examination papers. I believe it is \$15.00 for Grade XII or XI and yet the student is denied these papers when they are marked. Why is he denied? That's his papers; he paid for it; and he should have these papers that he can look through those papers where he was at fault; and yet the student cannot get them -- he is denied.

Elementary schools -- I was happy to hear that the Minister said that there is a lot of consolidation because actually I foresee in our area that there will be consolidation of these small schools, and I think it is to the good.

One more last thing as far as the school vans are concerned and busses are concerned, I have a lot of complaints that the students are being transported in none too best busses. I have questioned those operators that have these vans and busses and they tell me that they cannot afford to buy a bus, because next year they may lose the tender and that expensive bus may lie idle on the yard and then they would be losing the money on it. However, I would encourage, and I believe there is something going now -- some kind of a negotiation -- that possibly we should have longer term contracts, because it is not feasible, and I don't blame the bus operators or van operators at all, because if he's going to pay \$7,000 for a bus he must be sure of a job -- not only for one year. At the same time, if the contracts would be on a longer term, the students would be transported in more comfortable vehicles and the operators would be more agreeable to have better equipment.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to congratulate the Minister on his report that he made yesterday afternoon, which was rather a glowing report. I would also like to commend the officials of the department and the staff for their co-operation

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) . . . . and their splendid service that they provide the people of Manitoba. I know that people in all areas of the province are getting full co-operation and the very best of service from the Department of Education.

Yesterday we heard a very glowing report from the Minister covering many aspects of the department. He dwelt on the increased enrolment in our schools and the reduction in the number of school districts which has been taking place because of consolidation; the number of smaller classrooms that have been reduced, both in high school and elementary, that we have larger classes where we have more competition in school. He mentioned the construction program; the many new schools built; the large increases in grants -- I think he mentioned \$29 million in high schools and \$17 million for elementary schools. He also mentioned the increased grants made available with the estimates -- \$14 million '58-59 and now has reached \$27 million for the coming year. He also mentioned the performance of our schools. I think all this was very well, but all is not so rosy on the education scene.

There are many areas in the province, and especially down our way, where conditions have become intolerable. It is almost unthinkable, yet true, that in a province like Manitoba in this day and age, that a government would discriminate against certain areas of the province purposely, by withholding grants and making it difficult for school districts to operate. Yes -- almost impossible to operate. Now this has been going on for the past three, four years while this administration has been in office. Those in charge of our schools in the non-division areas are almost driven to their wits end. Classrooms are filled to capacity at central points and there is no hope in sight.

The developments at home, in the home area over the last number of years now, is getting from bad to worse. When this administration came to power they promised 50% increase in grants. Where are those increases? To date we haven't seen an increase yet. The only thing that we have got so far is free textbooks for our pupils. That is all. Not only that, the effect of the establishment of the divisions has worked to our detriment. We have to compete in our areas for teachers, for qualified teachers, salary-wise. We have to meet the salaries that are being offered by other areas with the same low grants. We have to provide accommodation and facilities in order to take the pupils in. The same thing applies. We get the low grants, the other areas get the increased grants. What we get is 40% on capital for construction.

Now for the last number of years we have encouraged students to continue their high school education. That is what the province wanted. We followed; we encouraged the students to carry on and to have fewer drop-outs. Our area has produced many good outstanding teachers. In fact, I think we were way above average in percentage of the teachers that went through school and went on to Teachers' College and got the qualifications so that they could teach; were certified; and they have proven themselves. In fact, they are in high demand all over the province and are teaching today in schools all over the province and all over the North American Continent. The results of our schools have proven that they compare favourably with that of any other part of the province. We're not falling behind. This is being shown annually by the reports of the exams when they come out, that our schools are meeting the standards; our teachers are doing a job; our pupils are applying themselves and are making a good show.

However, the situation today is one that we need an extension of facilities. Our facilities, at present, are taxed to the limit. Our schoolrooms are packed. According to the report just tabled the other day for the year ending June 30th, 1961, there were 346 students enrolled in the schools in my constituency. They expect an increased enrolment in the coming year so that more classrooms and more facilities are needed to accommodate the same, yet the capital grants available are 40% compared to 50 to 75% for the division areas. It makes it very difficult and the districts are unable to continue to operate. The grants are insufficient and many of the grants available to divisions are not available to our school districts. The maintenance grants are not available, and there are many likewise. Teacher grants are much lower. We receive \$2,500 per teacher, for the teachers teaching in elementary grades. For high schools, it is \$3,750 per teacher that is qualified for teaching high school grades. Yet the division areas, they receive all the way to \$9,000 and more per teacher, depending on qualifications and years of service, naturally, but they receive this regardless of the teacher, whether the

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) . . . . teacher merits it or not, and annual increases are made. It's a 100% grant. They don't have to worry when they hire a highly qualified, a teacher who has given years of service. They know they can get the money and it won't be any additional cost to their particular district, yet we have to put up those additional amounts through a special tax levy.

I made a check on the report that I referred to earlier for the year 1961, and I find on Page 125 some of the salaries given to the junior high school teachers in the City of Winnipeg and the suburban cities here, and compared them with what our principals gets. A principal of a school having 260-odd pupils is getting \$8,800 back home, and here in the city he gets \$12,000.00. Another category of 139 pupils in a certain high school, the salary back home is \$8,075; in the city it's \$11,000.00. Another one where they have a smaller enrolment of 75 pupils, back home they get \$7,400; here they get \$10,000.00. Now surely we cannot be expected to keep our good and best qualified teachers in our areas if this thing is to prolong. The best part about it is that we in the non-division areas help pay for these large salaries in the division areas. We have to contribute through the taxes to the general fund of the province from where these grants are coming.

In addition to the hardships that the high schools are having today, they get their revenues either from grants from the province, special levy in taxes or non-resident fees. Now the non-resident fees for high school students from Grade X to XII inclusive are \$125.00 per annum. This is much too low. It doesn't nearly cover the cost of educating a child in high school, let alone pay for the capital cost of erecting schools. These non-residencies haven't been increased for many years and high schools are now upping the tuition fee to non-resident pupils over and above that which is being collected by the municipalities and given to the receiving school, namely the \$125.00. In addition to that, they now ask, and I am referring to one particular school, is asking an additional \$225.00 per pupil. Now where's this money supposed to come from? The municipality cannot collect this and forward it to the school districts, as is the case for those authorized. The local school is not responsible for high school education and cannot collect this money. It has to come from the individual parents, and we have many parents in our area who cannot afford to pay this \$225.00 additional fee. That means that these high school students will have to go without high school or the only other course open to them is to avail themselves of a correspondence course. Well we all know that when you get to the higher grades that a correspondence course is not satisfactory, and that school facilities should be made available to these students.

Town schools will be unable to accept many of the non-resident pupils this coming fall term. Firstly, because they haven't got the facilities; and secondly, they are unable to provide them because their taxpayers won't allow them to make the additional costs for which they will not be reimbursed for these students coming from outside areas. Therefore, they're unable to provide and helpless standing by in this case. Local schools are not responsible for high schools, and I'd like to refer to my own particular district in this case. We have about a dozen to 14 high school students in my own district. We had a special meeting called recently to discuss it -- we've had two meetings in fact. Some of these students are able to attend the town high school because the parents of these pupils are also ratepayers in the town, having property in the town, therefore they are entitled to attend the school. We have a few others that are able and will be attending private high schools so that means that there will not be enough pupils left to open a one-room high school in our district. That means that these pupils are now left out in the cold, and all because of this government's policy and the way the program is directed.

Right now the situation back home is at a complete impasse. The division has been refused and the central division, which forms a part of my constituency, probably for various reasons -- some for the reason that it's a matter of centralization, others give different reasons -- at any rate it was not acceptable. The high schools are filled; the town schools will not extend facilities because of capital cost. It's not a paying proposition. The authorizational costs are going up and cannot be covered by grants and non-resident fees. What are we supposed to do? Are we just supposed to sit idly by? The secondary legislation that was on the books, prior to the divisions coming in, has been wiped out. It's no longer there. Now I don't know -- must our people come to their knees to get fair treatment from the government

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) . . . . who is arrogant and not responsible? Must our children be forever penalized for exercising their franchise in the way they please? We request increased teachers grants. Now I think the resolution that was sponsored here the other day by the Member for Emerson which reads and calls for increased grants -- it reads this way and I quote: "Resolved that the government consider the advisability of raising the basic teacher grants in all school districts to a level comparable to the assistance given within a division." That is one thing we need; that is one thing we're entitled to and have been denied for the last number of years. We should give our high schools a fair chance to operate. It's because of the government policy that we are in the fix where we are today.

Now we all know what happened at Dauphin-Ochre. When the people there rejected the division plan, they were not denied the increase grants. No -- that was the Minister's home ground. He wouldn't dare to refuse them because then he would lose his next election. They got the increased grants, but not so for the other areas in the province. Yes -- it's discrimination for sure. Two years ago we passed a bill here in the House preventing hotel owners from discriminating against certain people. I think that Act should be amended so that the Minister would not discriminate against the non-division areas.

I have a few other matters that I wish to bring to the Minister's attention. One of the matters is the autonomy of school boards. Here again the foundations have been nibbled at until today the school boards, which are an autonomous body and should give complete direction and have complete control, are not authorized to dismiss teachers the way they should. Another thing, the financial statements presented to our annual meeting are not acceptable to the government. They require separate audited statements by recognized auditors. Now at our last annual meeting, we, through special arrangements, got an audit statement by an approved auditor, but this is very difficult and most school districts are unable to get qualified auditors to audit their financial statements prior to the annual meeting. That means that the electors at an annual meeting have to accept one type of financial statement, which is not acceptable to the government; and the government then will only accept audited statements by their approved auditors. Now I notice that there is a bill introduced to the House which will rectify some of these errors, and I will have some further comments on this matter when the bills are discussed.

I also notice that we are getting this new Technical School -- what was its name -- Institute of Technology. Here again I have been informed, and I would like to know from the Minister whether this is correct, that is that Mr. B. F. Addy, who is the director of the Vocational School, is leaving the province. Instead of using our brains that we presently have to direct the programs for these schools, they are being exported and we might be unable to find new powers that can give us adequate service in this direction. I will have some more comments to make but I'll leave these to a later point in the estimate.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I don't want to make a statement, I merely want to correct an error that was made in one of the two papers. Yesterday I was talking about the amount of saving that might have been realized had school districts been able to borrow money from some sort of municipal bank at a rate of interest perhaps 1 1/2 to 2% lower, and I said that it was entirely conceivable that the amount of saving might have been between \$300,000 and \$400,000 in that one year. I attribute this to all the municipalities -- school districts in the province. One of the papers said "one municipality" -- "a municipality could have saved this". This of course is quite wrong. I merely wish to point this out and have it straight on Hansard, if it was said that way by me yesterday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 22 passed?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the Minister might have got up and made some few comments, but if he does not intend to, I just have a few brief comments to make on this particular item. I would like to congratulate him upon his very comprehensive report and, in particular, for at long last admitting to the fact that local taxes have gone up. Now I have listened with a great deal of interest to what other members on this side of the House have said on this item up to now, and it seems to me that running through what they had to say, in each and every one of them was this real concern over taxes at the local level and the very rapid increase in real property taxes, but I notice on Page 1206 of Hansard that the Honourable the Minister has at long last conceded that local taxes have gone up. He says that,

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) . . . . and I quote, "But costs have gone up, and will continue to go up." Well that's not very good news but -- the latter part isn't. "But may I just point this out, Mr. Chairman, that the cost to the local taxpayers, and bearing in mind all the matters that I've said, the cost to the local taxpayers since 1958, and down to and including 1961, have gone up 37.39%, whereas the cost to the province in terms of grants made to school divisions and school districts, in terms of grants the contribution by the province through school grants has gone up by 91.55%. Now I give those figures because I want to say, and I want to say it now, that the Provincial Treasury has not only matched the increased cost to the local taxpayer, but has gone almost three times in terms of the increase." That's the end of the quote. Now I would suggest that of all persons the Minister of Education should be a little more careful with his figures. He has suggested that it's gone up almost three times -- that is, the provincial contribution. I worked it out here on a piece of paper and according to my figures it's 2.5001. Now that doesn't seem like very much perhaps but when you're dealing with about a hundred million dollars, it can run into an awful lot of money. So I would suggest to him that in future when he's giving us percentages that we should be a little more exact perhaps.

MR. McLEAN: Maybe I should take a . . . . . course in mathematics.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that the Honourable Minister of Education, and perhaps I could include with him all members of Cabinet rank and backbenchers on the opposite side, on the government side of the House, often think, I suppose, that we say things just to hear ourselves speak; that we make irresponsible statements of all kinds; that we're not speaking for the majority of the people, and when we express concern over matters that it's only our concern. Well, Mr. Chairman, he may have some reason to believe that at times, but I would like to point out that in addition to our concern, and particularly our concern over the high cost of education at the local level, I would like to refer you to the resolutions that were passed at the 58th annual convention of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities held in Winnipeg on November the 21st, 22nd and 23rd, 1961, and that's not so long ago that we can't remember it, because that's only about four months ago. And it's interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that the resolutions that were passed at that convention total 44 in number, and resolution number one and resolution number two deals with education. That is, it appears that it was the first thing discussed at the convention, and they certainly express in these resolutions their concern over the increase in the cost of education at the local level. I know, Mr. Chairman, that I'm accused of reading a lot of things here, but I believe it might be well to just read these two resolutions to point up that the municipal men, and they are responsible in my opinion, agree with us on this one. And so I'll read you the two resolutions. They're moved by Mr. Creighton, the former Mayor of Brandon, and seconded by Mr. Henderson -- I don't need to tell you what his position is -- but anyway it was carried unanimously, and here it is: "Whereas the costs of education are becoming an ever-increasing burden upon the taxpayer; and Whereas the regulations with respect to education are imposed by the Provincial Government; and, Whereas the municipalities must accept and levy for the amounts required to pay school taxes; and, Whereas 46.34% of the City of Brandon's total mill rate for 1960 was required for school purposes; and, Whereas one-third of the City of Brandon's general budget requirements for 1961 is for school purposes; Be it resolved that the provincial government consider the municipalities problems of taxation with respect to the ever-increasing costs of education with a view to the stabilization of costs to the municipalities in this respect." That's the end of Resolution No. 1. So Brandon is a bit concerned.

Resolution No. 2: "Resolved that this Council request the Government of Canada and Manitoba to establish a new basis for financing the cost of education and to remove the education costs presently being charged as a land tax so that the education tax be equalized rather than restricted to that portion of the population who are landowners; that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the senior governments, The Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, The Manitoba Urban Association and the Union of Manitoba Municipalities."

Now they're all very responsible groups of people, Mr. Chairman. Both of these resolutions carried unanimously and I expect that the Minister has them in his possession and intends to do something about them or appoint a commission to investigate and set up some other fairer means of taxing to pay for the costs of education.

Now another very reliable group of people are the Manitoba Federation of Agriculture,

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) . . . and just a month ago, February 27th, 1962, they presented to the Premier of Manitoba and Members of the Cabinet--and incidentally, they met with our group too, and presented a brief. And I suppose you, Mr. Chairman, have read it all over and reread it perhaps. It's a 27-page brief and five pages of the 27 deal with education. Five pages out of 27. I'm certainly not going to read the five pages as the Honourable Member for Brokenhead has suggested. --(interjection)--But I want to read about two paragraphs to point up what they think on this very, very important matter, because it is an important matter. And they start off by saying this: "The Manitoba Federation of Agriculture has consistently been concerned with Canadian education at all levels. Historically, the organization has sought improvements in the standards of education in educational facilities available to rural youth. We express satisfaction that this situation is now gradually being improved--that is, they're happy that it has been--but note that in the process the necessity of increasing the rural estate taxes to meet educational costs is becoming unbearable." That's the word they use to describe it--"unbearable."

Another concern that they express in this brief, and I think the simplest way to express it is to read it: "The technological advancement in industry, coupled with automation, is demanding higher qualifications from those who wish to enter the skilled labour force. It is anticipated that within the next few years opportunities for employment will be available to only those with a high school standing or technical training. This possibility raises problems for the rural people of this province who should be aware that 85 to 90% of our farm boys and girls must look beyond the farm for employment. Failure to provide them with adequate educational opportunities condemns farm youths to the ranks of the permanently unemployed for future employment will be available to only the highly skilled tradesmen, technical or professional persons;"

Mr. Chairman, I had the pleasure at noon today to attend this Farm Forum that's being held over at the Royal Alex, and I had the pleasure, too, to listen to our friend the Honourable George Hutton--and it was a pleasure to listen to him today, I might say that it was a greater pleasure listening to him today than it is and has been on some occasions in the past. But this is one of the things that he stressed today--(interjection)--he must have had a time limit today because we were out of there in good time. But this is one of the things that he the Minister of Agriculture admitted today; something that we must do to correct this situation that I've referred to in the last paragraph.

Now I want to read from page five, so, Mr. Chairman, you'll know I'm getting over to the end of this brief, but I would like to read this one. It's headed taxation. "The Manitoba Federation of Agriculture fully realizes that provisions for good educational facilities is costly but it is also cognizant of the fact that poor standards will in the long run prove even more expensive. In a country such as ours where nearly everyone who owns refrigerators, radios and TV sets, where in 1958 more than \$2 billion was spent on cars, 1-1/2 billion on tobacco and alcohol, and only a billion on education, it is not imaginative to entertain the thought that we cannot afford some money for education." But they don't say at the local level, Mr. Chairman. "It is our belief, however, the ownership of real estate and personal property no longer indicates an individual's ability to pay taxes. This is especially true of farm lands which have been called upon to bear an educational taxation burden out of all proportion to other segments of society. With 90 percent of farm boys and girls leaving the farms for employment elsewhere, it is more equitable that other segments of society as well as farm real estate should bear the burden of providing higher educational standards."

Now, Mr. Chairman, another nearly as famous a group of people, The Manitoba Farmers' Union, and some would say it was more famous, but I would like to quote from page 17 of their annual brief, which was presented to the Cabinet on or about January 23rd last, two months ago, and they hold the same real concern as we do on this side of the House over the high cost of education at the local level. Theirs is a short one but it certainly deserves reading I think, and I quote: "the taxpayers of our province have experienced exorbitant increases in educational costs due to our comparatively new development of larger school areas across the province. It is with intent and purpose to enable the functions of this new system to a better advantage of all it involves, that we would recommend that the Act be amended to have all school division boards subject to publish annual financial statements and minutes of all board



(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) . . . . meetings and make same available to the public in the respective areas under the following basis: (a) publish financial statements and board minutes in a prominent local newspaper and (b) if publications of said information in a newspaper is found to be uneconomical or not possible we suggest that as an alternative that this material be mimeographed and be made available to any qualified taxpayer upon request." So they're pretty concerned over the high cost of education and what they're doing with the money when they get it--that is the school divisions boards. They go on to point up the school bus regulations and so on. Now, Mr. Chairman, I thought I would just read those to you to point up the fact that when we do express concern over taxes at the local level that we are being supported by the Union of Municipalities, the MFU and MFA, and there are many other groups that feel as concerned as we do.

.....Continued on next page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 22 passed?

MR. MOLGAT: The Minister is going to make some statement in reply to some of the points that have been brought up, will he not?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I have been enjoying this so much that I don't like to spoil it by entering the discussion myself. I appreciate all of the things that have been said in this consideration at this stage, and of course, want to acknowledge that many here, particularly the Member for Brokenhead and the Member for Burrows are much more competent in this field than I am. I am only a small-town lawyer from the best town in Manitoba and I'm rather out of my field when we get discussing many of the technical and philosophical professional aspects of education and for that reason I appreciate the many things that have been said and the many suggestions, particularly the suggestions that have been made. Now, certain general things have evolved out of the discussion so far and I will try to deal with them particularly, but before doing so perhaps there are one or two items that I might deal with just to have them sort of cleared away. With respect to what was said by the Honourable the Member for Rhineland, I have a suggestion to make to him. That suggestion is simply this, that if they are having the difficulties which he suggests, and I suppose they are, that they might try the formation of a school division. All of the reasons that were at one time advanced for not having a school division have been shown to be without foundation, and I think it would be not a bad idea, and I would challenge him to give some leadership in this matter, because I have a great deal of faith in his capacity to influence the decision of his fellow citizens and to suggest to him that he might like to undertake a campaign to enlist the support and interest of his citizens for the formation of a school division so that they could have the grants and the high school facilities that he so much desires, and just in case he thinks there is anything special being done for Dauphin-Ochre School area, if he would like to form a school area, that'll be fine too. In fact I would be very happy to have them form a school area and if they do they'll get the same grants. There's nothing specially associated with school areas. This Legislature passed the legislation that said school areas, school divisions receive certain grants, and made it so that there could be a transfer from one to the other and that would be open to them as well.

Perhaps I ought to say something about the Gunson case. I did become interested in that case. I spoke to a large number of people on numerous occasions in connection with it, and fortunately -- or unfortunately -- my discussions were all in confidence and I am not prepared to reveal what was said or by whom it was said, but by way of introduction may I just point out the provisions of the act -- The School Act -- which says that if a teacher is dismissed or purported to be dismissed by the employing board, that there is a right of board of arbitration. That right and procedure is quite clearly established. Mr. Gunson was employed by the school division of Agassiz and they wished to transfer him from Beausejour Collegiate, I believe, to the Whitemouth Collegiate, and as a result of that he -- he apparently didn't like that, and he asked for a board of arbitration, which under the law we were unable to appoint, and he was so advised. The reason was very clear that this was an internal matter and while he might choose, and members of this House might choose to regard it as a demotion -- that was the word used by the Honourable Member for St. John's -- that might be a matter of opinion. I can understand that if somebody was transferred from The Pas to Dauphin that would be considered a demotion, but I'm not too certain whether that's the case if you're transferred from Beausejour to Whitemouth. It was all in the same school division, and whatever term one uses it was a transfer by the employing board.

Now the position, the comparable position -- and I think this will become apparent when you realize the situation -- let us take the school division of Winnipeg which has a large number of schools; number of high schools. Is the principal of high school "A" entitled to a board of arbitration because the board wishes to transfer him to high school "B" or would he be entitled to a board of arbitration if a teacher were being transferred from teaching French in school "A" to teaching geography in school "C"? In other words, this is an internal matter and obviously we couldn't . . . . .

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister permit a question? Would the Minister consider a reduction of salary of \$1,500 a year an internal matter not to be discussed by anybody but the employing board? If he does it's a pretty strange idea about personal relations in a democracy.

MR. McLEAN: It's not necessarily a matter not to be discussed. It can be discussed by as many people as you like, but it doesn't give rise to a board of arbitration under The School Act and indeed I am sure that it would be impossible to have it in such a way. However, that's the position, and then of course the matter proceeds from there, because I believe that Mr. Gunson said he wouldn't go to Whitemouth and that was regarded by his board -- his employing board -- as a resignation, and so then the matter got into the courts where it is now, and no doubt will be decided before long. But I did take an interest in this, and as the Member for Brokenhead has said, I made a number of trips. I took an interest on behalf of both Mr. and Mrs. Gunson and rather attempted to help them as much as I could, although I now realize that I should have saved my effort and time, and it didn't turn out correctly, but I suppose there are lots of times when the Minister of Education and others try to help people and are not successful. As I say, our discussions were all in confidence with all of those with whom I discussed the matter and I'm not at liberty to bring them to the attention of this committee. As for doing it at odd hours, that's quite true. It was all done after 5:00 o'clock at night so that I wouldn't miss any time from the office. Some of the members of the committee don't like it when Ministers of the Crown are away from the office during business hours, and I tried not to let it interfere with the normal work that I am required to perform.

On the general subject of taxes and school costs may I just say to the members of the committee that for four years I was a school trustee and then I became the mayor of my town, and I know all of the arguments that are presented by municipal people and municipal taxpayers against the payment of taxes for school purposes, and there is a case that can be made out for saying that land should only bear taxes -- should only pay taxes for those services that benefits land. There is a strong case to be made out for that point of view. It is not the traditional view that has been held in this country, although it is held in other countries, and I have no argument with those who say that that should be the case. I simply say it's not the way that we operate in this country or in this province at the present time, but certainly there is much to be said for that view, and of course you can move down the scale from that point and say all money for school purposes should come from tax sources other than real property. You can move down the scale, and of course anything less than 100% of the cost of schools from other than real property taxes, anything less than that won't satisfy the real property taxpayers, and probably won't satisfy the municipal -- the person who is directly concerned and involved in municipal administration. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead said that we should move to 60 percentage points, making it 60-40, and that's certainly something that can be considered. There is one thing I can guarantee him, however, that when we would get it to 60-40 he and others would be suggesting 70-30 because there is no -- it's the old story. The Member for Gladstone-Neepawa said there should be a fairer means of taxation and I think that I could propose a fairer means of taxation. It would be the tax that the other fellow would pay, and we're all in favour of that, let's not kid ourselves. It's only a matter of where the equities lie. But there are problems in connection with taxation and I make these comments not to say that I don't agree and wouldn't be happy if there was some other source of taxation -- I'd be the happiest fellow in Manitoba if there was -- one that would be acceptable to those who had to pay the tax.

May I just leave with you a few items of information without comment, because I don't attempt to interpret them. The School Division of Winnipeg No. 1 had a surplus of over \$500,000 at the end of 1961 which was carried forward to their 1962 operations. I had a request within the past week from the School District of Neepawa No. 126 to purchase Province of Manitoba Savings Bonds in the amount of \$10,000, this money being money that they didn't require for their operations, and indeed the secretary of the board called me and said, "we really have \$12,000 but we only want to invest \$10,000 of that;" a request a little while ago, perhaps two weeks ago, from the School District of Weston to invest \$12,000 of their surplus monies -- I'm not too certain, I haven't a note here whether it was in Manitoba Savings Bonds or not -- but they wanted permission to invest that amount of money there. In the newest school division that has been formed, the School Division of Weston: there is a school district there -- I won't name it -- which for 1962 in view of the increased grants that they would receive -- this is a school district I am speaking about -- they would have been able to reduce their special levy in this district by \$950.00. Instead of doing that, they have budgeted and

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . properly so, they have budgeted for improvements to their school building in the amount of \$750.00 and will have a reduction in their special levy of \$200.00. It might be of interest to the committee to know that the mill rate in the city of St. Vital will be down by 3.10 mills in 1962, and in the town of Carman their mill rate for all school purposes, both school division and school district purposes, will be down by 1.3 mills over 1961 and --(Interjection)--

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would permit a question. What if any change has taken place in the assessment?

MR. McLEAN: I'm not able to tell you that, --(Interjection)--

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I point out that the figures are very interesting, but unless we have it on a basis of assessment changes as well, mill rates don't mean anything.

MR. McLEAN: That's quite correct, Mr. Chairman, and that was the point I was going to come to next, because the Honourable Member for Brokenhead was reciting the figures of school costs in certain municipalities in terms of dollars, which of course as the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party has pointed out, is meaningless unless you know the assessment, and that point is quite well taken.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, that's -- if I might -- I don't think that's a fair statement and I'll show later why it is not fair.

MR. McLEAN: Going on, if I might just finish the figures that I have, as I say, for the information of the committee, that on December 31st, 1959, the operational surplus of school districts and school divisions in Manitoba amounted to \$12,012,893. That has increased by December 31st, 1960, to \$13,094,000 for an increase of \$1,081,000, and the cash on hand at December 31st, 1959 was \$4,700,000 and on hand at December 31st, 1960, \$5,075,000. I mention these figures just by way of contribution to the discussion of school costs, which are important and which are high and which are likely to get higher as time goes by.

Some reference was made to the idea -- and it's a fruitful one -- of having liaison and perhaps statutory meetings between municipal councils and school boards, and that's an idea that could well be considered. I think sometimes we get this thing, though, out of proportion. What would you think of the suggestion that the municipal budget should be submitted to the school board for consideration? Or suppose that the school board were made the tax collecting agency, would we then be having the discussion about the unfairness of the municipal people asking for 41, or 51, or 61 percent of the expenditures for municipal purposes. You see, sometimes it depends which way you look at these things, and after all we mustn't forget that this is part of our total responsibility under our system of government and finance, and that all of these folks who administer these funds are elected, democratically elected people, and they have their responsibilities each in their own field. The matter of the imposition of the tax is, I suppose, a matter of convenience. That is they should be imposed by one body and collected by one body, although I believe that at one time a suggestion was made that could well be considered, that if it's embarrassing to municipal councils to impose these taxes that we might wish to consider having school boards levy their own taxes for their own purposes and collect them, and in all respects administer their own business. There is, as the members of this committee know, an interesting idea that is carried out in the Province of Alberta to some extent with the county system, where you have a board of county councillors or whatever they're called, who have the responsibility for both the municipal services and education, and I'm inclined to think that that's an idea that could well be considered. Perhaps it would tend to make the general administration somewhat easier, and my information is that this is being fairly well received in Alberta where it is in operation.

Speaking of the Province of Alberta, they have a rather interesting idea there where they make a levy all across the Province of Alberta, a levy against each municipal corporation for school purposes, that proceeds of that levy are paid into a fund to which is added the provincial contribution for school purposes, and then the money is paid out of the fund directly to these boards on the basis of a certain number of dollars for each pupil, for each teacher and for the various services. This involves, it would seem to me, a rather great degree of centralization of control over schools, but it's an interesting idea and of course it does carry the concept of equalization from the standpoint of the local taxpayer right out to the end of the line. I am hopeful that some time during this coming summer that I will be able to make a closer study of

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . . the Alberta system in order to form some opinion as to whether or not it might be usefully considered for adaptation here in the Province of Manitoba.

With respect to the local taxpayer, I agree with all that has been said, and we are interested and I am interested in bringing some degree of relief to the local taxpayer. I'm not too certain how that can or should be done, but insofar as agreement on the principles involved, I do agree. There are of course -- might be a number of ways in which it could be done. The thing that I would want to be certain about, if more money were being put into education from provincial tax resources, designed for the purpose of helping or relieving the local taxpayer, the thing that I want to be certain about is that it does in fact result in a reduction in the actual taxes paid by the local taxpayer, and that's where the nub of the problem comes, because if putting more money in from the Province of Manitoba were going to result in -- if that fact in itself were going to result in a reduction to the local taxpayer, we'd have had it -- we'd have had it. Because we've gone from -- in school grants alone we've gone from \$8 million to \$14 million in 1958-1959, to \$24 million this year we're just closing off, and one would think that that would result in some reduction to the local taxpayer, but as the members of the committee have explained, it hasn't, and the problem that any administration is going to have is to ensure that money that is put into the educational system for that purpose does in fact find its way, as it were, to the pocket of the real property taxpayer in the local community.

Now, turning to the Institute of Technology, when I made my report yesterday afternoon -- and all along I've been quite proud of this institute -- I was quite dejected last night, and I wondered if I'd been off on the wrong tack all the time. I wondered if the members had read the document that I had distributed some time ago about how the institute would operate. Now let me make it clear and say again that the Institute of Technology is one of the outstanding developments -- and I'm not saying this in any personal sense -- it's one of the outstanding developments in the Province of Manitoba. It will be a true "Institute of Technology." The matter of three years or two years is not in issue. The courses there are developed under the technical vocational agreement with the Government of Canada which requires for the purpose of this type of institute, 2,400 hours of instruction for completion of any particular course. The courses in Ryerson Institute run for some seven months a year. The courses in the Institute in Manitoba will run for 10 months a year. It seemed perfectly obvious to us that if we were going to build a \$4 million building there wasn't any object in having it sit idle for five months of the year. We propose to use it for 10 months of the year and we will be giving the 2,400 hours of instruction in each course, or better, as is required and as is given in Ryerson Institute even though it requires three years of time, although 21 months if one multiplies the three times the seven months in each year. So we will be on a par with the Ryerson Institute and on a par with all other institutes of technology in Canada, because the others have adopted the same system as we have, namely a two-year course running the institute for 10 months in each year.

The comparison with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology is not really quite right because that in effect is a university and grants degrees, and in that sense as I understand it is a professional institution as distinguished from an institute of technology. So I can report with good confidence that we will have a true institute of technology, and the graduates of the general course will be accepted in the Institute of Technology. If there is any difference between the Director of Curriculum and the Director of Vocational Education or any confusion in their minds, there has never been any in mine, and it's always been understood that graduation in the general course would be accepted in the Institute of Technology, and if anyone has ever said anything different they've been doing so on their own.

I must point out now, there is one slight variation here, because you will remember that I pointed out that for our friends in the Department of Health we were going to provide medical laboratory technology training and X-ray technology, and these folks are a group of people who have a statute of their own under which they establish their own entrance requirements and so on -- they're on the same basis as the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses -- and I understand that they do require matriculation standing to enter these courses. Now that's their requirement, not ours. As far as we're concerned we would take people into the courses from the general course, although it would hardly seem the right thing to do because their own Association would refuse to license them, or whatever it is that they would require, at the end.

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . Now I think this is a fruitful field of course.

MR. SCHREYER: Would you permit a question?

MR. McLEAN: Yes.

MR. SCHREYER: In view of your last statement, you would have to agree, then, that the syllabus outline which you had passed around to us was wrong, because it said that entrance requirements will be Junior Matriculation or Grade 12 standing in all other subjects. Now whatever that might mean, it would seem that up to now at least, the plan was for Matric students only.

MR. McLEAN: Yes. Well, we'll just speak of that in just a moment. Or we can deal with it now. I am reading now from the document Bulletin No. 1, "The Admission requirement for the four engineering technologies is high school graduation, junior matriculation or Grade 12 standing in all other courses," -- the other course in Manitoba being the General Course, so if that's not clear, we will see that it is made clear; "all other courses." Our other course is the general course.

Speaking of the general course and its relation to certain areas of training, I think perhaps it was the Member for Brokenhead who expressed some alarm at the possibility that people would not be accepted into nursing, graduating from the general course, and that's the fact again. The Manitoba Association for Registered Nurses set their own requirements for entrance. I think, if I might say so, I think it's unnecessary. I would hope that they might be prepared to adopt the general course as being satisfactory for entrance into nursing training, but certainly at the moment that is not the case, but again by statute, by statute passed by this Legislature, their own association has the authority to set their own requirements, which they have done, and until they change them of course there is nothing that we can do about it.

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question about the course? I am not quite clear. You said "other courses." Does that apply to students who have taken the industrial courses and they complete their Grade 11; can they go into this institution as well? Because, according to what I have found out, this coming fall I would say about one-third of the students will be going into the industrial courses in Grade 10 and I am just wondering whether they will be allowed to attend the Technical School if they pass their Grade 11 examinations?

MR. McLEAN: Well, do they get Grade 12 standing?

MR. HAWRYLUK: I don't know whether they're going to be on the Grade 11 or not, Sir. It's something new, you know.

MR. McLEAN: They would have to get their Grade 12 standing.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Grade 12. I see. If they have Grade 12 in industrial arts they can still go into this school then?

MR. McLEAN: That's what it would sound like according to this.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Well, have fun.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister wouldn't mind me asking him a question at this time? He said in regard to the question of whether the Nurses Association would or would not accept students graduating from the general course, that they are an autonomous body, they make their own regulations, and at present the fact is that they don't accept them, and he said until they change their minds that's all that we can do about it. Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask him, if it isn't a fact that if this Legislature decided in their good judgment after consideration that something should be done about it, the Legislature can do something about it.

MR. McLEAN: Well of course the Legislature can do anything it decides to do. The only thing -- and this is the small-town lawyer speaking now -- is that I believe that the statute simply provides that the Association for Registered Nurses shall by by-law establish the entrance requirements. In other words the statute itself doesn't establish the requirements, so that an amendment of the statute would have to take away, I assume, their right to establish the entrance requirement and substitute then, either by the statute or by regulation of the Lieutenant-Governor, some different entrance requirement. That would be the situation as I would see it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if along this point I might ask the Minister a

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . question. Why did not the Department consult with these organizations before proceeding with the general course? Surely this is an indication of some of the problems that my colleagues and others here have raised in respect of the general course. I would imagine that it would have been the practical thing to do, for the Minister of the Department of Education to investigate all pieces of legislation respecting professional groups, to see what their requirements were. Now, I don't know how many other professional groups have as their requirement senior matriculation, or even junior matriculation, before they will accept individuals into their respective professions. Now then, is there not going to be a considerable amount of confusion in those school divisions that the Minister has referred to that are going to start next fall on the general course? I think that because of the fact that the parents of these children and the children themselves, in order to agree or take part in this experiment on the general course that the factor should be revealed to them very conclusively that if you graduate in the general course, you will not be acceptable into many of these organizations or professional groups, and I think this is very, very important.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, . . . . . I would be very loth to suggest the drastic step which the Honourable Member for Lakeside suggested might be necessary. I would agree that we want to interfere as little as possible with the professional organizations, providing they're doing a good job, but I don't agree with the Minister that there's nothing we can do. Surely -- well you implied that they make the decisions. Now, all right, but surely, Mr. Chairman, if the general course is as good as the Minister would have us think it is, then surely the Director of Curriculum or the Deputy Minister of Education could meet with the representatives of the nursing association, explain how wonderful this course is and sell them on the easy matter of changing their regulations to permit people who take the general course to enter the profession. That's not -- here's the profession; the Minister of Health can tell us how short we are of nurses. A very large percentage of the students in the secondary schools are going to take the general course. Now do we want to make it that much tougher for the nursing profession to get people to take nursing? I don't think so. I think we want to make it easier, and it seems to me that it comes back again to what I said yesterday. We don't have enough people in the department who have the time to go out and explain what we're doing to the various professions that exist in this province, and I think that this is a relatively simple matter if the department wants to get at it.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, -- Mr. Chairman. There are really not that many that it's of that serious consequence.

You know, the Honourable Member for St. John's -- I should enjoy it because I know he means well, but he always manages to imply that nobody knows anything; nobody's done anything; nobody's doing anything; nobody is going to do anything. What does he think that the people in the Department of Education do? Sit around and wait till they collect their pay cheques? We're just as conversant with this problem as we should be, and we've had discussions with all kinds of people, and I wouldn't be talking about it if I didn't know what some of the problems were that were involved. But let me tell you; yesterday your colleague, the Member for Brokenhead, in speaking about his own profession said, "Of course, Mr. Minister, we don't want you to let people from the general course into teacher training," and that's all right, but the nurses have the same rights to make the same claim, and so do all these other people. We've got to deal with them as though they were citizens, and they have by law the right to make the rules and I think we ought to proceed on that basis. It's something that they have earned, or they have, and we'll be willing to do as much as we can to encourage them to change, but there's no confusion because students have already had lots of choices as to whether or not they took the matriculation course, because there are other courses that can be taken, and teachers and principals and students have known, or should know, that if they were going to go to university; if they were going to go to Teachers' College; if they were going to go into nursing; if they were going to do whatever -- Chartered Accountancy I suppose is one -- they had to take the matriculation course, and that situation has not changed. So I don't really think that there's any need of us to be concerned about the fact that we haven't got unanimous agreement by everybody that they're going to accept the graduates of the general course. And anyway, Mr. Chairman, anyway, the Honourable the Member for St. John's doesn't think it's a very good course to begin with, and if we took his advice nobody would take

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . . the course. In fact, we'd withdraw it, I presume, because he gave us a pretty poor bill of health during his discourse yesterday. And if I felt bad about the Institute when last night came, I felt a lot worse about the general course. This course, he says, we haven't consulted industry; we haven't consulted business; we haven't consulted labour; we're wandering into this without any preparation; we're not even thinking about it; we haven't got staff; we haven't got this; we haven't got the other thing. Well, I was just so downcast when last night came, I didn't know what to do. We don't have any aims, Mr. Chairman. It was just terrible. Well, I'd like to tell the member just how things are going.

First of all, let me point out that it was the Manitoba Teachers' Society who suggested -- and I told this to the committee a year ago -- who suggested that we must have a general course. It was the principals of the high schools in Winnipeg -- and I'm looking right at you, the Member for St. John's -- who you now say are so unenthusiastic about this course. It was they who said to me, "You've got to have another course in high school. It's no use trying to put everybody through the matriculation course, or sloughing them off to these other courses. And so," they said, "we must have a course and we want to have some part in developing it." And that was fine and we agreed that that was the basis on which we would proceed. And we did proceed on that basis. And we had a seminar, or meeting, or group, a year ago that met and developed the outline, the aims and the objections and the philosophy of the course, and laid the ground work. This was not done by me. It was not done by people in the department. It was done by practicing teachers, superintendents, school inspectors, each and every one of them picked for their capacity and ability in their particular field. And let me just read, let me read the general outline, the aims and the objectives of this course. And I'm now reading, Mr. Chairman: "The general course provides a three-year high school education, complete and satisfying in itself, encouraging the development of the student as an individual and as a member of society. The successful student will acquire knowledge of his country and the world community, of which it is a part; and of the cultural heritage which modern society possesses and enriches. He will acquire skills and knowledge providing a sound basis for further education or for learning in immediate employment. The general course offers a wide variety of challenging opportunities and rewarding experiences. Taking full advantage of these will help the student make better use of his abilities; play a more satisfying part in his society; and continue to develop as an educated and responsible person, valuable to himself and others. Specific aims: (1) to further the practical, aesthetic and moral development of the student; (2) to provide a program of studies that will assist students to live creatively in a democratic society; (3) to develop literacy, and in the process to stimulate a growing awareness and appreciation of our cultural heritage; (4) to inspire curiosity about man's environment; (5) to develop to the utmost the capacity of the student to learn; (6) to provide an opportunity for achievement."

As I reported to the committee yesterday, there have been experimental classes conducted, being conducted during this year in a number of the subjects that will be given in the course outlines that will be given. And I would like to read, Mr. Chairman, to the committee some excerpts from a press report appearing in the Winnipeg Tribune on Thursday, January 11th, 1962, written by Pat Campbell, concerning this particular general course, and I now quote: "After four months in business Manitoba's initial general course experiment is already producing big dividends. None of the subject courses is considered easier than the regulation matriculation course. In fact, they cover more ground and are rated as 'rather heavy'. Yet the Christmas marks of students in the experimental classes show a marked improvement over the norm. The difference is -- they like it." That's the end of that quotation, but going on in the same article, and again I quote: "This week the Tribune talked to three of the six teachers who have been trying out three general course subjects, English, science and geography since last September. For the first time some of the real differences between the matriculation course and the general course began to emerge. Is it easier? Only in the sense that any learning process becomes easier when it is made more stimulating and more closely identifiable with the students. There is an element of commonsense in the approach taken by the text books that have been lacking in matriculation texts, although they too may be due for an overhaul. Somebody has made a realistic appraisal of the average young mind before writing these new books."



(Mr. McLean, cont'd.)

Quoting again, Mr. Chairman, "The general course is designed to provide a high school education for students not planning to go to university. The idea is to give them a solid academic grounding, but of the kind they will need when they go to work. So far as could be learned in the Tribune survey, the specifics of the plan are encouraging." End of that quotation. But quoting again, Mr. Chairman, "I don't think there's any doubt about it, this is a more interesting course, says Cam Connell, of the science course he is teaching a class of 40 at Gordon Bell High School." That's the end of that quotation, but again quoting Mr. Connell, "The texts are more alive; it's a lot closer to the kids, not easier, but more useful, and I get a great kick out of it." Victor Caves who has a 24-member geography class at Elmwood High School, says, "Teachers will have an easier time keeping the students interested. They enjoy it and they respond well." End of that quotation. Mrs. Bernice Bond, who, if I might just interject here, is an old classmate of mine, had this to say, "I think it's a very good idea. I can certainly see a need for it. Right now it's more difficult than the matriculation course but it keeps their interest." End of that quotation, but again quoting: "Mrs. Bond, by keeping her students writing every possible minute, has seen a definite improvements in their ability to handle the written language. Their spelling has also improved. And . . . reading exercises followed by comprehension tests is increasing students' ability to understand what they read as well as their rate of speed. All three teachers vehemently denied any suggestion that the new material is easier. They regard the general course as an attempt to upgrade high school education, to raise achievement, and reduce the large number of drop-outs through boredom or frustration. And so far they are pleased with what the Special Curriculum Committee has come up with." And that's the end of that quotation.

Quoting if I may, Mr. Chairman, from an editorial in the Winnipeg Free Press, and I do this with some pleasure -- an editorial appearing on February 5th, 1962, and only quoting portions of the editorial and not the entire contents: "Their endorsation" -- the writer here is referring to the endorsation of the Manitoba Teachers' Society and the Trustees Association -- "Their endorsation of the new general course for high schools," he says they've given it their endorsation. "The Newsletter reports that the new course has been well received where it has been tried on an experimental basis and looks forward to its acceptance in a greater number of schools next fall. The article in the Manitoba Teacher is more detailed but adds up to the same thing. The general course thus seems to have surmounted its first hurdle. Instead of being regarded as a poor relation of the matriculation course, it is beginning to be accepted as having status and value in its own right."

Did we consult business and labour and industry, Mr. Chairman? Those who were here a year ago will recall that I reported that we did, and that a number of people took part in the original seminar: a gentleman from the Bank of Montreal, representing the Chamber of Commerce; a gentleman from Canada Packers; one from Great West Life; one from the Hudson's Bay Company; and one from the Trans-Canada Air Lines; the secretary of the Winnipeg District Labour Council; the Executive Secretary of the Winnipeg District Labour Council; the Manager of the Prairie Division of the Canadian Manufactureres Association; and the President and General Manager of the Pioneer Electric. And these same groups of people have been kept involved as we have gone along in the preparation of the course. We have some of the best teachers in the Province of Manitoba who have been devoting their time to the work of preparing the outlines for this course, including one somewhat closely associated with the Member for St. John's. And then finally, this report, because I was concerned with what was said last night, this is the report that I have. The high school principals in Winnipeg are all for the general course. They see some problems, and, of course, all of us see problems, and they are encountering some difficulty in securing a sufficient number of interested students at the Sisler and Churchill High Schools. Otherwise they have good enrolments, and indeed we've been asked to increase the number of authorized classrooms. The teachers, their criticism is not about the general course, the content of the subject matter, but rather it's the criticism that the teachers who have been working on it have been asked to do so in their spare time. The other criticism, which is a very valid criticism, but it's not a criticism of the course -- the unrest is not about the course, the unrest is about the work that the teachers have had to do after school hours and on Saturdays. And I'm sorry about that, although I must pause to

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . to say that there are not a few people in Manitoba who in one way or another do a little work after hours in order that things may progress. But that's a valid complaint and the teachers have made it. I know about it and the Honourable the Member has presented that complaint to us. But the complaint is not about the general course itself -- and I want that point to be quite clear. And I think that is probably all that I need to say about that report.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I reject, I reject the suggestion that this course has been developed without any planning, and without knowing where we're going, or why we're going. It was requested by the teachers. They asked to be involved in its preparation; they were involved in its preparation; and have been involved at all times as we have progressed. We have every indication of support and interest in it and we are satisfied, as the teacher themselves have said, that the subject content of the courses are good, they're stimulating and will call forth the best in the student to get them to work to their best capacity and I think that we might take good hope for the future of the course. I want to make that quite clear and to express my own confidence and the confidence of the Department of Education and the Government of Manitoba in this course, recognizing the difficulties that are to be overcome -- and as the Member for Brokenhead pointed out, this is something that others have tried and where there have been varying degrees of success. We give no promise of success; all we can hope to do is to do our best. But we have a grand, good group of people helping us and I'm certain that it will prove successful.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciated the Minister's remarks and the groups that he said he was in consultation with, but he omitted to mention whether or not he took into his confidence and consulted with those of the professional groups that we referred to a few moments ago. He mentioned to us that he'd had members of the banking profession, he'd had school teachers, he'd had representatives of labour and representatives of the manufacturers, but he omitted entirely any reference at all to those organizations of the professional groups that I asked the question on a moment ago. Now I would like to hear from him definitely or no, whether or not there has been consultation with the professional groups who at the present time have within their legislation requirements for senior matriculation alone. I think, and I repeat this again, I think this is something that the students who are going to go into this course should know before they go, and I'll ask the Minister once again, how much, if any, consultation has been held between the professional groups as apart from the groups that he has listed for our information in regard to the effects of this general course on students?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party I assume is asking that in relation to the acceptance of graduates of the general course into their particular field of work. On a formal basis there have been no consultations.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to debate with the Minister on differences either about the general course or the Institute of Technology at this time, although I certainly intend to have something further to say when we get to the item. There are two matters which I raised yesterday which looking at the estimates I don't see any opportunity to get any further information on and that's why I am on my feet today.

First of all I made suggestions, the Minister may think that they weren't suggestions, they were an attack on him or the department, but I am serious about them, that it's time we had a real research department properly staffed and so on, and I would like the Minister to comment on that. Secondly, the Minister talked about the--I raised the question of tenure and the Minister replied by pointing out the difficulties in the Gunson case. Now I don't entirely agree with the Minister because I think, Mr. Chairman, that tenure is so important, that if the Public Schools Act only deals with dismissal then it ought to be amended to include arbitration for demotion, because a transfer which along with the transfer goes a \$1500 a year reduction in salary is more than a mere detail and more than a mere transfer which the Minister tried to point out. So I think that the Act should be amended, but I think, Mr. Chairman, that even using the explanation of what the tenure situation is, which the Minister explained or implied, that the Elkhorn case certainly is a good deal more serious than we've had discussion about and the fact that it was settled by the board changing its mind really has nothing to do with the basic principle involved. In fact as I understand it, the arbitrator rules that there was nothing he could do and if this is so, or even if it's possible that it's so, it seems to me that the department

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) . . . ought to move immediately to change the Public Schools Act to make certain that an arbitration will be binding on both sides. Otherwise it seems to me that teachers are left in an entirely untenable position.

I want to say one more thing, Mr. Chairman, then I'm going to sit down. If the Minister thinks for one moment that I got any information about the Gunson case from the people concerned, I want to tell him that that is not true. He didn't suggest it, but I want this to be very clear. Both cases were brought to my attention by teachers who are concerned, not only about the particular cases, but concerned about what to them is a very important principle--the freedom of teachers--the right of teachers not to have to worry about arbitrary dismissals or demotions. I have never met the Gunsons and I have never heard their side of the story at all; anything which I have said in the House came to me from people who are responsible teachers. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister owes it to the--not to me because I'm not concerned in this at all, directly or indirectly, except that I'm a member of this House--but I think the Minister owes it to the teachers of Manitoba to make sure, and if he is sure that the tenure regulations and laws of this province are adequate, then to explain it to the teachers, because I want to tell the Minister if they haven't made representations to him, and I think they probably have, that a large number of them are very unhappy about what the cases which I mentioned seem to indicate as weakness in our laws and regulations.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, with regard to research, I don't disagree with the honourable member. I'd love to have -- I think it would probably cost oh maybe a million dollars a year, to have the kind of research department that he would like to have--and I'd love to have it. I'd love to have it. It's a matter of priorities, and if the Provincial Treasurer were to say to me: "you can have another million dollars for the Department of Education," I would have to decide whether to take the advice of the Honourable the Member for Turtle Mountain and make that in school grants, or whether to have the research department. But it's true, everything he said is true -- it's a big business; we must know where we are going. I think however, it would be perhaps -- and I make no complaint about this, because after all he has to make his point -- that it would be a little wrong to suggest that there is no research going on, because one must remember that many of the people in the Department of Education, by virtue of their office, are required to do research work, and one wouldn't necessarily employ a research department or research personnel to duplicate or do again what these people do. But there's no question -- I say "yes" we could do with more research, and leave it at that.

Now with regard to the matter of tenure -- and I am sorry I hadn't mentioned the Andrews case when I was speaking before, because that does stand on quite a different footing from the Gunson case. Now the Andrews case followed its regular course, that is to say the school-board gave notice to the teacher; she availed herself of the rights that she had under the Public Schools Act, eventually coming to a Board of Arbitration. The Board of Arbitration found that the School Trustees -- that the dismissal was not justified. Now ordinarily in most cases, the matter as far as the Arbitration Board is concerned, they stopped at that point. However, for some reason which is not clear to me, the Chairman of that particular Arbitration Board felt that he should go on and make what -- the lawyers have a word for it, I've just missed it -- but anyway it was unnecessary to the decision --(interjection)-- obiter dicta, that's right. He went on to give his view of what the law was and he said that now notwithstanding the fact that this dismissal was not justified, this teacher has no rights to go back to work. As I say he wasn't called on to make that statement, he didn't have to make it and --(interjection)-- well maybe that was it, I don't know. This raised rather an interesting point, because up to this time, up to this particular case, there had never been a case in Manitoba where, when the teacher was successful before the Board of Arbitration, that the employing board didn't take the teacher back. So that seemed to be working as everyone understood that it should and would. But here was the case, and it's the Chairman of the Arbitration Board who gives us this opinion. Well my understanding at that moment was that the Teachers Society was going to take the matter to court. They were going to find out whether this opinion that this gentleman had expressed was right or not. It was certainly contrary, as I say, to what everyone sort of understood was the case, and I was looking forward to the decision of the court, because that would have been helpful first of all in determining that particular case and in determining what should or should not be done with regard to the future. However in this particular case the board took the teacher

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . back anyway and of course that meant that was the end of the case. I presume she didn't wish to have her name associated with the case, once she had been reinstated to her position with the board.

So I think we're left with this position, that we have the understanding that up to this time, if a teacher is successful in arbitration, he or she always goes back on the job. The only viewpoint that's been expressed to the contrary to that is that of the Chairman of the Arbitration Board in this one case, and whether his interpretation of the law is correct or not, has not been tested and I think we're entitled to assume that what we have always understood the law to mean, it does mean; and until there is some further trouble I would think it quite unnecessary to have any legislation, because as I say, even in this case, the successful person was reinstated by the board.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, shouldn't the Arbitration Board have the power to order, if it finds that there was an unjust dismissal, to order the board to employ the teacher and to order back payment. This thing may run six months and a person may not be paid. It seems to me that there shouldn't be any doubt about it. Now if the Minister says that in his opinion there isn't any doubt about it -- I assume that means if we get another case like this maybe the Minister will use his influence and we don't need the legislation, I suppose we can wait and see. It seems to me there shouldn't be any doubt about this.

MR. McLEAN: . . . . bank too much on the Minister's influence, but I think the position is this, Mr. Chairman, that there is a contract between the employing board and the teacher. That contract continues in existence until it is terminated. Now it isn't terminated unless the teacher has been properly dismissed, or turning the matter around the other way, if the Arbitration Board finds that the teacher could not be dismissed, then that teacher is still under contract; still entitled to his or her salary; still entitled to work for the employing board under the terms of the contract.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Chairman, there were a number of questions, or rather, suggestions I made last night and I haven't received an answer to any of them. I'm vitally interested, and I think some of the members of the House are, regarding the status of the Provincial Examination Board, which I questioned, and I certainly feel that something should be done, or an answer given. And also I'd like to know what about the provisional pass policy that's been existing in this province at the expense of inadequately prepared students who are entering into the high school field, and it's been going on and on, and I don't know when we're going to straighten this matter out. I think it's about time we took the bull by the horns and made our young people realize that they've got to earn their credits in Grade 9, 10 and 11 instead of being pushed into it as we have been doing for years and years.

And thirdly, I wondered whether there's a fee being charged to the students who will have the privilege of entering the technological school. We are aware, for example, if a student wants to go from East Kildonan to the Vocational School in the City of Winnipeg, his parents have to pay a fee of \$380.00 or \$90.00. Now I'm just wondering about who will be allowed to attend the technological school after they receive their credits in Grade 11 or 12; and is there a fee attached to that?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, there are fees charged at the Manitoba Technical Institute now, subject to a lot of exceptions; the same rules will apply. There will be fees charged at the Institute of Technology, student fees. They have not been set. I cannot, cannot say what they are, or even -- the matter of their amount has not even been considered. But in that regard it will be -- the Institute of Technology will be operated on the same basis as the university. That is to say, the students will be charged fees for the courses which they take.

Now, coming to the questions which the Honourable Member for Burrows raised last night. With regard to the High School Examination Board and the matter of the passing and failing, I think with great respect that he has a misunderstanding -- I can understand the misunderstanding when he reads that famous resolution of the women of the Manitoba Farm Union. But members of the committee may remember that I tried to exculpate myself last year and to explain how that came about, and I take the full responsibility because the dear ladies misunderstood the whole situation when they passed the resolution. May I just tell the committee, if I might, of the occasion when I was invited to speak to the ladies at their Farm Women's Week and consented to answer questions. And the questions turned on the subject of

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . examinations. I've always found that at any public gathering the most important question is about examinations. How are they set? How are they marked? How many pass? How many fail? And so on. So I was endeavouring to explain to the good ladies that if a paper was set in say Grade 11 mathematics and it turned out that every single student in the Province of Manitoba passed, somebody would very properly conclude that perhaps the paper was too easy, and the experts, the teachers would look it over, those engaged, and they might say: "Well here, we've got to toughen this up and make — require a little higher standing in order to pass." Then I also explained that at the other end of the scale, if you had a paper in which say 90% of the students all failed, obviously the paper's been too difficult, and so you reverse the process.

Now I was doing that simply to try and illustrate how things went on. And it was from that that the ladies got the impression that somebody way up here -- I'm not pointing at the gallery -- arbitrarily says each year; "Okay, so many percentage have to fail; we're only going to let so many through." And that's not the case at all. And as a matter of fact, the first situation that I have described hasn't happened for a number of years. There have been occasions when it's been considered in fairness that the papers were too difficult, and that it has been necessary to -- I think the Honourable Member for Burrows used the word "bonus" -- that's not a very good term when you're talking about examinations, but I guess that's what the fact is, that some bonusing is done. But I can say that there is no decision by anybody that only so many will pass or that there must be a certain percentage of failures. That is not done by the High School Examination Board.

May I just remind the Members of the Committee that in the setting of the high school examinations and in the marking of them that, while it is true that the university people, professors, are represented, the majority in every case is a majority of practicing high school teachers, so that that protects against any possibility of someone who is not familiar with what work is going on in the school sort of imposing his or her ideas on what should be in the examination paper, or how they should be marked or answered.

Now the Honourable Member for Burrows also asked me whether or not the general course was going to be an inferior course. I perhaps have answered that and given him my opinion. He also asked me whether or not the High School Examination Board would set the general course examinations. Well now this matter has not been finally decided -- and you will understand that I'm not purporting to give a firm answer at the moment because the first students will be in Grade 10 this coming September -- but this is our thinking that we see the idea that they will be external examinations at the end of Grade 12 in the general course, and that these will be set by the High School Examination Board, but we will have to have a set of external examinations at the end of Grade 12. That is so we may give a certificate or diploma, or some recognition of achievement. Whether or not we will have examinations at the end of Grade 11 in the general course has not been decided. In other words, we haven't decided whether we'll have a set of external examinations at that point or not. If we do decide to have a set of external examinations, we will have to decide how they are to be set.

Now I think that's the most that I can tell the honourable member at the moment and if he entertains some concern about the High School Examination Board, he probably won't be too happy with the suggestion that they will be the people who will be called on to set the external examinations for Grade 12. But I'm quite willing -- I think he's made a valid point -- it may be that these folks are not the right people to set the examinations for the general course and certainly the matter is one that I will be quite pleased to keep in mind.

Now with regard to provisional passes. It is my understanding that provisional passes are only possible from Grade 9 to Grade 10. There can be no provisional pass from Grade 10 into Grade 11. I concur in all he said about the fact that a provisional pass may develop an attitude of indifference and that students should know that they have to get their supplementals off, and he may be interested to know that I've had several discussions with the people concerned -- I was almost going to say with the research staff but that wouldn't be the right term -- about the idea that we should require people to pass the grade in full before moving on, and I'm not really -- how would I say -- I'm not really firm in my own mind about it, but what the member has said is quite true and there is a real problem, which we recognize, and I'm concerned about it.

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) ....

Now if I may, there was one other thing about the textbooks. I was going to invite the Honourable Member for Burrows to read the article appearing in the Winnipeg Free Press on March 27th, at which time the President of the Canadian Text Book Publishers Institute, a Miss Gladys Neill, said that about 85% of the textbooks used in Canadian schools are written by Canadians. That was her statement. Now with regard to Manitoba, this is the breakdown of our authorized text. We have 81 texts, our Canadian texts. That represents 36% of our total number of texts. Forty of our texts are Canadianized American texts and that represents 18%. Thirty-four of them are American texts. That represents 15%. Sixty-three texts are British and that represents 28%. Eight texts are French and that represents 3%. And so approximately 30% of all authorized texts are of American origin if you include those that are American and the Canadianized American; or if you just take the strictly American texts in Manitoba, they amount of 15%. This is a troublesome matter and in this article that I refer to, Miss Neill points out the problem involved in costs and that sort of thing. We're watching this very closely. We're anxious, of course, to achieve a greater degree of Canadian texts, although one must recognize that there are American texts which are very good in their particular field.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just one question if I may, I know it's 5:30 or very close to it. The Honourable the Minister of Education mentioned 8% French. Is that imported French or French in Canada itself?

MR. McLEAN: That would be both, Mr. Chairman, because in a number of the French classes, I believe -- in some of the French classes the -- well, yes, that's right, they would come from France or outside of Canada. They would be French texts from outside of Canada.

MR. PAULLEY: But not all of the 8%?

MR. McLEAN: Oh no, oh no, there are -- a number of them are Canadian. A number of them come from Quebec.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman are we now ready to pass the item that we are engaged on? --(interjection)-- No, I understand they're some further speakers, Mr. Chairman, so in view of that I move the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. James that the report of the committee be received.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Monday afternoon.