

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, April 3, 1969

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to address the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my left. One hundred and twenty students, Grade 7 standing, of the Pembina Crest School. These students are under the direction of Miss Breaky and Messrs. Klassen, Onyschuk and Dumontier. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Attorney-General. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, if I just may take a moment or two to recap what I had set out to say before the House recessed for lunch. As I had indicated, our Minister of Education is a new minister in this department. Not only is he a new minister but he had also indicated some reorganization within it. It is now a Department of Education and Youth, in other words in some way, I take it, expanding and changing the role that the department is intended to play in the operations of the government of this business in the activities of the people of this province. And I sincerely regret, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister's opening remarks on the introduction of his estimates were completely sterile and void of any indication as to what his philosophy re the role of education in the present century is, re its aims and objectives; what should we be striving for; what should we be attempting to achieve; are we reaching our aims and objectives or are we not. The Minister merely reported on what has happened. He has told us we have schools, we have pupils within them and we have teachers within them. This we always had. He reported another activity. But is this good or bad, in the Minister's opinion? Is this what we should be doing or should we be doing more in some of these areas? This I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, the Minister did not comment on, and I suggest to you that if the Honourable Minister would take the time very early in the presentation of his estimates to get up in this House and do indicate to us what his philosophy regarding the operations of his department is, he would be doing the quarter million students that we have in Manitoba schools a tremendous favour - I suppose over a third of a million, more than that -- yes, about a third of a million people of under 21 years of age - he would be doing his Cabinet and his caucus a tremendous favour, because there were some references made in the Throne Speech, with which I will deal later, that I'm sure the members of his own caucus find difficult to explain to their people, that many people find very difficult to comprehend and accept, and if he were to explain to them that this is what we are attempting to do, this is what we wish to achieve, then perhaps in the light of that, whatever the Minister proposes to do would be more palatable to the people of Manitoba.

Now I perhaps could go on to deal with specifics; I could go on to deal with details of the operations of his department; but I suggest to you that until such time as we hear from the Minister what the aims and objectives of his department are, it will be a waste of time dealing with the operational details of the department. It would appear to me, and I have no evidence to indicate otherwise, that at the present time we have nothing more than a caretaker Minister; a caretaker Minister of a very vital department, a very vital department in the Province of Manitoba, and I say that he is a caretaker Minister because of an indication of an apparent reluctance to allot the type of recognition, the type of funds to the operation of our school system that it deserves. Instead, what is the Minister saying? What was suggested in the Throne Speech, Mr. Chairman?

Just to remind you, I will read the paragraph. "You will be asked to approve legislation to extend the powers of the Public School Finance Board." And why? Why? To expand our education system? To enrich it? No. To control total spending. To control total spending. Not the direct spending -- not the direct spending toward a better return for our dollar, but to control total spending with a view to effecting economies in school spending. That, Mr. Chairman, is what was contained in the Throne Speech and no doubt this was upon the advice of the Honourable Minister of Education that the Throne Speech read the way that it did on that particular point. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is adopting the attitude that let's sit still; let's hold fast; all's well in the school system; let's just keep the wheels going.

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) They've gained sufficient momentum in his opinion. Let's keep them turning and we'll provide the necessary funds to grease those wheels to keep them turning, but let's not venture in any new areas; let's not do anything that may require the expenditure of additional funds; and if any money has to be expended let's put that within the hands of a group of people beyond reach of the electorate.

We appoint a Public Schools Finance Board; they are not responsible to the electorate; we cannot defeat them come the next election and it becomes very convenient for the Minister to hide behind the Public Schools Finance Board. He can then say to the school boards, "I'm sorry, fellows, but there's no money. There's no money because the Public Schools Finance Board does not recognize as valid your proposed plan for development," or whatever else it might be that a school division may wish to do.

What happened, Mr. Chairman, to the position of this government as enunciated in 1965, of which the Winnipeg School Division in presenting its brief to a committee of this House dealing with Bill 22, quoted - and I'll read it to you, Mr. Chairman. "Education is the investment given first priority by the government. I'll repeat that. "Education is the investment given first priority by the government." While other services for our people such as health and welfare together with economic development may well be of equal importance, the government recognizes that without the training and education of our people all vital undertakings, both public and private, must suffer. Technical skills, research knowledge and enlightened utilization are all increasingly urgent requirements of our modern society. Education is the first requisite in the provision of these capabilities."

This, Mr. Chairman, were the words of this very same government. These were the words of this government stated in 1965 and now, four years later - four years later, Mr. Chairman - this government says, "Let's extend the powers of the School Finance Boards. Let's assume control of the expenditures of the school divisions. Let's clamp down on them."

Now I hope, Mr. Chairman, that for the benefit of the people of Manitoba that this House never does see the bill suggested in the Speech from the Throne, because if we do, I say to you that that would be the most serious retrograde step in the history of education in this province that a government could possibly take. Mr. Chairman, what justification is there for even suggesting what was suggested in the Throne Speech? Is there any evidence of extravagant spending, of foolish spending, of unreasonable spending by any school board? Can the Honourable Minister stand up and say, "Yes I have evidence of it. Here is a school division which was spending money as if it were to go out of date by sundown, and I must clamp down on them. I must clamp down on them. Their electors, the taxpayers, cannot control them, and some control must be imposed from above. We have the financial knowhow. We have a monopoly on financial knowhow at the provincial government level. We're the ones who are going to tell them how to spend money." Is there any evidence of extravagance? And I suggest to you, Mr. Premier, that there is none. There is none. And if there is, I'd like to hear of it. I'd like to hear of it. Is anybody prepared to -- well I hear nothing, Mr. Chairman, so I take it that there is no evidence of it.

Mr. Chairman, what happened to this concept that this very government preached, that education is an investment, that education is an investment? And the First Minister of that day repeated that phrase time and time and time again. Education is an investment. And today they're referring to the money spent on education as merely being expenditures. It's no longer looked upon as an investment. An expenditure, a burden, a drain on the financial resources of the people of Manitoba.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I would urge the Minister that before we proceed with his estimates that he do take the time to collect his thoughts on the role of his department and get up in this House and state to us that "in my opinion, this is the role of my department. This is where we should go; and what we are doing, what I had reported to you that this department is doing, it is with this goal in mind that we are proceeding in this certain direction." So that the members would know. And, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to you that if the Minister finds it difficult to do this in the time -- I think we can give him the time. We can give him more than time. We can assist him. We can assist him. If he's at a loss as to what direction his department should take, I would suggest that he call upon the New Democrats of this House and we'll help him. We'll tell him. We've told him many a time. We've told him many a time, in fact, and I'll tell you later, Mr. Chairman, that some of the suggestions that we've made, this House accepted; this government accepted the suggestions that we made, and I'll cite them

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) chapter and verse to you, Mr. Chairman. This House accepted them. But did it act on them? No. So in the meantime, Mr. Chairman, I can only proceed on the basis of the evidence before us and comment on the operations of this department as I see them as presented to us by the Minister.

One matter of great concern to me, being the type of a community that our province is, being a province made up of a variety of ethnic cultures, our forefathers having come here from many lands of this globe, I would just like to comment on the same matter that the Honourable Member for Emerson did a couple of days ago with respect to the teaching of Ukrainian in the Manitoba schools. I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether you had opportunity to study the statistics appearing at the back of the Department of Education report, but the Minister's report indicates that for the last school term - I believe it's for the last school term, but the most recent figures quoted in that report anyway, probably for 1967 - show that there were 5,565 Grade 12 students writing the final Grade 12 French examination. There were 67 students studying the Ukrainian language, writing the final examination set in that subject. Now, Mr. Chairman, I'd be the first to admit that some responsibility does fall on the student, on the parents, to encourage the student to interest him in the learning of this language, but I would suggest to you that this is to a large measure due to the manner in which the teaching of the Ukrainian language in the Manitoba schools was implemented. You will recall that it came in in a series of stages. Its first introduction to the public school curriculum was a non credit subject. In other words, the students had to find time within the regular school program to take Ukrainian if they wished it, and this, I'm sure that you would know Mr. Chairman, is very difficult, in fact practically impossible, to enable a student to take a full program and that takes up the bulk of the teaching day, and then in addition to that study Ukrainian.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a language of a large percentage of the people of Manitoba, and if I may, Mr. Chairman, I would just wish to express the thinking of those people and I have prepared a statement because I want no mistake made about it, about what I'm saying, so that for the sake of the record, in the event that any error should appear at any stage, I would like to be in a position to correct it. And in a moment or two, Mr. Chairman, if you find some difficulty in following me, what I'm saying, I will tell you what I'm saying:

Jaloo scho u nashi prowintsii Manitobi, u komri Kanaglytsi z Ukrainskoho pochogjenia, riwnautsia u chysli z inshymy bilshymy etnichnymy grupamy, ye take male chyslo stugentiw mowy tyei kpainy kotra taka bohata w istopii i kulturi.

Wyna w chastynti spadaye na nash uryad. Uriad musyt dokazaty ne tilky slowam, ale takoj dilom scho nauka i nahoga uchytyz Ukrainsku mowu na riwni z Frantsuzkou i Nimetskou mowow.

My wyznayemo fakt scho my tilky odna z bahatioch etnichnych grup. Otje, yak nash uryad diyсно pryznaye scho nasha prowintsia ye etnychnuy mozaik, to powunen daty prowid do wstanowlennia uchenia rijnych mow na yaki ye domaha. Tym spocobom my zmojem prychnynty go zbudowannia Kanadiyskoyi kultury yaka by bula rozbohachena wsim tym scho dobre scho z soboyu prywezly budiwnyky nashoi prowintsii.

Mr. Chairman, for your benefit and for the benefit of others, I regret that in our Province of Manitoba in which Canadians of Ukrainian origin are on a par in numbers with other larger ethnic groups, there is such a small number of students of a language of a country so rich in history and culture. The blame in part falls on our government. The government must demonstrate, not only in lip service but in deed, that the teaching of and opportunity to study the Ukrainian language is on par with the French and German languages.

We recognize the fact that we are only one of many ethnic groups. Therefore, if our government truly admits to the fact that our province is an ethnic mosaic, it should then give leadership to the institution of teaching all languages for which there is a demand. Thus we could participate in the building of a Canadian culture which would be enriched with all that is good which the builders of our province brought with them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I had mentioned earlier that my impression of the Minister's report or of his introduction of the estimates, was that all's well with the school system, and he quoted figures to bear out some of the claims that he made. I would like to point out some figures appearing on a couple of pages of the Minister's report. And I do believe, Mr. Chairman, and I'm sure that you'll agree with me, that what I'm going to say is a realistic measure of the effectiveness of our school program. Now we pride ourselves, and this government does, and I've heard this statement made, that it is the intention of the government to provide equality

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . of educational opportunity, but Mr. Chairman, something is happening between Grades 9 and 11. Now these are still young people, Mr. Chairman. They're 14, 15, 16 years of age. They're not of an age, very few of them are of an age to be attracted by the labour market. There isn't that much there that attracts them at that age. And yet, Mr. Chairman, if you would examine the figures - and one could go all the way back; I'm looking at page 68. I'm looking at the Grade 11 attendance for the year 1968 which is shown as 14,000. Where did those 14,000 students come from? They came from the 1966 Grade 9 class, of which the enrolment was 17,000. In other words, Mr. Chairman, only four out of five Grade 9 students reach Grade 11. And I would suggest to you, I would suggest to the Honourable Minister, that he take a look at some of the figures, some of the statistics for other parts of the world. Take a look at some of the statistics in some of the states of the United States of America. In fact the average, the average for the whole country of the United States of America of this type of comparison, is over 90 percent - well over 90 percent; around 95 percent, I believe. And in Manitoba, only four out of five Grade 9 students find their way to Grade 11.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I suppose and it may well be that somewhere in there are some who find their way into other educational institutions, of which there are very few provided for that age group. I'm sure that the Minister appreciates the admission requirements to R. B. Russell School, of which there's only one, by the way, for the whole province of Manitoba - one of that type, of that particular type - and by the time you meet the age requirement, by the time you meet the out-of-school school requirement, by the time you meet a history of repetition of grades in the past, meet that requirement, you're well over this age group. In fact, those students who may be eligible to enrol in schools such as R. B. Russell and others, they don't even get to Grade 9. They're likely not shown in the Grade 9 figure. In other words, these students, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you, are candidates for senior high school. The vast majority of them are candidates for senior high school. And yet, despite the school building program which we have seen over the last number of years, despite the reorganization of the school divisions, despite the transportation system that's provided, something either is happening or is not happening which is not keeping these people in school. I don't know the answer to that, Mr. Chairman. This is something that I feel that the Minister ought to explain. Maybe the reason why he didn't explain it, maybe he can't explain it. I don't know. Because I think that at the present moment I don't think that he can, because I think that this can only be explained, this has to be viewed in the light of our goals and objectives, in the light of the philosophy of education that we have for the province of Manitoba, of which I have yet to hear.

Now this, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you is one feature that is, to some extent, a measure of the type of educational program that we have. I want to make one further comment on the same point, that this percentage of Grade 9 students who find their way to Grade 11 hasn't changed significantly for many many years, since about 1960. In 1960, it was 75.6 percent. In 1962 it went up to 81.5 and it hovered around that point from then on. It dropped in one year to 78.8; up to 82. It went up as high as 84.2 in 1966. Now back to 82.5

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to point out to you that another set of statistics to examine in evaluating our educational system is the qualifications of our teachers - the qualifications of our teachers. Now I know, and I'm well aware of the fact, that even our President of the University of Manitoba did make a statement at one time, whether he was quoted in or out of context I don't know, but he did cast a shadow of doubt on the need for a post-high school academic education to any degree for elementary school teachers. Well, I'm not going to stand up here and argue in favour of an Arts or Science degree for every high school teacher, but I am going to argue in favour of some form of academic and professional training for teachers extending beyond that presently offered.

Now, at the present time -- all we had to work with in the past was the Faculty of Education that we now have, offering the courses that it offered, and if you would examine the statistics for the last three years, the percentage of teachers holding a collegiate certificate - and this is the distinguishing mark of those who have a university degree - has, in fact it dropped from 1966, in 1966 . . . just a slight drop, but it was around the 66 percent mark - 66.8 percent, 66.3 percent, 66.7 percent. So, Mr. Chairman, when the Honourable Minister says that we're expanding our teaching force, that we're bringing more people into the profession, on a balance - take into consideration the enrolment, the number of teachers - we are not making any progress. Nor, Mr. Chairman, may I - and this is the last point and this one could probably go on for hours on this aspect of it - nor has the pupil-teacher ratio changed significantly.

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) And the Minister knows full well that in order for a teacher to do an effective job in a classroom, you reach a point beyond which it is difficult to teach. You become a policeman, a disciplinarian, a baby sitter, but not a teacher in the true sense of the word. You have to have a manageable group to work with. And I suggest to you that over the last three years the pupil-teacher ratio has not changed significantly. It may have fluctuated a tenth or a quarter of a percent. But Mr. Chairman, it's nowhere near the level where it should be.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that our Honourable Minister has now reached a moment of decision, a decision he has to make, a decision that he has to make not only with respect to the separate activities of each of his departments, but he must also take a close look at the financing of our school system. And I suggest to you that on that point he ought to consult with the members of the front bench. He ought to tell them what his problems are. I believe that, Mr. Chairman, he is a member of that - what is it? The Priorities Committee. He's on the Executive Council yes, but there are a couple of committees which the First Minister has set up, I think it's the Priorities Committee. -- (Interjection) -- The reactionary committee, I'm told. And that may well be, Mr. Chairman. In fact the more I listen to the Minister, the more convinced I become of that. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that the -- (Interjection) -- Well the word "progressive." I believe that the government has lost sight of that because that's part of the name of their party label, or I'm not sure -- (Interjection) -- Yes, and they call themselves Progressive.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just what attempt is the Honourable Minister - this member of this priorities Committee - what attempt is he making to impress upon the other members the importance of education? What attempt is he making to remind them of what the First Minister of a couple of years ago said about education, about its importance, about education being an investment? Now he might be waiting for the Committee to call a meeting. May be the committee hasn't met and maybe that's the problem, but in that event then, as was stated in this House some time ago, any member of the committee has the right to call a meeting. So therefore I say that if the meeting of the committee hasn't been called, then it is the duty of the Minister of Education to call the meeting of that Priorities Committee and demonstrate to them the importance of education and the need for an aggressive and an ambitious educational program, and proceed with that immediately. After all, Mr. Chairman, there is the welfare and the future of a half a million people in Manitoba at stake. And I suggest to you that he talk to the Honourable Minister of Finance, that he talk to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, whom I don't see in his seat at the moment, that he tell them what his problems are, that he tell them; that he tell the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that there are \$200 million worth of resources belonging to the people of Manitoba extracted from that ground for which we receive \$2 million in return. Tell him that that is not enough. Tell him that we must revise our taxation system in this province. Tell him that we need a proper educational system and that we cannot continue financing it on the present basis. Tell him that those who reap the benefits of our education program . . . pay for it. Instead, Mr. Chairman, what does the Minister say? He says, let them pose some controls. Let them pose some controls on the expenditures of the school divisions. Let them pose controls - why? Are we moving too fast? What kind of controls are -- I'd like to know what kind of controls but it's crystal clear to me, Mr. Chairman, from reading the Throne Speech, that those controls will be with a view to reducing and limiting the expenses. It wouldn't be controls in the sense of directing the expenditures to provide an enriched education program which we deserve. It certainly won't be that, I'm quite certain of it.

Why, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister proposing an extension of the powers of the School Finance Control Board? Is he getting tired of listening to delegation after delegation from school boards, complaining about their sorry plight? Is he becoming a - and I must use the term again, or a variation of it - is he becoming a weary Minister? It seems that way. It seems that way, Mr. Chairman. It appears that way and hence he has appointed these financial wizards and he's going to extend their powers - this group of in his opinion, financial wizards. They know all the answers; they know how money is to be spent; they know better than school trustees do; they know better than anybody else. And I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that when this is done, in fact we're on the way to that point now, that the education system in Manitoba will not improve, will not be enhanced, but the minimum will then become the standard. The minimum will become the standard. Where is the progressive attitude to which this

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . government paid lip service a number of years ago?

And what about his own staff, Mr. Chairman? Have you thought of the position that this extension of the powers of financial control granted to the Finance Board, what would it do to his staff? Now, I not only assume but from my knowledge of the operation of the Department of Education, I know that we do have a very ambitious staff, a very conscientious staff, a staff extremely desirous to become involved in the establishment of the finest education system in the province of Manitoba. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me use one officer of his department as an example. I'll use one because I'm acquainted with that type of work, and I could well imagine what may transpire between him and a school superintendent or a board of trustees. And I'm thinking of the Guidance Department of which the Honourable Minister has every reason to be proud. In my estimation, Mr. Banmen is doing a first rate job in there, because he was responsible for establishing that department. Now a man in his . . . -- (Interjection) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would remind the honourable member he has one minute . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm sure because I don't think the Honourable Minister is prepared, not unless he has the statement in his back pocket, I don't know. Mr. Chairman, I'll just make this brief point. I have a couple of other points which I'll make later.

What position will that put his own staff? They approach a school board suggesting certain innovations and certain expansions in their program. Now what reply can that superintendent give him? All he could say, "It's a wonderful idea; we'd love to do it, but you know, we have to go back to a board of your own department for permission. We have to go back to a board of your own department because we'll have to expand our physical facilities and hire additional staff and so forth, and we can't move until such time as an arm of your department gives us permission." Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask you, would this type of structure allow his own department the type of freedom that they need to give the educational system in Manitoba the leadership that they require and deserve?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, could I just have one question? Would the member permit a question?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Certainly.

MR. FROESE: Did his group and party not vote for the legislation establishing a Public School Finance Board with the controls and the powers outlined in the Act?

MR. HANUSCHAK: If we did, Mr. Chairman, we also indicated and outlined the role that it should play in the education system.

MR. McLEAN: I'm wondering if the honourable member would permit me to ask him a question? I regret I cannot ask the question in Ukrainian, Mr. Chairman, but would the Honourable Member for Burrows indicate to us what government introduced the teaching of Ukrainian into the high schools of Manitoba and made it a regular subject of the high school curriculum?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that this government did not do it. I admit that it was this government but I criticize this government for the manner in which they did it, that at first they made it most unappealing, unattractive, in fact difficult and, in many cases, impossible to take. And with that type of start this is the effect that it's had upon the attractiveness of the offering of the Ukrainian language in our public schools curriculum.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would permit a subsequent question. Is the Honourable Member for Burrows aware that it was introduced on exactly the basis requested by the Ukrainian-Canadian Committee of Canada (Manitoba Branch)?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, the Ukrainian-Canadian Committee is not responsible for the people of Manitoba. This government is.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to see that the former Minister of Education is so ready and willing to enter into these questions, something he wasn't too fussy in doing while he was the Minister. And while he's here and with the present Minister and the First Minister in his seat, I am going to make a request. We have heard an awful lot about coming in with this, the French language and the French fact - we've heard the word "gradualism", and it was suggested that the rest of the country should do like Manitoba, and I think that this is sufficiently important that the Minister - and I apologize if he did say something on this; I haven't heard him - I expect a detailed report on the progress of the teaching of French or the use of French as a teaching language in our schools. This is something that is, I think, quite important not only for Manitoba but for the rest of Canada, and I expect that we will hear something before the Minister leaves his estimates. I want to know what we are doing as far

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) as Normal Schools are concerned. I want to know if we're developing French teachers or teachers that will use French as a teaching language. I want to know from the government if the government is satisfied with the progress that has taken place in this province ever since we passed this Bill a couple of years ago. I want to know where the government wants to go. Is it the intention of the government to teach more languages in French, in certain schools at least. I want to know if the French schools are taking full advantage of at least 50 percent of the time in French, teaching in French. I want to know the progress that is being made in the use of textbooks. I think these are some of the things that the people are vitally interested in.

The former Minister of Education said awhile ago that, as far as the Ukrainian language is concerned, they did that exactly as the Ukrainian Association wanted it. I'm sorry to report that the French Association, who do represent a lot of people here, are not apparently so fortunate because they are not taken too seriously in many instances. If we are going to progress -- do you remember, Mr. Chairman, I voted in favour of this Bill when it came through. I complimented the government. I said that I would do everything possible to make it work. I felt that maybe it was a good start. Some people wanted more but I felt that we had to bring this in in an orderly manner, an orderly fashion, but I want to know now if we are doing anything more about this or did we just pass this Bill to appease certain people and to be able to say at certain conferences that everything possible is being done in Manitoba? I know that this is not the case. I certainly expect the Minister to have a very good report on this.

And then, I wonder if he would look, if this hasn't been done, if he could look into the possibility of -- maybe in the Metro area, where you have many school boards, it would be too costly to have set up the French schools in so many of these districts; would it be possible for the government to set up through, of course, the local school boards, but to set up the French schools where people of the Metro area anyway, a different school board, composing the different school boards of the Metro area, could send their children if they want them to have the advantage of being taught in their own language once in a while. I think that this would be probably one of the cheapest ways of doing it. It would be something that would be of worth. It would be maybe, in this province anyway, a pilot project. It's being done in Ontario and I think it is quite successful, and I'd like to hear the Minister's comments on this.

There's something else I want to speak about briefly along the same vein. I guess it's national unity and I guess it's respect of each other and proper recognition of all. This could be taken under different departments, I'm sure, and we might come back to it, but I am very disappointed, and I might say hurt, in the reports that I've heard lately - and I think that this is a question of history, so therefore it should come under Education - I hear that there's a certain group of people in Manitoba who are organized to stop any movement of promoting recognition or a monument for Louis Riel, the real father of this province, and if this is the case today I challenge these people to come in the open. I think if these people feel as they do, they should have the guts to stand up and say so openly. There's been an awful lot of progress made. There has been an awful lot of progress made in this province on this, and it only takes one or two or a small group of people to keep on cultivating prejudice and division of our people, and I certainly resent this. I wonder if the Minister could tell us what he thinks on this. It's a question of history and it's something that this should I think by every -- have every right to discuss under these estimates of the Department of Education.

Now for years we have been, and I have brought in a motion I think it was close to 10 years ago, a motion to the effect that we use the medium of television which was the coming thing and it's still more so now, in the field of education. I remember at the time that the then Minister of Education, who just left his seat in the House, in the Chamber I should say, felt that there was no point at all because he did not like television. I know that we've come a long way since then but I don't think this is good enough. I suggested a few years ago that the department should keep that in mind whenever they extended the facilities and had new buildings and new schools, and I wonder if this is being done, because if we like it or not, one of these days television will play a very very important part, much more than it is now, and I think we should be ready in the field of education. This is not something that will replace the teachers, not the good teachers, anyway, but this will help an awful lot and there's unlimited fields that this will open, especially in the field of adult education, for one thing. We are talking about bringing television in this Chamber and in the House of Commons by way of education, and I think that most of the people agree with it. It's just in the setting up that they're a little afraid. I think

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . that we have to accept now that television is certainly with us and it's going to stay, stay a long time, and it is part of society, it is accepted, and it will play a very important role and I would like the Minister - I think there was something said in the Throne Speech, but very little, and the Minister certainly didn't elaborate on this too much. As I say, this is something that has been brought in here for the past 10 years anyway. If the Minister wants me to find the resolution that I proposed close to 10 years ago, I'll be glad to do it, and I wouldn't want to embarrass now the Minister of Transportation who was the Minister of Health. It's no use looking backwards all the time. Sometimes it is good, according to my friends in front of me here, but -- (Interjection) -- "What makes you think you're my friend?" You weren't this morning, I'll tell you that.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to hear from the Minister on this. Now there is something else. The Minister is being quite helpful in this. I've asked him a question but I think we could do better than this. I think that all the members here should be furnished with a booklet - we receive so much material - some kind of a booklet, or looseleaf or anything, all these bursaries available, the conditions of qualification and so on, and also all the information necessary or that we can possibly get under the student loans. I think this is something that would be quite helpful to a lot of us. I know that I'm asked many times what kind of bursaries we have and so on and I think if we could, without bothering the department in every instance, if we could give this information I think it would be helpful. I know that a few years ago the Minister of Education furnished us with little folders about the different courses in vocational schools, and I know that this would be very helpful to me anyway and I imagine to the rest of the members, even my three would-be friends in front of me, and I think this would be helpful. So Mr. Speaker, this is some other information that I would like to have.

These few short words were more or less to remind the Minister that there is other material that he hadn't covered and I hope he will cover this before we allow him to leave with his salary. I'm not about to suggest that we reduce it to 98 cents; I think he's worked quite hard, but I would like to have this added information.

Now I'm not going to start a battle or I'm not going to have everybody on that side of the House hide, and I'm not going to start an argument with my honourable friend, but I would like him to indicate the government's intention as far as any aid or recognition of private schools, if there has been any change at all. I'll be satisfied with this; I won't embarrass you. If there's no change I'd like to know. I understand that some of the people might insist on a remedial bill and I want to know where we stand on it. I hope the Minister, when he answers the other questions, will be able to answer all my questions.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, this week the Minister tabled the Boundaries Report with respect to the Interlake. I'd like to know from the Minister when he is going to enunciate government policy with respect to the recommendations which have been submitted by the Boundaries Commission Report. We have some very critical situations in the Interlake and immediate action is necessary. For example, we have the Moosehorn situation which is a disgrace. Here we have an elementary school which in the main is made up of three old buildings, and because of the overcrowding two additional schools were moved in, two one-room schools from the rural area - I think one was in the Basin school district and the other from Keisman, and they've been tacked on for the children to use pending a proper facility being constructed in this area. They have no proper toilet facilities at this school. I questioned the Minister earlier in the session about what's going to be done and I was disappointed at the Minister's flippant answer that a new school, a new structure had been built. Well, I can tell him what was built. They moved in a double outdoor toilet, insulated it, and put electrical heating in there. Now the Minister may think this is amusing for 170 children but this is how critical the situation is at that particular school. I can assure you that if some steps aren't taken by the next fall term, the Minister's going to have a lot of angry people on his hands from that district.

Now a lot has been said about ARDA and the FRED program and how special attention must be given to the needs of education in the Interlake. What have we done? Nothing has been done with respect to an elementary school at Moosehorn. They've been pleading with the department to take steps to rectify this situation. At Ashern the elementary school has been condemned and they moved in, I believe, 10 portable classrooms because the other school isn't of any value to them any more. The school board has met time and time again with the department in an effort to get something moving and they've been stalled continuously in their efforts

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd) . . . to have something done.

Now we have the latest report. A year ago we had a report and now we have what they term the final report. Basically the report does two things. It changes the boundaries of school divisions in the Interlake, reducing the number from five to four, and it makes it clear that the decision of school locations will be left in the hands of someone else, perhaps the school board, the division board, the government, or jointly, but they make no recommendations this time, and when the Boundaries Commission was established some three years ago, government spokesmen made it clear that it would be the responsibility of the Boundaries Commission to establish the location of schools, among many other problems that had to be faced. Now we have a situation where that's left up in the air and it leaves me and most people to wonder at what was the purpose of the Commission in the first place. Surely it didn't take three years for a commission to change the boundaries on the school divisions and we're back where we started from virtually. We don't know -- people are up in the air over the lack of proper facilities. They're waiting. We've been told of the great need for improved facilities but where are they? We're still waiting for them, and surely after three years we should have some idea what is going to happen. What I'd like to know from the government is, what are you going to do with the report? Is the government going to accept the recommendations? If so, when will they be made known?

With respect to Lakeshore, the Commission makes it very clear that special financial assistance will have to be made available to that division because of the low assessment. As the Minister knows, they lopped off the east side of the Lakeshore Division where there was a high assessment and that has been lost to the Lakeshore area, and the Boundaries Commission now states that there's no way that the Lakeshore people can finance their schools without financial help from other sources - which would obviously be the Provincial Government. Now what they'd like to know is, what form of help will this come as? What will it be? Are they going to accept the findings of the Commission on the basis of the boundary changes? If this is done, when will the new trustees be elected, because now we have a situation in Lakeshore, for example, where four of the trustees live in areas which would be moved outside the present Lakeshore boundary. There are a number of questions that have to be answered and I think it's imperative that the Minister make these answers known very quickly, because time is of essence in this matter.

Who will make the decision of where the schools will be located in the divisions in the Interlake? Will this be done by the government? Will it be done by the school division boards or will it be done jointly? Will it be done in consultation between the two bodies? There are so many questions that people up there are anxious to have answered, and if the government is going to move in time to have the necessary buildings constructed by the fall term, steps have got to be taken immediately so that the schools will be ready. Here we have a situation in Moosehorn where, as I said before, they're using old schools flung together, no proper toilet facilities, and it wasn't until pressure from the area that the last facility, such as they are, were built or installed. We have a case of 170 children in three buildings with one toilet. Now surely the people of Manitoba can expect something better than this and I hope when the Minister replies to those who have taken part in this debate, he will give some indication of what the people of the Interlake can expect with respect to the recommendations of the Boundaries Commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) Minister's Compensation -- passed . . . The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain) Mr. Chairman, one of the most important departments in the estimates of this province is this Department of Youth and Education, and I don't think there is or will be many people that will criticize government expenditure on education providing we can prove the fact that they are getting dollar value. Procrastination by certain departments of the Department of Education has set up a series of confusion within the people and if I might relate, in the southwest area - and I think possibly they moved a little bit ahead of other parts of the province - eight or ten years ago they accepted the decisions and the thinking of the educators that schools should be consolidated and they went ahead with consolidation in most of the communities there, and had to prevail for the last few years with temporary quarters. The division complex, the unitarian complex came into being, and the thinking behind the people's thinking at that time was that surely now we're going to be modern with our system of education. About in the month of October, the Boundaries Commission did

(MR. DOW cont'd) call a meeting of the southwest area and proposed a plan which I might say struck the people there quite a blow, that they didn't figure we had got to this stage in our system of education and they were backward in making any decision, and they asked the Commission to hold off their meeting for some time, and the middle of March of this year they held another meeting attended by many municipal and school division trustees. And the end result was, Mr. Chairman, the thinking there at that time was that now we have the unitary division and surely we should give it an opportunity to see if it would work before we moved into the new system of proposals of boundaries, and the end result was that the conclusion was that we would like to leave the division boundary, the unitary division boundary, the system of schools that we had, for at least five years and maybe ten, to give it an opportunity to work. Because the proposals made by the Boundaries Commission changed everything.

Mention was made - and I think the Minister questioned somebody here the other day - about the mileage to be driven, and one of the proposals to satisfy the Boundaries Commission's report in this particular instance was to get this type of a school you'd have to drive pupils a minimum of 65 miles. Now this is a composite high school I'm talking about and it does take a lot of pupils to get this. So the end result was that we in that southwest area have asked the Commission and we have reason to believe that they are going to agree with it, that we leave things as they are for at least five years, maybe ten, to give them an opportunity to give it a chance to work. And I believe this judgment was sound and that this will give a better system of education and get away from some of the temporary moves that we have and we'd likely have to wait a quite considerable length of time to improve it. Particularly in the division which is a large part of Turtle Mountain constituency, the Minister has approved of new building of schools which will take care of the current needs of the elementary demands at the time.

One question I would like to ask the Minister: if he would give us the number of school projects that have been approved in Manitoba that have not been built and haven't started to build. There is quite a large reduction in his estimates on his building of schools -- from 11 to 6 million, I believe -- and I would like if he could answer the question as to how many schools have been officially approved, and name them, and that are to be built in the current season.

Some mention was made here today and in the Throne Speech in regard to certain controls of school trustees, and I have wondered for many years why the same control has not been established on school trustees that had been established on municipal officials. Under The Municipal Act for special privileges -- municipal operations -- unless you have approval of ratepayers you are controlled to a certain mill rate, and I am quite convinced and I don't say this is any way that I suggest that there is frivolous expenditure, but I think it would be in the interest of the taxpayer if the special levy had a control on it set by the department, so that over and above this they had to get approval from ratepayers. And I think this would be a sound judgment, in my thinking. The length of time that I've been on municipal work this was always a control and very strictly enforced, that you didn't exceed this particular mill rate.

One other thing that I am told, and I've tried to check it and I can't find in the Act anywhere where the school division administrative officials have to supply the trustees with a monthly record of their expenditure in regards to their budget, and I had one trustee tell me that the only time they receive any financial statement about their expenditure and how they balanced up, was after they received their audit statement, and I think here the Department of Education could follow a similar line as the municipal department, that monthly these statements have to be provided to the school trustees so they know where they stand each month as they go along with their expenditure.

I have mentioned this before and I repeat it again, Mr. Chairman, that in our curriculum there is no place that schools - if it's there they're not doing very much about it - establishment of school bands. Now we have in Manitoba two or three locations where the citizens have established school bands very successfully, and when we compare the actions of our neighbours to the south, that you can go into any small village pretty near, and have an excellent school band, and I think this is a wonderful part of our educational system and I would like to see it included in it.

One of the concerns, Mr. Chairman, that we talk about the proficiency, and maybe I read it wrong, but under the teacher training program as given to us in the estimates this year, there looks to be a reduction of an amount greater than half a million dollars. In other words, we're going to spend less in teacher training and professional advancement courses,

(MR. DOW cont'd) . . . teacher recruiting programs. I wonder if the Minister has transferred this to some other part of his department or is this what we're doing? Are we reducing our expenditure on teacher training? I think this is one way that we have to get our system better, is by having the best teacher training we can get and not depreciate the amount.

And one other, Mr. Chairman, and here again I go back to: are we getting value for our dollar? and I've asked this on several occasions and they come back with the same answer. The only figure that we have to achieve the results of education is a figure that says "X" number of papers are written on literature and a certain percentage passed. To me, this is not good enough. I would like to see a figure produced which tells us that there are many students wrote a full Grade 12, Grade 11, Grade 10 operation, and the number that received their final certificate. Surely in our computer age this is not a hard figure to get. Before they told us that it was impossible to get this figure, it took so much labour and work. But I think this would produce the answer, to me anyway, that if we had a thousand pupils wrote a certain grade and 90 percent passed, we would have the answer whether we're getting dollar value or not; and the figures that are being produced, I'm not a whirlwind at mathematics but I could take those figures and show you that nobody passed by taking those percentages, and surely we can come out with a flat figure - there was a thousand pupils wrote Grade 12, there were so many got a clear standing, and I would like to ask the Minister if this couldn't be done because I think this would satisfy the public that the money they're spending - and we know it's increasing each year - would be value per dollar spent.

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, if I might go over these one by one. First of all, he and a number of the other honourable members have questioned what the trends are in education; what are the trends in the administration of our public schools; and expressed on several occasions a concern about controls. Well let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the concern about controls is far and away offset by the amount of decentralization that has taken place and is continuing to take place, as I've stated here in the House before, in our public school system. With the advent of the unitary division system, which the Honourable Member for Rhineland has his well-noted position and his concern about the fact that it is a centralizing move with dictatorial powers, just quite the opposite is true. As you know, at one time the department in years past, in decades past, has controlled the curriculum almost exclusively.

In our public schools with the multi-district divisions and the many one-room schools we had, the inspection part of the department had a very close rein on everything that happened in the public school system. With the advent of the unitary division system we are growing into an age very rapidly where almost complete control is maintained at the local level. The department involves itself to a very large extent in a programming and development role, curriculum development and television, some of the central things that have to be done in any large school administration such as we have in Manitoba. But as far as the local control is concerned, it is much greater than it ever has been and this will continue. The fact that we no longer have exams set by the department which at one time extended all the way down to Grade 9 - 9, 10, 11 and 12. The only ones, as I've stated now, are the ones that are set in the university entrance course in Grade 12, and as the . . . tests for university entrance develop, more flexibility may be allowed in these, but at the present time it is felt that this screen is necessary in the system. Now this means that the school divisions have within their powers to determine the progress and the grading of their students in their system to a much larger extent than they've ever had before. So if what we're talking about is education, there is no question that there is less centralization now than there has ever been. The talk of controls that the members are concerned about, that was mentioned in the Throne Speech, are controls that are put on the dollar spending and the dollar earning of the school divisions, and this will come up in forthcoming legislation and can be aired to any extent you like. But nevertheless it is being brought in, not as a determined effort to centralize, but to assist the school boards and to reach an even greater degree of equity, hopefully, in equal opportunity in education in the Province of Manitoba.

Now the Honourable Member for Rhineland, in a specific question, asked first of all about average teachers' salaries and I have some information for him that I can relate to him. This in fact was asked for in an Order for Return which he asked me for several days back. The average salary in 1968 for 10,602 teachers was \$6,881.00, the salaries percentage of expenditures 57 percent, and it has been running 56 1/2 to 57 percent over the last few years.

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) The total expenditures, aggregate teachers salaries expenditures was \$72,900,000. He also asked what the per capita, per student costs were in the non-unitary and unitary divisions. I can advise him that in 1968 on the basis of budget figures - because we still don't have audited figures in for the year 1968, these are all divisions in the province - the non-unitary division costs per pupil on the average were \$531.00, and the unitary costs were \$550.44. So there's a difference there of something in the order of 5 percent higher and these are including all divisions reporting and the budget figures that we have available to us from the non-unitary divisions.

He's concerned about loss of people involvement because of the unitary system. This is an argument we've heard back over some time. He had also a direct question regarding Teachers Retirement Allowance Fund information. I do have this available as well, if I can take a minute to dig it up here. The average of the grants, the new retirements in 1968, I believe were stated as quoted before, \$255.00. The average for the period from 1963 to the present is \$235.00. The average monthly in 1962 of all pensions was \$116.35. Now if you can place those three figures into perspective this will give you at least an indicator of the averages of the pensions under the Teachers Retirement Allowance Fund.

The Member for Rhineland also asked a question about whether we were promoting Frontier Division because it came under federal funding through the ARDA program. I would point out to the honourable member that the ARDA or FRED program is restricted entirely to the Interlake, and does not fit into any part of the Frontier Division. The Frontier Division is north, east and west of this area. And this is entirely funded; the Frontier Division is entirely funded by the province and in some cases, well in a number of cases, by the support of Indian Affairs Department of the Federal Government.

He also asked a question about the Manpower training courses, and I do have some further information for him on this as well. There are presently running 129 classes; 34 of these are in rural centres and the usual practice is to rent space when these are carried on. The balance are carried on at Fort Osborne Barracks, at the Vocational Schools at The Pas and Brandon. If there's more information he requires there, we can dig that up for him.

These are the Manpower training courses. Now there are also academic upgrading courses which are carried on primarily at Fort Osborne Barracks and in the urban area. The total number taking the upgrading academic courses are at the present time 3,270. Again this is all under the aegis of Special Programs of the Department of Education. So, in addition to the public schools responsibility for education, we are carrying on both the academic and the Manpower upgrading courses as a direct responsibility of the Provincial Government.

The Member for Hamiota brought up the question of television, as did the Member for St. Boniface, and this is something that I think we could talk about for some time, because there's no question that television, educational television, is something that is going to progress and grow and contribute at a very rapid rate to the educational system of our province. We are at the present time, and as indicated in the Throne Speech we're exploring the possibility of the concept of the open university. The idea behind this is that with the centralization of activities at the university in the urban area, and at the University of Manitoba primarily, it is the hope here to explore the possibility of using broadcast television to teach and offer university courses to the population at large, and this would probably initially, if it turns out to be feasible and we don't know yet but we have asked the three universities to join with us in studying this. There is some involvement at the University of Manitoba in programming of courses now for their own internal use. But what we are asking the university to do is to join us to examine the feasibility of whether or not we could develop an open university concept that may or may not be attached to any one of the universities. It may be a University of the Air, a completely different set-up; something that offers university level courses to people who are working or people who are at home and cannot go to the university, housewives, working men, who have the desire and the ability to upgrade themselves through taking a great deal of their education through the medium of television.

We don't know at this point whether it is feasible to attempt to do this for a population of one million people in the province of Manitoba. It may well be that we should be thinking about something that is a lot bigger and maybe it should be a Canadian one, perhaps maybe it could be a regional one. We're not exactly sure at this time. The economics involved are going to be a very heavy factor in determining whether we can do this or not. I can see it, first of all, starting out primarily in the humanities areas, in the non-technical, non-scientific

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) areas, offering the bulk of their courses in the traditional Arts type of areas, and this is something that has great potential. It's something that is exciting for the person who does not and has not had the opportunity to go to university because of circumstance, and there has been a very enthusiastic response to this concept, and it's our hope that this great investment that we have in higher education in Manitoba can somehow be tapped and made available to the masses of our population who cannot fall into the formal restrictions of attending a university.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood mentioned the very important field of child development for children with learning disabilities. He made reference to the Manitoba Association for Children with Learning Disabilities, and I must also compliment them on focusing a great deal of public attention on this critical area. They've done a very good job. The conference which they had in Winnipeg in the last month drew over 500 people to it from all parts of Manitoba, from Ontario, we had representatives from school divisions in Toronto and guest speakers from several places in the United States. I shouldn't say "we." I had no part in it except that I did attend some of their proceedings and people from the Department of Education also participated in this. The department is active in this field. The honourable member may not have been aware that there is a university course being established and will be available this year in this area of learning disability detection and remedial types of requirements that will be necessary to work with it. It's a step in the right direction. We have over the past three years, as he may also have been unaware, been bringing in speakers or specialists from the United States in this very particular area. Dr. Waddell from New York was one in particular that has been brought in, and over a period of three years others have also been brought in, but it is now being established as a course and one of the prime problems to be faced here is teaching teachers to be the general practitioners that must have more tools and facilities available to them to assist in this very important area. --(Interjection) -- Yes, I believe so.

The Honourable Member for Burrows managed to drool a great deal of vitriol around the Chamber and I don't think I have anything in particular to comment on which he made. He didn't make any points that were very specific. The one that I would check him up on are his statistics on retention rates in the high schools. I would point out to him that if he will look back for ten years, 12 years, and look at the graduates coming out of Grade 12, he will see that there is close to a three-times increase in the number of graduates coming out of our high schools. This in itself is a strong enough indication of the changes that have taken place. If we have not in fact reached a 95 percent retention rate, which he seems to think is desirable, then perhaps he should just hold his breath for awhile and re-examine what has been done in the period of time to get the retention rate up to what it is.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface brought in some points here which I would . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would permit me to interrupt at this stage, because he seems to be leaving what was said by the Honourable Member for Burrows. There's one question I recall that he asked and both the Minister and the First Minister reacted in such a way as if they were anxious to reply, and I would invite at this stage that he should reply. The question was: are the local school boards guilty of extravagance in their budgets, and are there frills which don't belong? And the physical reaction of both the First Minister and this Minister would indicate to me that they felt that there was extravagance, and I think that it should be cleared by this Minister. Is there and if so, where is there, and if there isn't they should be taken off the hook which I think they were put on by their reaction.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, the question is something like one that the Honourable Member for St. John's asked a week or so ago - I don't think it was answered either - but he seemed to be at that time attempting to put words into somebody's mouth to try and get them to say the teachers were overpaid. You know, it's about the most ridiculous question you can ask, because there isn't one teacher that's a good teacher in Manitoba that can be paid enough, and he knows it.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . answering, Mr. Minister.

MR. CRAIK: I'll apply the same general thing to what you're saying here now. If you think I'm going to stand up here and pick out a particular school board and say that that school board is extravagant in this area, you're wrong, because I'm not. But I'm going to say in general terms that all the indications are that there are school boards where their costs are

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . not in line with their ability to pay, and their ability-to-pay factor is not based on the fact that the assessment is too low. Ability to pay must be heeded if we're going to maintain the sort of public school administration we have and there's very little question that there are cases where there has been extension of services, extension of personnel and extension of activities that have pushed their bill far beyond their ability to pay, and there's no question about it, but I'm not going to stand here and specifically pick out a school board and say exactly where it is, but there's no question about it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well Mr. Chairman, if the Minister will permit, I didn't expect him to accuse an individual school board by name, but what he has said now is interesting and I'm wondering if he would care to indicate the nature of the program, and I'm saying this because it would be helpful, surely, for people to know what the Minister of Education feels is the nature of the type of extension which he feels is beyond the means of a school district to carry on.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, there is one rule that has to be followed. It doesn't matter how interested or how devoted you are to education or you are to anything else, you go as fast as you can within the financial restrictions or the financial potential that you have at your disposal, and this is true for every one of the school boards whether they're unitary or non-unitary in Manitoba. And I'm not saying that they're spending too much. Maybe they're not spending half enough. It's just that their financial restrictions and their financial capabilities are such that there's an awful lot of people think that they have to pace their progress to what the public purse can bear, and that's a very simple statement.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Minister if he would care to comment on a specific instance which I raised this morning, namely that the Winnipeg School Division approached him and asked whether they could use their reserve funds to put an extension on their administration centre for a resource centre, and he denied that request. They apparently thought it was an item of some priority and of some importance. He denied it specifically, and I understand that they're going to approach him again. I wonder if he could explain in general terms why he stopped that particular construction project.

MR. CRAIK: I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that that's the sort of question you want to get in the estimates. The honourable member did ask it before the Orders of the Day. If he wants further clarification on it, I'm sure that he can ask it again.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, we're dealing with the Minister's salary. I think this is a general area of policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has the floor. Let him carry on.

MR. CRAIK: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface asked a number of questions here which I would like to deal with. The teaching of French in Manitoba has expanded and has grown. I don't have the figures that are necessary to prove it at my fingertips but I think I can get them for him.

On the matter of television, I have discussed that and there's no question about it as I went to some lengths to describe. As far as the teaching of more French in the schools is concerned, we are anxious -- personally I am anxious to see this be done. I would like to see French milieu schools available to the population, not just the French population, because our main objective I think should be to make the language available to the non-French. Certainly there has been a dilution of French in the French community itself that needs some support, but more importantly in terms of the national picture, national unity, national goals, I think that we very definitely have to move in this direction.

I've said publicly that Bill C-120, I felt, was naive in many respects, because in fact there were better methods of achieving a greater use of French and an expansion of French in Canada without using the means of legislation that can, in fact, get peoples' backs up to an extent where they were decades ago in Manitoba, and I think that the way to do it is through the educational facilities, to extend French to a greater extent in Manitoba. I haven't anything I can say specifically at this time except that we have, as a department, been looking into the feasibility of creating French milieu schools in areas in Manitoba which can support such, and this is primarily in the urban areas. We have a difficulty, and it again amounts to dollars in most cases, the fact that you have to make double grants to -- we can't seem to get away from making double grants to get the job done, and until we have settled out this problem we won't have anything further to say on it. I can say, though, that the desire is there to extend the French language on a voluntary basis to the French people, and in more particular, to the non-French people.

(MR. CRAIK cont'd)

The Member for St. George -- I should also - the Member for St. Boniface is not in the House here - he asked a question about support for the private parochial schools. I can only answer that there is no change in the government's policy with regard to support to the private and parochial schools and there is nothing further I can add here. He asked about bursary booklets, and in the meantime I have sent out to get the bursary booklets because they are available, and I'll have them handed out to the honourable members of the House right now so that they'll have them at their disposal and it will give them, hopefully, a greater insight into the bursaries available and the regulations thereto.

The Honourable Member for St. George brought up the question of the Boundaries Commission and its impact on the Interlake area. He was particularly concerned about the problems at Moosehorn. We have been too, but let me point out again that the area of responsibility for this lies with the school board on the specific projects that they must undertake. I will agree that there has been some hardship probably worked on the school board and on the people by the fact that they have been waiting on the Boundaries Commission report to come in so that they can get on with their work. The specific project which he mentioned at Moosehorn - I explained this to him outside the House before - the project to rectify the problem they had there with the outhouse facilities was okayed by the department. I had an inspector go specially out there to look at the sanitation problem and urge the school board to get on with the project. The money was okayed as far as the Public Schools Finance Board was concerned to put in the sort of facilities that were required. I think the school board, in its wisdom, probably decided that when the Boundaries Commission report was in and we could get the plan finalized for the Lakeshore Division, that the secondary school at Moosehorn would become the elementary school and the elementary school facilities, as they exist now, would be relieved of some of their present load. The aim of the department is to get on as rapidly as possible in discussion with the school boards involved in the Interlake to get them to the point of getting early agreement and getting on with the project that will relieve most of the problems, and, in fact, give them hopefully a very fine educational institution in that particular part of the country.

I can't tell him at this point, give him any information regarding the election of the trustees, but we will hope to do that at an early possible date. We will first of all have to determine finally and certainly that the boundaries as they are drawn by the Boundaries Commission are going to be the final ones, and these discussions will be held with the school boards. I have written them and advised them of this and we will be getting together with them just as soon as they have had a chance to look at the report and we can have discussions with them.

The Honourable for Turtle Mountain wanted information on the number of approved projects that have not yet been built but will be in 1969. I will attempt to get this information for him. I would point out that the estimates in this respect are misleading. The reduction from eleven to six million on projects, on construction, shows high in 1968 because of the concentration of the construction of the MIAA being in that year. In addition to that, we had several property purchases for the three vocational schools that are now in the stage of being built. Those properties were purchased, incidentally, out of 100 percent provincial funds and that money comes out of the 1968-69 budget, so that the six million is not quite a true indication of our building program. I would like to say that I expect that in 1969 we will be building more capital facilities, more public schools than we did in 1968, so there is no slowdown on the school construction that took place. In fact I suspect by the end of the year - we haven't all the approvals in yet either - but I expect by the end of the year 1969-70 that we will have built more schools than we did in the year we are just leaving, 1968-69.

The teacher training programs he mentioned are reduced by half a million. The reason for this reduction is the imposition of the fees in the Faculty of Education at the University, which I mentioned in my introductory remarks, and the amount show in this reduction is approximately half a million dollars.

You asked also for information on the percentage of clear standings in Grade 12. I will take this under consideration and have it discussed with the department. I haven't any further information on it here right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister only touched on some of the points that I raised with respect to the Boundaries Commission report. One of the things that we are wondering about is why did it take so long to table this report? In private conversation, some members of the commission have indicated the report was ready months ago. I recall speaking to one member of the committee - I happened to bump into him in a restaurant - and I said, when are you fellows going to present your report to the government? He said, well you can have it right now. This was many months ago, so it makes us wonder why there was such a long delay in bringing it forward, because as the Minister well knows, there is some real problems facing the department in that area and the more time we have the better chance we have of getting them done.

The Minister never made any suggestion as to what financial assistance will be forthcoming to the Lakeshore Division. Now the commission makes it quite clear that Lakeshore itself will be unable to finance its school needs on the basis of the boundary structure. It is too small, the assessment is too low, and the taxes would be just too much without financial assistance. These are some of the questions they would like to know.

Now when will we know whether the recommendations are going to be accepted. You say the department is going to meet with the School Division Boards to get their reaction to the proposed boundaries. Is this what the Minister said? And when will we know what policy will be enunciated by the government as a result of the office report. The Minister doesn't indicate this at all and we would appreciate it, because I am getting a lot of queries from a lot of interested and very concerned people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I have two or three brief questions which I wish to put to the Minister at this time, and if the Minister will be good enough to answer them to clear up this point.

Did I understand correctly - and I believe I did - that the Minister, or through his Board, has refused, turned down projects or plans for projects in the process of the expansion of the education facilities as submitted by school divisions. There have been refusals?

MR. CRAIK: I'm not sure of his question. Was the question whether or not we turned down proposals?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Have you refused proposals?

MR. CRAIK: For what?

MR. HANUSCHAK: For anything within the powers of the School Finance Board, within its jurisdiction.

MR. CRAIK: Oh, I am certain there have been some turned down.

MR. HANUSCHAK: They have been turned down. Could the Minister indicate on what grounds they were turned down? Could he at least give us an example of a type of proposal. . . .

MR. CRAIK: Well perhaps if you'd give me an example. What are you talking about?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, a school board approaches the Finance Board. . .

MR. CRAIK: What school board?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, do not any school boards approach the Finance Board for approval? Is that not the law?

MR. CRAIK: If the honourable member would wish to propose a particular case to me and I can get the answer for him, I will.

MR. GUTTORMSON: reply to the questions I directed.

MR. CRAIK: Well, I'll advise the honourable member if he would pair with me, I'll go out right now and have the hearings, because I personally would like to sit and participate in these myself and we have every intention of going just as fast as we can in the Interlake region, particularly in the Lakeshore Division, because their problems are most particular there.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I'll facilitate the Minister in every way I can to get things moving in the Interlake, I can assure him, but I would still like him to answer these questions. When will we know whether the recommendations of the commission will be adopted? When will you be announcing government policy with respect to the findings or the recommendations of the report? What financial assistance is forthcoming to Lakeshore as recommended? These are the questions that people are concerned with, Mr. Chairman, and I would appreciate if the Minister could give me some indication of his thinking on it.

MR. CRAIK: Again, Mr. Chairman, the decision lies with the school division. We will

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) give them as much assistance as possible in arriving at the decision, but the ultimate and final decision in any particular division lies with that board. Now in this particular case we know that assistance is going to probably have to be looked at in some form or other along the lines of the recommendations of the Boundaries Commission, but I haven't anything further to announce specifically on that right now but just to remind him that ultimately, and finally, the decision on school locations lies with the school board, and anything we can do to get it to the point of decision and implementation in that particular division will be done.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Am I to understand then that if a school division, and I'm not referring to any particular division when I say this, makes a recommendation for a school to be located at location X, that the school division will get permission to build the school of its choice there without any objections from the government? This is what I am to interpret from the Minister's remarks?

MR. CRAIK: Well, the pattern is one that is standard for all school divisions in that they make their proposals to the provincial government. In this particular case we are probably talking about a composite school or a vocational school, and in that particular case it gets a little less well defined in the procedural arrangements because we have in turn to go to the federal government to get their agreement on their cost-sharing on the capital expenditures for the school, so that we are tied down a little more there and it's really a case of coming to mutual agreement on the location of the school that is acceptable as far as both the province and the division is concerned before we can make the plea to the federal fund to get the capital sharing.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, then the school divisions will not be the only ones that decide where the schools will be located in the four divisions in the Interlake; it would be done between the provincial, federal and the school division. Is this what the Minister says?

MR. CRAIK: Primarily the province and the school division.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What about the school divisions? Is there a possibility that they may be changed again, or do you expect that the present recommendations will hold fast?

MR. CRAIK: I certainly hope that they hold fast as they are now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . for Seven Oaks, and I was just wondering . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: May I just ask one brief question? Is there a regulation - is there a regulation outlining the factors which the School Finance Board must take into consideration in considering proposals placed before it.

MR. CRAIK: . . . any approval is given for schools, a school project proposal is made by the division. Probably the School Building Projects Committee examines it, and if it agrees that the population is there, in this particular case if it's a rural setting, they find they do have the student enrollment to do the job and they have a long term plan, the school board has worked out its plan and has indications that this is needed, they send it in, the school building projects okays it, it goes back to the school board, they in turn hire their architect, draw up their plans and then they submit their drawings for approval back to the School Building Projects Committee. The Public Schools Finance Board comes in at that stage and indicates that the financing is available. In many cases, or probably most cases, there are changes that are made in light of the experience of the School Building Projects Committee and 100 percent approved costs are covered under the Foundation program for these. Anything over and above the approved costs is carried by the local division, but in most cases the total costs, or very close to them, are carried. If the School Building Projects Committee feels that there are unnecessary items in it that they cannot support, the school board must take on itself the responsibility to provide those, but usually what is done is by mutual agreement, or the influence of the School Building Projects Committee, they can convince them to make changes in light of practical experience they have had. From there on in the school board gets its okay and its financing is arranged through the Public Schools Finance Board and they proceed.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry for belabouring this point, but I must ask the Minister again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on Education Grants - No. 2. Actually we are getting into a question and answer period. I would suggest . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister did make a point in replying to one of the honourable members that ability to pay must be heeded, which leads me to believe that in considering proposals submitted by school divisions - now I'm not concerned whether this aspect of it is considered at one level or the other, the school projects level or

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) the school finance, but I imagine it would be by the School Finance Board - now is there some formula, or are there a set of rules set out by regulation - or can they be obtained anywhere, can the Minister provide us with them - that would indicate on what basis, on what basis the School Finance Board administers the means test to school divisions, because obviously the Minister is saying that the equality of educational opportunity is not equal to everybody, it's limited by the number of tax dollars locally, and I wish to know, Mr. Chairman, what factors does the School Finance Board take into consideration in determining whether any given school division can or can not afford a certain expansion program of its education facility.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I got the impression when the honourable member started out that he was talking about physical facilities. Am I correct? Are you talking about building a school or are you talking about an educational program?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, one must be contained within the other, and if a school division wants to expand its education services, certainly it'll need additional building space for which it'll have to seek approval and obtain approval from the School Finance Board.

MR. CRAIK: Well, if the honourable member would wish to frame his question so that it could be understood, I will attempt to give an answer. I assumed he was asking a question about how you build a school and what guides and rules are used in determining the grant to a school division for a school, and I said it's 100 percent of the school's costs.

MR. HANUSCHAK: That I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, but let me give you a specific example then to illustrate my point. If a school division were to come with the following proposal, that we wish to expand our educational services and facilities by the provision of music rooms, art rooms, shop, guidance offices and whatever else they feel are maybe necessary to provide their children an education equal to that obtained elsewhere. Now I believe I understood the Minister to say that the ability to pay must be heeded and that some proposals of this type may be rejected. Well, what are the guidelines for determining whether any given school division can or cannot afford certain education services to which it feels entitled.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, not right now. Wait your turn.

MR. DOERN: In regard to an answer he previously

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks has the floor. He asked for it a little while ago and I'm giving it to him.

MR. MILLER: Well I hate to interrupt my colleagues who want to ask questions, and I don't blame them for asking questions because I think the Minister has made many statements today that certainly require answering. I'm going to try to answer one of the questions for him, the question about what does the Public Finance Board do about building schools. They build the schools as part of the Foundation Program. It sounds very simple, but it's governed by the amount of money that this government makes available to the Public Finance Board. If they haven't got the money from the government they cannot approve, and they'll stall and they'll use every means to prolong and delay a program, and I'm not critical of the Public Finance Board, they can only spend the money as it is made available to them.

Having answered that question, I'd now like to take up some of the points that the Minister made. He said he was critical of some school boards - names unmentioned. I'm going to mention one - Seven Oaks. I suppose this school board might qualify for the kind of criticism the Honourable Minister has in mind, because they provide a very high standard of education and they do it for two reasons: (1) because the community wants it; (2) because they listened to the admonitions of this Minister's department. They read, as I did - the school trustees and the administration - they read sentences like this in the report: "The heart of the school is the curriculum. Many of the staff of the department" - that's the Department of Education - "and all branches, as well as teachers and trustees, have worked hard to make new programs and courses function for the benefit of the pupils." And they say, "If our Manitoba children, youth and adults are to be well served to help them to meet the challenges of our society, it is reasonable to expect that we must build into our system a sensitivity to the needs of all students at all levels. This simply means that an educational system must move and must evolve rapidly. You can't sit back and say this is the year for retrenchment or this is the period for retrenchment, because the pace at which available knowledge is growing, the challenge must be met annually or we fall behind very rapidly."

The Minister of Education last year, or rather 1966-67 when he introduced the White

(MR. MILLER cont'd) Paper, on Page 800 from Hansard had this to say: "Literacy is not enough any more" - when he was pleading with this House to accept the whole concept of the Foundation Program - and he said, "We've just simply got to bring every child to the maximum of his potential." I heartily concur with that philosophy, but that philosophy apparently left this government with the departure of that particular Minister into another area. And now we have a different one, a philosophy which says it costs -- he questions whether some school divisions -- he feels rather that costs are not in line with their ability to pay and that the extension of services and the personnel and the services go beyond ability to pay.

Now what services is he talking about? Let's look at the same report. He's talking about the Department of Education who, through their own division, urge and recommend that guidance programs be developed all through the school system, because the key to a school system is the child. The same book will tell you that occupational entrance courses must be improved, and where they aren't available, should be introduced. They talk in terms of the fact that libraries have to be upgraded and that we have to attract people into being librarians. The Manitoba Association of School Trustees, which doesn't represent any one school division but all school divisions, all the unitarian school divisions plus the others, they came up with a resolution which said that -- in 1968 they said, "The new methods of teaching, such as discovery approach, place strong emphasis on increased research." Therefore, they request that the grant structure be altered to cover qualified librarians and a staff for resource centres, audio visual technicians.

Mr. Speaker, this Foundation Program which was introduced three years ago is basically the same Foundation Program which exists today. Last year some very minor adjustments were done; I think it was \$50.00 per teacher for administration or for maintenance, something like that, but basically the grant structure remains as it was. The grant structure simply isn't geared, and the Foundation Program isn't geared to a modern system which this government through its other arm, the Department of Education, urges all school boards to adopt, and wants them to adopt, because it knows that if it's going to do a job it's got to have this kind of school system. So when the Minister gets up and says, well some of the school boards obviously have gone too far and their costs are not in line because they're spending money on programs which are costly. Of course they're costly. They're costly, and they're being introduced because the trustees have more vision than this Minister; they're costly because the trustees and the people in the communities say, we will listen to the administration in the Department of Education, we'll listen to the people who know about education, even though the Minister of Education is dragging his feet on it. We accept our responsibilities, they say, and we'll support the trustees and we'll elect them to office. Has any trustee been defeated in this province because he suggested a better program? No, but I can tell you trustees that have been defeated who said let's cut back, so I'm afraid the Minister is somewhat out of tune. He may be listening to people who are concerned about costs, and they have a need to be because their property taxes are growing rapidly, higher every year. Despite the few bones that were thrown this year, taxes will rise generally throughout municipalities of Metropolitan Winnipeg and through rural Manitoba as well. What we're objecting to, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the Foundation Program has been locked, has been fixed, and so as new programs are introduced the school boards have no choice and no alternative but to use a special levy as a means to raise funds. They have no choice but to go beyond the Foundation Program.

So I question really the Minister's statement because I think he knows better, when he is trying to push the blame on to local school boards and somehow imply, without saying so, imply that they are the ones squandering the money. I asked him this question about three weeks ago, if there is any area - I didn't ask school board - are there any programs that he feels should be cut out; are there any changes in curriculum which he feels should not have been made; are there any courses which should be removed from the program of studies at the schools. If there are such programs, let him tell us, and the time to do it is now during his estimates. I don't expect him to name a school board perhaps, but programs certainly come under his jurisdiction and curriculum comes under his jurisdiction, and whether the curriculums are occupational entrance courses which are being promoted, and with good reason because they're needed, if a child is going to fulfill himself through a school system they're certainly needed, but you wouldn't know that they need it from the Foundation Program. There's no recognition of them or the whole question of teaching through new techniques, of language labs, of making our libraries something meaningful so that the students can avail themselves of it and use the new

(MR. MILLER cont'd) techniques which libraries make available to them. What has the Minister got to say about that in his Foundation Program? Almost nothing, Mr. Chairman, and so the Foundation Program is, as I said in an earlier debate, not a Foundation Program at all, it's a subterranean program; it's nothing; it's paying lip service to the support towards education.

There's one other point that the Minister brought up today that I think I would like to dwell a moment on, and his philosophy shone through very clearly. He says he believes in - regarding university education - he believes in fees. Our Minister of Education believes in fees; he says they are good. He feels that people should learn to stand on their own two feet, they should learn to pave their own way, it's good for their development. What a lot of hogwash, to point the finger at somebody else and to say it's good for them to learn to stand on their own two feet, it's good for them to suffer a little so they'll appreciate the fruits of what society is giving them. Does he apply the same yardstick to others? If they're going to suffer, let's all suffer equally, let's all give equally according to our ability; let's have a graduated fee. If he's going to introduce a needs test, let's have a graduated fee, let those who have wealthy parents pay more and those who have poor parents pay less. Does he think in those terms, if he wants a graduated fee or if he wants some fees so that people should have to sweat a little in order to be able to pay them? This is what he implied.

I'll give him a simpler solution. Cut out all fees, let him strike the total amount he wishes to spend on university education and then limit it only, limit that enrollment only to those who deserve it by virtue of their marks, their academic standing and their qualifications. Never mind saying that you can go but you have to pay X dollars. If he feels really that fees are not a hindrance, then I suggest that if he's trying to keep costs down then that's the way to do it. Let him determine how many millions of dollars should be put out by this province, according to his priority, towards university education, and then say it's open to one and all free, the only price you have to pay is not dollars but work, ability, your seriousness in seeking an education. You meet those and you can get the education. I think his problem will end right there; he'll have the kind of students he wants, he'll have it at a cost that he wants, and he won't be imposing any penalties or any obstacles on anyone in our society. To stand here and say before this House that he doesn't think that anyone in our communities in Manitoba are really suffering and that those who can't afford it somehow can find a way to university, is a lot of nonsense. There are dozens and hundreds of students who are not going to go on to university and who cannot go on simply because it's too difficult. It's true they're not on welfare, it's true they're not on welfare and you know the -- (Interjection) -- well, forget the Minister's department, he's always chiming in about something. If you want to ask a question I'll gladly answer it after I'm through.

If the Minister really feels that people are not making sacrifices to send their children to university, then I suggest he open his eyes because a sacrifice is being made, and the fact that they can apply for a bursary - and I can tell you that it's not all that simple to get a bursary, it's like everything else with this government and their requirements, they say no one need do without if you meet certain qualifications, certain needs, but they've put the needs at such a level that they strip you down pretty low before you can qualify, and the same applies to their bursary program and all their welfare programs as well.

This government, through this Minister's presentation, frankly has shown itself to be a very regressive government. It's obvious to me now - if I had any doubts before and I didn't really - the tack they are going to take, that the government is going to be going backwards and I can see within another year or two Manitoba is going to have to be fighting its way back from the level to which this government is going to sink as far as the educational system is concerned. I'll have more to say in the estimates in the department.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, first of all I'd like to direct a question to the honourable member who has taken a number of my statements out of context and who has made several of his own that are pretty well ill-founded. First of all, I'd like to ask him if he knows the year when greater increases in the financial support had been made to the public school system or to the universities, and let the proof of the pudding be in the estimate book itself rather than him creating his own.

MR. MILLER: Is that a question or a statement?

MR. CRAIK: Well, would you like to suggest the year when the increases were greater?

MR. MILLER: Are you asking a question? The answer to that question is this, every

(MR. MILLER cont'd) year the costs go up, every year the Minister pointed out there's a natural increase in cost due to the growth of the system in enrollment.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could also mention a timely article that was in yesterday's Toronto Globe and Mail with regard to the university fees that my honourable member has just talked about here. In this article it says, "Higher fees for university students can be expected if Ontario adopts a recommendation of the province's university professors. In a brief yesterday to the Commission on Relations Between Governments and Universities, the Ontario Federation of University Faculty Associations urged the Ontario Government to freeze its support of universities in favour of increasing student fees and that the federal government should make its grants for higher education available directly to the students."

It goes on in the same article and gives the NDP stand in a similar presentation to the same commission, and it's the same as the honourable member here has suggested, to do away with the fees, with no indication where the additional money is to come from.

MR. GREEN: Minister, if you are very anxious to save money - and I'm not anxious to save money - let us assume that you are now paying \$35 million towards university education. I don't know the figure - is it around that figure - do you know?

MR. CRAIK: 43 million.

MR. GREEN: A total of 43 that the province is paying, so you are spending \$43 million now. Now we'll go you one better. You don't want to spend more money; we'll save you money. We'll go down to \$35 million but eliminate the fee and educate those people who qualify for an education by objective standards, not by a fee standard. Now why do you say that we are talking about spending more money? Surely, surely you see that this is not a proposal which involves the expenditure of any money whatsoever. You will set the figure, you can set the figure at 43 - likely if we were in office we would set the figure at a higher amount. I tend to think that the people of the Province of Manitoba are willing to spend more than the forty-three that they are now spending, but you have indicated that somewhere in the back of your mind, you failed to come out today and answer specific questions as to what people regard as being a luxury, which are the costs that have to be cut down. You have been asked by the member for St. John's, you have been asked by the member for Burrows, which are the areas that you think we are spending more money in and you said - if I can recall your answer or the gist of it - everybody knows that people are saying that more money is being spent than is necessary and I don't have to be specific. That's just about what you said.

Well I don't know it, but let's put it into your context, not in mine. You are now the government - not us. How much do you think we should spend on university education - \$43 million, is that the figure that you are spending now, or do you want to go down to 40 or do you want to go up to 45. Take your figure, and then say we will educate those people who deserve and who will merit most by this education, and who as a result of receiving it will contribute most to society. Now how do you reckon that as spending more money, because that's continually your question to this side of the House.

MR. CRAIK: Well, I am sorry if I got the blood pressure up of the Honourable Member for Inkster. He's still with his same position. I mentioned this other proposal that the university professors had made. I don't suggest that the system we have now are the answers forever and ever. I made the statement this morning with regard to the fees and my own feelings on it. I think that personally there is merit in other systems which can be looked at and which we are looking at and which may develop. I think the one in particular that has merit is the ability-to-pay principle, if I might use it, whereby a person who is a recipient of a university education, who by the statistics as accurately as we can, and again there is obviously errors in them when you take them in the narrow sense, but on the average the statistics show us that he who receives a university education can expect in his earning lifetime to make \$150,000 more than the person who doesn't. -- (Interjection) -- Do you mind if I finish?

MR. GREEN: May I interrupt

MR. CHAIRMAN: finish his speech.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I am just asking whether

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, the Minister has got the floor.

MR. GREEN: That's right. Have you not given other members in the House an opportunity to ask whether a question will be permitted? That's all I'm asking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister said he wishes to continue his speech.

MR. GREEN: I didn't hear that, Mr. Chairman, you interrupted me.

April 3, 1969

MR. CRAIK: I'll be glad to permit a question when I have finished making my point. There have been techniques and studies undertaken, and we are examining ourselves to see what merits there would be in a system whereby the person that was the recipient of a university education does pay back over his earning lifetime on an ability-to-pay basis, in the light of the fact that he is put in this preferred position.

Now you are trying to make the point that I am deliberately trying to create a barrier, I suppose -- (Interjection) -- okay, let's forget that one, let's just keep in mind that the university fees that are paid are the smallest part of a person's cost in getting a university education, and his own personal costs, not the cost of his education, his own personal costs - I made the point this morning - this is the point I make, but you don't have the answer.

MR. MILLER: I thought I made it very clear, Mr. Chairman, the answer was that the Minister can set the amount he wishes to spend on university education and eliminate the fees completely by simply permitting those who qualify by his objective standards to enter. I am going to ask him this question. Does he feel that university graduates are a national asset? Does he feel that they have an ability to produce, that their growth is linked directly to a level of education? I am sure he agrees with this. Doesn't he realize that fees form a barrier, and that the records show that the lower class does not generate as many university students as does the higher and middle income groups, and he should try to encourage, to break into that group, because there is a mine of ability there that we are missing out on and this economy is losing out on.

MR. GREEN: Before the Minister answers, I'll give you another question too and I want you ...

MR. LYON: That's why your socialist doctrine failed - you don't understand human nature.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, call him to order like you called me to order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ask your question.

MR. GREEN: Well I would like you to call that gentleman to order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's all right.

MR. GREEN: That's all right, and what I was doing was wrong?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister did he not say, prior to his remarks at this time, that the New Democratic Party is wanting to eliminate the university fee and is not telling us where we are going to get the money. And I asked the question, was anything in the Member for Seven Oaks' proposal a proposal to expend more money than is now being spent by his department? I repeat that question - is there any more expenditure of money required by the proposal that was made by the Member for Seven Oaks?

MR. CRAIK: ... expect it's going to operate on the same standard as it is now?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister obviously has made an answer which he can't sustain and therefore will not deal with the subject. Let me advise the Minister that the present situation does not do what he suggests it does, it does not mean that it requires a person to exert some effort to go to university. That's not what happens at all. The existing structure with regard to university - and it was said, Mr. Chairman, by a group of students who looked into the problem - they looked into the problem and they came to the conclusion that a large percent of the taxes are paid by the lower income group, that these taxes are now used to sustain the upper and middle classes in their attendance at university because the present fees are high enough to deter the groups that don't have any money but they are low enough so that they offer an 85 percent subsidy to the middle and upper income class group who could afford the very thing that the Minister wants, that people pay for their education.

Why don't you follow the Member for Seven Oaks' suggestion? If you really believe that people should exert an effort in obtaining their education, then why don't you charge people what the amount is required to educate them and then go into what you believe to be - or what I've heard from members on that side of the house - go into a needs test and subsidize those who can't afford it. You know what would happen if you did that? You would make it difficult for the low income taxpayer - you would make it more difficult for the low income tax payer to subsidize the high income group who are now getting the benefit of his taxes to send their children to university. That's what would happen and that's why the Minister doesn't do it, whereas the suggestion that was made by the Member for Seven Oaks would at least clear away part of the problem. You are right that it still wouldn't pay for a person's education, it doesn't pay for his personal costs, but it would at least do two things: (1) it would limit the

(MR. GREEN cont'd) amount of money at a government figure that would be spent on higher education, and you choose the figure - the figure would be different than the figure that we would choose; but secondly, it would then make the requirement for university entrance be one of an objective academic test, not the ability to pay a premium.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order. I am going to ask you, Mr. Chairman - I figure I have a right to ask a question as one who attends pretty regularly at the committee - are you going to continue to allow honourable members to discuss details of university administration and salary on the Minister's salary? Do you know what you are doing to the rest of us that might want to discuss some of these individual items later on? Why don't we carry on with the system that we can have each one a general statement, each group a general statement on the Minister's salary, we can have discussion of any number of things as wide as you like, but having decided that, surely the details of administration of the university and the fee schedule and such like should not be discussed at this stage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I was just going to suggest that because I was hoping that the members would realize that we were really discussing the Minister's salary and hope that they would discuss these on the various items after the Minister's salary, so from here on in we will ask everyone to keep within the rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister on his introductory statement on his estimates, he mentioned about one composite school in the greater Winnipeg area, and I believe he mentioned it was on the East side of the River. I just briefly glanced through the Hansard and I did not notice any mention of any composite or technical vocational school that is planned for the west of Winnipeg which is St. James-Assiniboia. There was great concern, not only my own concern but the concern of the people in the constituency, of school facilities for the coming fall term, because you probably remember last year I presented a petition to this House on behalf of some 1,000 school children in the Crestview area where at the present time we had to have staggered classes. I know the Minister at that time tried to convince me that because of the population explosion in Assiniboia that was something that administration of the Department of Education were not able to do anything about. Now, Mr. Chairman, at the present time there is great concern by the trustees, as well as by the people in the west side of Assiniboia, particularly classes at John Taylor, Westwood Collegiate and Sansome Junior High, the people in that area feel that the schools will have to be enlarged otherwise in all those schools we will have to have staggered classes as well this coming fall.

Now it seemed that when the local people, the school trustees had the authority to supply the facilities, the shortages did not occur. When the administration, or the Department of Education assumed complete financial responsibility for school buildings, this did arise. Now I could probably have agreed to some extent perhaps in Assiniboia there was a great population explosion and maybe the department was not able to keep up with construction of facilities, but what happened in the St. James part last fall, I don't think that was a good answer from the government or from the Minister because we did not have any population explosion in the St. James part.

And the same thing happened in Bannatyne School, and at the present time there is staggered classes in the Bannatyne School. There is statements in the paper that the parents are greatly concerned, and in most cases they were unhappy with the school trustees. I would just like to quote one paragraph out of the letter from the Chairman of the School Board in St. James which was sent to me - a copy was sent to me, the letter was sent to the Minister of Education at that time. I would like to quote. "It is the feeling of the St. James School Division Board that serious, indeed unnecessary delays are being experienced in the development of this school and that the elected representatives are being frustrated in their attempts to serve the people in this community. Perhaps the most bitter facet of this situation is that this board is now the butt of very strong criticism for inadequate planning and tardiness of action. We do not feel that this criticism is justified by facts, but since shifting the blame to someone else only compounds ill feeling as well as inaction, we are seeking to take positive steps to obtain results."

In the last paragraph of the letter there is some statistics in this documented letter which shows the date the intent was given the government to start construction. "Not only do we experience long delays before receiving replies, but also the prescribed plan of action required by the Building Projects Committee precludes our taking further preparatory steps until they

April 3, 1969

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) approve. The result is that seven months after the St. James School Board completed its survey and was convinced of the need, we are forced to tell a delegation that we have only prepared sketch plans which are now labelled unsatisfactory. Sir, the situation is critical and will undermine faith in the government at all levels. May we have your assistance in clearing channels so that some of the electoral confidence we have enjoyed may continue. We will be pleased to meet with you at your convenience to discuss this matter further if you consider necessary."

So this is what has taken place, Mr. Chairman, in St. James, which I felt there was no population explosion and I don't think should have happened. I know the school is under construction and probably will be ready in the fall term, the Bruce Junior High, but the same thing may develop in the other three schools that I just mentioned in the western part of Assiniboia. I don't think that this should happen, because for the last three years the government has continually said that education was the No. 1 priority, and if it is, I don't think these things should happen.

Mr. Chairman, the other point I would like to know is if the government has any plans or is going to proceed with indeed a technical-vocational school or a composite school in this area, because if the government does go ahead, I think it would take some of the load off the present high schools and maybe we will not find ourselves in the position that we would if no action is taken on a composite or a vocational school. As I mentioned before, I think there is a need. We will have by 1970 somewhere in the neighborhood of 80,000 people in the St. James-Assiniboia area, and according to the statistics, I believe at least 25 percent of the survey that has been done in this area would enroll or take vocational courses. So I feel that a vocational school to accommodate anywhere from 1,000 to 1,200 students would be in order in this area, and I hope that the Minister would certainly tell the House at this time if there is any plans or if there isn't, because the school trustees in this area are really concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the other point that I would like to raise - and I have not heard the Minister answer or say anything on it - I know most of the members in this House have probably been approached by the school trustees or met with the school trustees as well as the teachers associations, and I have on many occasions in the last while, and there is, or appears to be a cloud hanging over many of the teachers in the Province of Manitoba in respect to the proposals that the trustees submitted to the government and asked for legislation. And the specific proposals, I believe the Honourable Minister probably knows, is that deadline dates for collective bargaining be established, regional bargaining units be established, that negotiable matters be clearly designated, that principals be recognized as part of administration, that school boards be permitted to pay salaries in excess of negotiated scale on the basis of merit, and that black-listing and lockout be prohibited.

Well, Mr Chairman, I am sure the Honourable Minister had some thoughts on the proposal. Is he intending to bring down any legislation or not? I think he should make a statement to the House and clarify it so the teachers would know where they stand, and perhaps the school trustees as well. I think it is his duty to tell the members of this House where he stands or if he agrees with the proposals or not. I am sure he must have had some consultation with the trustees before they submitted their proposals to him and requested legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I also was somewhat concerned, listening to some of the other members talking, that I feel there is not equal opportunity so far as education is concerned as compared to urban and rural areas, because it has come to my attention in some of the small country high schools, where you have somewhere in the neighborhood of 40 to 50 students in Grade 9, and only about two or three complete high school or complete Grade 12. Now this is not the case in the city but it is the case in the country, and I think that the Minister should have some plans or probably should supplement teaching staffs in these areas in order to improve and bring better education to these areas out in the country points where I think we have to improve and have more students be able to complete high school education.

I would also like to know what is the distribution of percentage of students as compared to commercial courses, general course and university courses in the high schools in Manitoba. I think it would give the members some indication of how many students are taking advantage of the General Course. I had not enough time to go through the report completely. I don't believe it is in the report, and I feel that if the Minister would give us some indication it would be a help to many of us here.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to just make another brief point or an observation. I think

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) that there is such things as certain local labour requirements throughout the Province of Manitoba, and particularly in towns or smaller cities throughout the Province of Manitoba, and I would like to see the Minister conduct a survey where he could determine what kind of labour is required in the local area. I think it would be a point, because many of these areas now have vocational schools, Brandon has and The Pas, and I think that local labour surveys would serve a purpose and that you would be able to attract probably certain students to a certain vocation that there is great requirement and need in the particular vocation. I don't know if this is done at the present time, but I think it would be a good idea.

So, Mr. Chairman, these are the few points that I wanted to make at the present time and I hope that the Minister would be able to give us an answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I first want to compliment you on deciding not to accept the suggestion made by the Honourable Member for Lakeside in the way these estimates and this committee is to conduct its affairs. We are on the Minister's salary and obviously you accepted that by agreeing to let the Honourable Member for Assiniboia deal with details that appear through the estimates thereafter.

However, I am not interested in details, I am interested in this Minister justifying his salary on the basis of his approach to education in the Province of Manitoba. There are several points that were raised today with which he dealt in such a manner as to avoid answering very specific questions dealing with his approach to education, and I want to, if I can't get him to answer them, at least I want to stress the fact that in my opinion he is not answering them. I would indicate - somebody suggested that when the last Minister left and this present Minister came in there was a change, and I can say there was a change in committee dealing with his estimates in that his predecessors, in as long as I have been here, have been prepared to lay on the line their policy and to answer questions and to state their program and their policies so at least we could find out where we differ. This Minister, today especially, has made snide remarks about the way questions have been directed at him, has made comments which would indicate that the questions are directed in such a way that no person could really comprehend what they are so how could he possibly answer them. I must therefore try to repeat for him those questions and those remarks that were directed at him, and ask him if he doesn't understand them to just read them back to us and we will try somehow to get on the same plane, so that we could at least understand what we are talking about.

One question that was asked of him, and I think it was first asked by the Member for Burrows, is to what extent are there any school districts whose programs are such as are spending too much money. And I said, after the Minister failed to deal with that, that both he and the First Minister reacted physically, while sitting there listening to the Member for Burrows, as if to indicate that there was all sorts of money being spent wrongly by the school districts. And when he was again asked specifically is it so or not, he then proceeded to comment about some questions I asked of him some time ago, which he didn't answer at that time either, dealing with school teachers' salaries, whether he was blaming school districts for having to pay those salaries, and then still did not answer until he said yes, there are some school districts, I won't name them - and I didn't ask that he should - who are living beyond their ability to pay, whose expansion programs were beyond what they were able to pay. Now is that a correct re-statement of what the Minister said to me? Well I don't know, we'll find out.

He was then asked what programs, what expansion, what type of thing were they doing that they cannot afford to do and should not be doing, and the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks read from this Minister's department's report on the type of expansion which is considered necessary. Now we are still entitled to know; the school divisions of this province are entitled to know. Should they cut out kindergarten? There's a question. Should they reduce their guidance program? Should they cut down on their library requirements? Are they too demanding for that? Should they stop on their programs of audio-visual education -- (Interjection) -- and the suggestion is that possibly the Minister will comment on the reading and writing programs. What programs are going too far for the ability of the school districts to pay?

The next question, Mr. Chairman, is he suggesting on this ability-to-pay principle that the school district which operates in the wealthier part of this city is entitled to give to its

April 3, 1969

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) people a better class of education, a better program, than is the school district which operates in a poorer part of - when I say city, I mean Metropolitan Winnipeg - because we have such. I am sure that the tax base in Tuxedo is of a higher level than the tax base in East Kildonan and probably they pay less taxes. Is he saying that on the basis of ability to pay with a tax base, that there is a differential that should be recognized and that he is critical of one of that type for going into an expansion program which is beyond its means? If he is - I believe that that's what he said, I believe he indicated that he is - if he is, then let him say to what extent their programs have been reduced. If I am quoting him wrongly let him correct that, but let him speak in specifics and not in generalities, and let him answer the questions.

He was asked, for example, by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, was the application of the Winnipeg School Division for some expansion of its administrative building refused? The Resource Center, or the Resource Wing, was it refused? I understood him to answer yes, it was refused. And then he was asked why was it refused? And I didn't hear the answer. Not that I particularly am interested in why was this particular one refused, but what was the formula, what was the thinking that permitted this Minister to say we refused it. Is it because the provincial government couldn't afford it? Is it because provincial grants were involved or is it because they decided in their wisdom here in Cabinet, or in the School Finance Board, that the School Division of Winnipeg couldn't afford it. Which is it? Aren't we entitled to have an answer, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister? Aren't we entitled to a specific answer? If Winnipeg School Division is prepared to pay for it itself, are you going to stop them; did you stop them; should you stop them? Aren't we entitled to answers so we will be able to evaluate the work done by this Minister so that we can then vote on his salary, and that's the matter we are discussing and I know that the Member for Lakeside must realize that.

Mr. Chairman, when we talk about education at the level of university and we look at this pamphlet that was distributed on regulations for government bursaries, and we read about the purpose of bursaries, the purposes are to equalize the opportunities for higher education in the province. Equalize doesn't mean to bring closer together, it means equalize, and for this Minister to say, as was quoted by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that they should have to work a little for it, that they should stand up on their own feet, by golly, Mr. Chairman, there's nothing tougher than sitting in front of a textbook and swotting it out and working competitively for the highest marks and for the highest attainment and for the best achievement in education, much harder and much more to be recognized and respected than for a fellow to go out and dig ditches to provide the money with which to contribute to the cost of education in the province, much more so, and certainly the incentive should be for him to sweat it out, showing that he has achieved the right to go on to university, not the ability to pay to go to university but the right to go.

I'm prepared to say to the Minister who answered quickly when he said he believed that the proposal made by our side here for elimination of fees would cost more, it's not true to maintain the present standards. The present standards involve the production of education for a number of people, and I for one, interpreting for the honourable members who have already spoken on our side, am prepared to say that I would rather that we were able to produce the best students, the best graduates in Manitoba in lesser numbers than we are doing today of the graduates that we are producing based on the ability of the individual to afford to go to university. In other words, if we are today educating 15,000 students at the university level, many of whom are there only because they can afford to be there and otherwise they are average students, and if we are keeping out students of high academic ability because they can't afford to pay, I would cut that 15,000 to 12,000 if I felt that the 12,000 were of a higher academic achievement level than the 15 we have, and that will even cost less money, but certainly we will be doing the right thing.

And one more thing, Mr. Chairman, I wish the Minister would comment on that, he indicated to us that the tuition fees are a small part of the cost of the student. I am prepared to pay that student to go to school if he is a student who will produce for the benefit of the people of Canada, or the people of Manitoba. I would pay him to go to school, and indeed we are doing it right now in the technical-vocational field. We are paying students who are married and with children, we are paying them to go to school to upgrade themselves, and I would certainly do that in order again to do what the regulation calls for, to equalize the opportunity.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like this Minister to make specific answers. He may not like the way we voice our questions, he may not like the way we attack him. When I said that he made snide remarks, he called out that I was the master. I apologize to him for those remarks which he interprets as being unfair or not kindly, but I do ask him to accept our sincerity in thinking that we have an approach which does deserve consideration and reply.

Therefore, having apologized in advance for what he thinks I may have said that wasn't nice or not fair, I am asking him to give us the answers to the questions we specifically asked of him, and not to talk around the subject but to tell us on what basis do you refuse programs that are proposed to the public schools board. What formula do you use? How do you relate it to the ability to pay of the school division? What programs should be cut in those divisions which in your opinion can't afford to carry out the programs even if they want to do it. What is wrong with eliminating the fees if in the end we are not asking you to spend a dollar more than you are now spending? Why don't you give us the answers to that, Mr. Minister, and maybe we can move on to the details that appear beyond your salary, so that we can then go ahead further with this work.

... continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CHERNIACK: The Honourable the Attorney-General is speaking again. I think you ought to recognize him.

MR. LYON: I'm happy to tell him, Mr. Chairman, the short answer to all of his questions is that most of us in this House, and most of us in this province don't believe in your levelling doctrine of socialism, that's why.

MR. CAMPBELL: It's good that I secured the floor before that particular statement, Mr. Chairman, because if there wasn't a peacemaker like myself in the offing between the Honourable the Attorney-General and the Honourable Member for St. John's, why fireworks would have erupted immediately and you'd have had a difficult problem on your hands I am sure, Mr. Chairman, so I am as usual the right man at the right place.

I wouldn't want you to think, Mr. Chairman, and I wouldn't want the honourable members of the New Democratic Party to think that I was in any way impugning the dedication with which they argue their particular philosophy with regard to education and university fees. I am most willing to concede to them complete sincerity in that. They believe in this program that they're advocating. I don't characterize it in just the same way as the Honourable the Attorney-General just did, but they believe in it and they have every right to argue it, but my only point was, and is, that while it's in order to do so, completely in order, yet it's also in order to argue any one of the other votes that we have here in the estimates in detail the same way, and we just wouldn't ever come close to getting through the estimates.

Now, I don't object at all to the — it is a fact that honourable members feel very keenly on this subject of education. It is an important subject and it's certainly taking more money all the time and we need to pay attention to it, and my only point is that once the philosophy has been stated and restated and stated over and over again, and once it appears that the Minister has his program determined, that the detail, it seems to me, should be argued on the particular item rather than on the basic one of the Minister's remuneration because, well, it just seems to me that's a better way to do it. Incidentally, I am interested in hearing people like my honourable friend from Seven Oaks and my honourable friend from Inkster appear to argue, and I don't class myself with them as an expert in education, but when they appear to argue that it's quite all right to just set a certain amount as what education should have, let the government set that amount and then just decide by proper scholastic attainment as to how many can qualify, I really thought that the philosophy of the most of us was that we wanted education to be available to everybody. I thought probably I was about the only one that would say such a thing that education should be limited any way by the amount of money that we had available, and I was glad to hear the Honourable the Minister come through this afternoon with something that was at least a little along that line. But to hear my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party, of all people, take the position that you first establish the amount of money and then divide it up on the basis of scholastic ability, well this has something to commend it and I'm not going to argue it in detail here on this, but I'll give it some thought and when we come to the proper item in the estimates I might be prepared to discuss it further.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1(a)--passed; (b)--passed....

MR. CHERNIACK: The Minister was, I think, rising to reply.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, first of all the Honourable Member for Assiniboia isn't in his chair here. He did have two or three questions. I would agree with him that that area has been one that has been difficult to keep up with because St. James-Assiniboia has been growing at a very rapid rate and in fact that area combined with Thompson in northern Manitoba has probably put the greatest stress on the building program that we and they experienced. Also in that connection, though, the amounts of support that have been given, although there may have been some difficulties, the amounts of support have been significant and I don't have the exact figures in front of me but I have had them in the past, and the capital expenditures in the area in which he was discussing a loan, I think have settled the problem that he mentioned, that it's over the hump and hopefully will be settled. I do know that the expenditures in the last two years anyway in Assiniboia have been of the order of \$7 million in capital and that the total amount of capital being carried by the Public Schools Finance Board for that division is of the order of between 13 and \$14 million, and this has all occurred over a very short period of time.

The other growth area that has given us similar problems and we've attempted to keep up

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) and I think we have, has been Thompson, that has been growing at just as rapid a rate as that particular part of the city.

He also mentioned the service to labour. Here we get involved with the Canada Manpower arrangement. If we have a particularly proud achievement in our educational system in Manitoba it has to be in this very particular area. The offerings that we have been able to make in the educational field have been greater in that one sphere of education than in any other. The number of people that have received training through the vocational set-up, through the technical-vocational set-up, compares with the amount of people receiving university education, and only a few short years ago this opportunity was not available. Now my honourable friends that we've had the sparring match with here, will possibly be -- it will give them some degree of satisfaction to know that the sort of programs that they are recommending at the university level are in fact operational in this area of technical vocational training where in fact allowances are made and assistance is given to those wishing to train. Now this is after they have had usually a degree of experience and wish to come back and expand their education or retrain for a job. It's a good program. It's not without its problems. We have a very severe problem in what's called the three-year gap, the gap group that falls into the three-year period, where there's not assistance available to them to come back and retrain. Most of our headaches in this area are ones that we're going to have to live with for awhile until we can see our way clear to finding solutions to them and, as I mentioned in the estimates speech, we are working very closely with the Manpower people with the Federal Government and through the Ministers of Education Council for the provinces to reach a solution to it. — (Interjection) — Well, this is all directed at the labour area which the Honourable Member for Assiniboia was concerned about, and this was his question, if I read him correctly.

Now with regards to the questions that the Honourable Member for St. John's has asked, again I'll say that a great deal of the questions I seem to get there are of the type where your answers are loaded before you give them. "Have you quit beating your wife lately?" or something like that, and you're stuck regardless of which way you answer them. But let me make it clear. I'm not here to knock on the head programs that school divisions have undertaken or wish to undertake. The statement I made is that our administrative set-up for our school divisions is based on the premise that they have to live within their means or they're in trouble. We have the Foundation Program which has been set up and in the eyes of many has worked very satisfactorily. It has brought a great degree of equity to the disparities that occur between the have and have not areas of the province in terms of the tax load that's put on them. It isn't completely equitable; it's much more equitable than it was before; but if they wish to undertake programs, they in turn must assume the responsibility for the costs that are incurred, and in terms of the controls that the concern is about here, it is at the request of a great many of the school boards who have come in for assistance and it's not intended to work a hardship on them, it's to work with them and to assist them, and as far as trying to create this image of putting the lid on education is concerned, it's dead wrong, and I can tell you in terms of my own personal philosophy, I think I've spent as much time in this business and have devoted as much of my lifetime to the purposes of education that would not have been spent there did I not have a pretty dedicated interest in seeing something constructive done. And I'll suggest to you that in terms of this great hardship and the facts and figures of proving that the low income bracket is financing the high income bracket, you still have to come back to the — there's a legal term that describes it, in Latin — the evidence speaks for itself. I've spent enough time involved in this area that I haven't found too many cases where a person, as I said before, that had the intellectual capacity and the desire did not receive his university education.

MR. LYON: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's 5:30. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply wishes to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before moving adjournment there's one item of House business I should call to the attention of honourable members. They have already the list of the estimates that will be called by the government. We would like to make one amendment and that is

(MR. LYON cont'd.) to call the Department of Agriculture after the Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Provincial Treasurer, the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I move the motion, I would wish the honourable members a happy Easter.

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