

Name	Electoral Division	Address
ALEXANDER, Keith	Roblin	Roblin, Man.
BAIZLEY, Obie	Osborne	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13
BJORNSON, Oscar F.	Lac du Bonnet	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
CAMPBELL, D. L.	Lakeside	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARROLL, Hon. J.B.	The Pas	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
CHRISTIANSON, John Aaron	Portage la Prairie	86-9th St., N.W., Ptge. la Prairie, Man.
CORBETT, A. H.	Swan River	Swan River, Man.
COWAN, James, Q.C.	Winnipeg Centre	512 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
DESJARDINS, Laurent	St. Boniface	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
DOW, E. I.	Turtle Mountain	Boissevain, Man.
EVANS, Hon. Gurney	Fort Rouge	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORBES, Mrs. Thelma	Cypress	Rathwell, Man.
FROESE, J. M.	Rhineland	Winkler, Man.
GRAY, Morris A.	Inkster	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
GROVES, Fred	St. Vital	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
GUTTORMSON, Elman	St. George	Lundar, Man.
HAMILTON, William Homer	Dufferin	Sperling, Man.
HARRIS, Lemuel	Logan	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
HARRISON, Hon. Abram W.	Rock Lake	Holmfield, Man.
HAWRYLUK, J. M.	Burrows	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
HILLHOUSE, T.P., Q.C.	Selkirk	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
HRZHORCZUK, M.N., Q.C.	Ethelbert Plains	Ethelbert, Man.
HUTTON, Hon. George	Rockwood-Iberville	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
INGEBRIGTSON, J. E.	Churchill	Churchill, Man.
JEANNOTTE, J. E.	Rupertsland	Meadow Portage, Man.
JOHNSON, Hon. George	Gimli	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg
JOHNSON, Geo. Wm.	Assiniboia	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
KLYM, Fred T.	Springfield	Beausejour, Man.
LISSAMAN, R. O.	Brandon	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
LYON, Hon. Sterling R., Q.C.	Fort Garry	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MARTIN, W. G.	St. Matthews	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
McKELLAR, M. E.	Souris-Lansdowne	Nesbitt, Man.
McLEAN, Hon. Stewart E., Q.C.	Dauphin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MOLGAT, Gildas	Ste. Rose	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
MORRISON, Mrs. Carolyne	Pembina	Manitou, Man.
ORLIKOW, David	St. John's	179 Montrose St., Winnipeg 9
PAULLEY, Russell	Radisson	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
PETERS, S.	Elmwood	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 15
PREFONTAINE, Edmond	Carillon	St. Pierre, Man.
REID, A. J.	Kildonan	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 15
ROBERTS, Stan	La Verendrye	Niverville, Man.
ROBLIN, Hon. Duff	Wolseley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SCARTH, W.B., Q.C.	River Heights	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
SCHREYER, E. R.	Brokenhead	Beausejour, Man.
SEABORN, Richard	Wellington	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
SHEWMAN, Harry P.	Morris	Morris, Man.
SHOEMAKER, Nelson	Gladstone	Neepawa, Man.
SPELLIE, Robert Gordon	Birtle-Russell	Russell, Man.
STANES, D. M.	St. James	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
STRICKLAND, B. P.	Hamiota	Hamiota, Man.
TANCHAK, John P.	Emerson	Ridgeville, Man.
THOMPSON, Hon. John, Q.C.	Virden	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WAGNER, Peter	Fisher	Fisher Branch, Man.
WATT, J. D.	Arthur	Reston, Man.
WEIR, Walter	Minnedosa	Minnedosa, Man.
WITNEY, Hon. Charles H.	Flin Flon	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WRIGHT, Arthur E.	Seven Oaks	4 Lord Glenn Apts. 1944 Main St., Wpg. 17

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, March 2nd, 1961.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Chairman, with respect to the remarks that were made before our supper hour by the Honourable Member from St. John's, I'd like to say that I spoke to many meetings during the campaign to sell this school division plan and I don't recall at any time, as I said earlier, making any promises of reduced taxes. And I don't, despite the quote that he gave from Hansard, I don't think that the Minister made any unqualified statement to the effect that taxes would be reduced either. And although the Minister did state this afternoon that if school boards were to continue to give the same standard of education that they were giving at that time that there was no reason to believe that the taxes would increase, and that in some cases there might be reason for them going down. In my area, at least, his remarks were not interpreted as indicating any decrease in taxes. People in my constituency anyway, the responsible persons that were in possession of the facts of life with regard to education certainly didn't interpret them that way.

I would like to read one paragraph from a letter that was sent out to all electors in the St. Vital School Division by the then School Board of Glenlawn School District and signed by Dr. D. W. Penner, who was the Chairman at that time and is now the Chairman of the St. Vital School Division Board. This is what this letter says about grants and taxes: "With the municipal school district" -- and you'll remember that the municipal school district was formed in St. Vital, the boundaries of which are co-terminus with the now school division of St. Vital -- says, "with the formation of a municipal school district we will qualify for the greatly increased government grants towards education. These grants will make it possible to maintain a high standard of education without unduly burdening the taxpayer." And from another letter that was sent out during that same period by the Windsor Home and School Association -- the Windsor Home and School Association, by the way, is the largest and the most active Home and School group in the Province of Manitoba. This is what this group sent out to the residents of that area, and again I'm not going to read the whole letter but just two paragraphs that deal with this subject of grants and taxes. "If the referendum is defeated we will not qualify for the new educational grants." And then it goes on to list the various grants. And the last paragraph is: "If we fail to qualify for these grants our taxes will have to be raised considerably to pay for the necessary expansion in school facilities in the next few years." And then it ends up by saying, "Please be sure to vote "Yes" on February 17th."

Now the St. Vital School Division is one of those divisions where the assessment is not rising at a rapid rate. Enrollment is going up very dramatically and the teacher count, therefore, is going up at a corresponding rate to the increase in the enrollment. This school division has gained immeasurably by the new grants that are set out in this system. Here I'm comparing the enrollment in the St. Vital School Division at April, 1959, when the division was formed or prior to the formation of the division, and at December 31st, 1960. The elementary enrollment in 1959 was 4,045. It increased to 4,408, an increase of 363. Now the secondary school enrollment at the beginning was 528; at December 31, 1960 there was 1,062; an increase of 534 or 101%. The total enrollment has increased from 4,573 to 5,470. The number of teachers employed in this division has increased from 174 to 222. During this time we have added 79 classrooms, or their equivalent -- 46 elementary and 33 secondary, at a total cost of \$1,170,000.00. We have planned an additional 41 classrooms, or their equivalent, at a total cost of \$633,000.00. And I might note that total costs are not expected to reach this figure because the bid that has been received on Hastings School, which is the latest addition, amounts to some \$331,000, or an average of \$11,033 per classroom. Perhaps we might have more to say on that when the resolution of the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain comes up.

Now what have these grants meant to our division in addition to these new classrooms that I have just described. The board now has a full-time psychologist and a part-time social worker. They can, with these additional monies, serve the mentally handicapped children, physically handicapped children and children that are emotionally disturbed; a service that they certainly could never have offered before. There are now five departments of industrial arts and home economics. Before, there was only one, but transportation is now being paid

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.).... for all of the students in this division, elementary and secondary. Before, the high school students, in addition to not being able to attend the larger high school without paying a fee, had to pay their own way to get there.

We have had an increase in the mill rate. In 1958, when there was a re-assessment in the Municipality of St. Vital, our mill rate was 24.6 mills. It is now 29.76 mills, an increase of 5.10 mills. This increase of 5.10 mills is very small when you compare it with the increased grant that the Department of Education, or that the government has pumped into the school system. In 1958 the total grant, to what is now the School Division of St. Vital, amounted to \$360,312.00. In 1959, one year later, these grants amounted to \$616,964, an increase of \$256,652 or 71.2% increase in the grant. The grant for 1960 amounts to \$781,766, an increase over 1959 of \$64,801; an increase over 1958, which was prior to the new school plan, of \$421,453; so that from 1958 to the end of the 1960 fiscal year, the grant that the school division of St. Vital received from the government more than doubled. -- (Interjection) -- That remains to be seen. I am not a prophet. Now if we look at the report that was tabled recently of the Municipal Board, we find the per capita taxes per school in the urban area of Winnipeg as follows -- the comparisons are made here between St. Boniface, St. James, St. Vital, Transcona and West Kildonan -- St. Boniface 33.41, St. James is 26.25, West Kildonan is 43.14, St. Vital is 30.97 and Transcona is 27.95. St. Vital, despite the fact that we have excellent schools in St. Vital, is second lowest as far as per capita school levies. Transcona, of course, is even lower than that and Transcona also has excellent elementary and secondary schools.

MR. PAULLEY: It has an excellent representative too.

MR. GROVES: Yes, I agree with that. I have confidence that our School Board, it is much the same now, the people on it that is, as it was prior to the incorporation of these divisions, would not have gypped the kids of St. Vital out of a good education even if they had not received these increased grants, but it would have cost us a lot more and we should be thankful for the benefits that we are getting from this new plan. And we should ask ourselves, I think, what we would have been paying and what our mill rate increase would have been if these extra grants had not been received.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this to the Honourable Member from St. John's. He and I don't belong to the same religious faith but we have in our church a hymn that I would like to recommend to him, and I would sing it, Mr. Chairman, if I could sing and if the Honourable Member from Wellington had his violin here to accompany me. I would like to apologize to the author of this hymn for changing three words. The chorus goes something like this: Count your blessings, name them one by one; and you will be thankful for what McLean has done.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon the Minister gave a very interesting answer to one of the questions I asked him, when he said he would turn down the proposals of the Lakeshore School Division because he did not want the people of Lakeshore School Division to be saddled with unrealistic plans. I wonder why he approved the plans when he did then if they are unrealistic because, Mr. Chairman, the last three proposals that were regularly turned down are practically the same as the proposal that the Minister approved just at the end of February.

MR. McLEAN: The first three.

MR. GUTTORMSON: That is what I said. Those three proposals were practically the same as the one he approved.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, the proposals were coming in about one a week over the last year.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I am rising to object most strenuously to some of the statements made here this afternoon by the Minister of Education on the matter of taxation and the cost of education in the Province of Manitoba. I understood the Minister to say in his comments that one of the reasons that the costs of the municipal taxpayers had gone up is that the trustees of this province had gone beyond the expenditures that this government was recommending, and that was the reason for the increase; and this, Mr. Speaker, I absolutely refuse to accept.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I made no such statement.

MR. MOLGAT: That is exactly what my honourable friend inferred. He was trying to get his government and himself off the hook for exactly the situation education finds itself in the Province of Manitoba right now. And, Mr. Chairman, I say that the responsibility rests exclusively on my honourable friend's shoulders and that of his government.

MR. LYON: Why did you vote for it then?

MR. MOLGAT: My dear friend, we'll come to you later -- you're not the Minister of Education. Don't worry, when your estimates come up we'll have plenty to say to you. You just relax a bit. Right now we're dealing with your other honourable friend.

MR. LYON: I'm not worried about you.

MR. MOLGAT: And he's trying to get off the hook and trying to get you off the hook; and that's all that's going on right now. The fact is that my honourable friends went up and down this province and they sold this plan in every constituency; and the statement that they were making at this time at all these meetings that were held, and I went to every single meeting in my constituency to which a Cabinet Minister went, and I listed carefully what they had to say. And I must say, Mr. Chairman, that the statements that were then made were a far cry from the mild meek statement made by my honourable friend this afternoon when he said, "Well now, really, you know we think this plan is a good plan. We think it will help education in Manitoba. We endorsed it." Roughly that's what he told us this afternoon, but was that what he was saying when they were selling the division plan? Oh, no! My friend then was the great knight in shining armour. He was sounding like he did when he introduced his estimates two or three days ago, whenever it was, out for battle; out as a salesman; and he did a good job. I don't deny that, but he cannot back down now on the statements he made at that time. And I say that if the costs have gone up, it's a result of the sales campaign that my honourable friend conducted at that time; and let us not now try and shift the blame onto the trustees of this province, because the blame rests exclusively on the shoulders of this government.

What were the statements made in this House when my honourable friends were in opposition? Well I must confess there aren't too many of them here now who were in opposition in those days, but those few who were. I well remember my honourable friend, now the Minister of Public Works. He used to sit over here and he stood up here before us in his very fine legal pose, stood before us and told us that we, then the government, were starving the municipalities. True? Thank you, gentlemen. I'm glad to see you say it. You'll pay for it some day. That's exactly what my friends then said, ~~that we were~~ loading the municipalities with great extra costs; that we were putting an unfair burden on them. And I well remember that my honourable friend referred to some municipalities in his constituency, and we got the figures out on their old revenues that changed his views a little, but that was always the claim; that was consistently the claim of the present government; that was their claim during the election campaign. My honourable friend from St. Vital got up a few moments ago and told us that this wasn't at all the case. Well now, what did the government say during the election campaign? Here's a little folder that they produced for all the Conservative members at that time. They said then that this progressive program is endorsed by every Conservative candidate. Now I'll admit that my honourable friend from St. Vital since that time has appeared to be a little on the verge of the Conservative Party, but I presume at that time he was running as a Conservative. And what did this little pamphlet say then? It said, "The Roblin Government for education -- an effort to equalize education costs in the province to lighten the load of the municipal taxpayer." And that, Mr. Chairman, was all the way through, consistently, the claim of these people; that they would lighten the load of the municipal taxpayer.

My honourable friend from St. John's, this afternoon, read the Minister's statements to him again that he made in this House; and those statements cannot be denied. And, Mr. Chairman, let us not try and fool the public of Manitoba. Let's have the facts as they are. My honourable friends sold this program on the basis that it would lighten the load on the municipal taxpayer; and now they are trying to pretend that the increase in the load on the municipal taxpayer, which I think we all have to admit, is a result of the actions of the trustees of this province. And that I categorically deny. -- (Interjection) -- I'm glad you do, but that's not what you said this afternoon. That's exactly why I am objecting, because you pretended this afternoon that this business of approved costs and actual costs was something entirely different. Well, let me tell you that the actual costs are the result of your sales campaign because when

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.).... you went out you put no brakes on the situation at that time. --(Interjection) -- Many of them, and my honourable friend can remember them because he was at meetings with me in Rorketon and in McCreary, and I told him at that time, but he denied them. He said no, no, the trustees will be entirely free to do as they please. -- (Interjection) -- You -- you, my dear friend, my colleague, my neighbour from Dauphin constituency, the Minister of Education, because you were at those meetings as well. You were the main speaker.

MR. McLEAN: as I recall, you weren't speaking on those occasions.

MR. MOLGAT: Oh, yes. I spoke on both occasions, in Rorketon and in McCreary; and I have copies of what I said and notes of what you said. -- (Interjection) -- What did I say, Sir? I'll be delighted to tell you. Delighted to tell you.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I didn't ask for his speech, I just said what side was he on?

MR. MOLGAT: Make up your mind. Do you want my speech or don't you?

MR. LYON: What side were you on?

MR. MOLGAT: Well, I won't give it all to you but I'll tell you what I will give you.

MR. LYON: Your speech won't betray us probably.

MR. MOLGAT: No, no. I'll tell you some of what I said. I said at that time that there were many political aspects to this whole matter of school divisions. And my honourable friend got up and said, "No". He never realized there were any political aspects at all. This thing was a pure interest in education. It was an absolute coincidence that there should have been an interim report; an absolute coincidence that they should act upon it so quickly; and there we were selling the school divisions; and my friend put on a sales campaign, and he can't deny it. He had every inspector in the Province of Manitoba up every night, at meetings up and down the country, and he sold it. In fact, I well recall one of the statements that was made then. After the school inspector, and my honourable friend was at the same meeting, made a speech, he explained all the grants and everything that would come with this fine system, and he said, "How do we get this, how can we assure ourselves", I am now quoting the inspector, and my honourable friend was there and didn't deny it. "How can we get all this?", speaking of the grants, "How can we assure ourselves? There is only one way -- vote "Yes" on establishing the divisions. If we do not vote in favour, all this is lost and we are on the old plan. We may not even be as well off as that; we may only have permit teachers." And that is the sales campaign that my friend put on.

MR. McLEAN: That was the inspector that said that.

MR. MOLGAT: But you were there. You were sitting right there at that meeting. You were the main speaker, and I was very interested in your comments. Now, Mr. Chairman, let's us not confuse this issue. The cost in education, the cost -- I'm saying this -- the cost in education or the rise in the costs are due directly to my honourable friends, and let's not try and pass that cost on to anyone else and let's not try and deny that those costs are not up. He mentioned to me this afternoon that in my particular division he was paying -- what? -- 75% or 80% of our costs? Well that may be; I haven't had the chance to check those yet; but all I know is that we're paying a lot more. I haven't got the latest figures. I'll admit these are only the figures for the first year after his plan got into operation and, at that time, our general school tax, and this is Ste. Rose Municipality, went up by 14 mills. In the other municipalities in my constituency -- in Glenella they went up 15 mills; in Kelwood they went up 3 mills; in Glencairn 15 mills; Oak Leaf School District, 21 mills; Glenellen School District, 18 mills; McCreary Municipality, 2 mills. Now that, Mr. Chairman, is not a reduction on the load on the local taxpayer. It is an increase in the load, and we still have not felt the impact of the construction program, because as my honourable friend knows, that one is just starting now. We won't feel it in that whole area until a year from now, until the program really starts. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to make this absolutely crystal clear, it is not the school trustees in this province who are to blame for any increase in costs, and there is no point in trying to shift that blame onto them. Let it rest where it belongs, directly on my honourable friend.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I really don't suppose there is too much point in pursuing this matter any further, but I object to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose undertaking to pervert and twist what I said this afternoon. I was explaining the difference between actual and approved costs. I have always made it abundantly plain, at the meetings where you were

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) in attendance, that the plan contemplated the possibility that local trustees, in their own decision, could encourage expenditures over and above what were known as the "approved" amounts; and that under the law that was their authority and privilege to do so; and that if they did so, that the costs were costs on the local taxpayers. That situation hasn't changed and I am not undertaking to place any responsibility or blame, indeed I don't suppose there is any blame needs to be attached to anyone in connection with it. Now I think that the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has done something that, in my experience, has not been done in this House before. He referred in this House to a statement which he alleges that a school inspector made, a civil servant who is not here to defend himself. It's quite in order to attack me, or any member of the government, but I think that it is poor taste

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I object to that statement. My honourable friend was at that meeting. If he didn't agree with the statement, he could have got up at that time and corrected it.

MR. McLEAN: It is in extremely poor taste for the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose to make what, in effect, amounts to a personal attack, because of course it is well known who the inspector is, was and is, on this matter; and I think that it is something that I trust would not occur in this House again. If all that's worrying my friend are the rise in costs

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I rise to object to the statement made by the Minister. If my honourable friend did not agree with the statements that were made at that time, he should have got up then and contradicted them; now now, to accuse me of using them or twisting them, because I am quoting what was said then. If he didn't like it then, he should have objected at that time, not now.

MR. McLEAN: Now if the honourable member is concerned about rising costs, at least it's good to know that he is concerned about something, because he certainly wasn't concerned about the quality of education that was available to the boys and girls in his constituency prior to June of 1958. This plan, which he attacks with such cheerful abandon, is giving a quality of education to his own people that they never dreamed of during the previous administration. Now I've never been one that wanted to particularly indulge in this business of what somebody else did when they were here, or any of this sort of thing; but it must be certainly recognized, and he ought to recognize it, that this plan is providing a quality of education for the people of the Ste. Rose provincial constituency that, in their wildest moments, they never thought was possible under the old system. There are boys and girls being picked up at 8:00 and 8:15 and 8:30 in your constituency, Sir, who, under the old system, didn't even have the right to go to a high school much less to be picked up in the school van or bus and taken to school. You've got seven new high schools going to be constructed in your constituency, or what is largely your constituency, to replace and put school accommodation available for the boys and girls of that constituency that they didn't have before and had no chance of getting. Now if you're concerned about the rising costs, it's a good thing to know that you are concerned now, because you certainly weren't concerned before this took place.

MR. MOLGAT: It is interesting to hear what the Minister has to say. I did not attack the plan as such. In fact, if he listened to what I said at those meetings -- (Interjection) -- my dear friend I spoke at every single meeting -- at every single meeting in my constituency.

MR. McLEAN: That's right. You spoke and you said nothing.

MR. MOLGAT: I did say something and I'm prepared to back up what I said, which apparently you're not, and exactly what I said is that I did not agree with everything in the bill that was then passed; that I thought there were many political factors in it; and my honourable friend in the Town of McCreary denies this, said the first he ever heard about this was in the newspapers. But that's exactly what I said, and I said that under the circumstances, in my opinion, we had no alternative in our constituency except to vote for this; because if we didn't, then the penalties would be entirely too hard for us to endure. And I said that at a meeting -- two meetings that he was at; one meeting that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce was at; one meeting that the Minister of Public Utilities was at; and I can get plenty of people to back me up on that one. I went out and I approved of the plan as it was then, with reservations, but I did approve and recommend it to my people in their circumstances that they should vote for it. But my honourable friend is again trying to bring up other subjects. He's trying to say that we opposed the plan. Now that's not what the point is -- (Interjection) -- well,

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.).... that's what you suggested -- that I opposed the plan.

MR. McLEAN: No, I didn't say

MR. MOLGAT: Well then, what on earth did he say, if he didn't just finish saying that? The point is my friend, that I'm contradicting your statements of this afternoon that the costs have gone up because of what the trustees have done, and I say that is not so. The costs have gone up because of what you have done.

MR. K. ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Chairman, I was one of the ones that helped the Minister of Education sell this school plan in Roblin -- sell is right. I'm proud of it; I'm glad of it; and I'm quite prepared to run the next election in Roblin on that basis, because I still think that nothing better was ever done. This is one of the best things, I think, that ever happened in the rural area of Manitoba. Now I've got facts here on my own area. In Inter-Mountain School Division #36 there is an increase of 246 students getting a high school education; 246 students getting the opportunity of getting better jobs because they will be better educated; 246 students in Inter-Mountain School Division, which includes part of the Gilbert Plains area, who'll be better equipped to face this world and face this life, who'll be better equipped to take advantage of the opportunities that are prevalent and available in this country because of the actions taken by this government.

Now there has been much to-do made about promises, taxes and costs. On the matter of promises, I'm speaking for what I said and from what I heard the Minister say in the meetings that we held in our district. There were two things made abundantly clear. The extra grants that the government was giving from the Department of Education to the school boards -- (Interjection) -- Just wait a minute. It's funny you're always in such a hurry to talk but never in a big hurry to act. The provision was definitely stated that with this increase in money available for education in the Province of Manitoba, one of two things or a combination of both could happen. The first thing was that if the standards of education and the facilities of education stay as they were, that there must, and everybody will agree with this, there must be a lowering of local taxes. Secondly, that if this money was used with the local tax level staying the same, that there must be an increase in the standards of education. -- (Interjection) -- That was said all through the Inter-Mountain School District and at every meeting I spoke at, including Swan River and some of the other areas. That was made quite plain.

Now the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose has mentioned something about divisions of responsibility between the Province of Manitoba and school districts, and I think he knows very well that in this province, in our education act there are certain costs where we bear a great share of the grants. Now I'm not going to go through each one individually because I haven't got them at my finger-tips, but the honourable member knows what they are. Now that is given to the school boards; then to make up any extras that they may wish, they can levy a local levy of their own; and that applies to elementary school boards as well as division boards. Now what is the honourable member suggesting when he's talking about increased costs? Is he saying that we are giving too much money or not enough money to the school boards? Or are you saying that they are spending the money not efficiently? Or are you saying that they themselves are levying too much? Now what are you saying? Do you think the money is being used inefficiently -- the money that we are giving them? Because I think not. There's been mention made of future salaries. Are you saying that we should not let the school boards set these salaries? Do you think we should set them? There's only one answer, Mr. Chairman. There's only one answer to all the questions that have been raised by the opposition in the field of education, and that is take away the local autonomy and give it to the government. That is the only solution to satisfy or to answer the criticisms that have come from that side of the House. And I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that we are ready yet, in the Province of Manitoba, to take away the responsibilities of education from those people that are more directly concerned and directly interested in it.

I mentioned my own district of Roblin, and this is fairly sharp in my mind because we just opened this past winter a new high school there costing \$375,000, 75% of which was put up by the Provincial Government; and that is a lot of money. But I want to tell this committee, Mr. Chairman, that before the school was officially opened there were 250 students in it and those students, prior to that, were in the basement of the Masonic Hall; they were in the basement of the Elk's Hall; they were around the furnace room of the school owned by the local

(Mr. Alexander, cont'd.) school board. And since those 250 students have been put into suitable high school facilities, the local board tell me that they haven't got any extra room for suitable classroom space in their two schools that they now own. That is what the school space situation was like in that area, and I hate to think, Mr. Chairman, speaking of school taxes, what the taxes would have been if that district had been forced to build a new school under the grants that were given them by the Liberal Party of this province when they were in power. This they needed and this they needed badly; and this they have got. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say in conclusion that the thing that I am proudest of, of this government, is the education system and the forward-looking education system that is available to the boys and girls of this province.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, would the honourable member answer a question? Does he agree with the statements of the Minister of Education this afternoon that the increases costs to the local taxpayer are a result of the actions of the trustees?

MR. ALEXANDER: I didn't understand the Minister to make that statement, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, I don't know what else he said then if it wasn't that.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, there's an important point here that is being overlooked. We've heard of how many children are receiving this high school education and of all these new schools going up, and what was being done when the Liberals were in power, but I think that we should remember that there are an awful -- (Interjection) -- Well, all right, what wasn't done. You can't do things for people that aren't there. Now, I think that you realize that the war finished around '45 or so, and how many new babies did you have -- those war babies became of age around this time. I think that's an important point. Now I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable the Minister has an awful lot of nerve to come here and talk about the quality of education of certain children in certain districts when he's not worried about the quality of education for about 10,000 of them. The bragging about the boys and girls that are being picked up at 8:30 -- he doesn't mention the boys and girls that are being kicked out. And then he has the nerve to say that somebody was over at a meeting, talked and said nothing, when he's refused to answer a question. Whenever anybody asks him a question, he's there sitting like a bump on a log. Why can't we get those questions answered?

Now talking about those grants, I'd like to ask this question. Does the Honourable Minister think that it is right -- well, first of all, maybe I should ask him is there any change -- I haven't seen any -- is there any change in the policy of the department on the question of books? Now if I wanted an answer to this I would have to ask him in a roundabout way, ask him if there is anything new, instead of getting a straight answer. So I will save him the embarrassment of not answering that question. But if there is nothing changed, I would like him to tell me if he thinks it is right that I should pay for a certain book, a certain colour by the same author, the book approved by his Department of Education, should I pay for this because my children attend a private school? Shouldn't it be free for him, the same book? Now I won't ask him this question. He won't answer me, but maybe we should arrange some kind of a signal. If you think this is fair, maybe you should stay in your seat; and if it isn't fair, maybe you can wipe your brow or something because that is the only way I will have an answer. It's all right to talk about this honourable friend from Roblin who's talking about how proud he was of selling something. Is he proud of not being able to say anything about the second part of that report? Why does the government insist on the first part of that report? To plan an election? Do you think I'm blind? Do you think it's enough to come and say -- send me a note -- congratulation, you made a good speech. That is not what I want. I'm not talking here, I'm not asking what side you are. I'm not going to make that same speech again. You know what side I am, but at least I have never heard of such a thing asking some question that should be answered. I'm not asking are you for or against. I'm asking you to give us some intelligent answers. That is what I am asking, not make a joke of this and laugh at us because we are asking you for something. At least if you can't do that, quit your bragging about all those other things and telling us how wonderful you are.

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, I would almost ask, like the Irishman, is this a private fight or can anyone get in to it? I am not going to get into the fight at all, but I would like to ask a few questions of the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose. I am

(Mr. Corbett, cont'd.) not too quick in my thinking, I'm a little thick in the head, and I had a little trouble from his remarks distinguishing the difference between an inference and a statement of fact. He said that the Minister of Education stated something and the Minister of Education denied it, and then he said he inferred it. Well, I think there must be some difference between an inference and a statement of fact. And then a little later on he said, I think I am getting this right, he said that the inspector spoke very heatedly and favourably, almost I inferred from that that the inspector was speaking in favour of the Robln administration. Well, I don't know whether he was or not; but I wish you would, as soon as I finish, would clear up the definition or define for me the difference between an inference and a statement of fact. But I must say we had our school inspector up in our country. He went around at the request of the government and he simply and earnestly tried to explain the features of this Divisional Plan. He made no political allegations or made no political advances of any kind. He was a fine, straightforward gentleman and any inference or statement of fact, take your choice, that these school inspectors were working politically in this matter is absolutely wrong, I think. I think our school inspectors, even though most of them are appointed by the late administration, are a fine bunch of men, and I am quite sure that in my own particular case that any inference that these inspectors at these meetings were employing political tactics is entirely unfounded. Once the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose clears up the difference between an inference and a statement of fact, I will be very pleased. Thank you.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted at the question that the Honourable Member from Swan River brought up. He has confused the issue between inference and statement of fact so thoroughly, that I think I will have to refer him to Hansard tomorrow so he can see then what it was the Minister said. But I think if he will check my statement, I did not accuse the school inspectors of going out and working politically for any government. -- (Interjection) -- Well my honourable friend then has a different view on inferences than I have. That certainly was not my statement and he can check it in Hansard. I only said that he went out and recommended the plan. That was not a political statement, that was a statement of fact. Simply, he recommended the plan because in his view, I presume, he wanted the plan to go into effect. There was no accusation on my part against the inspectors at all. I think that they are non-political. I would object to them being used politically. I did make some objection at the time that my honourable friends were using them so strenuously in the sales campaign on this plan. However, as long as the inspectors are convinced it is a good plan, it is fine by me. But if he will check Hansard tomorrow, then he can find out if my honourable friend the Minister this afternoon made an inference or a statement of fact, that the school trustees were responsible for the increase in costs on the municipal taxpayers.

MR. J. COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Chairman, it is utter rot for the Member for Ste. Rose to say that the Provincial Government is solely to blame for these increases in costs, and I think that the Member for Ethelbert Plains realizes that from his speech this afternoon, for he was putting the blame on the fact that the teachers were very, very well organized. He is putting the blame to some extent on the fact that the teachers were very, very well organized and the school trustees were not very well organized. And, Mr. Chairman, if we look at the figures we will see that the Provincial Government, in 1956-57 spent \$12.8 million on education; in 1958-59 spent \$19.6 million on education; and in the coming fiscal year will spend \$33.5 million on education; an increase in three years of almost \$14 million, or almost 75%. And so we have the Provincial Government giving very, very large assistance to the municipalities and to the school districts and school divisions throughout Manitoba. They have given, and are going to give a great deal of money to help with the cost of education; and when they give money like that, one cannot say that the Provincial Government is responsible for the increased costs that come up in the municipal tax bills. I would just like to refer you to something I have here from the Winnipeg Free Press dated January 5th, 1959, in which it points out that the increase to be offered to Greater Winnipeg teachers in 1959 agreements for a teacher with one year normal school training and four years' university standing would begin at \$4,200 instead of \$3,500; and end at \$7,300 instead of \$5,700. That \$7,300 is an increase of 28% in one year over the previous maximum of \$5,700. The school trustees were not controlled at all by the Provincial Government with respect to the wages that they should pay or the salaries that they should pay. The Provincial Government gave them large increases and it should have meant,

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd.) I would have thought, some relief for local taxpayers; but it didn't because the teachers, instead of the local taxpayers getting the benefit of the increase, the teachers got the increase. The Provincial Government didn't give the teachers the increase, the local school trustees gave the increase. We should look at that and we find that \$7,300 is quite a good pay for 9 1/2 months work -- about \$776 a month. Now \$776, that is the maximum for the university graduate with one year normal training after 11 years teaching, and there are not too many people in this province that make that much money. If you look through other professional people, their lists -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. ORLIKOW: Lawyers.

MR. COWAN: Lawyers, that's quite right, there are some that make more than that but there are many, many more that make less.

MR. PAULLEY: you referring to until they receive similar amounts of money?

MR. COWAN: Not as long. The lawyers have to go through two years university and then five years articles -- about seven years; or four years university and four years articles -- about eight years. And then we have clergymen.

MR. PAULLEY: It was 11 years you mentioned. Is it not before she reaches that after university education?

MR. COWAN: Then the lawyer after the eight years, or the seven years as the case may be, he is just starting. When I started it was \$75 per month we got. That was what we got when we graduated. And then later on, of course, we were able to work up a practice and earn some more. Today I guess it is perhaps \$300. And now clergymen -- do clergymen compare to \$776 a month? They have had a lot of training. Then there are nurses -- nurses are professional persons and they take training for some three years. Can they compare with \$776 a month? Home economists, social workers, chemists, musicians, newspaper reporters, newspaper editors and so on. And so we find that these large increases were given by the local school trustees. They were not ordered by the Provincial Government. The Provincial Government gave them large grants and that surely should have helped out the municipality, but instead the teachers got the increase instead of the taxpayers, which made it a little bit harder on the rest of the taxpayers and the rest of the earners.

And one other thing I would just like to point out is this, that in Manitoba, according to this last report of the department, there are 426 teachers with collegiate standing, that is, four years Art and one year Normal, teaching in elementary schools; and in many of the school divisions they are paid exactly the same as the teachers who are teaching in the high schools. They may be teaching grade III, have their B. A. s and one year at Normal, going over the same thing year after year with grade III students. Now it is important that Grade III students have a proper education, but I think everyone would agree that it wouldn't be as hard to teach them as it would be to teach a Grade XII student. And so we find that we are having higher educational costs, to some extent, because of these policies of school trustees. I think most people in the province would agree that \$776 a month is quite a lot of money to pay for a school teacher, and there are a number that get more. You have more education, you get in a higher class; and you're a principal or assistant principal, of course, you get in still a higher class. And so I would just like to close by saying that it isn't all the fault of the Provincial Government. They do not control the wages.

..... Continued on next page

MR. PREFONTAINE: I would like to just say a word about this famous vote that was taken and about which the Honourable Member for Roblin is so proud of having taken part in. Apparently to him it's something very great that has happened in Manitoba, the taking of the vote on the school divisions. I for one, Mr. Chairman, believe that it is the greatest bribery attempt that was ever perpetrated on the people of rural Manitoba. Here was a government that had promised during the election just before that vote, that they would increase the school grants by 50 percent. They promised that, but they had no program at all; they didn't tell anyone, nowhere, at any place how they would do it, but they would just increase the grants by 50%, and then they came to power on the grounds that they had elected 26 to the Liberals 19, and they didn't know what to do. They wanted to follow Mr. Diefenbaker's example by going as rapidly to the people as possible, but they needed something worthwhile to go to the people, so they got after the Royal Commission on Education for a quick report on reorganization, and the Royal Commission accommodated the government and came out with an interim report, and the government called a session. At that session it introduced a bill with respect to school reorganization, these larger divisions, but the government told the City of Winnipeg, told the City of St. Boniface, the School District of Norwood, the School District of St. James, of St. Vital, of East Kildona, of West Kildonan, of Brandon, of Flin Flon, "Yes you can have your share of \$6,000,000 for the taking; we don't ask of you anything; you'll get your share of \$6,000,000 which we want to spend for education, but we'll have a referendum for these poor people in the country; we'll go to them and we'll tell them, "if you want to get your share of \$6,000,000 you must vote yourself in, otherwise you won't get a cent. Vote 'yes' or you'll get nothing." That's bribery, bribery attempt. I don't think it was a free vote at all, Mr. Chairman, the way this was conducted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we should be careful of our use of terms, and making charges of bribery, that's a very serious I believe.

MR. PREFONTAINE: An attempt at bribery, to try and coax the people with money, with their own funds, to vote one way rather than the other way. I don't think I have derogated from the privileges of any members of this House, and I don't think it was a free vote, and I wouldn't, I wouldn't boast that I had a part in this way to influence the people. If the grant had been good on its own without this money inducement, okay, I would have been for it. I was present when the Minister spoke in St. Pierre and I said a few words. I am quite sure that I remembered exactly what I said. I said, "I do not want to be a party to conducting such kind of a vote --vote one way or else --" but I told the people, "We can't vote ourselves out." My town voted seven to one in favour, because we couldn't financially afford to be out, because we would have been penalized. There were four divisions that voted out of the scheme and one came back in, one in my own constituency. In Hanover there are three still that are out and they are being penalized yet. I have maintained in the House that we could not have two systems working side by side. We should have one or the other. Now we still have mostly one, but there are still three divisions that are not getting their fair share of thefrom this government, who are still penalized because they cast a free vote like free men should have a right to cast without this money inducement that was offered to them, and I say that nobody should pride themselves too much for having taken such a part in having that vote at that time.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman it seems that when the education estimates are brought before this House, I have to be at odds with the Honourable the Minister of Education on some points, and I wish to express my disappointment very emphatically here tonight, and I was disappointed when the Honourable Minister disclosed that no provisions had been made for the non-division areas for increased teacher grants. These areas are losing thousands and thousands of dollars just because of the policy that this government is pursuing, and I just wonder sometimes what the honourable minister would do if the shoe was on the other foot, and his area was penalized the way our people are penalized up in the southern area. Earlier today, it was mentioned that the vote in Dauphin-Ochre didn't carry, yet it was seen-- there was provision made through legislation that this area would get the increased grants. Now how long is this supposed to continue? How long are we going to continue with this practice of denying certain people in the province the right to the grants that they deserve? How long are they supposed to be second-class citizens of this province? Just because they had the courage to live up to their convictions and vote the way they did, and I think the situation is

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) being further aggravated by continuing this policy. A change should be made to stop it. The government is antagonizing the people in our area by continuing a policy of this kind where they discriminate. At the time of the vote it was stated that it was a free vote, and also that the grants would be increased by 50%, yet to date in our areas, we have received no increase in grants. The teacher grants are still the same that were in effect prior to the vote. The only thing that we have got is free text books. Now, is the government going to go to the people on this record of discrimination, that they are exercising at the present time? It seems all right for the government to legislate against individuals not to practice discrimination, but when the government itself does it, nothing seems to be wrong. Surely something should be done and some measure of reason should be taken into this matter, and something should be worked out so that the non-division areas receive a fair share of the grants that they are entitled to.

Earlier when we discussed the estimates, I posed a question, whether any of the school divisions other than the one division did acquire existing buildings or school plants, and if so, how many, and what was the rate of grant paid to these divisions on those schools so acquired, whether they are the same as those paid on new schools. I still would like an answer to that if possible, and also the member for Ste. Rose raised the matter of costs, and I think this government is to blame for the increase in school costs that we have today. It was the grant scheme that came in with the division plan that started the ball rolling, and it hasn't stopped. That is all I wish to say at the present time, and I hope the Minister will see fit that something is done at an early date to accommodate the people in our area with increased school grants, especially teacher grants.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised at the turn this debate is taking. Until the honourable the minister lost his temper, I thought that everything was going along very nicely. He has to get used to the idea of being criticized. After all is said and done I don't think there was a minister ever sat in that front row, no matter what government he was in, that wasn't criticized by the Opposition. That is the role of the Opposition and there is no use in losing your temper. (Interjection) Oh I never lost my temper. (Interjection) Mr. Chairman, I pretended to lose it, but I never lost it. That is the difference you know; considerable difference between pretence and the actual fact.

MR. ALEXANDER: Don't pretend.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: absolutely serious. Now Mr. Chairman, I didn't hear any unfavourable criticism of the plan as it is until the strategy of the government has been changed this evening. What the Opposition was criticizing was not in the plan so far as it goes; they were criticizing the methods of implementation, the short-comings which shouldn't have existed then, and that is legitimate and proper criticism. I didn't hear anybody say that the plan is no good, not until this evening. I didn't hear that from a single person on this side of the House. In fact I heard a lot of complimentary remarks offered to the minister, and why he should all of a sudden bring the question of the Opposition saying that this plan is no good and come out with the facts showing the advantages that the children of the province have, well that isn't argued. Certainly the advantages are there. We expect them to be there and they are there, and what we did criticize, and will continue to criticize, and rightly and justly so, is that the government had made certain promises to the people of the province and haven't carried them out, and that's legitimate criticism, and there isn't anyone there, including the Honourable the Minister of Education who can say that that isn't the facts and the proper statement. Certainly the government doesn't intend to sit there and do as it likes and not be criticized by this House, this side of the House. Why lose your temper? Why change your strategy?

MR. ALEXANDER: May I ask a question Mr. Chairman.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Certainly.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Chairman, how does he know that the Honourable Minister of Education wasn't pretending to lose his temper?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Well because I have known the honourable minister for many years, and I have a fairly good idea when he loses his temper and when he is pretending that he has. The only explanation, Mr. Chairman, is this, and it was quite evident this afternoon, that the honourable minister was finding it more and more difficult to answer the legitimate questions of criticism that were placed before him and against his method of implementation of the plan.

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) So what does he do, instead of having to be on the defensive all the time, he goes on the offence, but he had no basis for that offensive, because the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose gave him no reason to say what he did, none whatsoever. We must always remember that when the plan was being implemented, and I say it did take sales talk, and it was necessary, but I do not agree with the type of sales talk that was used and the methods that were used. That is the difference. Now insofar as the inspector is concerned and the remark that my honourable friend for Ste. Rose made, well, Mr. Chairman, the inspectors were out with the minister, not only at that one meeting, they were with him at all the meetings, and I think they carried out their duties well, but the minister must take the blame for what that inspector said. Nobody is criticizing the inspector for having said it. That is a big difference and I think we want to bear that in mind, and I would like to see the honourable minister carry on in that smiling way of his that has been before us for two days. I wish he could carry on -- we won't be long now -- it won't be more than another two days, I assure him, and if he will just keep up his good nature and take the criticisms as they come and admit it like any of us would, that if there is room for criticism, we'll accept it. In fact, he invited us to do that this afternoon. He was in such high good humour that he said, "I invite this type of criticism; I like it; I adore it; I want it", and all of a sudden he turns around and he gets pretty sore about the criticism that has been levelled at him.

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, I too wish to take objection to the policy of the present government, the policy -- I said discrimination yesterday -- I am going to add another word and I also say dictatorship. Discrimination and dictatorship. And in regards to the grants, the refusal to grant teacher grants to non-division areas. Yesterday I asked the minister why he did not apply the same policy to the area that he represented and I asked him is it because he represents the area, and I did not get an answer. I hope to get an answer yet.

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, probably if I was very clever I'd just sit back at the present time because I know there are a good many people over there that are lying in wait in the weeds for me, but some of the remarks that have been made here this afternoon have prompted me to speak. I think that the Honourable Member for St. John's could take the credit for giving the last controversy of a number of them and what he said disturbed me just a little bit. He seemed to infer, in fact I think he went a lot farther than that, that he indicated from his argument that he felt that Winnipeg and other urban centres were getting a raw deal out of the new education program and the formula which is used to arrive at the grants to be given to the various school districts. In other words, I took out of what he said that he felt that the city of Winnipeg and some of those districts whose costs, or where the grants were small -- and he used the city of Winnipeg, 18% -- he seemed to indicate that they were subsidizing education in rural Manitoba. Now I think the very reverse is true. I'm a farmer. I represent in a large part farmers, and I try to make it my business to know a little bit of the factors in our social life that affect them, and I know about 12-1/2% of the university students, for instance, come from rural Manitoba -- come from the farms of Manitoba -- 12-1/2%. Now where do they go? Where do they go when they leave university? They don't go back to the farm. They go to the urban areas; they go to the Winnipegs, and so these urban areas get the fruits of the labours of the mothers and the fathers in rural Manitoba. And why shouldn't the urban areas take less of a share of the monies that are available for education in the Province of Manitoba? Another 12-1/2% of our students at the university and affiliated colleges come from rural towns, rural centres. Eighty percent of the young people in rural Manitoba leave us. This is a direct subsidy to the urban areas in this province. The farm people of Manitoba have entered into a partnership with the government of Manitoba and have endeavoured to make facilities available on a higher standard of high school education than has ever been available before. To a large extent, who's going to benefit by it? The urban areas of Manitoba, and I would say that the very reverse of what he intimated today is true. Rural Manitoba is subsidizing urban Manitoba in the field of education. (Interjection) Oh yes. (Interjection) Well you get the fruits of the educational system -- 80% of our young people find their way to urban centres. It seems to me that here is as good an example as any to show the lack of understanding on the part of a party who tries to hold themselves up as champions of the farmers. The other day I noticed the Leader of the CCF Party with a lapel button and it had a very interesting emblem, the emblem of the New Party, and it is a fork and

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)....a wrench crossed with a maple leaf. (Interjection) ...well maybe a pin I sure wouldn't buy it. I expect the wrench must stand for labour. I don't know what the fork stands for, but I sure hope it doesn't emblemize the farmer.....because my conception of a farmer of 1960 or an adequate emblem or an appropriate emblem is something other than a fork. What is it? Farming today is a highly industrialized occupation, highly mechanized, technical, and the fork is twenty years out of date. They don't use them very often on the farm today. (Interjection) ...well we could use one here. Well, that particular party is always advocating that farmer and labour should get together to solve their problems. I think that there's an awful lot of education to be done between the farmer and labour, or else they will make strange bed-fellows, and they'd better do their educating before they get together, so they'll know what they have to sleep with.

I've also sat here this afternoon and listened to the dreary, dismal dronings of the damned - the official Opposition. Damned? Why? Well, they can't make up their minds what they want to do in the field of education. I'm not sure they know what to do on any other major point, but they certainly don't know what to do with education. They'd like to take responsibility for this. They'd like to take responsibility for all the good things about it, but they don't want to take any responsibility for any of the less attractive aspects in the new program. I've sat in this session -- this is the third session that I have sat in this House. Ever since I came in here, I have -- this doesn't apply to the CCF Party; this doesn't apply to you honourable gentlemen in that section, but it most certainly does across there. I've been here - this is the third session and this is the third time I've had to listen to them try and justify the stand they took during the campaign to promote the secondary divisions in Manitoba. (Interjection)...they certainly haven't and they won't. They won't. And they're going to find themselves in a most embarrassing situation come the next election, because in community after community in Manitoba they're going to find themselves by force of circumstances standing on Duff Roblin's platform in the auditoriums of all these schools. In all the auditoriums of these schools you'll be holding meetings, in many, many cases, and you'll find yourselves on Duff Roblin's platform, and what an unconvincing talk you will give on education! What an unconvincing talk you will give on education. When the Progressive-Conservative Party ran in 1958, and when it ran again in 1959, we didn't use bribery; we didn't use bribery at all. We went to the people of Manitoba and we said (Interjection... Yes, the school division -- and you said we used it for political purpose. When we went to the people they had to vote for us on the basis of faith, and you know what faith is? Faith is the substance of things hoped for and the evidence of things not seen. And the next time we run in this province they don't need to have faith, because they can look around and see concrete evidence in every community of the policies of this government.

Taxes? You'd like to talk about taxes; you love to talk about taxes. Well let me talk about the Campbell taxes. There are two kinds of taxes, you know. I'm not denying that taxes have gone up. I don't like paying taxes on real property any more than anyone else, but I know that there is a penalty -- there's a penalty we have to pay when we don't face up to our responsibility, and the people of Manitoba realize that too. They don't like taxes. I'm not going to tell you that the farmers in my constituency enjoy paying the increased taxes. Sure their taxes are up my taxes are up, but they do, in spite of the grumbling I hear -- I'm not going to deny that there isn't grumbling -- in spite of the grumbling that I hear, there are not many of those people who underneath aren't proud and happy that the children in their district have an opportunity for an education in the future that was never there in the past. And the cost of not having taxes in the previous administration was lost opportunity and blighted hopes, not only in the field of education but in almost any field that you want to think of. Well -- and then it's most interesting. At the same time that the official Opposition chastises and castigates us for the increased costs, they promote ideas that are bound to increase local taxes even more. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain wants us to raise the grants for school construction from \$15,000 to \$20,000. Well even if we give the maximum grant of 75% - 25% of \$15,000 is a lot less than 25% of \$20,000. Quite a lot less. And when you multiply the difference times the number of schoolrooms, classrooms that are required, say, in Interlake Division -- I think it's 61 that they're going to build next year -- it runs into a pile of money, and I'm not in favour of it, and I know my people aren't in favour of it.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Will the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. HUTTON: Yes.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: You're using the figures 25% of \$15,000, 25% of \$18,000, or 75%. Doesn't the honourable minister know that the difference between 15 and 18 today is paid locally by the division?

MR. HUTTON: He advocates putting it up to \$20,000. This has got nothing to do with the difference between. In every division the.....

MR. HRYHORCZUK: That is not my question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HUTTON: In every division the cost of the classrooms are not \$18,000. They may be in some. But the basis of the grants today if \$15,000 and we'll pay 75% of it.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: And the difference is paid by the community.

MR. HUTTON: All right, if there is a difference.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Well, there is. (Interjections) You can't argue your way out of this one that easily.

MR. HUTTON: (Interjection) I can. 75% or 25% that the taxpayers have to pay.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: What's the difference?

MR. HUTTON: Just a minute; 25% that the local taxpayer has to raise of \$15,000 is a lot less than 25% of \$20,000.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Yes if you don't take in the difference that is paid today, you're right, but let's keep the facts straight.

MR. HUTTON: Well, we know what will happen. If you increase that grant to \$20,000 the basis of those grants of \$20,000, those classrooms will be costing \$20,000.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: They are now.

MR. HUTTON: Oh no they're not. Oh no they're not. They aren't costing \$20,000 in the Interlake Division. Well, there was another suggestion here that we should enforce standards in vans. Well it would be very nice if we could enforce standards in vans but I suspect here again if you laid down standards in vans that would make sure that the type of vehicle that your child rode to school in was up to snuff, if you try and keep up with the Joneses it would be very nice, but I'll bet you my hat against yours that it would cost money; and it would cost the local taxpayer money. (Interjection) Oh. It would cost money, and yet this same party in this House tells us that what we have done is costing the people of Manitoba money out of all reason. Well in the Interlake Division it's costing us money. I didn't look at my tax receipt but I think I'm fairly accurate when I say my taxes have gone up about \$50.00 a quarter. Yes it's a lot of money. \$50.00 a quarter. But, you know, you can't blame it on the division. A year and a half, a little over a year and a half ago, there were 434 high school students in the Interlake Division, and last fall, a year and a half later, there were 650, an increase of almost 50%, or an increase of 50%. In 1965 they expect there will be 900, or double the number, and it isn't a question -- we can and you can if you like, spend the next two sessions, the next three sessions, the next 10 years talking about the costs, but the burning question is: what would it have cost our people if it hadn't been for the division? What would it have cost the people of Manitoba if the government hadn't put \$10 million more into education? We wouldn't have any division; we would have two alternatives. Either these children wouldn't have the opportunity for a high school education, or the alternative to that would have been, that you could add another slug of money on top of what they are now paying if this government hadn't increased the grants across the province. You can't come to any other logical conclusion and the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains pointed this up himself, the fact that -- no, it was the Honourable Member for St. Boniface who said that this is essential because of the increased number of high school pupils due to the increased birth rate at the end of the war.

Well, these are points that I think we need to take a good honest look at. I don't mind these very fine men on the other side criticizing us for programs, but I'd like to know whether they really want to take credit for having a part in bringing this new educational opportunity to the children of Manitoba or whether they don't want to. They've got to be either for it or they've got to be "agin" it. Now they are getting closer and closer to an election. They've got to formulate some policy, Mr. Chairman. Now the indications are here this evening that they are against it; that they reserved their position; they reserved their position. They didn't go

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . whole-heartedly. While I'm inclined to agree with them -- and that's why they're sitting over there was because they reserved their position. They just sat on the fence until they fell off on the wrong side, and now they don't know what side they want to be on. They think it might look pretty good over here because the people are grumbling a little bit about the taxes. "We might be more popular if we went along with that. But then on the other side of the question, we've got all these beautiful new schools in the province and you know the people of Manitoba are builders. It's in their blood; they love to build, and that's what makes this province great, and we don't want to be against that instinct in them because maybe it's stronger than the one about the taxes," and they're right in the fire, and that's why I say, "They are among the damned." It is pretty hot where they are sitting.

MR. E. I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): To correct the Honourable Minister, if he is not conversant with this Interlake School District vote, that from the Gazette of September 30, 1960, they voted on a bylaw that gives them 61 rooms for \$1,132,000 and if my arithmetic is right, the cost per room in that district will be \$18,500, which, in effect, will charge directly to the taxpayers of the Interlake District \$210,000 over and above any grants.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman I would like to inform the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that I attended a lot of those meetings and I spoke in favour of it because along with the Honourable Member for Roblin I am ready to stake my political career on the educational program in Manitoba. I know which side of the fence I'm on. I know what the figures are. I know that they represent in the case of Interlake the maximum that they feel this is going to cost, and they are hoping that they get it for less, but -- I realize that too -- but this doesn't take away from the argument at all, that if you raise the grant to the \$20,000 level it's going to cost the people of Manitoba more money no matter how you slice it, and they're in favour of it. -- (Interjections) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, now that the farmers have got in the act, I think perhaps I would like to make a few references to the remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture. He and I are living proof that farmers do go to university and go back to the farm. The odd one does. We have had three very interesting revelations tonight from the Minister of Agriculture. They say while the cat's away the mice will play. The three most interesting observations made by the Minister of Agriculture were, No. 1, Taxes have gone up -- this is the first time I have heard it admitted from the so-called front benches; No. 2, that the extra pupils in the high schools are caused by the increase following the war which is an interesting observation once again from the front benches, the first time we have heard it; and No. 3, that we are getting close to an election. These are three very interesting observations in a quite interesting talk. (Interjection) From the philosopher of the government ministers I expected a philosophy of education. Instead, we got an oration on the cost of education and the buildings that are being constructed for education. This, too, was a little bit disappointing to me, for as I say, from the Minister of Agriculture we expect considerable philosophy, and I am sure he has a philosophy of education, a philosophy of what kind of students we are turning out, and why we are turning them out this way, not what kind of buildings we are teaching them in. I think I for one am quite enthusiastic about the number of schools that have been built throughout the province, and particularly in the constituency which I represent. I am very enthusiastic about the number of students that are going to school in the Seine River Division. I think this is a wonderful thing. I would be a great deal more enthusiastic if I felt that the students that were being taught in the high schools of the Seine River Division were coming out of it with a better education. The fact that they are being taught in new buildings is a wonderful thing but it is not making better students of them. The important thing is the curriculum; it is the teachers, and it is the methods of examiners. These very important basic factors in education have not been discussed tonight, and I think that we can talk about money, and about this wonderful government and the amount of money that they are investing in education, and we can say what for? For the students of the Seine River Division are being taught the same subject by the same teachers, examined in the same manner, as they were three years ago.

MR. HUTTON: I would like to ask the Honourable Member if Ste. Anne is in the Seine River Division.

MR. ROBERTS: It certainly is.

MR. HUTTON: Well I saw 25 typewriters in one room and when I asked about them they told me with a great deal of pride that this was only a drop in the bucket, they had 125 of them. Did they teach typing before in Seine River Division?

MR. ROBERTS: I expected, as I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, a philosophy of education from the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. If his philosophy of education and how to turn out better students is 125 typewriters, it is a very interesting observation. I think the turning out of students -- and I feel very seriously about this -- out of high school, is a very very serious undertaking, and one that should be accepted by the government of the province in a very very serious manner. And the providing of better schools is a wonderful step in this direction, and the providing of more salaries for teachers is a good step, and the providing of pensions to teachers is an interesting side light. But to think that this is the answer and now because we have done these things means that we have better turned-out students than we have previously, is highly debatable, and I think that we should take a great deal of time surveying a philosophy of education, and I think that we should study; we should know what our goal is; we should know if our goal is turning out thinking people with an abundance of information. Not the kind of information the state wants them to know, not the kind of information the state wants them to know, but the kind of information which is required for a thinking mind. The very survival of the democracy in which we live in my opinion, depends on the ability of the majority of the people to make fair and realistic decisions. They can only acquire this ability to make these fair and realistic decisions with adequate training and information in their schools.

I think it is pretty important as I said, for us to examine at this time, the curriculum of the province, to see if we are improving on it, because this is basic, whether we are improving our methods of examination, and the minister has spoken on this but really hasn't given any satisfactory answer, or hasn't attempted to, to indicate that our method of examining is improving. Are we studying methods of examination being used in other countries? The oral examination method that is being used in the Danish country, for example, in conjunction with the written examination? The Minister of Education spent some considerable time this afternoon telling us how he had gotten into trouble with the farmers' union ladies, and yet ended up still leaving me, at least, with the opinion that our students writing examinations are still having an arbitrary percentage figure put on them, of the number which can pass and the number which cannot. Surely if our education system is improving, surely if it is doing the job that we intend it to do, surely if our method of teaching, of imparting information is improving the way it should be improving, then our examination method will be in line with this and our examination method will not require this completely, in my opinion, unfair method of determining the percentage of people, of students, who can pass their curriculum examinations. Our Minister of Education made some references, of course, to the university students and where they come from. He said 12 1/2% of the students of Manitoba come from farm centres, from farming communities, and 12 1/2% come from rural towns. This is a total of 25%. If his figures are right, this just means that 50% of the population of Manitoba provides 25% of the students at the university. I wouldn't have been bragging about it, I don't think, if I was on the government benches. I think this is

MR. HUTTON:wasn't bragging about the fact, I was just pointing out that rural Manitoba, was proving the fact that rural Manitoba was subsidizing urban Manitoba in respect of trained young people.

MR. ROBERTS: I wish I could follow your logic.

MR. HUTTON: It doesn't surprise me at all that you can't.

MR. ROBERTS: If rural Manitoba is providing 25% of the students graduating from university, how the Minister of Agriculture can state that the rural Manitoba is subsidizing urban Manitoba by only providing one quarter of the university students, appears a little bit peculiar to me.

MR. HUTTON:of the university dropped into the lap of the urban community. Do I have to paint a picture?

MR. ROBERTS: You certainly would have to paint that picture because there is no logic attached to it, but the important thing is we have thousands upon thousands of boys and girls in rural Manitoba, who have the qualifications and the intelligence and the ability and the enthusiasm

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) to go to university, but who are not getting there, and surely if we were doing a job as a government we should be providing means for these people to get to university.

MR. HUTTON: May I point out that the more children that attend the university and find their way to urban centres with higher qualifications, the greater the subsidization is to urban areas by the rural community. That's all I'm pointing out, and I pointed out that it is not true that the urban people are suffering as a result of these grants.

MR. ROBERTS: If we had the number of university students coming out of rural Manitoba that we should have, then we could say that rural Manitoba was subsidizing urban Manitoba with trained people and actually we would be doing the country a great service, the province a great service, by providing trained personnel to come into the city, if necessary, to stay in the country if they so desired, and to do the things that make the province great and that is to bring new ideas, new industries, new industries, new management, new thinking into every part of the province. This is the sort of thing that makes a province great, that makes it stand out above the others. This is the training that is required; this is the opportunity that is required for these students.

MR. CHAIRMAN: passed.

MR. GEO. WM. JOHNSON (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, just to relieve the minds of those Doubting Thomases who feel that rural schoolrooms cannot be built for \$15,000 per room, I mentioned last night that the fast-growing area of Assiniboia, where they have completed two schools of 37 rooms at a cost per room of \$13,378 approximately. Now Mr. (interjection) Pardon? What happened to taxes? Pardon? (Interjection). Well what would you think would happen? Let me tell you one thing, that there has been a lot of talk tonight about increases. Well, Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that any area where there has been increases, there will be increases, let me tell you that those people in those areas will receive 100% value for them, and every one of them, with very few exceptions, would thoroughly approve today of the magnificence and the job that the present administration is doing on education. Let me just say this, and I can understand those in the Opposition of doing all they can to tear down and to criticize Mr. McLean, Honourable McLean in the present government on their Education Department, but that is rather human after all, because they do look with envious eyes upon a government who has lifted the shade and let some sunlight come into the educational system of the province which remained in darkness, or semi-darkness, for a number of years.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, we have spent, now, this evening, about an hour and three-quarters discussing the propaganda that was alleged to have been dished out two years ago at the school division campaign. Now earlier this afternoon I referred to propaganda that is presently being dished out, and if the Honourable Member for Swan River will bend an ear, he'll probably learn the difference between inference and matter of fact. Now I refer once again, Mr. Chairman, to this Information Service Bulletin of Sept. 30th, 1960, and there's a note on the top of it, and incidentally this goes to every weekly and every daily paper in the province, and the note says, and I quote: "This is the second of two articles assessing the school division plan following its first full year of operation," and it's headed as I stated before, "Province assumes 60% of the 1960 School Cost." Now I know, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank the minister for explaining the difference, because he did make a very comprehensive statement on the difference between "approved cost" and the "actual cost". Now Mr. Chairman, the inference from this report is that the province assumed 60% of the 1960 school cost. There is certainly that inference there; it's titled that. But the matter of fact is that they don't pay 60% of the cost as explained by the minister, so there is the difference between inference and matter of fact, and then again, Mr. Chairman, the Information Bulletin of February 24th, 1961, I didn't get an answer to that one. I will read the paragraph again, the first paragraph and I quote, "The comprehensive and careful program of Driver Education and Testing was launched Tuesday, February 21st for the province's 2,500 regular and spare bus drivers who transport 2,500 pupils back and forth to school". Now the inference there, Mr. Chairman, is that we have one bus driver for every pupil that is being transported. The matter of fact is that that isn't a fact.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on this matter. I listened for some days now to the very intelligent speeches on the

(Mr. McKellar, cont'd.) . . . other side of the room, and being interested in education, not from the standpoint that I have any children going to school, but I am inclined to think after listening to the number of speeches on the other side, that I would be a little afraid to even get married at this stage of the game, because if the taxes are going to increase at the rate that they say they are and the farmers are going to be pushed off their farms, as they say they are, it must be very disappointing to people who are thinking of going into farming. I for one, have no problems in our area, because we of the school district who operate a one-room elementary school and a one-room high school never were better off than we are today, tax-wise or otherwise. In fact if I told you the very truth of what happened in our local school district, you people wouldn't even get up and talk for the rest of this education. Well, I'll just tell you, and if I get kicked by my own ratepayers — We have accumulated so much money in our school district since this school plan came in that we gave back all school taxes this year to the taxpayers, and I want to tell you another thing, I'm the secretary of our school district. Now I'm not saying that I'm the best secretary in Manitoba, but I say the best secretary that can hand out cheques anyway. I'm greatly interested in education, but I want to tell you the difference between what we have had in the past and what we have now. In our school district we operate, we have eleven sections of land allowed us . . . our town. We have an assessment of \$230,000. We were providing high school education for all the surrounding school districts. Now what happened in grade nine? The grade nine pupils were not the responsibility of the school district in which they lived in the surrounding district. They were not the responsibility of the parents as most of them said they weren't. They were not our responsibility either. What happened was, the former government told the school districts that all they were responsible for was \$16, the price of a correspondence course. Well what happened to those children? They had two choices. They could stay in their own school and take the correspondence course with the teacher who wasn't supposed to even teach them, with the teacher who was supposed to teach elementary education, or they could come to us and beg us to take them in for nothing, or they could come to us and say we'll give you \$50.00 and they were supposed to pay us \$75.00. Some of them came to us, some of them didn't pay, and we took them in -- if we felt that they couldn't afford it we took them in. If we felt they could afford it we took as much as they could give. Well that was fine, but still nobody was responsible for grade nine students. Now what happened when they came to grade ten and grade 11 and grade 12. That was the responsibility of the taxpayer of the municipality. That's fine. They paid \$125 for each pupil. Well who paid that? We paid a share of it. We were keeping the high school and also had to pay a share for those outside school districts. Well up to there, that's fine. But that didn't solve the problem, because those people were eight or nine miles from school, had to get there themselves, and who paid for that? It was up to the parents to see that they got to school, and if they couldn't get to school they had to find a boarding place in our town, and who paid for that? The parents, at the rate of \$50.00 a month. Well that's all right, but you add that up, and what does that cost in dollars and cents? That costs the very sum of \$50.00 a month, for ten months is \$500.00, and it cost a lot more than that too, because they have to come in for them on the weekend and take them back on Monday morning. Well figure that up. If you can tell me on a half section of land where it costs \$50.00 more a quarter, as the Minister of Agriculture was telling us tonight, which is \$100.00 on a half section, if you can tell me where that's dearer than \$500.00 for board in the town, I'd like to know why you're telling us that the people are paying more taxes today. That's one good argument.

Now what's happened today in our part of the country -- is not in the member for Rhineland -- no, because they didn't want this, and now he's telling us that we were depriving him of something. We're not depriving his people of anything any more than what our people had the opportunity. The only difference was that those people didn't want to change. They were happy to stay \$2,500 grant to elementary schools and \$3,750 to high schools. Well if they want the same old thing, that's fine -- let them have it. We're not asking them to take it. But what have we got now? The difference between your setup and ours is we got a high school in Wawanesa -- next year -- we still have our own high school yet, a one-room high school -- but next year we get a brand new high school in Wawanesa where our children are going. They get up in the morning, they get in the van, they go down to Wawanesa and they have their schooling and they come back at night. What does that cost the taxpayer? It costs them not a dollar

(Mr. McKellar, cont'd.) . . . more than it was costing them before, but they're getting a good education. And why are they getting a good education? Because this plan is providing it for them. Now that's the difference in the plan, and nobody can tell me that this plan is not a thousand times better than the other plan. Now when anybody tells me, as you told us tonight, that we're depriving you and making second class citizens out of your citizens -- that's entirely wrong. That's not so. Everybody when they cast a ballot to elect us, and the defeated man just because he's defeated it's not saying that he's a second class citizen -- you're telling us that we're just knocking the skids out from under your people. If you had the leadership in your community and if more of them had the leadership down in the other southeast as we gave our people, you'd have the very same thing, and you wouldn't be us today.

Now I might sound a little rough but I'm speaking as a bachelor's point of view. I'm interested in everybody's education, and I'm paying \$191.00 a year on education costs. That's what our school taxes were this year. (Interjection). That's the one I got back. Now I'm interested in everybody's education. My grandfather came into this country -- they didn't ask for handouts. My father and other citizens of our district had the initiative to build a high school in 1930 to educate myself and all the rest of my family, and I give him courage for doing so, and I give the people a lot of credit for doing the same thing as they did two years ago when they brought in this school plan, because they had a forward look. Let's go forward, not backward! People, I think, prove here as the Minister of Agriculture mentioned -- the former government three years ago had exactly the same number of seats that we've got here now. Now where are they after two elections? Right down to the same number that the Conservatives had three years ago, and that's the reason why we, here, are proud of this plan. And I don't think the plan is perfect for one minute, but I do think its got something that we citizens of this province are going to be proud of in the years to come.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable the member who just spoke made a good point there that they are proud of this program because of the fact that they are now sitting over on that side, and I would admit that I think the way they presented it to the people that it had something to do with their election. That's one of the points that we have been debating here, and that's where the argument started this afternoon with my honourable friend the member for St. John's, and I've been waiting all this time to get back to the point that he raised, there have been a lot of other points raised in the interval but I wanted to get back to the one that he raised, because with all due respect to my honourable friends who have spoken from that side, I do respect their opinions; they have claimed that the great issue here is whether we are or are not for this type of education. Do we admit that it's an improvement? Do we think that it should have been put in? Did some of us oppose it and some of us support it, and all this sort of thing. My honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation is sure that some of us sat on the fence on this and he thinks we're still trying to do so. There may be differences of opinion on this matter but the question that has been raised by the Honourable Member for St. John, the one that I wanted to speak on for a moment, is the question -- what was promised to the people of Manitoba? What was promised to them, and has it worked out? Now we'll talk about the educational part later on -- I'll be willing to, and I'm quite prepared -- if this is a general confessional that's going to be taken here, then I'm quite willing to state where I stood in this matter. I attended several meetings, not all of them in my constituency, because in a couple of cases they came on the same day and I wasn't able to attend both, but I attended one where the Honourable the Minister of Education spoke. I attended one where the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce spoke. And I think that -- I'm afraid that they might apply to me the same terms that they did to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, because I'm afraid that they would say that I didn't contribute a great deal to the discussion. I'm afraid that the Minister of Industry and Commerce might say that my contribution was almost negative, because I think the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce will do me this justice to say that I told the people this plan would cost more money. The Honourable Minister neither shakes nor nods his head, so I can't get either confirmation or denial from him. It seems to be an occupational hazard of sitting on the front bench here these times to not be very good at answering questions. I'd ask the Honourable Minister of Education if that isn't the correct statement of the position that I took. I said, and I say to this House now, that of course we favor the two main principles of this program; the two main

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)...principles as we saw them was that every boy and girl in Manitoba as they came to the age and to the standing of being prepared for high school should have a high school that they could go to as a matter of right (interjection).. I stated it in front of your two colleagues.

MR. ALEXANDER: When did you start favoring it?

MR. CAMPBELL: I beg your pardon?

MR. ALEXANDER: I'd like to ask the honourable member when he started favoring that principle.

MR. CAMPBELL: We put the legislation in. We put the legislation in when we were here. (Interjection).. Well it wasn't very effective because up to that time the people hadn't voted for it, but we didn't go out with the kind of a campaign that my honourable friends did, that's true, but we had the kind of a program that would meet exactly the conditions that the honourable member who just spoke related to us. That was what our program was designed for; No. (1), to have a program that would provide high schools in the logical location; (2) in an area of a logical size to which, as taxpayers, every boy and girl could go when they had arrived at that age and standing in school. And we had that kind of a program, and there were four divisions operate under it. It's nonsense to say that this is something new that's been put in. It's different, of course, but it's not new, and we had the other main principle, too, of equalization, and I said at every meeting that I attended, I said that we were in favor of those two things and they were the main principles, but I thought the divisions as laid out were too large; I thought that they would lead to difficulty because of the fact that there would be conflict of opinion between the different centres as to who would get the areas. I always admitted that I did not agree with the amount of centralization that was proposed in the Royal Commission report. I make no apologies for that. My honourable friend who just spoke mentioned that they have a one-roomed high. The Royal Commission wouldn't approve of that; your experts in education don't approve of that. I do not object to it. I've made that plain all the time. I think there's been too much emphasis laid upon the question of centralization, and Mr. Chairman, let me say this in the presence of the two Ministers that I heard speaking on this subject, that both of them when they were asked by the local people, both of them back-pedalled very very quickly on the question of centralization, because where I happened to hear them was in both cases -- the Honourable Minister of Education, the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce -- in both cases it was in a small town, just a village, and both cases the question of whether their high school would be maintained or not maintained, was of very vital interest, and both of them said, and correctly -- I don't blame them for this -- but both of them said that would be left to the Board of Division Trustees. So it is, under the Act, but the idea of the experts in education is centralization and a lot more centralization. We had provision to meet exactly the case -- what's the constituency of my honourable friend, I have forgotten -- we had the legislation to exactly meet the case of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne that he mentioned. These were the two main principles of this legislation. We are not arguing. There are some points of difference, of course I admit I'm not in favour of centralization. There are other things in the Education Department, but it's not education that we are arguing. My honourable friend from St. John's and I would not agree on the question of centralization, but we do agree on the question of what was told to the people of Manitoba. That's what we are talking about, and we agree because we can both read. We went to school enough to be able to read and we can read what the Minister of Education said. It's been read into the record more times than is necessary, and I won't go through it all, but once again -- this is not taking it out of context -- "this plan will provide equal educational opportunities for children throughout the Province of Manitoba, particularly with respect to high school education. It will relieve, in large measure, the real property from the burden of school finance, transferring a larger share to the taxpayer which we have in the Province of Manitoba." What could be plainer in the English language than that? My honourable friend from St. John's emphasized the word "share" -- transferring a larger share to the taxpayer which you have in the Province of Manitoba; and it hasn't done that. But I emphasize, as well, the word "relieve" -- it will relieve in a large measure the real property from the burden of school finance; and it hasn't relieved it. That's where the argument started this afternoon. We can debate the question of the merits of education, of the different system. We can debate all the rest of it. What we started to talk about

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)... was whether or not they had implemented the promise that was made. That's the simple fact. I don't expect the honourable the Minister to get up and apologize for what was said at that time. I don't expect him to try to recall the campaign that they put on. I'm not knocking the system of education that they have, but I am pointing out that this has cost more money. I am admitting that the province is paying more more money, much more money, but I also say that it has not relieved the local municipality. In general, it has increased their taxes and it has not given a larger share than it was doing before.

Now, the Honourable the Minister of Education when he spoke in this house, and though he is a very articulate man and a very capable one, he was speaking on the occasion that he made that pronouncement from very carefully prepared notes. He will remember that. He doesn't have to read his speech. My honourable friend is very capable of delivering his speech. He doesn't have to read one, but he recognized the importance of this announcement that he was making then. He was putting it on the record purposely, and he had very carefully prepared notes. He had a script before him which he was following closely. This wasn't a slip, but if it had been a slip it was repeated, as someone else has pointed out here, when the literature came out for the '59 campaign. I have one of these documents, too, and this one happens to be the constituency in which I live. I like to give my member a boost once in awhile. "Re-elect Sterling Lyon". This came to me. One of my honourable friend's constituents, and what did he tell me? He sent me a nice picture of the Premier of this province, smiling, looking happy. He had reason to -- big smile -- and he says, "Given a majority, you have our pledge that these further measures shall be put into effect. We stand ready and willing to get on with the business of Manitoba". And here are some of the pledges, and as has already been mentioned this afternoon, "this progressive program" -- and by the way there is a picture of my member on here too -- "re-elect the Roblin Government in Fort Garry. Vote Sterling Lyon -- Thursday, May 14th -- Progressive Conservative. Let us get on with the business of Manitoba". A serious looking young man. I was delighted to have this literature come to my house. I have preserved it most carefully and I say, to show how much I think of my member, and you can depend upon it, that I wouldn't take quite a bit of money for this document. Why?

A MEMBER: Did you vote for him?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well you know, the ballot is supposed to be secret, but you have heard that I have said some very nice things about him and I want to read what he told me when he sent me this document. He said, "this progressive program is endorsed by every Conservative candidate" -- no exception -- "it will be enacted into law as soon as the Roblin Government is given a working majority in the Manitoba Legislature". And there are a lot of good ones here. It will do, it'll do for some other departments as well. But this one is education: "A new program to provide equal educational opportunities for every child in Manitoba, free textbooks for every school child to Grade XII, \$6 million more appropriated by the new Roblin Government for education, an effort to equalize education costs in the province, to lighten the load of the municipal taxpayer". And my honourable friend, addressing one of these poor farmers living in Tuxedo, thought that that would make an appeal to their hearts -- to lighten the municipal load -- and, consequently, he got great support in that area. And my charge now is that my member has not done what he promised me he would do. He has not lightened my taxes. If I told you the harrowing details of the position of we poor taxpayers in Tuxedo, I know that your hearts would be softened much worse than hearing about the ladies who write about margarine. It's an even more sad tale, but the thing that hurts me is that my member let me down. This is the point that I'm making here today, my member, the Minister, this government, the Premier, did not do what they said they were going to do. Now that's the point.

A MEMBER: Don't vote for him next time.

MR. CAMPBELL: I shall give the matter very careful consideration. Now that's the question that was raised by the Honourable the Member for St. John's, and until that one is decided here, Mr. Chairman, until that one is decided -- I should put it the other way -- when that one is decided, we can carry on with the other business, and I have some remarks to make on the general question of these grants. Now I don't intend to make them at the moment in case anybody else wants to deal with this particular subject, and no doubt the minister wishes to reply. But I do want to say something on this question of 2(a) and, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that you don't expect this to be passed for a little while yet, because 2 (a) is an item, if you will notice, of \$24,725,000; and I think when we are discussing an item of that size, we have a

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)... right, and even a duty, to examine very very carefully what the situation is. Up to date we have been dealing with one point, mainly, the one brought up by the Honourable Member for St. John's; but I would like to ask the minister, when this other matter has been decided, to give us a breakdown of the \$24,725,000. I protest that it is wrong for this government to put into the estimates items of that size, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that even though you are a very excellent chairman and try to get the business done, that here is one place where you should not try to hurry it, because here we need all the time that we need to ask all the questions and get information. It would be ridiculous if we tried to pass an item of \$24,725,000 in block. I would like to know from the Minister, what is the breakdown? This should be broken down, in my opinion, into elementary, high schools and transportation and the items that used to show in the old days. I think it is a mistake to consolidate the estimates to this extent. However, we can have more to say about that later on.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I have kept out of this "donnybrook" so far, but in view of the fact that certain statements have been made from the other side of the House, making a political issue out of the larger school division, I would like to keep the records straight. Long before the Royal Commission presented its report to this House, I was an advocate of larger school divisions. I am not like my honourable leader. I have no fear of centralization. I would even go further than has been gone by the Royal Commission, and I would even include elementary schools in the larger division, because I think that it is an economic waste to have these different bodies of school trustees operating in a larger secondary division. Now when the Royal Commission did submit its report to this government, you were a minority government at that time. The first meeting that the Honourable Minister of Education held, was held in my constituency. It was held in the town of Selkirk. I was present at that meeting. I was invited there by the Minister and I told my people that they might think it was strange for me, a member of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, to be appearing on the same platform as the Honourable Minister of Education, but the reason why I was doing that was because, in my opinion, education was too important a matter to become embroiled in politics. It transcended politics. I also told my people that night that the recommendations of the Royal Commission regarding the larger school division were unanimously adopted by this House.

Now up until that time, Mr. Chairman, the question of the recommendations of the Royal Commission regarding larger divisions was not a political issue in this province, but this government did, in the election of May 14th, 1959, make it a political issue and try to make as many kudos out of it as they possibly could; but the members of the opposition at that time, with one or two exceptions, supported the recommendations of the Royal Commission and did their utmost to see that these recommendations were accepted by the people and voted on by the people. I know I myself attended almost every meeting that was held in my constituency. I even attended a meeting at which the Honourable Minister of Health was supposed to speak but, unfortunately, could not attend, and I took his place. Now that shows you how non-political my activities were with respect to the larger school division, and it is a matter of regret to me that it should now be dragged into this House as a political issue, because it is not a political issue. It was adopted and accepted by the people of Manitoba on the recommendation of almost every member who was in the House in April of 1959.

Now I regret that this debate has taken the course that it has taken. I regret very much that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture should drag into this issue, an issue which has been foreign to politics in Manitoba for many years, and an issue which my Leader was responsible for abrogating to the dust heap many years ago, and that is the issue of city versus country. I also regret, too, that there have been so many recriminations during the course of this debate regarding who killed cock robin. Who is responsible for the higher costs, the trustees or the Province of Manitoba or the Department of Education? Now to me, representing a rural constituency, it is not important who is responsible for the cost. The important thing is that the costs are going up, and representing a rural constituency, I want to tell every member of this committee that my taxpayers feel it a burden, a burden which they are unable to carry much longer; and what they are interested in hearing from this Government is, what are you going to do about these rising costs? That is the question that we are discussing here tonight, not the question as to who supported the larger divisions or who opposed them, but

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.)...what is the Government going to do about the rising cost of education? Are they going to do anything to relieve the financial burden which is becoming too burdensome altogether for the average municipality. I have farmers in my constituency whose taxes per acre are in the neighborhood of \$3.60 an acre. Now when a man's farming some 200 acres of land, you have some idea as to what his tax load is; and that man is not interested in whether the trustees are responsible for his higher taxes or whether the Government of Manitoba is responsible. All he is interested in is getting these taxes reduced to an amount that he can take care of, and I think that that's what our energies should be directed towards tonight, to see what we can do to relieve the burden from the municipal taxpayer of the cost of education. Let's forget all about the recriminations; let's forget what you promised in the last election or what you didn't promise; but let's try to work together in the interest of education so that the taxpayers of Manitoba will get the best system of education in the world at the least possible cost.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I feel that I must speak again. I have the highest regard for the Honourable Member of Selkirk. There isn't a member in the House that I have any greater respect for, regardless of party. I am disappointed that he attributed to me, because I spoke on this question of the rural contribution to education in this Province, that he attributed to me the low -- and I don't know what the word is -- unworthy reasons for bringing it up. I never would have spoken at all in this debate had it not been for the remarks of the Honourable Member for St. John's, and I think I made that clear when I got to my feet. It is a fact, Mr. Chairman, and a fact that the people of Manitoba should be aware of, a very important fact, that the rural people of this province do make a real contribution to the urban areas in respect of the finished products that they make available, to take their place in urban society. And that was the point that I was trying to get across in respect of rural-urban relationships. I was not endeavouring to open up any wounds. The Honourable Member for Selkirk attributes to the fact that this issue was relegated to the ash heap by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and I won't argue that point. But certainly, Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the Honourable for Selkirk associating the statements I made on this subject with the mean objective that he attributed to me in doing so.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, that was the only logical inference that I could draw from the Honourable Minister's remarks and I am sorry if it is the wrong interpretation.

MR. ORLIKOW:reject any suggestion or inference which seems to have been made that anything I said this afternoon, or any other time in this House or anywhere else, could be taken as suggesting that I feel that the people in the City of Winnipeg are paying too much so that the people in rural Manitoba should pay less. I never suggested that, I never even thought of it. We in this group, long before I was in this House, Mr. Chairman, long before the Honourable Minister was in this House, were suggesting, were urging the former government to increase the assistance to education in rural areas to bring up the standard of education in rural areas to somewhere near the point which education had achieved in the cities and towns of Manitoba. We are happy that we helped to lay the groundwork for this. I am not sorry for it. I'm not saying that the people of the rural parts of Manitoba are paying too little. All I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the people in the cities are paying too much and they are paying much more than they were promised by the Minister and by the First Minister. I said no more than that, no less than that. And while I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear that, as far as we in this group are concerned, we have no reservations with regard to the general purpose which the plan has accomplished -- the purpose of raising the standard of education. We have always been for that. We always said it was required and we always said it would cost money. We have no objections about that. We think it will cost more money and we will support that. The only objections which we have made, or will continue to make, are that the promises that were made, with regard to the way in which the cost would be borne, has not been kept.

MR. JOHN A. CHRISTIANSON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, a fellow with my limited experience should perhaps know better than to get into a debate of this kind, but there are some things I think should be brought to the attention of the members of the committee. The Minister has been quoted as saying, "it will relieve in large part the real property from the burden of school finance, transferring a larger share to the taxpayer which we have in the

(Mr. Christianson, cont'd.)... Province of Manitoba." Well the other day we got the book from the Department of Education, and looking on page 173 I find that in the year 1957 Provincial Government grants totalled \$10 million-odd. Total operating receipts in that year were \$37,484 million. That's roughly a 28% increase. In 1958, Provincial Government grants 13,189, total operating receipts 41,336. Slightly more than 25% again. In 1959, combined grants, capital grants and other grants totalled \$30,553 million. Total revenue for the year, \$48,477 million, or 63% in Provincial Government grants. Well my arithmetic isn't very good, but municipal taxes in 1958 yielded 24.4; special taxes, which I can only presume to be the same thing -- I must confess I am not an expert, were 17-odd; so even if there is a considerable amount of money coming from other municipal taxes which are not included in this figure, but I submit, Sir, it probably is, the amount of money being paid by real property would appear to be less. In any event, out of the total revenues of 48,477%, 30,553 coming from grants is 62%. Now I ask you, Sir, is that in any violation of what the Minister said, that a larger share would be transferred to the Province of Manitoba? It is quite true that the costs of education have gone up. Why have they gone up? We got more kids. All you have to do is look at the enrollment figures to figure that one out. And not only that, a larger percentage of the kids of school age are going to school. The sudden increases in school enrollment in the rural areas didn't happen because all of a sudden a bunch of kids became of age. It happened because there were kids who were not going to school who are now going to school. In any school division, or any larger school area that had a good system of education setup prior to the introduction of the division plan, the cost of education has not gone up substantially at all. In fact, the cost per student is practically the same. In areas where they were not getting secondary education the costs have gone up, but I think the Member from Souris-Lansdowne pointed out very graphically where those costs are going, and I think that the taxpayer is getting good value for his tax dollar.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Chairman, I was almost going to say to begin with that I was surprised at a statement that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition made, and on second thought, possibly I should say and do think that I am not surprised at all, because the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said that he was still in favour of the one-room high school -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think the record will show that I did not make that statement.

MR. ALEXANDER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would still like to say that I was one of those that took all of my high school education in a one-room high school. -- (Interjection) -- It shows a lot better than those who went to a ten room high school and didn't learn anything. As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, I know what it is like to go to a one-room high school -- the Honourable Member from St. George is distracting me -- and to see students for three grades, IX, X and XI sitting in one room with one teacher; getting one-third of the time of that teacher; getting the distraction of hearing the other two grades getting their instruction at the same time as you are trying to get yours. It isn't conducive to good education. Also I would like to point out the fact that we had 7 1/2 miles to go to school, in a horse van, which meant a lot of time away from home; a lot of time that we might have been better employed in school. And to compare those facilities which lasted in that district, which lasted in that area up until the Conservative Government took power -- they were still there when the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, who now states that when he was in power he believed in an equal opportunity for all children to go to high school. He didn't do very much about his beliefs. He didn't work very hard at them, because he sure didn't make much progress.

Costs have been mentioned. I am very fortunate I don't live in the Rosser Municipality because I am very pleased to say that, prior to 1959, although there had been a steady raise in municipal taxation under the regime of my honourable friend, that my taxes today for 1961 are lower than they were two years ago. The tax load has been mentioned -- the burden on municipalities. Mr. Chairman, now that we have a completely new system where every child is guaranteed a high school education, guaranteed a grade XII education, which I wish I had been able to receive; I wonder, I wonder how much it would have cost the municipalities to have their children entitled to that type of education if my honourable friend had stayed sitting on this side of the House.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I was sorry that I could not carry on after the

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.)....Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie had spoken. My remarks were intended to correct what I believe was a wrong impression that he conveyed to the House. He was comparing the government contributions to education under the old system with government contributions under the new system, and I might stand to be corrected, but I believe that under the old system the general municipal levy went straight from the municipalities to the school districts and was not considered at all as part of the provincial grants; but under the new system, I believe that the general municipal levy goes to the government and from the government direct to the school districts and becomes, in a sense, a government contribution. Now, am I not right on this assumption?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I've stayed out of this hassle today deliberately, with the exception of one or two interjections. I do want, however, to substantiate and support the remarks of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that I think that we should get back on an even keel in respect of this debate on the very important subject of education. In saying that, I realize that many of the members in the House have made a very valuable contribution to the cause of education in Manitoba. I'm sure that the Honourable Minister did not mean what he said this afternoon. I'm sure it was only in jest when he suggested that he may not be there this time next year. It might be that he has in mind a transfer to some other department. I'm sure that he wasn't serious insofar as we being in the position of not having available to us his expertness in this House.

We've heard a lot of talk this afternoon and this evening, Mr. Chairman, in respect of the larger school areas and the school divisions. I think that it's only proper for me, as leader of my group, to bring into proper perspective criticisms on both Conservatives and Liberals in education in Manitoba. I recall, Mr. Chairman, that for many years we of the CCF party advocated in this House the larger school areas of administration in Manitoba, and I might say, Sir, that the records, I think, will reveal that both Conservative and Liberal alike, with possibly some minor exceptions, rejected our contention of the larger areas of school administration here in the Province of Manitoba. Oh, I know my honourable friends to my right did, after years of prodding, bring in a suggestion of a secondary unit of administration; but it wasn't until the Royal Commission on Education had made their report, and incidentally I think that I'm correct in stating that it wasn't until after years and years of prodding on behalf of our group here in the Legislature, that the Royal Commission was set up in the first place. I recall, and I can picture him now -- and I believe he sat in the same seat as the Honourable Minister of Education does tonight, the late and former Minister of Education, Mr. Miller -- I can picture him as I'm saying this here tonight, standing up and berating we of the CCF because we suggested that there should be a Royal Commission into education. I can see him standing up there with lots of letters to prove that we were wrong, saying, what is wrong with education in the Province of Manitoba? However, after years of prodding there was a Royal Commission set up. Now then, my friends opposite tonight are demonstrating, or trying to establish the fact, to a large degree that the school division plan was there. I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, that in my humble opinion, the Conservative Party of Manitoba had absolutely no plans for education other than a greater contribution financially into the general pot, until such time as the Royal Commission interim report was received.

I think the member for Selkirk hit the nail right on the head when he said it doesn't matter who didn't do it when or who is doing it now, the ratepayer and the resident of Manitoba is only interested in one thing -- or rather two things. I think first and foremost is the fact of a good and as complete an education as possible for his children; and secondly, as the Honourable Member for Selkirk did say, that the costs of education are becoming overbearing and too burdensome on the land taxpayer in the Province of Manitoba. I think what the Government of Manitoba have to face up to is, despite the fact that they can show increased percentages each year to education, I think they have to face up to the fact that it is still not enough. I agree with them, to some degree, that under the former administration not nearly sufficient was done. I agree that they had a problem to overcome; but I say, Mr. Chairman, that that is not sufficient, still more has to be done in the field of finances to education.

During the minority government, the question arose as to the question of going too fast, particularly from my friends to my right. The Liberal administration says "we will do the job." I suggest to them that they are not doing what they set out to do, and I suggest that they

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) should take under consideration the criticisms have come from our side of the House and indeed, Mr. Chairman, some criticisms have come from their own side of the House. Our job is to get ahead, to make provisions fully for the full education -- and my own suggestion would be that while we are talking here this evening and this afternoon on the question of elementary and high school education, there's still another vast vast field yet untouched in the Province of Manitoba in respect of education, and that is to ensure to every child, who has the ability to absorb knowledge, full and free facilities to the university and the higher echelons of education here in the Province of Manitoba. I know that statement, Mr. Chairman, may sound radical. I don't think really though it is. I think that is what we've got to do; I think that is what we in Manitoba, if we are going to do a real job for the children and the future experts in the province, that is the goal that we've got to set our eyesights on today.

Now a minute ago the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie was telling us about the increase in enrollment and the increased costs which accompany that. He didn't tell us anything, Mr. Chairman. Any government should surely have realized that, that after hostilities had ceased and we had on our hands, and we're all glad of the fact, a birth of a figuratively speaking new Manitoba; that at about this stage in the game, insofar as years are concerned, that we were going to have this problem. And I suggest, too, Mr. Chairman, that one of the problems that we're facing today, one of the reasons why we're having a more constant number of high school students, is due to the economic recession that we're under at the present time, because we have not jobs at the present time for many students who are still in school that, under times of relative prosperity, may be leaving to go into other spheres. So I say, Mr. Chairman, let's get back to the basic fact that we're facing.

I join with Honourable Member for Selkirk, the fact still is that despite some advances that have been made in the Province of Manitoba, and I give a considerable amount of credit to the Conservative Party because they did adopt the recommendations of the interim report of the Royal Commission on Education, but let them not forget, Sir, that they did not do that alone, there wasn't one member who sat in this House who voted against that. We joined in unitedly at that time, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that despite some of the criticisms that may have been offered today, it is our united job as members of this Legislature to forward the cause of education and go on to a new dawn here in the Province of Manitoba. And I say, to use one of the favorite phrases of my friends opposite, "let's get on with the job of Manitoba."

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I think by now I'm about the only one on this side who hasn't spoken in this particular aspect of the debate, so I would like to take about two or three minutes to make comments which I feel are pertinent at this time. I think, Mr. Chairman, it would suffice to say that the government deserves commendation for taking positive leadership in bringing about the establishment of division areas in this province. On that score they deserve commendation. It's also true that they deserve criticism for the fact that they did not live up to one of their statements which they used so often in the campaign to sell the plan to the public of this province, and when you counterbalance the two, I think that after that is done we should leave the matter.

I do think, Mr. Chairman, that this government could have escaped a good deal of the criticism which we've taken three hours now -- practically three hours to throw at them -- they could have escaped all this by doing one of two things. First of all, they could have escaped it if they would not have tried to open the question once again by gloating over what has happened education-wise in this province in the last year or so. I can't help but feel that the Minister was speaking to us, when he made his general statement, as though a general election were in the wind, I feel that he was trying to create the impression that the government and strictly the government was to be given all the credit for all that's transpired in the last 12, 18, 24 months. So, because of the fact that he gloated, he has now had to sit there for 2 1/2 hours and take this criticism, and rightly so. The other way in which they could have avoided these 2 1/2 hours of criticism is if they would have lived up to their promise to relieve the real property tax burden on the people of this province. Now how could they have done that? They could have done that by appropriating an additional \$8 million, approximately \$8 million, to their departmental appropriation of \$33 million. Now I know that the money has to come from somewhere, and where can it come? Well it could have come from a sales tax. Now, having made the promise to relieve the burden of real property tax, it seemed logical to assume that they

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) should live up to it by implementing a scheme or a system of a sales tax. They couldn't very well do that, Mr. Chairman, they were caught in their own web, because the First Minister promised some time ago that the sales tax was as dead as the dodo. By making two promises, which almost go to work at cross purposes to each other, they are caught in their own spider's web; and I don't feel one bit sorry for the Minister and his colleagues for having to sit there for 2 1/2 hours and take this criticism. If it had not been for that I think I would have felt sorry for them because, as I said at the very beginning, the fact that they did give positive leadership in getting the divisional plan off the ground certainly merits some commendation from us on this side.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party has re-entered the Chamber, because I wanted to say something regarding his contribution of a few minutes ago. The Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party premised these remarks by saying that he agreed with what the Honourable Member for Selkirk had said, and the two points that he had made. As I understood those two points, and they were somewhat repeated by the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party; first, the best possible education for our children, and certainly that is what the Honourable member for Selkirk said; then the second one, as I had understood the Honourable Member for Selkirk, was that this government should be giving attention to the ways of keeping down the cost of education because real property had got to practically all the taxes it could stand and they needed to be guarded against any increase. Now the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party, I understood, to say that he agreed with those two points. What I would like to ask him, Mr. Chairman, and I don't need to defend the present government or what they are doing, and it is not my intention of trying to do so, but what I would like to ask the Honourable the Leader of the CCF is, how are they going to keep down the cost of education if they accept the recommendations that come from his group all the time? My Honourable friends, there hasn't been one point come up in this discussion that I know of but where they have advocated more expenditures. Right? They admit it. Yet my honourable friend the Leader, with that wonderful display of consistency, stands up and says let's keep the cost of education down. Quite frankly, I don't see the logic in that. Maybe he does. If he does, I would like to hear it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy, but once again apparently my honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal Party must have been having a little snooze during the time that I was speaking, or he didn't get the significance of what I was talking about. Of course we of the CCF are advocating greater expenditures in the field of education, as we do in other fields. I think we are quite justified in doing that, Mr. Chairman. Lord love a duck, after years of an administration like the Province of Manitoba had to put up with, which was led by my honourable friend, such a reactionary, penny-pinching, tight-fisted administration, we must advance. We can't help but advance. But if my honourable friend had been listening to me very closely, I agreed with the Honourable Member for Selkirk that in respect of the tax on the land taxpayer, that it should be reduced. And then after having said that, I suggested that there should be a greater contribution from the Provincial Treasury. Surely my honourable friend, who sits so sedately in this House, could not have misinterpreted what I said. But he asked me for my answer, and I've given it to him, I think. And I might warn him, and warn my friends opposite, that as far as we of the CCF are concerned, we are going to continue advocating greater expenditures of the Province of Manitoba on behalf of the people of Manitoba, and I realize that these are going to cost money. I realize, too, something that my honourable friend may not agree with or did not realize, that we have within the resources of the Province of Manitoba the ability to increase expenditures. But I suggest that there can be a realignment of the source of that revenue, which apparently escapes my honourable friend.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, will my honourable friend tell me how that keeps the cost of education down?

MR. PAULLEY: Again, Mr. Chairman, I did not suggest that the cost of education should be kept down. I said that the cost of education to the land owner and at the municipal level should be kept down. And if I am not mistaken, that is what the Honourable Member for Selkirk said too.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well maybe we had better let the Honourable Member for Selkirk tell us what he said. The Honourable Member for Selkirk was saying that the costs of education

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....were getting so high.

MR. PAULLEY: At the municipal level.

MR. CAMPBELL: It wasn't only at the municipal level. Then is my Honourable Friend the Leader of the CCF Party, and his colleague the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, are they advocating a sales tax?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I was very brief, and perhaps in being brief I did not explain myself too clearly, so sometimes I suppose it doesn't pay to be too brief. The gist of what I said is simply this, the government promised, made these statements through the Minister, that the burden tax-wise on real property would be relieved. Now they failed to live up to that, and we level criticism at them for that. It was, we suggest, irresponsible of them to say that the tax burden on real property would be relieved, while at the same time the First Minister was saying that the sales tax was as dead as a dodo. Obviously this could not be the case. It simply couldn't come about. And so what I said was, Mr. Chairman, and I hope the Leader of the Opposition gets me correctly this time, we admit and agree with any statement to the effect that the tax burden at the local level is too harsh and should be relieved. We would attempt to relieve it by appropriating additional funds from the Provincial Treasury -- just to give a rough, and a very rough approximation at this time, somewhere between five and ten million dollars more, and to do this would necessitate a sales tax. This is our stand and I fail to see what is so difficult to comprehend about it.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think it is quite clear, Mr. Chairman, that my honourable friends are advocating still higher expenditures in education, and because they say that real property is bearing all the taxes that it can afford to carry, then there should be a sales tax.

MR. McLEAN: Just before we conclude, and having been admonished not to lose my temper and not to be political, I think though that I would like to have one point on the record on today's proceedings, because there has been just a slight transposition in some of the debate that has been taking place. The reference has been made to my famous speech on the 18th day of March, 1959, in which I made certain statements; and without commenting upon the interpretation to be placed on that, I would like to point out that that statement was made after the campaign for the institution of school divisions. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it would be helpful to the committee in considering Item No. 2 (a) tomorrow, if we reach it, if I were to have available as many copies as possible of the breakdown in the grants, the \$24,725,000, as between the various categories, making only this comment as I have done previously, that under the present grant system we cannot give any breakdown as between elementary and secondary schools costs. We have all of the various types -- salaries, maintenance, administration, supply, transportation and the various capital accounts, and I can have that available for members of the committee, I hope, tomorrow for their consideration.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I remember the Honourable the Minister making approximately the same statement a year ago, and perhaps the year before that, but surely in the department there could be an approximation of the breakdown between elementary and high school, could there not? I can realize that perhaps the first year of a new program of this kind that it would be difficult, but surely after the second year, that some close approximation of the breakdown would be possible.

MR. McLEAN: I am afraid not, Mr. Chairman. I have learned a pretty good lesson about making approximations.

MR. CAMPBELL: Would the honourable member undertake to check again and see what can be done in that regard, and to also put on the record one closing word for the evening. While I accept my honourable friend's statement about the time that his statement was made in the House, I think he could not make the same regard with the one that I read from the election material of my member in the House.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same, and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Friday afternoon.