



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 47 8:00 p.m. Thursday, March 29, 1962.

5th Session, 26th Legislature



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, March 29th, 1962.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department V, Resolution 22.

MR. DOW: Mr. Chairman, when you called it 5:30, I was developing the tax angle in regards to the percentage of taxes required for education within the province. I would now like to put some figures on record in regards to the percentage of tax that was imposed for education in the various groups within the province and I brought it out to the even percentage point. In 1958, the rural municipalities of Manitoba contributed 40% of their taxes towards education, and I would like to point out, Sir, that this percentage in the rural municipalities doesn't include any cost-sharing basis towards the roads that were required for school purposes. In 1959, their contributing cost was 43% and in 1960 was 44%. The villages of Manitoba in 1958 contributed 36% of their tax imposition for education; in 1959 it was 41%; and in 1960, 36%. In the towns of Manitoba, it was 36% in '58; 38% in '59; and 40% in 1960. The cities of Manitoba contributed 40% of their realty property tax towards education. In 1959, it was 44% and in 1960 it was 47%.

Now, Sir, if you wish to take it the other way, that in relation to the total figures, the total tax figures and the total monies received for educational purposes within the province, in 1958 the general and special tax produced \$23 million from real property. The total tax imposition in 1958 was \$56 million and the school tax was approximately -- works out in percentage approximately 40%. In 1959, \$26 million was produced from real property tax as against \$60 million of total imposition, which was 43.5%; and in 1960, the total monies received for schools was \$30,202,000 as against \$66 million total imposed, which was 45% for schools. So you can see from those figures that the pattern is now showing that the increase on real property is gradually increasing percentage-wise.

I believe, Sir, that the sooner the enquiry on the Committee of Municipal Investigation comes in with a direct recommendation charging the responsibilities of the municipalities and the provincial government in regards to taxation, the better it's going to be, because very definitely we are now minimizing the monies that can be used for general real property use in favour of education. As I said this afternoon, with the implication of the debenture tax and the other taxes going on, our increase -- I know in some municipalities it's rising as high as 50% -- but the general over-all province was 45% in 1960.

One other feature that I would like to produce, Mr. Chairman -- as you know in other sessions I have produced a resolution in regards to 75% construction costs over \$15,000 per room. This year I did not bring it in, but I still believe that the divisions that are building schools costing more than \$15,000 per room, as authorized by the department, they're being penalized. In my particular constituency we have three new schools, and the percentage of grants that is being received by the school division from the province is approximately 60 to 62%, setting up a penalty in that particular area from 13% above what they pay in direct tax. I think, Sir, that consideration of this government would go a long way to assisting and bringing the tax into a true perspective in regards to the general over-all picture in regards to the spending and collecting of taxes.

There's one other feature, Sir, that I would like you to take into consideration -- and I bring this out not as an alarm -- but the arrears in taxes have increased over \$2 million in '58, '59 and '60 on real property in Manitoba. When you consider that 45% of this money is due to the schools, we're getting to a point that, as you all know, the municipalities must pay when the levy is assessed and it puts them in a borrowing position.

Of interest to the committee, and possibly some of you read it and some of you didn't, but in tonight's Tribune, an article given to the reporter by Mr. Mooney, the Executive Director of Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities in Winnipeg, and he points this out: "that municipal governments have been borrowing at the rate of \$250 million a year in Canada and they have only scratched the surface in the needs of civic improvements." Now, Sir, if this is true, these civic improvements are going to be lessened by the demand on education and real property. He goes on to say in his clipping that: "the heart of the municipal finance problem in Canada is the improvements that can be given to property, and unless a solution is

(Mr. Dow, cont'd.) . . . . found, future urban growth and development will be jeopardized in Manitoba."

Sir, I wish to close with that thought in mind, that if we, as a provincial government who are the fathers of imposition of the educational tax within the Province of Manitoba, it's their duty to find a solution to lessen the burden on real property tax with the idea that they can develop in urban growth in a natural state of affairs.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to inform the Minister that after having had dinner with four of his curling colleagues, I find much of the edge taken off what I was going to have to say to him tonight. But I would like at the very outset to commend the Minister for the rather comprehensive report which he gave to us late this afternoon and, at the same time, to offer the same sort of feeling toward the members, the staff of his department. After having had the pleasure of touring the facilities that we have here in this province respecting technical and vocational education, I've had an opportunity to get to know some of his senior staff assistants, and I cannot help but feel that Manitoba is fortunate in having people who take such a personal -- as it were -- a personal interest in what is being done education-wise in this province.

Everyone, Mr. Chairman, expresses concern about education at some time or other and I don't think it can be disputed that this concern seems to be growing in the minds of most people in Canada and in most countries in the world today; and after hearing the Minister's report, I think we would have to conclude that we have gone a considerable way toward making progress in education in this province. We have gone a long way, but I don't think that even the Minister would want to say that more enlightened, more progressive policies can be followed, because we must always strive to meet the challenge of our times and we must always strive to innovate and get maximum value for our education dollar.

It is unfortunate that education is very often a subject of platitudes, a matter of platitudinous talk, and after the platitudes have been spoken we all too often fail to get down to the very concrete and specific matters that might be ailing in a given system of education. Of course, perhaps the Minister has one crowning achievement which he can boast about, if he cares to boast from time to time, and that has to do with the implementation in this province of our secondary school division system. It is one major achievement, but if it is not followed up with other achievements just as important and just as clearly thought out, then this crowning achievement will be forgotten, and justly so, because the spending of money -- and Lord knows we are spending a lot of money these days -- the spending of money alone is not going to ensure success and no one will dispute that.

In the 1930's, Canadians spent about 4% of the GNP in education. In the early 50's, instead of spending more to meet the growing demand we were spending less, and only in the last four years has there been any pronounced trend in this country toward bringing the level of spending as proportion of GNP back to where it was in the thirties. Of course this doesn't tell the whole story because our GNP was that much lower in the thirties. The point I'm trying to make is that if it seems that we are spending so much, it's only because we weren't spending enough a few years ago -- not just in Manitoba but in most provinces. I think the important thing is to try and determine, not whether we are spending enough but whether the money we are spending is being spread equitably on the three levels of government; and, also, whether this money is being used to maximum effect.

Now I'll try to avoid being nebulous any further, Mr. Speaker, because I do have some rather specific remarks to make. The Minister quoted at length, in ringside voice this afternoon, statistics outlining the increase in enrollment in our schools in Manitoba, and he laid special emphasis on increase in enrollment at the secondary level. He went on by clever anticipation to admit that there was a tremendous increase -- he didn't use the word "tremendous", but he admitted there was a substantial increase in the burden on real property as a result of rising educational costs.

I would like to show to the Minister just how it has affected the area that I represent and the area just surrounding that. In Brokenhead in 1958, \$66,000 on education; in 1961, \$94,000, for an increase of 40%. In St. Clements in 1958, school costs, \$100,000; in 1961, \$154,000 -- there again an increase of about close to 50%. Selkirk -- this isn't in my riding but nearby -- in 1958, \$155,000 on education costs at the municipal level; in 1961, \$237,000 -- an increase

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) . . . . . of about 50%. In Springfield in 1958 --'57, \$120,000; in 1961, \$160,000 -- increase of about 35%. In Beausejour in 1957, \$34,000; in 1961, \$61,000 -- an increase of about 80%. In North Kildonan in 1957, \$113,000 for schools; in 1961, \$246,000 -- an increase of 110%. In East St. Paul in 1957, \$58,000; in 1961, \$135,000 -- an increase of about 125%. That is in my area and vicinity. It could well be, and I have no reasons for doubting the Minister's figure which he used, that the increase on the average to municipalities across Manitoba was approximately 33 or 34%.

The point I want to make is much along the line that was made by the previous speaker. It is true, and no one can really argue with the Minister that the Province of Manitoba is assuming a much more fair share cost of education than was the case several years ago, but lest this bit of knowledge should lull the Minister, should lull him I say, I want to point out to him that we still have room for assuming a somewhat larger share at the provincial level. According to the Order for Return which I received from him a couple of weeks ago, it shows that of the total expenditures in the province for education, the provincial government, when everything was lumped in together and proportioned out, the province was assuming 51.7% of the total education cost which includes higher education -- that is the university.

It might interest the Minister to know that we should think in terms of moving at least another 10 percentage point towards easing the burden on real property at the municipal level. I want to tell him that in Britain it has been for several years now a cost-split of 60% and 40% to the local education authorities. In British Columbia, according to the Tribune of March 27th, that province is assuming approximately 60%. I didn't have time to check the ratios for the other provinces, but on the basis of that, I would suggest that even if we are in the vanguard, let us attempt to completely ease the burden on real property as far as education costs are concerned and move another 10 percentage points -- at least let us plan in that direction.

It could be, and I don't know whether the member for Turtle Mountain mentioned this specifically, but even if the province were to assume 60% of total education costs there could be other ways in which some savings could be affected as far as the local units were concerned. I don't know how far-fetched or improbable or impossible this might be, but it seems conceivable that school districts in municipalities could make significant enough savings if we did have in this province, or in this country, a municipal bank as was recommended or suggested by The Canadian Federation of Mayors and Reeves of Municipalities. Because as I look in the Education Report I find that of all debentures that were issued, I believe it's on Page 19 and 20, we find that the school divisions and districts are paying between 5 1/2 and 7% interest on debentures, and it seems possible that from 1 1/2 to 2% interest rate reduction and savings could be affected by having social capital available through a municipal fund or bank. As I say, I don't know how possible or how conceivable this is, but it seems like a worthwhile idea to investigate further. It does seem a pity that if this could be brought about that it wasn't brought about two or three years ago, because we have had tremendous expenditures in school construction -- \$29,000,000, Secondary; \$17,000,000, Elementary. The Minister was telling us this afternoon -- \$46,000,000 for school construction. How much could have been saved if debentures could have been at a slightly lower rate of interest? I suggest to you it could mean as much as three or four hundred thousand dollars a year to the municipalities -- to all of them that is.

I would also suggest to the Minister that inasmuch as education costs are assuming a greater and greater share in the municipal budget and inasmuch as these costs are considered to be uncontrollable by the municipal councils, some merit there might be in trying to bring about -- I know there is a limit to how far you can try to use your influence in that regard -- to try to bring about a greater degree of liaison between school district boards, division boards and municipal councils. I wouldn't go so far as to suggest that we think about making school boards a Committee of Council, but I would suggest that it might be a good idea to make statutory provision for the meeting of at least twice a year of school boards and councils so that progress reports -- so that school boards can inform council of future needs, because I'm given to understand that very often municipal councils are completely in the dark as to what school budgetary requirements might be until it's sprung on them all of a sudden, and there isn't even a thought given by school boards toward letting council know what might be the requirements 3, 4 or 5 years hence, if they know themselves.

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd)

So I suggest that perhaps it would be in the public interest for us to make some statutory provision for such liaison meetings. And this can be done Mr. Chairman, without detracting from local authority, without detracting from it to any substantial degree. What is needed here is guidance perhaps; perhaps persuasion; I think it can rest there. And without being too unkind to the Minister I would suggest to him that sometimes local authorities do need guidance and council, and he is not above giving it to them because this summer I know that he took a personal interest in some of the difficulties that were going on in the local school boards in the Beausejour area -- he came out there and tried to get the opposing parties to reach some agreement -- and while there is a case now before the Courts which prevents me from trying to deal with the merits of the case, Gunson - vs - Agassiz, I would like to ask him only one question -- why did he not allow that particular case to go to arbitration? Why did he not allow it to go to arbitration? He refused, and no one yet knows why he chose to make this sort of decision. It was rather amusing Mr. Chairman to see the way the Minister took a personal interest in that particular affair. I don't know if honourable members remember the story of the Ancient Roman Cincinnatus who left his horse and plow in the field -- he was a farmer by vocation -- and hurried to the defence of Rome which was being attacked; and just like Cincinnatus, the Minister of Education left his offices in Winnipeg and went tearing out to Beausejour on two or three occasions showing up at the most unexpected of time, trying to save the day -- but with less success than Cincinnatus. --(Interjection)-- I really didn't offer this in a spirit of criticism because these things can get pretty involved. But I say again I would like to know why he prevented that case from going to arbitration.. This is the way you settle disputes in a democracy it would seem, and I really want an answer.

Now reverting back to the main problem or question which I propose to deal with. Are we getting maximum value from our expenditures here in this province both provincial and local? One of the, and I'm not suggesting that we have to spend more, this isn't the problem today, the main problem is value for money. Now one of the greatest sources of frustration -- and I know a lot of people are dissatisfied with our school system because of small incidents that may take place, failure rates--and one of the greatest sources of frustration in our present educational system has to do with the fact that we have a single ladder as it's called, a single ladder or a unilateral system of education, and because of that fact teachers in the classroom teach to the slower ones, and that's why we're not getting and we're not providing the best we could for the faster learners, and this is I feel the main source of criticism and frustration. Because of this fact, teachers are not giving enrichment to the faster learners. This is why teachers often, instead of dealing with education in its broadest sense teach very narrowly for exams, all because of the single ladder system.

Now we're getting away from it -- the general course, the general course. It has tremendous possibilities. On the other hand it's fraught with danger and what could very easily happen in Manitoba is just exactly what happened in Great Britain. In the late 1920's they brought in their secondary modern schools -- the counterpart of our general course -- and I want to tell the Minister, and I don't know how much information he has on the British experience with the secondary modern, but it has never yet achieved parity of esteem. Parents still have not accepted it, and its results are many and varied--one of which is that children at the age of 10 and 11, that's when the channelling exams takes place, whether they go on to academic or channelled off into the general course. Parents push their children and strain them to the limit. Why? Because the general course or secondary modern school has never, never been accepted. And one of the reasons has been that it has been treated as a terminal course and I'm afraid that's the way we're headed here in Manitoba--a terminal course. I'm surprised to find that there is no clear thinking in the department as to whether this general course shall serve as a prerequisite or a feeder for technical education--post-secondary--there's no clear thinking on that point. And if we are going to go in the direction of Britain, we shall live to regret it. It would be unfortunate.

I agree with the Minister that the general course will be a means of providing for differences of aptitudes as between individual students. If we don't provide for this difference of aptitude we shall go along as we have up to now with a single track academic system of education -- and what's the result? The result is not very gratifying because we have, out of 15,000 students -- and I just took these on the basis of one class going up all the way -- 15,000 starting grade 2

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) ... in 1950, 4,900 in grade 12 in 1960 -- a drop-out of about 10,000 because we have made no provision, adequate provision for difference of aptitude. The general course will provide such an alternative, but it will only be accepted if it is not treated as strictly a terminal course. It will be accepted if it is accepted as a feeder or prerequisite course for post-secondary technical or business vocational training and education. I would be very disturbed if rumours which I have been hearing -- namely that the general course graduates will be accepted into Teachers' College. If this is going to apply carte blanche I'll be very disappointed, and I wish the Minister would deal with that particular point. And despite the wholehearted co-operation of these part-time teachers, part-time research assistants in the general course who have been formulating the general course, despite their best efforts, I'm wondering just how successful the setup of the curriculum will be. I have heard on substantial authority that some phases of the general course, particularly mathematics, are returning out to be more theoretically based or set than the academic course mathematics and I don't think that this is what we're aiming at.

I feel that we will be making a mistake -- not only in the general course but we will also be making a mistake as regards technical education, if we are going to set up at Brooklands the new Institute of Technology on a mixed basis such as it is. Partly it's a trade school. Fine. It will in that way replace MTI. It's party supposed to be an Institute of Technology, but let's clear it up now and once and for all. Will it be a true Institute of Technology? Since when is a two year post-secondary technical course at the Institute of Technology level? Ryerson Institute in Toronto, Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the US are based on three and four year courses. The old MTI was a misnomer -- it's not a technical institute, it's a trade school. The Institute of Technology we are now building will not be an Institute of Technology, it will be a technical institute, and let's not confuse the picture more than it is. Because it is a confused situation, Mr. Chairman, and we have so far to go. Not just in providing the facilities but enrolment-wise. We have now approximately 40,000 students enrolled in our high schools and everybody agrees all these 40,000 are not inclined or interested nor able to do well in an academic course of education. What have we done -- up to now at least? Out of these 40,000 we have provided for 1,200 taking 50-50. That's the 50% academic, 50% industrial-vocational -- 1,200 out of 40,000. We have provided for 2,100 at the technical institute, but some of these are part-time, so we can't really count them as part of our high school enrollment. We have, it is true, 12,000 taking industrial arts, approximately -- but industrial arts are not really helpful so far as preparing young people for technical and highly skilled work when they leave -- so for all practical purposes, out of 40,000 students in our high schools, we are preparing 1,200 with technical skills. And don't let anybody say that we are really overstating the case or the need for technically skilled people, because I want to read to you what was said by one of the directors of Canada's National Employment Service, and he said this, having to do with unemployment and education. Mr. Thompson pointed out that 30% of the labour force is unskilled or semi-skilled, and yet only 12% of jobs fall into this category. On the other hand, 12% of vacancies require highly skilled personnel while only 2% of our applicants meet these standards of technical skills, thus we have the paradox of a shortage and a surplus at the same time. As jobs become more complex the situation will worsen and so we have the paradox of unemployment and jobs going begging for lack of properly skilled and competent workmen. Not a very pleasant situation, and it would be, of course, the height of folly to suggest that we aren't making some effort in that direction. Obviously the Institute of Technology -- if we can be excused for calling it that -- will fill this gap somewhat; but unless we get down to serious business with the 50-50's in the senior part of our high schools, I'm afraid this gap is not going to close very quickly. And it's not going to be such an expensive proposition for Manitoba cost benefit-wise, if I could use that expression, because the federal government has an agreement to pay 75% of the over-all cost, and I realize it terminates in 1963 but I don't think that it will not be renegotiated at that time.

And I want to tell the Minister that he has been losing out a little compared with the Province of Ontario. What have they done in Ontario? As a matter of fact, you have the situation -- queer situation, where Members of Parliament are complaining that their home province is getting too much from the federal government. You wouldn't think that ever happens but we have some Ontario MP's who are saying that Ontario is getting more than its fair share from the

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) . . . . federal government so far as the building of technical institutes and institutes of technology are concerned -- and this is what they have done. They have built one new institute of technology, 18 new trade schools, 5 new combined trade schools and institutes of technology and 114 vocational high schools. They have received from the federal government the sum of \$190 million, while we have received about -- what -- \$2.7 million for this Institute of Technology. On a population ratio basis, they should have received -- Ontario should have received about six times that of Manitoba, but in effect they've received 40 times as much in the way of grants for technical education in the past 12 month period as the Province of Manitoba -- and I could be a little out, but not enough to erase the complete disparity of the situation. Now just why? Why has this developed? Do we think that one institute, that a central location with an enrolment capacity of about 3,000 is going to suffice? I don't think we should feel that way. We're really falling behind, Mr. Chairman, despite these glowing figures and statistics which the Minister has given us this afternoon. Relative to western European countries we're not really setting the world on fire. For the sake of brevity I'll simply state the ratio, but it might interest the Minister to know that the Province of Norway with a population about three and a half times that of Manitoba, has a technical school enrolment of about eight per thousand while we have about two -- four times as much effort into technical vocational education as Manitoba, and it's not as wealthy an area I don't think. Britain is doing more. I realize that once you get into industrial vocational education you're getting into a pretty relatively costly phase, aspect of education, but I think that in view of our mounting unemployment problem, in view of increasing complexity in industry, in view of increased competition which we might have to reckon with in the Common Market, plus a host of other reasons, we must move more quickly still -- more quickly still, in providing more and better industrial vocational education opportunities.

Some of the arguments could be that it has a narrowing effect, it's better to give a child a broad education as a base, and one can't argue with that too much, but from about the Grade X level, the practice of other countries would indicate about the Grade X level, it would seem that here is the time to branch out to deal and to provide adequately for differences of aptitude. And I would go so far as to say that even if it is as narrowing as all that, technical education is still better than having them drop out and receive no training or education at all, and one cannot dispute the fact that our drop-out rate is still uncomfortably high. Thanks to the initiative of the Minister, we now have secondary schools in Manitoba that are larger and more equipped and adapted to the providing of more varied courses of learning. It doesn't seem inconceivable that even in rural areas we can at least begin to think about bringing in more of the 50-50's into the larger schools in the province, and each division I would hope has at least one school that can be considered as a central school. Mind you, one can't go too far in voicing that hope because I'm afraid that our Minister, despite his initiative and success in certain things he has undertaken, has not shouldered sufficient responsibility with regard to -- how shall I say -- seeing to it that schools were built, or using his influence to see that schools were built to a more optimum size. In the Order for Return of March 6th we have here a list showing all those schools that were constructed last year and the size, number of classrooms and equivalents, and we find -- I don't know what the reason is -- but I daresay it isn't geography or population sparsity so much -- we find still all too many schools being built with five, six, seven and eight classrooms. When you consider that equivalents are included which means auditorium and library, I would assume that some of these schools have no more than three or four classrooms. If they're there well we can't do much about it, but it was not very prudent nor wise of the Minister to allow this sort of thing. I realize that his area of discretion here was limited but I wonder how much he bothers himself with this. Did he really plead that this sort of thing not be done? It's disturbing. And when you have a six and seven room high school, two of which can be knocked off as auditorium or furnace room, you can't provide very much in the way of vocational education in those places and you are spending money and you wonder whether you are getting optimum -- the best value for it.

I hope the Minister doesn't suggest that this amendment which case I pleaded so much two or three years ago is responsible for this, because at that time I made it very clear that maximum grants should be provided for less than 12 room high schools only in those cases where population pattern warranted, and it had to be justified first. I don't know how many members

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) . . . . have this Order for Return but they should avail themselves of the chance to look at it. Let's just take one School Division as an example -- Turtle River school at Alonsa, 7 classrooms and equivalents; Amaranth, 7; Glenella, 6; Kelwood, 7; Laurier -- Not very encouraging. So with all that Mr. Chairman, I think that despite the enthusiasm with which the Minister gave his annual opening statement on education today, there is still quite a bit which he must attempt to explain and justify. I don't think that we can be satisfied with our program regarding technical and vocational education until many of these things which I have outlined have been met and dealt with.

Now I would like to spend just a few minutes on academic education proper because after all this is the area of education which still commands our greatest attention and our greatest expenditure of money. This is still the area of education where most people would like their children to enter into. I'm quite satisfied that in this area things are much, much better -- much, much more settled. We know where we're going to a greater extent than in the field of vocational education; but even here I have a few comments and criticisms pertaining to the classroom itself. I don't know just what the Minister can do about it but I think he would be interested in my observation that I feel many of our high schools, even with the new secondary division system, we really don't have adequate library facilities. Now I don't have anything grand and magnificent in mind. All I'm suggesting is that we have sufficient reference books so that when a teacher gives students an assignment to do they will have reference books in which to look up information. I've found that all too often the only place they can get information to answer an assigned question is by reverting to the text itself and you don't really broaden their outlook that way; you don't really give them enough sources of information; they don't have anything to base, from which to draw additional information about the particular subject matter being studied. I know that might be a little bit too cursory an explanation but I do feel rather strongly about this. After all, how many subjects do we have on the curriculum -- academic? -- six or seven subjects -- and if in each subject field we had no more than nine or ten reference books which students could use it would really serve a useful purpose. But it seems that -- at least the schools I've been in -- library facilities are not planned to cover that sort of need -- fiction, etcetera yes, but not that. Another thing, I feel that if we want to get more out of a classroom we must -- and I'm no expert in this certainly and so many other things tonight -- but visual aid, especially in the slower -- not slower learning -- but with average students, visual aids are of immense help to a teacher and I -- to be quite honest and frank -- I just don't think they're being used to the extent which they should be. And there again what can be done I don't know, but certainly the Minister with his staff, with his research facilities -- I don't know how good his research facilities are -- but assuming the department did have adequate research staff and facilities, this question should be looked into.

Teaching of French -- teaching of foreign languages in our high schools, starting from Grade IV up, as far as French is concerned -- one can only welcome this. It's a pity that up to now we haven't moved this way -- we haven't moved this way previously, because starting a foreign language at the high school level should be avoided if at all possible. I realize we can't start teaching German and Ukrainian at Grade IV, but let us just hope that before too long -- before three or four years have passed, the teaching of French will be taken up from Grade IV on and not just in a few places.

I notice that again we have increased the amount for loans and bursaries. According to my calculations, last year we offered \$189,000 in bursaries to various students and \$10,000 in scholarships. I don't know how much we loaned out -- I couldn't seem to get that information -- but I would like to point out to the Minister that in the Province of Saskatchewan they have now increased the revolving loan fund from one million to three million dollars. Now it's revolving, understand and that doesn't mean that that much goes out -- that is the fund itself -- out of which \$200,000 a year are loaned -- at least the provision is there -- it might not be loaned out or borrowed but it's there. Are we doing as much in that particular regard?

I do not want to deal with teacher pensions because it might be thought that I have a sort of a vested interest in it -- which I don't really because I'm not teaching. I would like to ask the Minister only one question. He might not like it, and if he doesn't it's up to him to deny it if it's not true. But I have been given to understand that he has purposely moved slowly on teachers' pensions, the question of the whole problem, in the hope that a sort of a

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) . . . . . rapprochement and understanding could be made with some of the teachers that they would hold back in negotiating for salaries. Now this is a sort of sub rosa approach. I hardly think the Minister would indulge in, and he'll have an opportunity to dispute it and refute it no doubt if it's not true. In other words, what I'm trying to say is that teachers' pensions, fine -- we'll do something about it if you'll give us an understanding that you shan't negotiate too strenuously salary-wise in the next year or two. I'm not making it as a charge. I am suggesting that if this is so it should be cleared up.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that I have dealt with most of the points which I wish to deal with at this stage. I feel in concluding that talk as we will, procrastinate if we will, we cannot avoid the harsh -- to some people, harsh choice. We must make a decision if we want to get the most for our education dollar. We have to make the decision whether we are going to provide alternative courses, put some substance into them; live up to them; try and inject into them something which will give them parity of esteem or whether we're going to continue along a single track system in the hope that everyone will have the chance to go to university and end up with having a large percent of our young people drop out. This is our choice.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be confined to about four points which I'm vitally interested in -- two more or less of a general nature and two more specific. I may go a little further, something that may be discussed tomorrow, but if the weater permits I do not think I'll be present tomorrow at the session because I'm invited out, so I may go a little further to some items which could be discussed later so I hope I'm excused on that part.

I wish to congratulate the Minister on some of his achievements because I do know that there was some good progress made in this department although I'd have been happier if greater progress could have been claimed. I also wish to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleague in regards to the staff of the Department of Education, inspectors and so on. I really and truly believe that they're doing a very good job. But, as I said before, I wish to congratulate the Minister but I do not think that this is the time for us now to feel that we are in the position where we could claim complacency. I think we're far far from that. I think that the Minister was very lucky to take office at a time when he did. We all know that he took office at a time when the Royal Commission on Education presented a report. And I truly believe that the Minister if he would have really taken more heed of this report and followed the report more carefully, took more time to study it that he would have gone down in history as the greatest Minister of Education ever. But I'm sorry to say that I think that the Minister missed the boat. As I said before, he was presented with this wonderful report -- I thought it was good, I agreed with it and I believed in the principle of it -- but again I say, he missed the boat. This report was made by the Royal Commission on Education and the Commission was appointed by the former government. Why did they do it? Because in their wisdom they knew that not all was right with education and they wished to seek some improvement in this field. I'm sorry to say that the government after receiving or taking this report, in its haste, as I mentioned before, between two elections, proceeded to make great changes in education, but in some cases a very slight reference to the report. And I'm only going to dwell on one. I did mention it before in one of my speeches and the Honourable Member from Brokenhead did mention it too. And that is the basic principle, as I consider it, of this report. And to me it seems that the basic principle in order to improve our education the principle was a great amount of centralization. And if you take the report, it definitely states in here that the divisions should so be formed that so far as possible be in each division but one high school unless there be in a division a sufficient number of high school pupils to warrant two or more high schools with each of not less than 12 classrooms. I would ask the Minister -- of course, he can say he's not responsible for the formation of the divisions -- but I think that the Minister is responsible for everything that goes on in his department. The commission was formed to form these divisions, these boundaries and I say that some of them were formed very unrealistically. I don't know -- I wasn't in the department then and I'm not in now -- whether the Minister -- and I don't think he did, probably he shouldn't if he did -- gave them instructions as what actually should be done. But the report recommends 50 to 60 divisions. He did not adhere to that. The Commission recommended less. It seems to me that if the Boundary Commission would have had more time to study Manitoba more carefully; if there wasn't a

(Mr. Tanchak (cont'd) . . . . . date set for the Commission to have Manitoba divided into boundaries that they would have done a better job than what they did now. But they had a deadline to meet I imagine so those divisions were formed and I say that the principle of this report was scuttled.

We have a further report here. In this report I didn't mark the page but it mentions that there should be so many teachers to a division. In many cases that was not adhered to. Now what do we have, as mentioned by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead -- he read a few divisions with so many classrooms and so many schools built. We've had schools spring up like elevators, as mentioned by the First Minister, almost in every town -- some towns only six, seven miles apart and I do not think that was right. I don't think that was in the interests of better education. True, there might have been pressure put by the local residents, but once they had accepted the division plan I think that the Minister could have stood his ground. And since this is the report of the Royal Commission and I expect you to adhere to this report, I'm not asking him or telling him that he should have been a dictator, no, but he had this report to base his decision on. But once the Minister gave in on one division and set a precedent, I think that that took hold and in many divisions, many divisions, there are more schools now than there should have been and he scuttled the basic principle of centralization. Now what happens in most of -- well I shouldn't say most, but in many of these divisions there are almost as many schools as there are towns. We know these towns are jealous of one another, they want their schools there; but it wasn't the right thing to do. And I would hazard to say that in a number of years, some of these schools have debentures for the next 30 years, that in a number of divisions some of these schools will be abandoned before they're actually paid for. Sure, the Minister or the First Minister or any of the government officials may say: "Well the government is paying a greater share of it."

I've heard in one instance when one of the Ministers of the Crown spoke to the people at the opening of a brand new school. Now I'll just use, I forget the exact ratio but we'll use this for example because it was better than this, he said: "You've got a school that cost 'x' number of dollars, and just think of it, you yourselves are only paying 40% of the total cost of construction; and you're fellow citizens are paying 70% of the cost of construction, that's 30 to 70 or 40 to 60 whatever it was. And I don't think that statement is right. It may be true that the fellow citizens are paying the other 60% which the government claims the government contributes towards the construction. But at the same time, it's these same citizens who live in that particular district that contribute towards that other 60%. It isn't simply, you're fellow citizens excluding ourselves. We're also included in it. And I say that the number of schools, high schools we have is not according to the basic principle of this report and I feel that a lot of money is thus being wasted in this manner.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister in his remarks just before the dinner hour made a statement that he knows now that the real tax is up. In fact, I think if I caught it right that the real tax has increased by something in the neighbourhood of 37% or 39 or something since the school divisions were introduced. I think I'm right in that. So now, at least, the Minister, and I give him credit for that as being honest with the people and himself, telling the people of the Province of Manitoba that the tax has gone up. But it's quite a different story to what we heard and what the people of Manitoba heard when the government officials were out in the country trying to get the people interested in the school divisions. At that time they didn't say that, and I know that -- I mentioned it previously, some others mentioned it in this House -- that the government promised the people of Manitoba that the real tax will not rise. And I heard it. The Minister is shaking his head. I'm not going to accuse the Minister because I think I had the privilege of being with him at two meetings -- at one I spoke and another I didn't -- and I didn't hear him say that himself. But there are other government -- (interjection) -- yes, he said it here and I think in the House, that it will lessen the burden -- you could interpret that in many ways -- but I definitely heard at other places where such statements were made as these, in answer to questions asked by the taxpayers. What about our taxes? Can you promise us that the taxes will not go up? The answers were such similar to these: "If any change in your tax, it will be down." Another quotation: "This system will relieve your tax burden, not increase it." So how are the people to understand it -- that the tax will be less? And in one, when I just previously mentioned that don't you believe when anybody tells you that your tax

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd).... will not go up, don't you believe them. Your tax is bound to go up because you're going to have better services, more costly services -- it will be an improvement, and who do you expect will pay for those better services? I said: "You'll pay, and your tax will be up but I still consider it worthwhile." And I think the Minister heard me make this statement, when I said it -- he acknowledges I did say that. I said I still think it's worthwhile, but don't listen to anybody telling you that your taxes won't be up. I said that at another place, and here's what one of the government officials did answer, and it wasn't the Minister -- another one: "It is hard to believe that anyone would be so naive as to even suggest that the tax would rise." -- "To be so naive as to even suggest." -- one of the officials that was sent out on those tours of speeches -- (interjection) -- no, I won't say a civil servant, I said one of the officials. The people of Manitoba were promised something; that they believed him; and I say that the government has broken its promise. Now the Minister comes up and tries to justify this increase in taxation by the fact that our education is improved -- and I agree with him. It has been improved to a certain extent. It could have been improved much better than that, but the fact is that the promise was there and that promise was not kept.

Now, I'm going to come -- oh there's something that really bothers me. In the Dominion Bureau of Statistics -- and I have a notation here which I was going to use later, and I don't know if I'll have a chance -- the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for 1961, and in there it states that in that period nearly 1,000 Manitoba teachers left the Province of Manitoba. I didn't make this up -- this is in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. To be exact, it quotes the figure of 963 of our teachers trained in Manitoba are now teaching elsewhere. And it goes further -- breaking it down -- gives an example; our loss to Ontario, for example, is 314; and our loss to Alberta is 204; to Saskatchewan 135; British Columbia 296. Now I said I'm worried about it and I hope it isn't true. Perhaps the Minister will give me an answer to this because what worries me is this -- why are these teachers leaving? Is it because of insufficient salary? I can give the Minister credit for this, and the government, that the teachers' salaries -- at least one thing that they succeeded in doing is increasing the teachers' salaries -- this increase was long overdue and the teachers really merit that. I'm happy about that. So could it be the salaries; could it be the pension scheme that we have; or could it be both? I do not know. But they're satisfied with something. Now further on it goes ahead and says that we did recuperate or we did get some teachers from other provinces, but the difference still was 70 more than our total enrolment in that particular year. I would like the Minister to give me an answer to this.

Now there is one other specific one that I'd like to refer to, and that is the one that we have already discussed in this House, and that's the matter of curriculum. I know it was discussed but I think that I can say a few words about it here. I think that in the curriculum -- I would like to know, and I think I'm right -- that in our Department of Education, we haven't got a standing committee on curriculum -- a standing committee on curriculum. I think that it's composed of part-time workers, teachers, probably working, to my understanding, working on Saturdays, weekends, Saturdays, after school hours. I think if we had a standing committee on curriculum, maybe the Minister -- I see him smiling, maybe he has one now -- and I hope he has -- I think they could do a better job, because it will be more incentive in research. I understand that Mr. MacDonald, years back, did try but I think he gave it up for reasons which, I was told, but I don't wish to bring them up at the present time.

In the matter of setting school examinations, I think we should have a permanent body, staff, setting them. I think the present system is that the Department of Education asks a certain body of people to do it. They start about Christmas time. I think that these exams should be set by teachers given leave of absence for a certain period of time. They would have more time to study it -- instead of teachers coming in -- I don't say they're not trying their best, but if they were full-time, occupied full-time, I think they'd do a better job. With these remarks I think I'll close. I had one more, but probably we'll be in this department next week and I'll bring it up.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, this is the largest spending department which this legislature has to deal with, and in view of the importance, I think that it is essential that we give the closest scrutiny to the proposals of the Minister and to the entire problem of education. I want to begin by saying that I believe that in Canada we are doing a poor job of meeting the educational requirements of the people of this country. But I want to say this,

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd) . . . . . that I don't think that this provincial government or any other provincial government can solve the problem because, although the British North America Act leaves the responsibility of education to the provinces, they certainly could not have foreseen at that time that the growth of knowledge and the growth of techniques and the growth of technology would make the cost of providing an education adequate to meet the needs of our people such that no provincial government can do the job which is required. And so if I am critical, Mr. Chairman, I have to be critical, not just of this government, but of all the governments of this country and of the people of this country for permitting this country to fall so far behind nearly every other country of the world. If one were to examine the amount of money which is spent in the Dominion of Canada by all levels of government for education, in terms of a percentage of the gross national product, if one were to compare that with what is spent by other countries, and by most of the countries which are far poorer than Canada, one could only hang head in shame.

Now Mr. Chairman, a number of people, including the Ministers of Education and their Deputies, and key education people across the Dominion of Canada, have been giving a good deal of study to the problems of education in recent years. Conferences on education which have been held have charted to a large extent the things which need to be done, and they've charted and listed how far we are from achieving those things. It has been proven conclusively that the economic well-being of this country depends to a large extent on the education of our citizens. Studies are shown that the size of income is directly related to the number of years of schooling which people have. One study shows that people with 13 or more years of schooling make 20% more than the average earnings of all the people in Canada; while people with less than 8 years of schooling make less than 80% of that average earning. In a survey conducted last year, it was shown that in a recent year, over 70% of Canada's unemployed had no schooling beyond Grade VIII. A third of Canada's children are still leaving school with less than Grade VIII education. Canada has only half as many skilled workers in proportion to population as United States, and a recent national employment survey in Toronto showed over 19,000 jobs for skilled workers going unfilled while there were 23,000 unplaced job applicants who could not qualify because of their lack of technical training. In 1961, 9% of the people in Canada were unemployed. Only 3% of these were people who had completed secondary school, while 19% of those who were unemployed had not completed the primary school education. So, Mr. Chairman, we ought to realize how important it is that we raise our sights. Total education costs in Canada have almost doubled between 1955 and 1960, but in terms of the percentage of total personal income, the amount spent on education rose only from 4.1% to 5.4%.

We can foresee, Mr. Chairman, we can expect that as long as the Canadian birth rate continues at its present high level we will have to provide an increasing number of classrooms, of teachers and of schools, and so even if we merely maintain the present expenditure per pupil, the total educational bill will have to increase but even this is not enough because our present system is not meeting our needs in a number of important fields. We have a tremendous rate of drop-out amongst our students -- a rate which is scandalous, it's inexcusable -- of 100 students who enter Grade XI only 66 reach high school and only six go on to get a University degree. I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that there is a country on either side of the iron curtain which can call itself a modern industrial country, which has the low rate which I have just mentioned. So, Mr. Chairman, we have nothing to be proud about in the field of education, and yet what are we doing about it? Nothing is more important if we're going to have a good educational system than having competent teachers. Experts are agreed that these are most likely to be found in persons who have lengthy academic and professional training. In 1958 the Canadian Conference on Education strongly recommended that the minimum -- I want the Minister to note this -- that the minimum requirement for a fully qualified teacher should be four years of training above Grade XI. Today the Minister tells us that he hopes -- he hopes -- now I don't want to be critical but this is the same hope we heard last year -- he hopes that next year nobody will get into the teachers' training college unless they have a full Grade XII. In 1958 -- four years ago -- the Canadian Conference on Education, of which the Minister, I think, is an honorary or an actual well, -- let's just look at what his position is -- it's easy to find out -- unfortunately we have -- the Minister is an honorary co-chairman. In 1958 -- four years ago they were recommending that teachers, to do a job, needed four years of University training,

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd) . . . . . and today the Minister tells us that next year he hopes that we will have teachers who have one year of University training. I'm sure that this isn't much to be proud about.

But, Mr. Chairman, having said this, I want to revert for a moment to say again what I said before -- that I don't believe that education problems of this province can be solved unless we have a massive infusion of federal assistance. So I don't want to discuss the theoretical objectives of education tonight. I want to look at what we are doing in this province. We are spending some \$36 million and it is important that we look at this amount to see how we are spending it, but before we do it I want to point out one thing. The Minister mentioned this afternoon how much we have increased, with some justification-- how we have gone up in the last four years. I want to point out to the members of this committee that despite our increases we still are down in the middle in terms of per student expenditure. The last figures I have for student expenditure per annum are for 1959 and if you look at them here's what you find: In 1959 Alberta spent \$367 per student; British Columbia spent \$351 per student; Saskatchewan spent \$300 a student; Ontario spent \$299 a student and Manitoba spent \$257 per student per years education. Now I know that we've gone up since 1959 but we are spending \$36 million this year; the Province of Saskatchewan is spending \$41 million this year for education, so I suggest to the Minister that we are in fact probably still down about the middle in the per capita expenditure per student, so that we have not very much to be proud about.

I want to suggest also, Mr. Chairman, that to a large extent we are spending this money without sufficient thought, without sufficient consideration, without proper planning and therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have to assume that to a certain extent, if not to a large extent, we are misspending our money and wasting our money. And members may think that this is a queer tack for me to take because I believe in education and I will defend the expenditure of more money for education, but I believe that we have to get value for the money we spend. Now we on this side of the House have often been accused of being visionary, of being impractical, of not carrying about -- on that side of the House, of course, they are efficient, they are businessmen, they know how to run things. Well, Mr. Chairman, what business, what industry in this province -- in this country -- would spend three and a half million dollars, let alone thirty-six million dollars, without having a research department of some considerable size? What business spending one million dollars a year wouldn't have a statistical department so they could assess what they're doing? They could know whether what they're doing is the proper thing; whether the things they're doing this year are comparable to the things they were doing last year; whether the things they are doing this year are better than the things they were doing last year. I challenge the Minister to show any business concern that would follow that kind of procedure, because it couldn't, it would go under. But since this is government and since this is education apparently we can get on with -- what have we got -- a one man department of research -- and I'm told that he left in the middle of the year so we didn't even have a one man department of research. I'm not being -- and I want to make this very clear, Mr. Chairman -- in the things I'm saying tonight I'm not being critical of the staff. I think we've got excellent staff; I think we're getting a lot more than we deserve for the money we're paying, and if I'm critical tonight I'm critical of the government for spending money without taking the proper care to see that the money is spent as it should be.

Now, we are beginning a general course, Mr. Chairman, and let me make it clear -- we on this side are not opposed to a general course. Most of us in this group represent constituencies, represent people who are in the lower income groups. The percentage of our constituents who send their children to the Universities is much lower than the percentage in the constituencies in the upper income groups. So we have known for years, Mr. Chairman, that the emphasis on matriculation course -- the single minded feeling that if you don't take matriculation you just don't rate -- that this is all wrong. Only six out of 100 students go to University, or graduate from University. The people we represent, if we want to be parochial -- if we want to think only in terms of our own interests -- they don't go to University so we know -- we've known for years that we needed something else. We welcomed -- we welcomed the approach of a general course. We worked for it for years; we proposed it many years ago. But, Mr. Chairman, a general course will be a failure unless the general course is as good in its field as the matriculation course is, and I want to tell the Minister that if he thinks the public knows that this is so

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd) . . . . . he is mistaken. If he thinks the teachers think this is so, he is mistaken. If he thinks the principals think this is so, he is mistaken, because, Mr. Chairman, I talked to people -- I talked to educators who are interested and they are concerned -- they are worried -- they think we are going into this without sufficient preparation and I'll tell the committee some of the things which they are saying.

What discussions, Mr. Chairman, have been held with business? What discussions have been held with industry? What discussions have been held with commerce to make sure that when we graduate people out of the general course two or three years from now, that they will be acceptable; because if they're not acceptable, Mr. Chairman, then I want to say that we are completely wrong in recommending to the children and to their parents that they go into the general course. I have been told that the people in charge of nurses' training have already said that graduates of the general course will not be acceptable in schools of nursing. Now if this is so, it's a fine prospect we're holding out for girl students when we recommend to them that they go into the general course. We are building an institute of technology and I'll come to that a little later. I have been told -- and I would certainly like to find out that I am wrong -- I have been told that the director of curriculum told the teachers on one occasion that graduates of the general course would be acceptable, would be welcomed in the institute of technology. Sounds good. I have also been told that the director of vocational training, Mr. Addy told the teachers that the graduates of the general course would not be acceptable in the institute of technology. Now, Mr. Chairman, if you have two people in the department telling diametrically opposed things -- making diametrically opposed statements -- is it any wonder that the teachers are confused. Is it any wonder that the principals are confused. Is it any wonder that one of them said to me last night -- and I can tell the Minister that in my opinion he is one of the finest educators in this province -- that he is hesitating -- that he hasn't got the heart to advise his students to take the general course because he does not feel that he can guarantee them that they will be acceptable to industry and commerce when they graduate out of the general course. And this is the course which we are telling the people of this province is something which they have been waiting for for 25 years. Well, Mr. Chairman, if we had a department of research we would have answered some of these questions before we got into the position which we are now in.

I think the honourable member who led off for the Liberals mentioned the fact that in yesterday's newspaper there was a report the Winnipeg School Board was discussing the perennial question of examination results. Well, Mr. Chairman, surely members of this committee don't believe that if this year the Grade XI students have 25 percent more failures in mathematics than they're 25 percent stupider than the Grade XI students last year; or if there's 50 percent more failures in history, as we have had on occasion, that they're 50 percent more stupid than they were in the year before. Surely that isn't a valid conclusion, yet that's the conclusion which many people make, because they don't know the facts. I think the facts are obvious. If you get a tremendous variation in the examination results there's only one conclusion one can draw, and that is that the examination content between one year and the other changed drastically, or else that the method of marking changed drastically. Now, if we had a statistical department, which was geared to evaluate the examination and to evaluate the marking, we might have some of the answers. But we don't have -- we go blithely a long spending \$36 million -- which reminds me of that famous phrase of Mr. Howe's: "What's a million!" And yet this is the kind of program which this government is proposing for the people of this province.

Now the Minister's talked about curriculum. Surely the curriculum is of the utmost importance in the kind of education we provide. And what do we do about curriculum -- and again I don't want to be critical of the teachers. I think it's tremendous that dozens, hundreds of teachers across the province who are carrying a full work load -- and I'm not one of those people who believes that a teacher works from nine to four because I know too many good teachers and they put in long hours -- I think it's terrific that teachers will give their evenings; will give their week-ends to help develop curriculum. Mr. Chairman, is that the way to get a curriculum? I wonder what we would have thought when we started to build the hydro power plant at Grand Rapids if the Hydro Board had gone to the engineers that they have working for them and said: "Here's some pencils, here's some paper, on your free evenings and on your weekends get busy and sketch a plan for this \$150 million power plant." We wouldn't even think about it, but we don't think anything at all about saying to the teachers: "Come on do this work

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd) . . . . . for nothing" -- and I'm not so concerned about the monetary return -- "but do it in your spare time," And when they do it in their spare time, when they do it on the basis of part-time, we get exactly what we ask for. We get a part-time, half-time job. I want to confirm what the Honourable Member from Brokenhead said. One of the best teachers in this city told me that in two courses he knew of -- and I don't think he was talking about mathematics -- that the curriculum proposed in the general course was more technical, more theoretical than the curriculum we already have in the same grade for the matriculation course. And if this is true, then we have defeated the purpose of the general course before we even start, because a general course is for those people who are not going on to university and so don't need a theoretical course. But this is the kind of thing you get when you ask teachers to do it on a part-time basis. I want to suggest to the Minister that it's time, and we're spending enough money that we stop asking for volunteers to do things in their free time. Not that I don't believe in volunteer work, but it's not at all impractical, and I think the expenditure would be well worthwhile, that if we want to revise the curriculum in its basic tenor that the Minister should call for the best teachers in the province, one in the field of science, one in the field of mathematics, one in the field of history, one in the field of languages, to take a year off from their regular teaching work to be paid their regular salary by the department, and to work full-time until we develop the curriculum which we need. We're not going to get the kind of curriculum changes we need with one director of curriculum, as competent as he may be, Mr. Chairman. This is asking just a little too much. And I think the Minister ought to give some very serious consideration to this.

Now, what about this general course about which we've heard so much. As already said this curriculum has been and is being designed on a part-time basis. What are the objectives of the course? I've asked teachers. Aside from a little bit of vague generality, they haven't been able to tell me. Who evaluated the proposed courses? What objective tests for these courses were made and by whom were they made? What special steps have been taken to make sure that the students and their parents know enough about the course? I repeat that many teachers are uncertain about this course -- and when I say that I'm putting it mildly. What discussions have been held with business, with commerce, with industry, to make sure that the graduates of this course are acceptable? I know that when I happened to be on the Winnipeg School Board in the years just before we established the Technical Vocational School and for three or four years before that school opened we had advisory committees of industry, of labour, of commerce, working to make sure that they knew what we were doing and that they would accept the people who come out of that. Mr. Chairman, we cannot expect the public to accept this course. We have no right to insist that children attend this course, make this choice unless we have answered some of these questions. And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that these questions have not been answered, although the Minister seems to think they have, because the questions I have raised are the questions which were brought to my attention by some of the most competent people in the field of education.

Now what about this Institute of Technology, Mr. Chairman? We certainly go along with the idea that we need an Institute of Technology. In theory this is a tremendous development, and long overdue. All the studies that have been made would indicate that there's a tremendous shortage of technically qualified people in Canada, so we ought to be able to greet this proposed institute with unreserved praise. Well what are the facts? I want to tell the Minister that some of the most prominent educators in this city are bewildered, puzzled, befuddled and anxious about this Institute of Technology. And I want to tell the Minister why. I know that two years before the Technical Vocational School in Winnipeg was opened they had already picked a principal. Now they weren't charting a new field; they were doing something which had been done in many places. We're opening something which is new. I asked the Minister I think sometime ago: "Have we picked a principal yet?" The Minister said, "No" -- (interjection) -- Well, I think I asked it a little while ago and got the same answer. Without a principal, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that there's not much that can be done in this field. It's easy to say we're going to have a technological institute but what kind of technological institute will it be? The department gave us a four-page pamphlet which listed the curriculum. I hope the Minister is not fooling himself. He may think that we are fooled; he may think that the public is fooled; but if the Minister thinks that a four-page pamphlet is a curriculum, he's got another think

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd) ..... coming.

MR. McLEAN: I didn't make any such statement.

MR. ORLIKOW: Well I know. That's just the point I'm getting at. The Minister has made no statement, and the result is that not only the members of the legislature but teachers and principals all across this province are very concerned about what kind of institute this is going to be. If you're going to open this school a year from September, the teachers ought to know now what the curriculum will be, because unless the teachers understand the curriculum, unless the teachers understand the objective of this school, unless the teachers are sold on this school, how are they going to sell the students who are now in Grades X or XI who have to attend this institute, how are they going to sell this institute to them? And I want to tell the Minister that they know as little about this institute as we in this House -- and that is a big fat zero. Now we ought to know now -- some members say, "Hear, Hear" they have a good deal more faith in the Minister and his department than the teachers and principals of the Greater Winnipeg area. And I make that statement with some knowledge of what I'm talking about. The teachers of this province ought to know what the curriculum will be, and they don't know that. The teachers of this province, and the students ought to know whether this is a post-secondary school project, a junior college type of operation or a mixture of technical vocational and junior college. These things the Minister hasn't told us -- and, more important, he hasn't told the people who, as I say, have to sell the technological institute to the students. What consultations have there been with the teachers? Where is the staff for this technological institute coming from? Are they going to be graduates of university with teaching experience? If they are, I suggest that the Minister better not wait 'til 1963 to try and hire them because he certainly won't get them if he waits 'til a month before the school opens. Are they going to be practical people without teaching experience? Are they going to be practical people with teaching experience? I want to tell the Minister that there are a number of people who have a good deal more responsibility for technical education that I have, who are worried that the technological institute is suddenly going to depend on the few technical schools that we have and take a good part of their staff, in which case you will be robbing Peter to pay Paul, because where are they going to replace the teachers that you take. And these are things which are worrying the people who have to administer the school system of this province.

Now what consultation has there been with labour and industry about the technological institute? What steps have been taken to acquaint teachers, and particularly guidance teachers, with what the objectives of the institute will be and what the institute will be offering so that they can really explain and sell the course to the students who we hope will go to the institute? If these things have been done, Mr. Chairman, -- and I want to tell the Minister that a large percentage of the best teachers in the Greater Winnipeg area are completely unacquainted with the answers to the questions which I have raised tonight and which I think are the key to the success or failure of this technological institute. Mr. Chairman, I would hate to think that we are going into this tremendously new, tremendously important and tremendously exciting field without proper preparation simply because we want to get the 75% grant which the federal government is allocating for this, and which has a cut-off date sometime in 1963. I'm just as interested as the Minister in getting any share of the money which the federal government provides for this or any other service but surely the whole question is too important to be dealt with simply on this basis.

..... continued on next page

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

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with just two other matters. First of all I want to deal again, as I have in the past, with teacher training and teacher qualifications. Some time ago the Manitoba Teachers' Society and the two trustee organizations urged the Minister to increase the qualifications necessary for teacher training. They suggested that as of September 1961 a complete Grade XII be required for entrance to the Teachers' College. Well the Minister announced today that this will be done this year. I suppose that a one-year delay over this request is not too serious. Better late than never I suppose. But I want to mention to the members of this committee, because these are not my suggestions--these are the suggestions of both the trustees and the Teachers' Society, and I think that between them they have the knowledge of what is required which some of us in this committee may not have. They went on to suggest that by September of 1963, a complete matriculation Grade XII be required before people can enter into the Teachers' College. I think the Minister ought to give this committee and give the Teachers' Society and the trustees' organizations, ought to give them that commitment now. I don't think that this is being at all idealistic. I think that we are only following in the footsteps of jurisdictions which are way ahead of us in the field of education. This unit--and, Mr. Chairman, when I say "this", I'm not even discussing tonight with the Minister implementing the recommendations with regard to teacher qualifications which the Royal Commission mentions, so that we're certainly not being very aggressive, very progressive, very rushing, because it's now some years since the Royal Commission made its recommendations. Now, Mr. Chairman, this year, out of 540 students at the Teachers' College, 143 or 27% have less than a complete Grade XII. If these figures are wrong, Mr. Chairman, and I think the Minister on one occasion said that figures similar to this are wrong, then I think the Minister owes it to this committee to give what the actual figures are. If the teacher shortage is really easing up as has been suggested on that side of the House on a number of occasions,--I, for one, question it because Winnipeg, for example, has empty classrooms,--supply teachers, which they ought to have, they have not been able to hire. But if the teacher shortage is really easing up, surely now is the time to raise the standard, because if not now when the supply of teachers is easing up, when will we do it, if ever? There are 580 teachers in the Province of Manitoba, according to information which I have, who hold conditional certificates. These are supposed to be for one year only, but they are often extended. Can the Minister tell us how many of these there really are; how many of them have been extended for more than one year and for how long they have been extended? When is the Minister going to end these conditional certificates, as he ought to?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, in 1964--you heard my speech this afternoon.

MR. ORLIKOW: I heard it, but the Minister has made other speeches and other commitments which didn't quite come through, and if he now says 1964, on the basis of past performance, maybe by 1966 or '67 we'll have it. That still will be better than we have today but a long way from what we ought to have.

Now the Manitoba Teachers' Society recommended that after 1961 teachers be required to remove conditions by September of the year concerned. The Minister should tell these teachers who have conditions that if they don't remove the conditions that they will not be permitted to teach. If he doesn't do this, Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to him that the people who are going to suffer, the people who are going to be shortchanged in the kind of education that they get, are the students in the 580 classrooms which these teachers with conditional certificates are teaching, and the only person who will be responsible for shortchanging the education of those students will be the Minister, because the Minister has it in his power to tell these people that they've got to go to work and clean up their conditions or they might as well quit teaching. He won't let them teach. It's as simple as that. The Minister can do it if he wants to do it, and other jurisdictions, as the Minister knows, have done it. I am told, Mr. Chairman--I find it hard to believe; I find it incredible; but I think my source of information was pretty reliable--I am told that the Teachers' College is still accepting as students, people who have failed two years in a row at university. I want the Minister to check this. I think it's important, because, Mr. Chairman, the university is now saying that if a person fails two years in a row at the university they've got to quit. They can't continue on. In other words, they can't become doctors; they can't become lawyers; they can't become social workers; so I guess the only thing

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) . . . that's left for them to do is to go into the Teachers' College and become teachers. This is a fine prospect for the students of the Province of Manitoba in the year 1962. I hope I'm wrong. I hope the information I've been given is wrong. If the Minister didn't know about this and if it's true, I hope that the Minister will come back tomorrow and tell us that he's going to take some action--going to take some action so this doesn't happen again next year, because if it's true, I think it's a disgrace. I think it's inexcusable.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak just about one other matter which the Honourable Member from Brokenhead mentioned briefly. Maybe he was a little hesitant about raising it, first of all because he is himself a teacher, and secondly because part of what I am going to say happened in or near his own constituency. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if we are going to establish an educational system which works and works efficiently, that teachers must have the feeling that they cannot be dismissed without adequate cause, and that they cannot be demoted without adequate cause. I'm not suggesting for a moment that teachers, once being appointed, ought to have a lifetime tenure. I spent six years on the Winnipeg School Board and I know from experience that teachers may have been good at one time and they may be getting old; they may be sick and they may not be able to do a job; and I want to agree with suggestions that have been made, that school districts ought to have the power to dismiss or demote a teacher with cause, but surely if this system is to be equitable, surely if people are to work without fear, it must be only on the basis of justifiable cause that dismissal is permitted. Now how do you get this kind of a system? It seems to me that the only way you can get it is by establishing a system of arbitration which works both ways. Not a one-way street arbitration which we seem to have. And yet that is precisely what we have. Let's look at a couple of cases which took place within the last year. I'm sorry I have to refer to them but as they've happened in the last year I think this is the place where we can talk about it because it's the Minister's responsibility to do something about it. Let's look at the case in Elkhorn where a teacher was dismissed; where an arbitrator was appointed; where an arbitrator held hearings; where an arbitrator made a report; and what did the arbitrator say in his report? He said, in essence, "Yes, this teacher was dismissed; this teacher was dismissed unjustifiably; this teacher was dismissed because one of the school trustees took a dislike to her and hounded the rest of the board until they dismissed her. This teacher shouldn't have been dismissed, but I can't find anything in the laws of this province which permits me to order the school board to take that teacher back; which permits me to order this school district which unjustly dismissed that teacher to pay her her back salary." But it happens that the school board had a change of heart, aided by an election which eliminated the offensive school trustee, but the principle involved is important. I don't know whether the Teachers' Society made representations to the Minister, and I don't care, but maybe the Teachers' Society thinks that the way to handle this is to go to court. I don't think so. If there's an inequity and if a competent lawyer, acting as an arbitrator, says that the law is deficient, I suggest that the Minister doesn't have to wait for the Teachers' Society to make representation. We ought to have an amendment to The Public Schools Act here right now today which we don't have. And that's the first case.

And what about this case which the Honourable Member from Brokenhead talks about? What about the case of the principal at Beausejour who was demoted? I'm not going to express an opinion, Mr. Chairman, about whether the division school board was right in demoting him or not. I don't know, but I do know that nothing could be more harmful to the morale of teachers or any other employees than to have a situation where the employer can unilaterally, without cause, or without stating the reason, demote an employee. And yet, this is precisely what the school division board did. Now the Honourable Member from Brokenhead tells us that the Minister was out there. I wonder what he was doing there. I wonder what he was doing there. I wonder why he didn't exercise his authority or his influence to see that an arbitration board was appointed. Surely that teacher, any teacher, has that elementary right--I'm not talking about a legal right; I'm talking about a moral right. We've heard members on that side talk very often and very eloquently about moral issues. Well there's a moral issue which I think needs to be settled right then, and it hasn't been settled. And that principal has been put to the expense--completely unnecessary, completely unjustified, of fighting the case himself through the courts of Manitoba. And I think that the Minister was remiss in his responsibilities, if not legally, certainly morally.

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

And then I want to deal with one other case which I must say I find completely incomprehensible, and the actions of the Minister, to me--I just can't believe that they're true, but I'm going to tell the members of the committee and tell the Minister the details of the case as they have been told to me, and if I'm wrong, then I think the Minister ought to say so because there are a lot of teachers who are wondering about what happened, or why the Minister took the action which he did. I'm referring to the case of Mrs. Gunson, the wife of the principal to whom I just referred. Mrs. Gunson, I am told, is a qualified teacher. I'm told that she took a special course which qualifies her to teach at the secondary school level. As a condition of taking that course, I am told that she and all the other students who took that course, signed some kind of paper to the effect that they would only teach at the secondary school level. This makes sense in principle. After all if there's a shortage of secondary school teachers, particularly in the rural areas, it doesn't make much sense for the province to be permitting them to teach at the elementary school level. I'm not quarrelling with the principle.

Mrs. Gunson applied for a job, I'm told, with the division board, as a secondary school teacher, and a division board said to Mrs. Gunson: "Look, we're in this dispute with your husband; the relationship between the Gunson Family and the division board isn't very good; we don't think it would be very good for morale if we hired you." And I think this is very understandable, given the . . . . . case of Mr. Gunson. But the elementary school board in Beausejour had a need for a music teacher and Mrs. Gunson was very qualified to be a music teacher. The elementary school board hired Mrs. Gunson, at which point somebody--I'm not saying the Minister--but somebody in the Minister's department notified the elementary school board at Beausejour that Mrs. Gunson could not teach elementary school; she had to teach at the secondary school level. Well, Mr. Chairman, I ask the members of this committee, what kind of thinking created this situation? Where is the justice of this? Did the Department of Education want Mrs. Gunson to leave her husband? Did they want Mrs. Gunson to move out of Beausejour? It was one or the other and they succeeded, because Mrs. Gunson is not living in Beausejour and she's not teaching in Beausejour. I understand she's teaching in Fort Garry, and I understand, although I'm no expert and maybe the Member from Springfield or the Member from Brokenhead can shed further light on this, but I understand that the attempts of the Beausejour school board to get a music teacher were fraught with a great deal of difficulty and they certainly did not get a teacher of the quality of Mrs. Gunson. Now I just don't understand, Mr. Chairman, what the Minister or his department were doing in this case. Now members may think that this isn't very important, but I want to suggest to you that unless the teachers of this province have a feeling that they can teach without being interfered with unjustly, that they are not going to put in their best efforts. They're not going to feel that they have the confidence of the people of this province. They're not going to do the job as they ought to do it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are other matters which I intend to deal with. I want to tell the Minister that we are going to be--whether he likes it or not--when we get to the item on pensions in his estimates we are going to discuss the items in some detail. I think it's unfortunate that we are going to discuss it twice, once under the estimates and once--I think we're going to have a bill although with the conflicting rumours and statements which one gets from that side I have to wonder, but it's announced in the Speech from the Throne, so I feel we're going to get some kind of bill at which time members on this side will have to discuss the question of pensions again. I'm sorry we have to discuss this twice and probably rehash the matter and thresh old straw, but we can't be blamed for it. The Minister knew--I think he knew what he wanted to put in the bill, and I see no reason, the House having now been meeting for five weeks, why we couldn't--six weeks--why we couldn't have had that legislation here, but we haven't so we will be discussing it under the estimates.

Mr. Chairman, I painted a gloomy picture. Naturally people on this side always paint the dark side just as people on that side always paint the bright side. Not everything the Minister or his department does is bad. Occasionally--very occasionally--they do things which are right. The Minister is hard working. He's a good guy and all that, but I want to say to the members of this committee that we've got a long way to go before the education of the young people of this province will reach the standard which it ought to and as long as we on this side of the House are here we certainly will not let the Minister forget what needs to be done.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I have but three or four points to discuss tonight and I certainly intend to be brief. I had hoped that this year the Honourable Minister would deem the subject important enough to give some indication of his philosophy regarding the education of 15,000 or so children attending private schools. Heaven knows that he has had ample time to arrive at some decision and to make some policies. I am the first one to admit that politically he has a very difficult decision to make, but should we say this and then stop there? Should I be silent? I wonder--I know that members of the government would like it, and probably the members of this House, and maybe the members of the Press and many others would like it much better, but would they admire me more? We have tried--well, one of them said yes, and it might be possible--but I don't think so. I think that I have a voice here as much as anybody else, and I think that if I have convictions that I should express my thoughts here, especially when I feel so sure that there is something wrong here. In four years I haven't heard--I don't remember any case where any Minister or member refused to at least make an attempt to answer questions--not once in four years. Now when this subject is brought in, well we're told and I'm told that I'm not fair; it's not right to embarrass anybody like this; that this subject should not be mentioned.

Today, the last speaker told us about moral issues; moral responsibilities. We have a motion in front of us for asking uniformity of curricula--trying to work on it--but anything about this subject is never answered. If we ask the Minister how many teachers teaching in private schools are qualified he doesn't know and he's all surprised that we should ask such a question. If we tell him why there's a certain book, written by the same person--his Department insists it should be studied in different grades--why should some people of Manitoba pay for it and others have it free, they look at us with a hurt look. Why do we ask questions such as these? It's not fair. I have said that--I know. I realize that politically this is a touchy question, only what are we here for? Nobody is forcing any of us here to do this kind of work. Don't we have a responsibility? Because it is difficult, does that mean that we should forget about it? Does the Minister think that I relish standing up year after year with the same thing? Is that what the members of this House feel? That I like it? I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I've been shaking and sweating here for an hour. Should I stand up again and say what I think and fight for what I think is right? Do you think it's easy, when I get 'phone calls telling me that as long as there are certain people--this would be the words this person said--that as long as there are people like me you can't lick so and so--we'll get nothing in Manitoba--that this is a democracy and majority rules and you're not entitled to anything--if you don't like it you can move. Do you think that's pleasant, Sir? Does the Minister think it's pleasant? Does he think it's pleasant because of my nervousness--because of my excitable nature, that it is so hard to be quoted right. I'll make a speech. I'll speak of the lack of leadership, the lack of courage of the government and I'll speak for forty minutes or so, and one sentence about schools, and the paper will quote: "Desjardins Fights With Duff Again" or something like this. Why? When I ask these people this do you know what they tell me? "Well this is the only colourful thing." I am afraid--especially this Session--I'm afraid to open my mouth because I'll hurt the cause that I think is so important, because my words will be changed or exaggerated but, Sir, does that mean that I should be silent, that I should not ask anything about these things? We have talked here--and the last speaker talked about teacher qualifications--you should be tougher with them. Would it be so difficult to bring in at least a bill to say something about this question of this aid to private schools, something of this recommendation of this Royal Commission? Would it be so difficult to bring something--a direct grant or aid to qualify teachers only teaching in these schools? Why? Haven't they got the same right as other people? What kind of schools are you going to have if you don't do this? It's getting more and more difficult. The taxes are going higher all the time. Some people are asked to give but cannot share in this. They haven't the right to share--they shouldn't expect it because in a democracy majority rules and minority--any kind of minority--hasn't any right, or so we are led to believe. Now is this right, Sir? Is this why I'm accused every time I stand up, of being a fanatic? Do you think it's easy for me? It is not any easier for me than any members of the government. I like to be a good fellow and to be friendly with everybody also. I don't like to be branded a fanatic because I do believe in certain things. Can anyone here stand up and tell me: "No, those teachers haven't any right to live like other people and those 11,000 people do not count."

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

Now here is a very good write-up that appeared in the Tribune on June 17th, 1961: "Roblin Warns of Cost in Massive School Plan. Plea for Education Aid at Next Session." From Neepawa: "Premier Duff Roblin wound up the history-making Cabinet meeting here Friday by warning Manitobans their sacrifices for education probably will be maintained with even higher government spending next year. The Premier was speaking at a town-sponsored dinner after holding the first full-scale Cabinet meeting outside of Winnipeg. In one of his most stirring speeches in months Mr. Roblin called on all citizens to support a massive education program--tremendous and imperative investment. 'I know the local taxpayers have been called on to meet that need. Their contributions have almost doubled. I think that they will be asked to contribute even more when the Legislature next meets. Must keep faith.' He said the education of children was the foundation of society--an . . . . . towards peace in a free world. "The whole world cries for better education. We of this country and province must keep pace with our tremendous development. Of all the unemployed today,' he adds '70 percent were poorly educated or untrained in any skill. The people of Manitoba have been making tremendous sacrifices for education and we are getting tremendous results. More than 2,600 new schoolrooms have been built at a cost of \$39 million--the greatest effort in the history of this province. The greatest domestic responsibility we share on three levels of government is concerned with education. I beseech you to help school boards and other bodies of citizens concerned with this subject because they need your support. Then you will get the best value from this tremendous and imperative investment.'"

Well I can say that I beseech you also to help these schools--to help these 11,000 people and those that are trying to do a job with them, but if I say this I'm wrong--I'm unfair. Yesterday, Sir, in front of approximately 2,000 people, the Premier of this province stood up and spoke to the people assembled in a hall in St. Boniface--spoke very good French. I was proud of being a Manitoban. I was proud of him. I've watched him progress over the last three or four years that I've known him and he is progressing very rapidly, but Sir, why must this be tarnished? Why must I have this doubt of his sincerity if he cannot do anything about this at all? Now dozens of schools--private schools have been opened. The Premier has been there and given words of encouragement to these people and he's shovelled the first bit of dirt. Well, is he burying these private schools or what is he doing? Now it is true that this is a touchy question but are we going to achieve anything by waiting? Are we sincere--are we sincere when we're waiting? Are we waiting for those people that tell me that as long as they have people like them, themselves, the Catholics will get nothing in this province? Are they going to change their minds, Sir? I'm not mad at this statement--at people phoning me like this. I feel sorry for them. One day watching the Premier of this province speaking French, making an attempt--recognizing French--and listening to the Minister of Education telling us that this French is going well in Grade IV and so on--that they're progressing, and then some other day hear from some citizens of Manitoba that the people--a certain minority group of the people in the province should not expect anything.

Now, Sir, what are we waiting for? Don't you think that it is well conceivable that some day maybe there will be more Catholics in Canada? Now what do we expect? Are we going to close all the other schools? Is that what Quebec is doing? No, I don't think so and I'd hate to live in a country and I'd hate to call myself a Catholic and that's what I felt would happen if we ever became the majority and that I had to 'phone somebody or tell somebody, "As long as we're here, you Protestant so and so will get nothing." I'd hate to see that day. Well is that what we're waiting for? Are those people going to change their mind? I said before, I'm not trying to shove anything down the throat of any of the members here, but I would like some indication that something is being done, some indication that at least if we're afraid to bring this politically, if this is a political football, at least that we're worried about those children; they're not going to be sacrificed because this is a touchy question; that they're not going to be sacrificed because some people want power so much, and I'm not talking only about this side of the House. I'm talking about all the members here because we are afraid; we want to stay in power. Does it mean that much? Is it that kind of power? Well I think this is enough on this subject. It probably won't do too much good.

I'd like to bring in another few points that were mentioned here today, some of them in

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . form of question and asking for more information. There is the question the Honourable Minister spoke about sports. I think that he should later on maybe have a chance to elaborate a little more, what he means by encouraging sports at these schools, at the--I can't help but say this; it kind of hurts me that I see him now sitting up. We're finished about a certain subject; now he has pen in hand--he's taking notes. I wish he would have taken a few notes and answer me some of my previous questions. Well anyway, this sport business; is it going to be sponsored by the government, this question of inter schools? I think it's a very good thing but I hope that they will not forget this inter . . . . . question also. I hope that we will not--and coming from me, I coached football in different schools, high school teams, and I love the sport but I hope that we don't forget that everybody should participate. I hope that we will not put the emphasis that we have in certain large universities in the States where the big thing is to win and win at all costs.

Then there is the question of physical education. I'm glad that this is mentioned but I'd like to know a little more about that. We're told that there will be a program. I don't know where the Honourable Minister feels that he's going to get his teachers. I don't know where we have a department of physical education here. I know that we have large gyms. I've seen in certain towns they have two gyms side by side, one for primary school, one for secondary school, and I wonder if we're really using this. I'm not condemning it; I'm not knocking these gyms but I think--it's too late to worry about it now--but I think that we should and I commend the government if they will go ahead and try to get a program going. And I hope that we will try and get physical education established in this province, but I know that we'll need teachers if we want to do it right. We can't just talk about programs without teachers and I don't know where we are going to get these qualified teachers, because it's no good to start a program if it's not done right and if the teachers are not qualified.

Then there's another thought. Maybe it's too early for this but I think that we should talk about this. I would like the government to think about the suggestion. I feel that certainly television is here to stay; people will spend even in Winnipeg here up to \$200.00 or very close to it a minute, for advertising, and those people know what they're doing. They're not spending this money for nothing and I think that we could think of having a TV station sponsored by the university, originating from the university maybe, on a modest scale at first, but giving education to the people of Manitoba, those that maybe are a little older to go back to school and maybe those that are a little too young to go to university, and I think that it would certainly help fulfill the needs of the people of Manitoba. I think it would be a step forward. It would have to be modest at first, no doubt, but I certainly would like to see it. I think that it will come to that. I think that we'll see this in future years and the government could be well advised to start thinking about this and maybe planning for the future.

There's another question, the question of alcohol education. I was going to say when I was young and foolish four years ago, but I think that most of the members of this House feel that I'm still as foolish, but then I question the decision of this grant. It was always the same. To me it looked like if it was blackmail or trying to buy something, or it's a must. And I might say that on this instance the Honourable Minister seemed to agree with me. He kind of smiled a bit and told me that I probably would receive the letter on this occasion, the letter that he had received in the past, and I did receive these letters. I waited for a couple of years but it seemed to be the same thing. Now reading some of these write-ups then we were told that some of this education especially in school level wasn't doing too much good. The Minister at the time was going to look into this--that's three or four years ago--and then one of the members said that while he had been talking to one of the directors and they had accomplished something, they had stopped some of these New Year's parties. Well I don't know where they get the credit for that. I think that some of the companies and some of the police have been instrumental in that, asking the people to co-operate because of so many accidents and so on. I think it's a good thing, mind you, but I doubt if this grant is doing any good and I would like to see, in this case, the government take over this field. In the Tribune of March 13th, 1962, the man that is accused or praised for instituting this grant for alcohol education, Mr. Bracken, was interviewed, and I think that if we read this we'll see that he's disappointed himself and he says that he doesn't feel that this is doing too much good, and may I quote, Mr. Chairman. "In a world where a thousand different people are preaching a thousand different philosophies and

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . people have nothing to cling to, what do you expect?' he said in an interview while visiting Winnipeg." Later on here. "Education is the only answer,' he said, 'and education has failed. We decided to let them vote if they wanted it or if they didn't. Two-thirds of the population wanted to drink more so it isn't surprising that giving them the right to drink more has resulted in a higher consumption level of alcohol,' he said. Figures recently released in the 1961 annual report of the Liquor Commission shows Manitobans consumed 13% more liquor this year than last. Per person they drank 13.75 gallons of beer during the year ending March 31, 1961 compared with 13.66 gallons the previous year and 12.56 gallons in 1956-57 when the recommendations of the Bracken Commission were put into effect. 'For all the liquor legislation, alcoholism continues to mount every year,' said Mr. Bracken. 'Willpower is fading. Psychological pressures of a fast paced atomic world are only partially to blame' he said. 'The changing character of the people is the main cause. They are leaning more and supporting less. Individuality and individual willpower are fading. It's an entirely different world you're living in today than it was 40 years ago. Now public sentiment is in favour of what you call a welfare state.' " This is very interesting, this part here: " 'Then in the old days people didn't lean on government; in the last half century people have come along expecting government to solve all their problems for them. Now governments are more socialistic than the socialists were then. And people drink more to drown their troubles,' he added, 'Of course economic stress, the threat of war, the fact that . . . . . drink and social drinking is rampant are reason too,' he said. But during the many years he was Premier of the province, people used to lead, now they follow." And I want to add this little paragraph here: "He doesn't blame the present government for this softening trend but for the corresponding rise in liquor consumption."

Now I don't think that this is actually that bad a sign. I think there's more drinking because you can drink now in the proper place, in a restaurant where you are enjoying your meals. I've very seldom seen any people drunk in a restaurant. I think there's less people drunk these years and I think that this is a good thing. There's certainly nothing wrong with moderate drinking, and I'm supporting myself now, nobody else. But I feel that there certainly should be certain education of this great problem because it seems to be the reason for so many troubles that we have here, and I think that let's not worry about receiving letters; let's get together on this and look into this and see that we can make every dollar spent--maybe we could spend a little more. I'm not saying that too much money is spent, but I don't think we're getting our value for alcohol education.

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to participate and make some suggestions, regarding some of my observations in the number of years that I have been privileged to teach school. All I intend to do is make some constructive suggestions in order that the Minister could see the light and possibly impress certain officials of the department that some of these things must be considered in the very, very near future. It has been my privilege to suggest ideas in the past. Particularly I think I feel that I take some pride in the fact that I have appealed for many, many years for a technological school to be built in Greater Winnipeg in order to meet the problems that we have had from time to time of the students, particularly those who could not attend the city vocational school. We are aware of the prohibitive cost of sending a student from any suburban area to the Technological School in Winnipeg for which the cost, I think, is around \$390.00 per student.

We are all aware, Mr. Chairman, that we've heard this catch phrase from time to time about equal opportunity, and I believe that we are giving our boys and girls an opportunity today. The Minister of Education gave us an interesting survey as to what has been done in the province in the past number of years. We're told that the budget today amounts to around \$36 million. We know that we have more students staying in the schools; we have less drop-outs; we know that we have wonderful facilities for our boys and girls today; we know that we are offering them every opportunity to stay in school, but we do have a problem. For years we have attempted to teach for one purpose only and that is to prepare the student for university. And even today in 1962, it is a recognized fact in this day and age that only about 8% of our students do attend university. So therefore, you could just imagine how many potential good students are not able to continue with their education because of financial resources, and others who possibly were not academically inclined that we have lost by the wayside in the past--well

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd.) . . . ever since the war ended. I would say literally tens of thousands of students have gone in other fields of labour who could have been trained in some vocation of which we could have reaped the benefits today. The fact that automation is moving in has deprived the people who used to leave at the Grade VIII level and were able to get any kind of a job. Today we are faced with a serious problem, a problem where we have to train our young people, and not only our young people but some of the men who are married today, retrain them again in order to earn a living--to earn a living.

Here we are setting up a technological school at Brooklands. Something that as I said, we've been waiting a long time. We are asking that the students who'll be allowed to attend this school will have to have junior matriculation or Grade XII standing in all courses. That's fine. I'm worried about that particular student who cannot cope with the kind of course that we're offering today, and that is the student that we have in Grade IX. In order for the student to get into high school--and I'm speaking from experience and I'm very serious about the situation because I'm faced up with it and I have been for years and years--records have proved that we have Grade IX students who have, let's say, average ability or a little below average ability. We are asking them to pass in the four basic subjects. They have to pass the four basic subjects before they can enter Grade X, and that is science, language, social studies and mathematics. The rule says that if they fail in more than one basic subject they have to repeat the year. We have a turnover of failures in Grade IX for the past 16 years anywhere from 15 to 20%, and out of that 15 to 20% we lose at least 10% that cannot continue into Grade X. Why? Why should those people be eliminated who have, let's say, average ability--who could and should be allowed to attend a vocational school or given a kind of a course that will allow them to go into Grade X and then deviate into something that's practical and something that will be beneficial to them? And yet we are still sticking to this course for the past 25, 35 years that the students have to pass the basic subjects and we have to eliminate them because they are continually repeating, and as a result, when they get around 16 and 17 they more or less quit of their own accord. All because they cannot pass two basic subjects. They could either fail in mathematics or language or any other two subjects. They are the ones that I think that we have to consider. They're the ones that are walking the streets today. They're the ones that I have seen from time to time, that have no means of getting any kind of work because they haven't even got a Grade VIII standing. I feel that something should be done about giving a more practical course to some of those students who cannot cope with that kind of a course. And I think--I'm very serious about this, because it's becoming a problem, and as the Minister has indicated, our Grade IXs have increased in the last three years from 9,772 to 12,179. Do the honourable members think that all those 12,000 students are going to pass into Grade X? Well I'll bet you differently, and yet we are not meeting the problem of those students who cannot cope with the academic work, and yet we state that in order to enter any technical-vocational school they've got to pass their Grade IX and get into Grade X and so on into a general course or . . . . I would suggest we've got to start a course in Grade IX so we can deviate some of these students from Grade VIII into a Grade IX course--a special course in which they are not compelled to write the kind of subjects that we do give the able student. They are entitled to the same privileges; they are entitled to the same consideration as we are giving to the others who have possibly more ability that God has given them, and I think it's only fair and just that we should consider those too. And we have them leaving us by the hundreds that do not even get a Grade IX education and yet I presume they're intelligent, they'll become law-abiding citizens if and when they take their place in our society, and I think some consideration will have to be given that we can offer a course that will permit these students to go into Grade IX and not insist that they have to take these four basic courses or insist that they have to take a language. That's my first criticism.

Now I come to the second point which I think is very serious. From time to time we get the reports, the results of our Grade XI examination and Grade XII, and in spite of the fact that we do offer a variety of courses, the results are deplorable. We have as many as 25 and 35 such failures in certain subjects in Grades XI and XII. And yet it is with dismay and some indignation that one reads about what is being done, and this is that there seems to be a policy, a policy by the high school examination board which seems to have a policy in which they are permitting so many students passing into the next grade and so many students failing. We have

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd.) . . . a situation that one cannot understand. It seems that if too many students are too successful in writing their Grade XI and XII examinations, then they are marked down, and those obtaining marks just above passing level, are marked down to keep the total of those passing within the prescribed percentage. On the other hand, if too many students fail, they get bonuses--extra marks in order for them to pass. Now this is a situation that's existed in this province for years and years, and it's deplorable. We are actually defeating the purpose of giving these boys and girls a break--an honest break--all because the high and mighty group says that so many can pass and so many should fail. I don't think a select group of people have that authority. Who gave them that right? On whose conditions is it based--university authorities? And yet it's a true fact. Here we have a situation where this was actually discussed with the Minister of Education: "revealed in a three hour session of questions, in comments with the Manitoba Minister of Education, Honourable Stewart McLean, this unjust system of marking roused the farm women more than the economic injustice suffered by the farmers as a whole. This happened a few years ago back, and the exasperation of the farm women with the situation was expressed by the following resolution which passed unanimously, and this is the resolution: "Whereas we understand it is an established practice to limit to a certain percentage of those writing the number of students allowed to pass; and whereas we consider it unfair that students' marks be arbitrarily raised or lowered in order to comply with this percentage; therefore be it resolved that we request the high school examination board to see this discrimination . . . ." And I think it's about time that we look into this matter. I think we're being unfair and unjust to some of these people who could be failed because of the whims of a select few who think that they haven't the right to continue on to high schools, and I think it's a matter that should be looked into seriously and now. We've lost too many. We lose enough as it is in the drop-outs from grades VIII, IX and X; why should we lose them in Grades XI and XII? I think it's unfair and unjust, and I still question the authority of the select few who are on this board who set the paper.

I would like to also comment about the new general course. I think it's a long awaited change--a change that we should have had right after the war as other provinces saw fit to do. As I've said before, we have continually--you in this House here, every member of this House, when you went to school you were being prepared for one place--for university--everyone of us right in this House, were preparing for those who were to be the select few going to university. And how many of us in this exalted group in this House are university graduates? Everyone of you who has a profession or is in business is doing a good job, but the point is that we have attempted strictly to train or prepare our students for university--the exalted few at the expense of over 90% of our students who did not have an opportunity. I am very pleased that this course is being offered, but I have my doubts. The reason why I say this is a problem, it was being introduced this year and I, as a principal of a large junior high school was faced with a problem, because we had to fill out forms--forms had to be filled out by the students entering Grade X because they have to make a choice now in Grade IX, if they passed into Grade X, and the result is that we had meetings held, parents came down, I had 'phone calls in which the parents asked what should be done. In many cases I advised them to suggest their children to take the matric course, and in many cases I advised them to take a general course or an industrial arts or commercial course because of the child's inability to cope with the academic work. But there appears to be a stigma attached to that. Many parents feel that possibly the fact that this is a secondary course that their children will not get the same type of education, and I think we have to educate the public that this is a course that possibly will assist those who cannot continue into university because of financial conditions or those who cannot cope with the academic work being offered. It's important, but I can assure you that I have been faced with this problem where a parent directly asked me, "Is it an inferior course being offered?" and I said, "No, it's not; it's the kind of a course that I think your boy and girl will get some benefit from."

But there's one thing that I think the Minister has to give us an answer. Up 'till the present time our Grade XI and XII courses have been set by the high school examination board. They have been the ones who have set the papers. Now the problem arises--are they going to be given the responsibility of setting the general course examination? Some educators believe they will, but I think it should be set by an independent group of teachers regarding this

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd.) . . . . particular course. Certainly I don't think the high school examination board should be given that privilege at all. I think it should be an independent group who are familiar with the kind of a course that is being offered for the year 1962-63.

Now, Mr. Minister, this is something I have said before and I think it's something that we have to face up to. I don't know whether the honourable members in this House know how many students we allow to get by on a provisional pass. Actually, putting a student into Grade IX or X or XI today is becoming a farce. What are we doing today? We put a student into Grade X with a provisional pass; we put a student into Grade XI with a provisional pass. And do you know what's happened in the past few years? Nothing is being done about forcing that individual to get his supplementals off. What an attitude to develop. An attitude of indifference. A boy or girl gets into Grade X without passing the Grade IX examinations in some particular subject--goes on into Grade X with the same attitude--what do you expect is the attitude of that boy or girl in Grade XI? Is it any wonder that we are getting the atrocious failures in Grade XI and XII as we are today? Because it's an easy way out. Well why should I worry about passing a supplemental in language or mathematics or any other subject? I'm going to be in Grade X anyway; I'll be in Grade XI. No one insists that they get that supplemental off.

I would suggest that we certainly have got to raise the standards of the boys and girls who get into high school to the extent that they know the responsibility they have to themselves as far as the subjects in which they have failed. This has been going on for years, Sir. Here's an article--here's an article of 1956--this is six years ago which says: "Pass or fail. Provisional pass means wasted effort." I spoke on this several times before and yet nothing is being done about it. How can you develop character? How can you develop and instil into a boy and girl that they've got to earn the marks--they've got to work for it, even if they have to attend summer school, which they have to pay for. I can assure you that if the students were aware that they had to get their supplementals off they would be the better for it--better as students and better as citizens--not have something given on a platter to them and they get the same credit as the student who works hard all year round. I think this is something that ought to be done and done--not wait another six years before this matter is brought up--(interjection)-- Well there's nothing being done--there's nothing-- we've attempted--to answer that Sir, I can tell you this that I know--I've done it myself. I've insisted that my pupils pass the supplementals but it's not done all over. I've done it myself in Grade VII and VIII, over whom I have control, but I don't have control over them when they get into Grade X, and that's exactly what I'm appealing for. If all the principals were told--or that the boys and girls who got into Grade X and XI were told that they had to write their supplementals in the fall--which I have done-- then I can assure you that would raise the standard and these boys and girls would realize that they'd have to work. I think something should be done about it.

Now something else I wish to bring to the attention of the members for your consideration. We have heard from time to time that we are using a variety of textbooks. Now I'm rather amazed--and I spoke on this matter a few years ago back--that we are using--that for every one book that's published in Canada by Canadian authors--and after all, I don't think we are that backward in the field of education across Canada--that we are using three American textbooks today. That's right. Here it is. Here's an article that states emphatically that for every one Canadian published book here in Canada we use three American textbooks; and the influence of United States textbooks in Manitoba schools is about as welcome as a two-headed monster, and almost as controversial. That's right. One book in every three handled by the Manitoba student is printed in United States. The total value of these books runs into hundreds of thousands of dollars. Here is a comment of a geography teacher at Grant Park School who says that "the Grade X geography book throughout leans heavily to the United States." I've got nothing personal against the United States but I think it's about time that we accepted books and authors that have something to do to emulate the Canadian provinces and the Canadian people and their ability. And yet this is a fact and it's still with us in 1962.

A MEMBER: In Manitoba, or all Canada?

MR. HAWRYLUK: Yes, his in Manitoba and in Canada and every province that has jurisdiction . . . . . It states very clearly here that you could get Canadian textbooks--the only thing is that they are a little more expensive. But I think it's about time that we should give our Canadian authors an opportunity to be read in our public schools. After all, how are you

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd.) . . . going to encourage our people to stay in Canada and produce books that are worthwhile reading. We have a few cases of Canadian people who have gone to the States because their books were limited as far as being used in the various schools or in the university level. I think, Mr. Minister, a standard curriculum throughout Canadian schools would be one of the answers to having more Canadian books. This would be one way a Canadian textbook could be assured of wide circulation required to make it profitable.

May I make another suggestion as regards textbooks?--one that I think is very practical. Ever since this government took the stand to offer textbooks free of charge to all the boys and girls, with the exception of those attending parochial and private schools--it was costing the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars. This experiment has been in effect two years. Now I don't want to be contradictory or argumentative about my experiences about free textbooks, but I can tell you that there's a slight difference in how these books are being appreciated. Anything that is free is naturally not looked after--especially textbooks. In order to offset that--in order to offset that--I don't think there's anything wrong as far as free textbooks, provided you can train the parents to realize that this is loaned to their children for a period of one year. I think the life span of any textbook that is being used in this province is said to be about a minimum of anywhere from three to five years. But in spite of all that, we will have books torn and abused, especially if they know that they can come up and say: "I lost my book" or "I tore my book--I'd like to get another one." May I suggest something that's being done across the line. I think that the printers who supply the books to this province--I think we should get paperback books that cost one-third of the books we pay for today--one third--soft cover books. Possibly, maybe not the best quality paper, but you still get the same results. Maybe the life span of those books would be two and three years--after all, you people have read pocket books--you've carried them around. I think it's something that this government and other governments across Canada should start looking into, especially if we're going to supply free textbooks. I think it would be a lot cheaper to buy paperback textbooks than it is the kind of textbooks we have today.--(interjection)--Well, the publishers will be glad to get your business and I think it's something that should be considered because, according to the figures given, it is said that it will cost about one-third of the hard cover books that are being supplied today to every boy and girl in the Province of Manitoba. This is something that any government will have to look into because I know that this government this year will have to spend thousands of dollars on new textbooks, and it's not enough that you have to replace the supply of books that are being used today, but what about the new books that we are getting from time to time, and then you have to discard the old books and get a new textbook and generally always costs a few cents more. Now if we are to save money and to be practical about it I think this government will have to talk turkey to the publishers and say "I think it's about time that you gave us paperback books" which will last just as long and be just as useful as some of the hard cover good quality books we get today. Instead of paying five, seven, eight dollars as we are paying for the high school books, we could probably get them for two or three dollars today, and I think I would leave that to the Minister to consider that in the future.

Now I come to another point which I think we should consider regarding a very controversial subject. You have seen from time to time comments made in newspapers, of educators, of parents, of the home and school association, who are worried about the ability of their children to read. Now I might be creating a hothouse here but I've been in the profession long enough to know--and I think you people who have been taught the old method of reading in Grade I and II by the phonetic method of teaching--I think it had a lot of merit--a lot of merit. In the last decade or so, we find that we've streamlined our methods; are trying to teach a youngster who gets into Grade I or into kindergarten--we're trying to make this youngster attempt to read something at sight and unless he has a background where his parents who had possibly the foresight enough to teach the youngster the alphabet, to teach the youngster something about word recognition or letter recognition, then I can assure you that for every one that can I would say there are two that cannot--two that cannot. And yet, what is happening? Need I tell you members of what the criticism is at the University of Manitoba level today? We are being criticized that our boys and girls entering the high school and university cannot even read a question properly--cannot comprehend. This is the truth, and it's happening day in and day out, and this problem is not a happy one I can assure you. We have students who have been

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd.) . . . . tested in Grade XI on a remedial course of tests and it's amazing that you think that the students who should be able to read and comprehend what they're reading actually make a mess of the tests. This has been proven time and time again, and I would appeal--let's go back to the old-fashioned days of concentrating on the three R's--reading, writing and arithmetic. Let's be old-fashioned about that because it's the basic fundamental of your education as far as any society is concerned.--(interjection)--It might apply to some of the members too, but nevertheless, this is an appeal, not only made by myself as a teacher, it has been expressed at gatherings and conventions of teachers--but this is an appeal that was unanimously passed in December of 1961 by the Manitoba School Trustees Association--400 delegates were unanimous in the vote to bring back the phonetic method of teaching reading. I think there's a lot in that. I'm speaking as an individual, also speaking as a teacher, who realizes the problems we're face with, especially when we get them at the junior high and high school level. The present system of teaching reading which starts students off sight reading, switches them to phonics and then to a combination of the two methods leaves much to be desired as a member of the Manitoba School Trustees Association made the statement.

There was an experiment done by somebody in St. James--a Mrs. Ernest Johnson--who gave 600 Winnipeg school pupils a reading test--I'll be through shortly, Sir--and claimed before the Royal Commission on Education, that the result indicated that the sight system stressed in the primary grades, were producing poor readers. I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that some consideration should be given. Get a group of people with old-fashioned ideas; get a group of people who have been teaching for any length of time in the junior high and high school level and get their opinion as to which method is the best to be provided for our students today. I could go on but my time is short.

I just brought these matters up. I hope that you will take them for what they're worth, Sir. I'm speaking not in a critical way but in a constructive way. I'm speaking because I have been in contact with this situation for years and if there's anything that you can accept in the way that I have given it, I think it will be not only appreciated by the teachers but I think by the Trustees Association, by the people as a whole. Anything it can do to evaluate the worth of the child, because we are dependent on the child of today who's going to be the citizen of tomorrow, which will reap the benefits in our society. Thank you very much.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I move 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 Morris 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 the Attorney-General that the House do now adjourn.

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