

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Monday, February 24th, 1964.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, a little before 5:30 I asked if you would call it 5:30 as I would like to speak. Now I would like to give way to the Honourable Leader of the NDP for just a couple of minutes. I understand that he has an announcement of great political importance to make to the House.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that I was not in the House just after 5 o'clock but I heard that there had been a statement made by one of the honourable members in this House to the effect that he was moving into the great constituency of Radisson and was going to take advantage of that fact to run against the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. The white flag is token of surrender, Mr. Chairman, to my honourable friend who is now absent at least surrender for this evening in deference to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I saw the white flag and wondered whether that meant that the opposition had decided to pass administration - the white flag of truce.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I think we are going to admit the honourable member in the House and we wish him well in whatever vocation he may take up in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with the appointment of the one-man commission in respect of handicapped children. This matter was dealt with slightly on Friday evening and the Minister did have some remarks to make regarding it, but I wasn't satisfied with the remarks he made nor was I satisfied with any explanation that he made. Now I wish to make it clear at the outset that as far as the present Minister is concerned, that any remarks that I do make are not directed to him. They are directed to his predecessor.

I think that in order to understand what has transpired in connection with this matter and in order to revitalize the memories of the members of the committee and in order to put things in their proper perspective, I think that it would be well to review what took place in this House last year.

On March 12, 1963, the Honourable Member for Inkster at Page 151 of Hansard moved a resolution in this House which subsequently I amended, and my amendment appears on Page 801 of Hansard of Friday March 29, 1963. My amendment amended the resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster by knocking out everything in the resolution excepting the first whereas, so that my amendment to his resolution read "that whereas no survey has ever been made of the number, types, or kinds of handicapped children in Manitoba; and whereas this problem must be approached objectively and studied in its entirety with a view to setting up the necessary schools, acquiring the necessary specialized help and teachers to deal with the problem effectively and intelligently; and whereas this problem comes within the jurisdiction of many departments of government; and whereas many associations and organizations have been set up, constituted and formed to deal with the problems, training, education and welfare of handicapped children; therefore be it resolved that the Government consider the advisability of setting up a committee composed of representatives of the relevant departments of government and of such associations for the following purposes, namely: 1. To make a survey of the number, types and kinds of handicapped children in Manitoba; 2. To separate the number into age groups; 3. To separate the number into the various types and kinds and into their geographical locations; 4. To recommend and suggest the best type of schools and training for the various classes and kinds with a view to the rehabilitation of these handicapped children as useful citizens; and 5. That such committee submit its report and recommendations to the next session of this legislature.

This amendment of mine was dealt with by the then Minister of Education on the 19th day of April, 1963, and he amended my amendment by striking out after the word "of" in the 5th paragraph, everything following that word and substituting the following: "Continuing their study of these problems in consultation with those interested associations and organizations with a view to providing an appropriate policy in these matters for the consideration of this House in due course."

Now, Mr. Chairman, that amendment to my amendment was passed by this House and that amendment to my amendment became a directive to the government for the government to continue its studies of these various matters. Now when I spoke on the amendment to my

(Mr. Hillhouse cont'd) . . . . . amendment as made by the then Minister of Education, I asked him to give to the House particulars of the studies that the government was then making, as I could not see how anyone could continue studies unless studies had already been started.

Now nothing was done in respect of that directive to the government until some time in November or December of last year, and the first intimation I got that anything was being done in connection with the subject matter of this resolution, as amended, was when I received from the Department of Provincial Secretary, Information Section, a letter dated Nov. 15, 1963, which was no doubt received by everybody on the mailing list of that department, informing me and the others who received it that a detailed survey to provide information for an overall government program for the education and training of handicapped children in Manitoba is to be undertaken by former Welfare Minister, John A. Christianson. Premier Duff Roblin said Mr. Christianson has been appointed as a one-man commission to examine all aspects of the question including numbers of handicapped children, present facilities and programs and to recommend a future program for government in training and educating the handicapped. He said that at the last session the Legislature, by resolution, expressed approval for continuing in detail a government-launched study with a view to preparing an appropriate policy. Mr. Christianson is armed with six terms of reference "(1) To determine the kind, number and geographical distribution of handicapped children within this province"-- which is copied from my amendment to the resolution made by the Honourable Member for Inkster. "(2) To conduct a comprehensive survey of facilities and programs at present available for the education and training of handicapped children, including those programs carried on by voluntary and charitable organizations"-- which in substance was also copied from my amendment. "(3) To consult the voluntary and charitable organizations which had been active in the field of service and training of handicapped children, and to obtain their views on future programs in this field." That was also in my original amendment to the Honourable Member's resolution. "(4) To study as far as practical the methods and programs at present employed in this field by those other jurisdictions which are generally adjudged to be most effective in it. (5) To recommend future programs for the Government of Manitoba, to provide for educating and training of handicapped children within the limits of resources available." That, too, was in my resolution, excepting that I had no reference to within the limits of resources available. "(6) To examine such other relevant matters as may be referred to by the Executive Council."

Now what I'd like to know from the government is this. Is this the first step that was taken by the government to implement the resolution which was passed in this House on April 19, 1963? If it was the first step, could the government advise me why they amended my resolution by referring to a continuance of studies already undertaken by the government, because my information is that the government had never started any studies so therefore there was no studies to continue. I'd also like to know what qualifications Mr. John Christianson has, or had, to undertake this survey as a one-man commission. We all know that he was the Minister of Welfare in the government for a period of approximately one year. We all like Mr. Christianson; we all respect Mr. Christianson. We all know that Mr. Christianson was a defeated candidate in the last provincial election. We all know, too, that he is the brother of the Minister of Welfare, and we all know that he has already -- a brother-in-law, I beg your pardon -- of the Minister of Welfare, and we all know that he has already been given a government appointment on the Municipal Board of the Province of Manitoba.

Now what I'd like to know from the Minister, and my reference is more to the present Minister's predecessor, are these the necessary qualifications to enable an individual to conduct a study of this nature or was this purely a political appointment made about two months before this Legislature sat so as to enable the government benches to reply to any criticism of not having taken any action in respect of this resolution? I am of the opinion, Mr. Chairman, that this was nothing more or less than a "fluffing off" of government responsibility. I do hope, for the sake of the handicapped children in Manitoba, that this commission of Mr. Christianson will have good results, because I am vitally interested in seeing a comprehensive program introduced into this province regarding the training of these children.

To me, it seems almost farcical to think that the government had the necessary authority, if it required any authority, but it did have a directive from this House to undertake a particular study and that directive was given to them on the April 19, 1963. Now why did the government

(Mr. Hillhouse cont'd) . . . . . wait 210 days before taking any action in respect of this matter? I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this problem of handicapped children is far too important a problem to be dealt with on the basis of political expedience, and I think that the present Minister, since he is now clothed with the authority vested in him in respect of education and matters relating to his department, should explain to the House or to this committee, and give an answer to some of the questions that I have asked.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm only too happy to reply to the Honourable Member from Selkirk. First of all, I know his interest and concern in the field of the handicapped children. The resolution as passed last year, as amended, was taken under consideration. I happen to know that in the area in which I had some jurisdiction previously in the Health Department, that we began to gather together certain information that was within the department and through the various associations. As the Honourable Member from Selkirk well knows, our Director of Rehabilitation Services in the Department of Health has worked most closely, with all these groups for many years and was pulling together many ideas and thoughts. These were shared, I know, certain opinions in our department. However, the difficulty when you say continuing studies, I think that a great deal of background material was required to be pulled together within the government service, as well as all the statistics and information that can be gleaned from the voluntary people in the field and the people working for the various associations who in turn are working with the handicapped. I think the Department of Education had some pretty good ideas in the field of the deaf -- the need for facilities, the potential need for different kinds of facilities in the future, the conflicting opinions in that field. And I became involved somewhat before the honourable gentleman Mr. Christianson was appointed, and I think he was appointed because of his very real concern in the field of social needs -- he had had some insight into this during his period as Minister of Welfare, where he gave some outstanding leadership. And I don't know -- Mr. Bracken was a defeated candidate at one time, the former premier of the province, made a very eminent contribution to this province -- I don't think that because someday the Honourable Member from Selkirk and I will be defeated -- and our days will come -- makes us any less better -- (interjection)-- Yes, before we may imagine would make any less a sincere contribution or have the problems any less close to his heart than if he were in office. However, I certainly feel that he would. I happen to know that before his appointment was made public that he spent many weeks, after being approached by the Premier, reviewing the entire problem, deciding how this could be set up, what kind of researchers he would need, talking with the people knowledgeable in the field -- I know for one thing they've tried very hard to get a knowledgeable person in the field at the Child Guidance and Welfare Work from the University on a part-time basis. This fell through due to other commitments and one thing led to another. It was during the holiday season and it was so hard to get a hold of people. Now I'm not making excuses, nor should I, for not getting this study of the handicapped off the deck sooner. But there was a lot of material to try and pull together. There was a decision to pick someone who could give the necessary leadership in this field, that had some insight and concern and interest in this work, and to plan his attack on this problem. I don't think we have to make any excuses. I think the Honourable Member from Selkirk should be delighted to know that things are moving -- a great deal of work is going on. The problem is identified and we're on the right track. I'm sure that after the many years he's been in the House, this should be a very happy occasion for him, rather than the attack he has launched on the particular individual who's been asked to lead this and, knowing the integrity of my colleague, the Minister of Welfare today, and knowing the real contribution which this gentleman could make and the chap appointed to be chairman of this commission, I would hope that he would get all our support in casing and bringing forth the kind of report that will map up the future direction in which we should be going in these most complex fields.

I don't really think I have anything more to say on that particular question.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, in order to save time to ask questions under the different items, I have a particular interest in one or two items now. I thought perhaps I could bring them out under the Minister's salary.

When the members threaten the Minister's salary I am always opposed to it because I realize that his salary does not justify the heartaches and the efforts that he has, particularly

(Mr. Gray cont'd) . . . . . in answering all questions. So I'm not going to try to reduce his salary -- although I was willing to work for half of it. But I do want to take up a couple of questions which in my opinion are important and the Minister could enlighten us, or at least give us some hopes that it may be remedied.

Now my first question is: Is the curricula or curriculum perfect to date? I know that I have in my own primitive language in the last ten or fifteen years, suggested that the curriculum be changed in several aspect which is quite, in my opinion, important. Now take the book now placed on the table in connection with the, say, social disease which the report admits that it is quite dangerous and it's not subsiding, it's growing. The medical section of the problem, in my opinion, is being taken care of but not the social problem. If a person gets a disease like venereal diseases-- in all its aspects, you are doing the best you can to treat him. But you cannot cope with the situation unless you have added to it an educational program. We're afraid all the time to discuss in the school the question of sex. They're afraid of it. It's not proper. Why? Why is it not proper? Why couldn't we have textbooks and so far we have very very little -- and this came in just lately. Textbooks suitable to the older school children, explaining to them the danger, the hardship, the whole situation -- no we're afraid. It may be disclosing some sex problem which they had not had -- they know more before the education. But something could be done on this here subject. The reports indicate -- I'm not going to take up the time of the House to quote them -- but the reports indicate the situation is dangerous. It's not cured. It's getting worse from day to day.

Now the question is, what is to be done and is anything being done? You could read up page 33 on the synopsis of activities, Manitoba Department of Health, and you admit there is a danger. But so far you explained that so many had been treated and so many had been cured. I don't say you personally, Mr. Minister -- maybe the past ministers -- and so much has been done and so on. But very little has been accomplished. I admit that the Department of Education is doing a great work but it's my right to point out to you certain items which you are not doing enough and I don't think that you are even making any effort to do it. I say there is one remedy for all the evils and this is education. And if you have a class of 60 pupils and you could sell your goods to ten, it's worthwhile. If it takes 25 years to remedy an evil situation, it's worthwhile because we are working for the future; we are working for our children; we are working for those who may in a short time, or a longer time, take over our duties and that should be our idea. We should prepare somebody to take the Minister's job if and when he retires, or resigns. And he shouldn't be selfish enough to leave his post if he finds -- and then not leave anyone to follow him. So my main beef tonight is not details -- I leave it to the educationalist to work out all the details on education -- this is a human approach on behalf of those who have to be helped -- and I as an individual cannot help them -- and ask government to do it, but fortunately or unfortunately they concentrate on the bigger things and forget the smaller things which are just as important.

MR. McLEAN: If I may, Mr. Chairman, I should like to just say something having to do with the contribution to this discussion made by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk, because he was kind enough to include me in his remarks and I had some association with the proceedings to which he made reference.

His recitation of the events of the 1963 Session of this Legislature is, of course, correct. I'm certain that he has been here long enough to know, of course, that it's just a lot of -- and if you'll excuse the comment -- a lot of tommyrot to imagine that everything is done as of 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. Because that is not the way things are done and it is certainly not the way things are done if one is to have suitable, well devised plans with respect to any matter which is of public interest and concern.

Not only that but he knows very well that his whole problem, as he himself has said, is one involving many departments of government. As a matter of fact his particular interest, that of retarded children, and the particular group of retarded children in which he is interested, does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Department of Education as such, although it is certainly a government matter and has been for many years prior to when this government was in office, a matter dealt with by the Department of Health. Now let it be said at once, and I speak now from personal knowledge, that the amendments which I had the privilege of proposing a year ago were going on and had been going on for some time prior to the session

(Mr. McLean cont'd) . . . of the Legislature and prior to the time that he introduced his resolution here. That is not a matter that is discussed or debated in public, these are matters which are conducted every day of every week of every year, by every department and in this particular reference by the Department of Education; and there was a large group of senior people in the Government of Manitoba representing the departments that he mentioned and had in mind, that had been concerning themselves with this matter and their work was continued after his resolution as much as before. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, if it had not been for the work which they did it would not have been possible for me to prepare the basic documents which were necessary to give Mr. Christianson the basic information that he required in order to start on his work. I am not talking about the terms of reference, they're general arrangements, general terms as have been read and as we know, but the basic information, the basic data, the groundwork for the study which Mr. Christianson was asked to undertake, was prepared -- and I want to emphasize this from personal knowledge -- was prepared on the basis of the work which had been done in these studies which the honourable member now wishes to belittle and in fact suggests--which is not true--suggests that it was not in fact going on. And so the resolution, the amendment that was proposed, Mr. Chairman was an amendment in strict accordance with the facts as they existed at that time and that we did not feel that we could accept the amendment which he himself had proposed, goes only to the matter of judgment as to what ought to be done. There were certain obvious points with regard to his proposal which, as I pointed out at the time, was not in our opinion,--and this is a matter of opinion--in our opinion, one that could be acted upon. Then he says 210 days --210 days. Well Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many days; I was almost going to say whether it was 210 years, but it wasn't. How many days was the former administration of this province--did it take them to make up their minds to have a Royal Commission on the subject of the flooding of the Red River? How many? How many days, Mr. Chairman? How many days did it take the former administration to decide to have a Royal Commission on the subject of education? And I know that they were asked by groups associated with education for years, for years, to have a Royal Commission on the subject of education. How many days were they involved in that? How many days, Mr. Chairman, were they in deciding to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the operation of the Liquor Act and the general administration of liquor in this province? How many days, Mr. Chairman, did it take? And how many days, Mr. Chairman, did it take to decide to have a Royal Commission on the subject of the government of the Greater Winnipeg area -- the Royal Commission whose report subsequently led to the formation of Metropolitan Winnipeg? How many days, Mr. Chairman? Now, Mr. Chairman, when I say, "How many days?" I'm not casting any blame. I think that perhaps, as events have proven, the time taken in those instances was a good idea. Perhaps that time was necessary, in order to properly assess what ought to be done and how it ought to be done -- what the approach should be. But to stand up and say because you haven't done anything, as he alleges, for 210 days, in the light of what the party to which he belongs did when they were charged with the administration of the public affairs of this province, Mr. Chairman, must surely be, if I may again, just a lot of tommyrot.

Now then, Mr. Chairman, he's chosen to do something else, which I think is most unfortunate. He referred to the person chosen to perform this task on behalf of the province and appointed by the government, and he has recited his contribution, or whatever one might call it, to the political affairs of the province and to the affairs of this government and has even chosen to bring his relatives into the matter as well. Now, Mr. Chairman, haven't we reached a fine situation in the Province of Manitoba! Isn't it a wonderful situation when, because a man offers himself for serving in the political and the public arena, when because he does that, that he cannot be trusted or asked or thought to have any ability to perform any other task for the Province of Manitoba! Isn't that a very lovely prospect that every one of us faces, that because we have come to this place, or taken any part in the political and public affairs of the province, we have thereby debarred ourselves, we are stricken from the list; that only those -- only those, Mr. Chairman, who remain pristine pure of politics, remain aloof from public affairs, have no concern with the day to day activities of our public life -- only they, Mr. Chairman, are to be trusted with tasks on behalf of the people of Manitoba. Isn't that a wonderful theory to propose; isn't it just lovely! But of course, Mr. Chairman,

(Mr. McLean, cont'd)... he doesn't believe it and the party -- the political party that he belongs to didn't believe it, has never believed it, and you only have to look at the list, the long list, and indeed, Mr. Chairman, a distinguished list, of men and women who have served in the political arena that they -- that they appointed to positions of high responsibility, appointed Mr. Chairman right out of this Chamber, appointed, Mr. Chairman, from the front benches of this Chamber. Men -- mostly men, I can't recall any women to mind at the moment -- who served with distinction and I think, Mr. Chairman, that a serious disservice has been done to the public and political life of this province, if that's the basis on which we are going to discuss what has been done or what ought to be done. He would have us say to the young men and women of our schools, "If you ever expect to be trusted, if you ever expect to be asked to do anything worthwhile, for heaven's sake, young man and young woman, stay out of politics; don't muddy your fingers in the practical everyday affairs of your community or of your province." That is, I suggest Mr. Chairman, to be rejected completely and without any qualification. Mr. Christianson's work, Mr. Chairman, will have to be judged on the basis of what he does; would have to be judged on the basis of how he is able to bring into consideration the groups and the people and the problems that are concerned in this most important matter, and we will have plenty of time in the future to judge that. There are many of us here who have good hope, who have indeed sure confidence, that he possesses that ability. We wouldn't have asked him to undertake the task if we did not believe so. We may be proven wrong; my hunch is we'll be proven right.

Now there is one other thing, Mr. Chairman, that I think perhaps I might say while I'm on my feet and in view of the fact that I no longer have the direct responsibilities with regard to the subject of handicapped children. Sometimes, and the Honourable Member for Selkirk is one, this matter is debated as though it were a simple problem; you can solve it within the terms of the resolution presented to the legislature and you can act on it right away. There are literally -- I was going to say hundreds, it's certainly a hundred -- classifications, sub-classifications, problems beyond almost belief, in this whole question of dealing with handicapped children. My goodness, Mr. Chairman, why there are a half a dozen classifications of mentally retarded children, mental retardation alone, not to mention all the classifications of deaf and hard of hearing, of physically handicapped and all that sort of thing, and to get an acceptable policy is not an easy matter. That doesn't say that one doesn't have to strive to get a policy but to get a policy is not an easy matter. Indeed if it had been an easy matter I would assume that it would have all been solved by the administration that was here before we were. And they didn't do it, and I'm not criticizing them, I know of the complications. Not only is it a complicated problem in itself, Mr. Chairman, but there are about as many opinions of how to do it as there are groups of people and people individually concerned in doing it. Did you every try to thread your way through the question of whether the deaf children should be educated at a residential school or a day school? Just grapple with that one little problem in itself and it will drive you round the bend because of the many varying opinions there are, and strongly held opinions too, by people who are directly and indirectly concerned. And if you have a residential school, should you have a day school and let those who want to go to the day school go, and those to the residential school go. Or should you compel them all to go to the residential school and say, "You're deaf so you must go to the residential school and you must stay there." I mention these matters, Mr. Chairman, only to indicate that this is not a simple problem. This is a most complicated problem and also of course a most expensive one, because the amount of money that would be required to provide the individual attention for every child -- every handicapped child -- and I use that term in its widest sense -- for every handicapped child, that they would be entitled to. If I had only to consult my heart in the matter they would all be entitled to it. The amount of money required would be a staggering amount indeed. In fact, one can imagine that -- I once made a rough calculation on one occasion and we could spend, without doing anymore than just what all of us would like to do, we could spend half as much money as we are spending on school grants at the present time, and I'm talking in terms of a figure of \$15 to \$20 million per year, to do just the things that we would like to do if we could do them, and to do them for each individual child and to do them with due consideration for all of the various considerations that have to be taken into account. Mr. Chairman, this problem has not been solved. We were alive to it, as indeed I'm certain everyone who has been here before has been alive to it; and we are proceeding as we consider best and we have the responsibility of doing that at the present time.

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

One final comment, Mr. Chairman. I thought -- I thought that when we chose -- when we came to the point of finishing the one stage of the work in which we were engaged when we met last year, and when we chose the words, the very words that were used by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk in outlining the terms of reference for Mr. Christianson, I would have thought that we would be commended. After all, we were showing that we were broad-minded enough to accept the general thoughts that he had proposed and I think that they were very good ones, and we did. But surely he can't have it both ways. Is he for us or is he against us? Because we chose his expression and we selected a man to undertake the task, and we said in effect to him, "Will you undertake this and do so on the basis of the suggestions that have been made?" We didn't say to him, "Take the honourable member's suggestions" but we used his words, to ensure, to ensure, Mr. Chairman, that no one could say, no one could say that we had restricted, that we had restricted the terms of reference given to Mr. Christianson, because we had not taken our own words, but we had taken the words that had been suggested from across the way.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I'm amazed at the Honourable Minister who has just spoken. He tries to give the impression that the government was very condescending in using the expressions which I used in my resolution. Now why was it the government in April 19th, 1963, amended my resolution as amended, and defeated it? They had an opportunity then if they thought my amendment was so good, to adopt it holus bolus. No sir, they didn't do that. They went ahead and amended, and quoting from page 1385 of the Hansard of April 19th, 1963, here's the reason then given by the present Attorney-General who was then Minister of Education, for turning down my amendment. He says, "I am therefore of the opinion, Madam Speaker, that we would be better advised to limit the committee as it were, or the investigation of the study, whatever term one uses, to that of a departmental group, who would approach it from that point of view, and making use of the experience and the assistance that undoubtedly could be given to them by other groups." In other words, there was no thought in the mind of the Honourable Minister of that time of appointing a Royal Commission of one man. What he intended to do at that time and what he was authorized to do was to set up a departmental committee, and my very point tonight is that he never set that up. He set up a one man commission on November 15th. Now he accuses me of oversimplifying this problem. I have never oversimplified this problem, Mr. Chairman, and I quote from Page 1385 of Hansard of April 19, 1963, where the Minister, the present Attorney-General, speaking as Minister of Education, at the top of the page, says: "Am quoting, Madam Speaker, from Page 801 of Hansard of Friday, March 29, 1963 from the address of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, and just quoting one or two sentences from his address, he said this, and I now quote. 'The question of handicapped children is indeed a problem, and I feel that it must be faced in its entirety, objectively and without the thought of partisanship. It is a problem which will not be solved by oratory, rhetoric, or emotionalism. It's a problem which will require for its solution, well coordinated total community planning, and one of the greatest errors which we can make in facing or approaching this problem is in over-simplifying it'." And in these sentences the Honourable Minister says, "I'll agree with the Member for Selkirk." Now, how can he, standing in his place in this House tonight, accuse me of an oversimplification. It's absolutely absurd. Now as to his suggestion that I have been unfair to Mr. John Christianson, all that I asked him was what were his qualifications? He never answered me. And I'm still asking him, what are his qualifications?

MR. JOHNSON: Pardon me ...

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister is evading the very question that the Honourable Member for Selkirk is asking. The Honourable Member for Selkirk has spoken for a number of years now in this House on this matter of retarded children. He's extremely interested in this. He is knowledgeable in it. The Minister tonight said himself that this -- I should say the Attorney-General, the ex Minister -- said himself that this was a very difficult problem, Mr. Chairman. He told us a few minutes ago that there were hundreds of cases, hundreds of types, hundreds of individual problems, and that they had to be handled in that way. Well Mr. Chairman, that's the very point that the Member for Selkirk was making. That the first thing that we have to do in the Province of Manitoba is determine what these problems are. You can't tackle the problem without knowing what it is to begin with. You have to find out what your handicap problem is, where these children are, what type

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)... of problem they have. At present the Province of Manitoba, and the ex-Minister knows this full well, right in the Town of Dauphin for example, there is a group there, active in the retarded children, who are thinking of establishing a school. But, Mr. Chairman, they have no facts on what type of children they may expect; they have no facts, numbers on where these children are, they don't know and can't find out, without having a survey themselves, what it is that they are going to have to deal with. They're there willing and anxious to get to work. And this government has not taken the steps to get this information. Now, the Minister says it's very complicated. So what does he do? Does he appoint an expert in the field, Mr. Chairman? Does he choose someone who has had a background in sociology, psychology, teaching, or disease problems or health? This particular background that would permit an individual to make a choice of this sort? No, Mr. Chairman. He chooses a politician. And this is the very complaint that the Member from Selkirk is making. He asked last year for a survey. The government turned him down. They voted against it. Then they set up a politician to conduct the survey instead of setting up someone or a group who have knowledge in this field. And I agree completely with the comments of the Member for Selkirk that this government has not taken this situation as it should and has not acted in the way that it should, and insofar as the remarks of the ex-Minister that "why didn't we do it when"-- Mr. Chairman, why doesn't he get up-to-date? We're not discussing what went on six and seven years ago. The problem exists now. This government is charged with the responsibility now. It doesn't need to say, "Why didn't you do it when?" Get tackling your own affairs. You've got plenty in your hands and if you would tackle it instead of playing politics the Province of Manitoba would be much further ahead.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, a great deal have been done. I think this debate's getting a little bit out of hand, and I think everybody's missing the point. It's one thing to call in an expert from an outside source to give you a considered opinion, but Manitoba has problems peculiar to Manitoba, and I am sure that the Member from Selkirk as well as myself is familiar enough with one or two of the associations involved in this study to know that they were very keen themselves that we should do this locally involving them to the fullest, and that the necessary experts could be brought in, and I also think that in such a complex and wide field you needed a research director to pull this stuff together, but you have to have one man responsible-- someone who can coordinate the activities and involve the local, voluntary people, the people here in Manitoba. We have some pretty good experts. I always respected the former Leader of the Liberal party, the member from Lakeside, who always used to say to me -- or I always got the impression he felt that we had the experts right here. We didn't have to go out -- anybody outside the four corners of Manitoba was an expert. So we wanted a home-grown, home-brew study, and we're going to get a good study involving to the maximum the executive, full-time paid people on the staffs of the Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Association for Retarded Children, and the host of wonderful volunteer organizations, who, I might say, are extremely knowledgeable, and at national meetings I have attended, such as the Retarded Children's Association meetings and the Rehabilitation meetings, where do the best programs, where does the best thinking come from? Right here in good old Manitoba; and by jimminy, we should stick to it. There's a time for experts, and then there's not a time for experts, and I think this is one case where this is pretty close to home, and I think that we can bring in the necessary experts as we need them.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister. Is this going to be a full-time job with Mr. Christianson?

MR. JOHNSON: Answer -- no.

MR. DESJARDINS: In other words, he still has time with this other board, municipal board, that he was named on by the government, eh?

MR. JOHNSON: Just like my honourable friend has time to do his work.

MR. DESJARDINS: But not .....by the government I can assure you.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the estimates and I wonder if we could have an estimate of the amount of money that our QC friend -- and I mean "Qualified Conservative" friend at Portage is getting. I mean we should get that information.

MR. JOHNSON: Nothing.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Is the Minister suggesting that he is not being paid for the job?

MR. JOHNSON: At the present time no financial discussions have occurred. We've asked him to do this job and he's consented to do it.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What expenses is he getting?

MR. JOHNSON: He gets his expenses for secretarial, stenography and whatever expenses are required, and \$5,000 has been placed aside in this budget.

MR. GUTTORMSON: How many members has he got on his staff?

MR. JOHNSON: At the present time I believe he has two.

MR. GUTTORMSON: When does he start drawing his pay, then?

MR. JOHNSON: I don't think there is any need to answer that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have a right to know what we're paying this man for the job.

MR. ROBLIN: .....haven't the right to tell the Minister he hasn't given you the facts. He said this man is not on salary, or on emoluments of any sort, that I'm aware of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: .....discuss very thoroughly. I wonder if we could make a little progress, now?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister then telling us that this survey is going to be conducted completely at no charge?

MR. JOHNSON: There will be considerable -- there will be expenses of collecting the material, the secretarial, stenography, but no firm arrangements, no discussions have taken place between ourselves and the commissioner re any indemnity for his work which he may carry out. A similar arrangement, I might point out, was made from time to time in the past. For example, in the Willard Commission, where we called in these people and asked them to do a survey for us -- on loan, of course, from the federal authorities. We paid a small honorarium to these people. This has been the spirit in which we've entered into this arrangement with the gentlemen concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a).

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I think you set the tempo here when you said about could we make a little progress. Now, I hesitate to bring this item up under the Minister's salary, but I can't see any other place where I could mention it. I want to report on the Seven Oaks Community School experiment, and last year I sat here with considerable pride, but being the cautious soul that I am, and knowing that it had just started, I was a little hesitant. But now after having one year as an experiment, I'd like to tell the House something about the Seven Oaks Community School project. I was particularly happy because I was one of the critics of the school board from 1946 on, asking them why they refused to use the schools to the full advantage. In other words, the taxpayers went to considerable expense to build these fine buildings and we thought they could be used more of the day.

The Seven Oaks School Division sent some of their members to Flint, Michigan, and the newspaper clipping that I didn't read or quote from last year, Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote a little bit from it now. Its big headline is: "Seven Oaks Scores the First with Community Schools. A Canadian 'first' will be starting later this month when the Seven Oaks School Division, representing 15 schools and over 5,000 students, begins a community schools project." This has now been in operation for one year -- this, by the way, was dated October 8, 1962, and I might say that this at the beginning of last year had started with an enrollment of 1,000. This year, 1964, there are 2,100 enrolled, and I am particularly proud to report that in the year just passed this was accomplished with no extra cost to the taxpayers of the community. This was done by the very efficient use of teachers who had spare periods and so on. But apparently you can learn anything from roller skating, sewing, typing, ceramics, conversational French, or whatever you like -- and I should mention physical fitness, because in this day and age I think it's becoming of more importance. But I thought that if I would let this go by this year without telling the House about it I would be very remiss in my duty. Last year, of course, it was a new thing and I think it took considerable courage and vision to start on a project like this, and I would invite any of the members who want to see this in operation to let us know, because we're particularly proud of it.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I don't like contentious matters, and I don't intend to say anything that could raise the type of an argument we had here a moment ago. I'm quite sure that the Honourable Minister of Education will agree with most of what I have to say, I

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd) ... think as good a place to start as any is stating what is admitted, that if we want our children to find employment in the future they must have at least a high school or secondary education, preferably with vocational training and university training added thereto. Now, it's interesting to note just how far we've come along to provide these opportunities. For the past four years, at least, we've heard about equality of opportunity. In fact, I think we fought an election in 1959 on the cry that it's time we had equality of opportunity in education in the Province of Manitoba. What I say tonight, Mr. Chairman, is directed towards our rural areas in Manitoba, not to the urban centres. Seeing that we've agreed that equality of opportunity, or opportunity, is the key note to the future of our children, it is interesting to note what has been said in the debate on these estimates for the Department of Education so far -- some of the criticism and some of the replies of the Honourable the Minister.

Now, we notice that we have two courses. We have the general course and what has been known as the matriculation course, or the university entrance course, and the Minister in answer to some question by the Honourable Member for Emerson, stated that we had the general course in 21 divisions, and last year 26 divisions; but what he omitted to say, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that we have more than one school or collegiate in any one of these divisions. When you say that you have 37 schools in 26 divisions, it looks pretty good. But when you consider the fact that we have divisions with as many as seven schools, then the progress is not quite as good as the Honourable Minister would intimate. Now, we've come a ways in supplying certain facets of equal opportunity. We supply transportation for our children to get them to school; we supply buildings for them to be in while they are in school and away from home. But there are two things that we're far from supplying. We're far from supplying the necessary facilities, the kind of schools that we need to give these children the kind of an education we want them to have, and we have not made too much progress, proportionately speaking, insofar as qualified teachers are concerned. Our permit teachers, proportionately speaking, in the rural areas of Manitoba, are about what they were four years ago -- proportionately speaking. Now, what has brought this on? Why do we find ourselves in the position where we've spent millions of dollars in the construction of schools throughout the province and we still haven't the physical facilities that we need. And I think the key note is in the reply that the Honourable Minister made in this House the other day, and I'll quote from what he said: "Of course it just points out so very clearly that the absolute needs in the wisdom of the division system, it points out the need for larger schools if these boys and girls are to get the opportunities they deserve and have a right to." The point is that his predecessor didn't see things that way, in spite of the fact that it was often pointed out to him that it was a mistake to construct four, five, six, and seven small schools in a division -- he kept on doing so. I don't think that he did so because he didn't realize that it was a mistake. I don't think that he did so because he didn't realize that this was wasting public funds. I think he did it because he thought it was politically expedient to do so. He wasn't treating the patient with the type of medication he knew was good for him, but he was giving the patient what the patient asked for, and that is where we made a big mistake. In the last four years -- and when the Honourable Minister says today that our demands for structures are coming levelled off, they're coming to a stage where the demand is not so great, may I say, Mr. Chairman, that it isn't in the too distant future when the demands will be greater than they ever were. What we will do with these small schools I don't know, but they certainly are not, in their present size, sufficient to give one of the courses the type of treatment it deserves, leave alone two. How many of our two, three room schools can give a general course? Have they the physical facilities for it? No. Or the university course? No. So we'll still have thousands of children in rural Manitoba who will be no further ahead than they were four years ago. In fact, if anything Mr. Chairman, they'll be worse off. The competition is getting keener day by day. The drop-out in the schools is enormous. Not only the drop-out, but the children that complete their collegiate training in some of these schools cannot get into university and they won't be able to get into vocational training, because they haven't had the basic studies that they need for either one of these courses. And I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister has a hard job ahead of him. I don't know how he's going to solve them now, because of what was done by his predecessor. He certainly didn't make his job any easier. If anything, he made it considerably harder.

Now, insofar as our qualified teachers are concerned. Suppose we did have the physical facilities, which we haven't. What are we doing to supply the necessary teachers that these

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd)... courses will demand? Are we going to be able to -- Interjection -- The Honourable the Attorney-General says "train them." Well, I hope that they train them a little better than he built the schools in the past, because if the same kind of a job is going to be made of training our teachers that he made of building schools in the province, then we certainly are not going to get anywheres. I don't envy the Minister his position at all. I know that when he left the former portfolio he probably thought that he was going to get into something softer. I'm afraid he's found it not to be a bed of roses.

Now, as to the question of taxes, I don't want to quote figures from my particular area, because they're just unbelievable, the increase in taxes -- school taxes. Most of my people do not mind the increase in taxes providing they're getting value for their money. And I'm quite sure that applies to most taxpayers in the Province of Manitoba. But when you see the kind of waste we've had, and you see that the opportunity for these children is not becoming equalized, that in spite of all this spending there are still thousands of children in the Province of Manitoba that do not have the equality of opportunity, then they begin to wonder whether it's worth it. And all I can say to the Honourable Minister is briefly this. I do wish him every success. I do wish him every success. I do hope that he keeps on looking at this problem as he has at the beginning of these estimates. He realizes what is needed. I hope he doesn't weaken like his predecessor did, and that he does his utmost to see that the recommendations of the Royal Commission are carried out, because after all is said and done, if those recommendations insofar as equality of opportunity are not carried out, then the spending of the billions that we've had in the last several years will be wasted. And I do hope that he doesn't take this as criticism for the purpose of criticism only, but what I have said happens to be factual and I hope that he does find solutions for these problems in the not too distant future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Chairman, before we pass the Minister's salary estimates I feel I should say a few words on the program, the four-point program that was advocated this afternoon by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

A week ago tonight we had a debate in this House on the matter of aid to parochial schools, and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and myself, we had our say, and in my opinion I think it would have been better if we had left it at that. At that time my feeling was that the decks had been cleared and we were now in a position to consider a resolution from the government setting up a committee to consider this plan of shared services and probably at the next session to deal with the report of this committee. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that this is what we should do; that we should proceed to set up this committee and to study this plan and to consider the recommendations that are made by this committee.

I would refer your attention, in the light of what was said by the Honourable Member this afternoon to this evening's Free Press, and the headline says: "Archbishop stamps Roblin plan unacceptable. Prelate says shared services plan will create causes of friction." Now, I don't think it's necessary to read any further in this article, but I believe that this plan has been prejudged before the committee has been set up, before this House has been made aware of the terms of reference for this committee, before the committee has had an opportunity to be constituted and to meet to hear public representations and to make a report to this House.

The Honourable Member forgets about the statement that appeared in the newspapers just a few days ago from the Presbytery of the United Church, which, on the basis of religion, represents the largest group in this province, and they were favourable to this plan that was advocated in the speech of the Premier. He also forgets the statements that have been made in the past few days by other Protestant groups that have been most interested in this matter from the time that the Royal Commission made its report a few years ago, and they haven't entirely rejected this plan.

I personally have some reservations, but I want to see this committee set up. I want to see the committee's terms of reference. I want to see representations made by the interested groups before this committee, and I want to see this committee's report. And this, Mr. Chairman, I think is what we all should do in the name of unity and to prevent the controversy and the open conflict which the Honourable Member predicted in his remarks this afternoon. He suggested that this plan should be suspended because it is objected to by the point of view which he advocates. This afternoon he said that the Roman Catholics of the province were disappointed.

(Mr. Groves, cont'd)... He said that prejudices will not disappear by pretending that they don't exist. He said that Manitoba might not be ready for this plan. He said that we aren't born bigots but that we transfer prejudice to bigots. He said that some groups -- all of their rights had been refused. He accused the -- I don't know who he accused, but he said words to the effect that the minority were being oppressed, and that the Premier's plan -- now I'm not quoting him because I don't remember the words, but he said in effect that this could be a declaration of war, and that it could be a breeding ground for prejudice. Mr. Chairman, I reject all of these statements because they're nonsense unless somebody is prepared to foment trouble and make them come true, and I, for one, want to declare right now that I have no intention of doing that. He said that we should have a motion granting fringe benefits, but he didn't describe what fringe benefits were. He said that all members, or that it had been agreed by all members that fringe benefits would be a good thing, or words to that effect. I reject that as well, Mr. Chairman, because this is something that is the specific purpose of this committee to decide. And does he not realize that the fringe benefits that he talks about, provided that they are taken within the structure of the public school, are benefits that those who advocate private schools might be expected to receive as a result of this committee's deliberation. In my opinion, to accept this would be premature and would be bowing out to only one group who has rejected out of hand the recommendations that were contained in the speech made by the Premier the other evening.

He also said there should be a grant for the education of the public, and in connection with this grant he suggested that such a grant used for the education of the public would avoid bitterness; that it would eradicate prejudice. He also expressed the opinion that this thing was going to blow sky-high -- and I'd like to ask him on what grounds he makes that statement.

He also appealed to the newspapers not to print bias. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the newspapers haven't printed any bias. They have repeated only the statements that were made by others. And as I said the other evening when I spoke, I refuse to sit back and see only one view on this matter expressed, and I intend each time that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface brings this subject up, where he makes statements with which I disagree, where he makes statements which I think are biased towards his own point of view, then I intend certainly to put forth the other point of view.

Now, I can just imagine, Mr. Chairman, in connection with this grant the fight that might take place between many, many groups in this province that might be interested in getting their hands on these grants in order to put their point of view before the public. Mr. Chairman, I believe, and I say this not bitterly, and without prejudice, that the Honourable Member is the only one really to this moment that has presented this problem from a biased point of view, and I say that because, in my opinion, his view is biased towards one minority group that at the moment is pushing for direct aid to parochial schools.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things, and I think one of the serious problems in this connection, is the fact that the Honourable Member refuses to believe that there are others that honestly, sincerely, without bias, without bigotry, and by conscience do not see this thing from his point of view. I have a conscience too, Mr. Chairman, and I have consulted it a lot lately in in this matter, and I honestly believe, by conscience, as the Honourable Member from St. Boniface does, that it is wrong to segregate children in the Province of Manitoba, or any place else for that matter, on the basis of religion. And I honestly believe, Mr. Chairman, by conscience, that the public school is the only school that at the present time is properly financed and equipped to prepare the children of Manitoba for the complicated life that they're going to have to get into when they leave school. And I honestly believe, Mr. Chairman, by conscience, that it is the job of the churches outside of school hours to prepare not only the children but the rest of us for the life hereafter. This is what my conscience tells me, Mr. Chairman, and I would like this house to respect what my conscience tells me as we have done these past two to three years for the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

He also states that he would like to have a referendum. Can the Honourable Member honestly and truthfully say that he would be bound by the decision of a referendum? Can he honestly and truthfully say that a referendum is going to settle this matter? If, in his opinion, he would be prepared to accept a referendum, or if he would be prepared to make the statement that in his opinion it would settle this matter once and for all, then, Mr. Chairman, a referendum has a lot of possibilities and might well be considered. Does he really think,

(Mr. Groves, cont'd)... Mr. Chairman, that a referendum would be a way of preventing this open warfare and prejudice that he referred to in his remarks this afternoon? Because, Mr. Chairman, if we did have a referendum this whole matter would be thrown into the area of public opinion; much of it, despite any grant for education, would be uninformed, or not too well-informed; and the results of such a referendum might well be that this province would be split on this matter even worse than it has been these past 60 or 70 years.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a matter for a referendum, this is a matter that we should keep out of politics. It's a matter that we should not have to discuss during an election campaign. This is a matter for we, the duly elected members of this Legislature, to decide. And I think that the Honourable Member, at least in this connection, is right, but I think that we should make this decision and I think we should make this decision at this session of the Legislature -- not only on the shared services program that has been advocated by the government but on the whole and much wider and more real question of public aid to parochial schools.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, only once we have come to a decision, or stood up and been counted -- if we want to use the words of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface -- on the over-all matter of public aid to parochial schools, can we then, in the absence of pressure and all the other matters that are going to enter into this one way or the other if we don't settle this, only then, once we have made this decision on the over-all question, can we then sit down without these pressures and consider the plan that is to be presented to this Legislature.

For three years, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from St. Boniface has spoken on this subject and we know what he wants -- and I don't quarrel with that, Mr. Chairman. If this is what he feels to be in the best interests of the Province of Manitoba he has the right to advocate it in this House. So we know what he wants. It says in his resolution that this House approves the principle of public aid to private and parochial schools where this can be done without injury to the public school system. He has threatened, at least for the past two years, to bring in this resolution. The only time that he has done so has been at this session, and at the time it was called out of order -- as we know it would be -- because there was mention of this subject in the Throne Speech.

At the time that the Honourable Member spoke when his resolution was before the House, the Premier of this province suggested to him that if he wanted to get this matter before the House that he could always amend the government resolution setting up the committee. He explained to him in detail, Mr. Chairman, and I think perhaps it bears repeating that when the government brings in a resolution to set up a committee to consider a plan of shared services, usually a resolution has a number of "whereases" and then the operative clause which in this case would set up the committee. It would be very simple at that time, Mr. Chairman, for the Honourable Member from St. Boniface to amend the government resolution in order to accomplish what he has been after these past few years, and that is to get a vote taken in this House on the matter which he deals with in his resolution. He appears, Mr. Chairman -- and his suggestions of this afternoon are really backwashing on this matter -- he appears to be settling for something less, something that in my opinion in the long run would not be acceptable to the point of view which he represents. He apparently does not wish this committee to meet and to bring in a report, and I would suggest to the Honourable Member, Mr. Chairman, that he should have the courage of his convictions and that he should amend the government resolution in order to get what he wants from this House. He seems to be convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt that we should all stand up and be counted on this issue. He doesn't want the government resolution. He has said that this afternoon. He has the opportunity on that resolution to get a vote on the over-all question. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared, or I might be prepared if the Honourable Member isn't, to prepare an amendment to the resolution and I will seriously consider doing it in order that we may have at this session of the House a vote on this over-all question of aid to parochial schools so that we can then go about the business of deciding on its merits the shared services plan that has been advocated. The Honourable Member states that he doesn't want any open war, yet he doesn't want this issue to become a fight in the field of perhaps uninformed public opinion, and yet in the next breath he states that he will run in the next provincial election against the Honourable Member from Radjsson on a platform of state aid to parochial schools. This, Mr. Chairman, certainly is inconsistent with what he said in the earlier part of his talk, because this is one way of really having a real "doozer" of a conflict on this issue -- interjection -- or any other issue -- absolutely.

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

So if we stand up and be counted, as he wants -- and this is what I think we should do -- we should let the committee do its work; we should -- all parties should support this resolution to set up the committee so that we can get from them an intelligent decision on what they feel should be done. The next election I think can take care of itself. Perhaps this will be an issue and perhaps it won't. I hope that it won't and I hope that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface wasn't serious when he suggested that he would endeavour to make it an issue by doing what he stated this afternoon. His offer to run -- I note this in passing -- was hedged with a lot of conditions that he makes it pretty difficult to accept. So perhaps the Honourable Member or the Honourable Leader of the NDP is safe at least for the next election. The majority in this province, Mr. Chairman, has the right to be heard. They have the right, now that this plan has been announced, to appear before this committee. They have the right to listen to other points of view that might appear before this committee. They have the right to pass judgment on this plan as considered in this committee's report, and I don't think that we can back down on that now. So we should get on with the business of the House, Mr. Chairman. We should stand up and be counted, get it over with and get down to the business of considering the plan that is before us. Now that this policy has been announced I -- and I say this sincerely -- I think that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface and I had better bury the hatchet and keep quiet until the resolution comes before the House, and after that until this committee has made its report. Mr. Chairman, I pledge myself and I hope that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface will be willing to do likewise -- to do just that.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I don't rise to start a debate again with the honourable defender of the majority. There's a few things, though, that I'd like to correct in some of the statements that he's made, set him straight on this. I think he mentioned that I predicted open warfare. It isn't true. I said that it could very well happen and I think that we should try to stop it before it started. Then he said that I -- quoted me as saying that Manitoba was not ready for this. I said the opposite. I said that Manitoba would never be more ready because the prejudice is transmitted to the children and it's always the same thing, and I think that we have the good example of the colour problem in the States where they said a hundred years ago, "Don't rock the boat" and they are saying the same thing now, and if somebody hadn't started doing something about it they'd wait another five or six hundred years.

Now, he wants to know what I mean by fringe benefits. I think that it is very clear. If not, I would tell him that I'm talking about the text books and the bus transportation in some isolated areas. New he mentioned that I said that everybody agrees on fringe benefits. I didn't say that. I said that most people, including the United Church, agreed that if the child has the right to the whole he has an equal right to a part. This is what I said. I took this from the text of the Honourable the First Minister.

Then he talks about the difficulty of bringing in grants, what would you do with a grant. I think it would be very simple that these could be divided equally between the people, the adherents of both camps, those favouring and those rejecting.

Then he talks about -- that I've been discussing this for three years. He's wrong. I've been talking about this for five years. He seemed to think that this was wrong. He had the chance to talk about it then and I took my responsibility seriously. This was important to me and I've talked about it for five years. I did threaten that I was going to bring a motion? I advised the members of this House that I would bring a motion. I did that not twice but once last year. Now I'm very satisfied to know that I finally have an ally. I think we agree. I think that then there won't be any prejudice and that we can listen to this committee. I'll go all out for this committee if they start from scratch and discuss all the principles, not say all these principles -- we've decided all your principles are wrong; everything you've been fighting for for 70 years are wrong; we are just going to give you this if you admit that; in other words we'll put the flag there, you can get this if you walk right across the flag. It's the same thing.

Now I was debating -- I wasn't sure if I was going to bring an amendment -- well now we've .... been asked -- apparently what I did this afternoon was very wrong, because I suggested that I thought I had a constructive plan; I gave it very sincerely; I can't see where anybody that is as sincere as the Honourable Member from St. Vital would be afraid of letting the people of Manitoba know what this is all about. I can't see where he should be afraid of that. Now I'm glad to see that he's on my side. He'll relieve me from the responsibility of fighting

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)... alone on this question of standing up and being counted and I'll follow his amendment with great interest and I might even vote for his amendment. Thanks very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I. Administration. Are we ready now to pass the first item?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would answer a question? It's concerning the present legislation in regards to the pre-schoolers. I'm referring to the kindergarten classes or kindergarten schools in the province. I understand that the City of Winnipeg and City of Brandon are carrying out kindergarten classes very efficiently and have been for years, and some of the other school divisions it appears that they are not and they are operating kindergarten classes in homes or halls sort of in a jerry type operation where parents have to pay for the lessons and for the instructions. I wonder if it is an equal opportunity for all as far as education in kindergarten classes are concerned.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, earlier this evening I thought it might be essential for the Provincial Government to also set up a senate so that we could send some of our ex-politicians to the senate, but since then the commotion has come down so I think think from here on we'll have free sailing again. I think one matter that has not been discussed here in the education estimates has to do with adult education. Personally, I feel that we are falling short in this aspect, and I don't think we are accomplishing what we set out to do. Certainly I can't see where the Department can be satisfied with the work that they are doing and accomplishing. I note on page 97 of the report a comment on evening classes, and they set out the purpose of our evening program was to assist employed workers to increase the skills and knowledge which they needed in their daily work, and they also list the number of people who attended during the various months, which range from 410 to 457. Now, I just wonder how many applications they received from the rural parts of the province in connection with evening classes and getting classes going. I think in rural Manitoba we are way behind and something should be done in this respect in the rural parts. Is it because we have a shortage of teachers for evening classes, or what is the reason for it? I also feel that they should be subsidized to a greater extent than what is being done at present.

I also feel that adult education should more or less be a challenge to the Department. At the present time we find that the University of Manitoba is also carrying on a program of adult education. We know that the facilities there are being used by various groups and conducting of short courses and what have you, so that some use is being made, but when I see the appropriation that we are making to the university of over \$6 million, I just wonder how much of that money do we spend on adult education outside of the university regular classes, and are we effective in our work and in our effort when we divide our work in this way. Then I would like to hear the Government explain their policy in connection with adult education. I feel that we have a right to know and certainly there should be a change so that we would be more effective, and in this way we would also be able to make greater use of the facilities of the larger schools that we have throughout Manitoba now that we have the divisions set up. Surely we could make those facilities that we now have and put them to greater use through evening classes and thereby give our people who would desire adult education to inform themselves and be better informed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister would be as well pleased if I preceded him because my unfinished business deals not with him but with the Attorney-General. This is in order, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, because the Honourable the Attorney-General during his remarks here called into question some of the practices of the former administration -- and if he's determined to do that, and you allow him to, Mr. Chairman, then I guess that I have the right to question him a bit on that matter. I want my friend the Honourable Attorney-General to tell us one single occasion where the previous administration appointed somebody from the front bench, or from their group to some political job. My honourable friend said, as I understood him, that that had been done, that appointments had been made right from the front bench. I'm a great believer in these things, that if we're going to talk about them at all, let's get them right out, let's get them right in the open. I don't recall it but I'd like to know who are they? What were the cases?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I was not calling it into question. In fact the theme of my argument was that it was a perfectly proper thing to be doing. I was suggesting to the Honourable Member for Selkirk that it was a wrong principle that he was espousing when he was suggesting that it was improper to have appointed Mr. Christianson. I'm not saying it's a wrong thing, and I make no criticism. In fact, if you will recall, Mr. Chairman, I said that these

(Mr. McLean, cont'd)... men had served with great distinction, great distinction, and I say that again and I hope that's clearly understood.

I might give some illustrations. A number of these gentlemen are now deceased and I don't know that I would wish to labour it. I think for example of the late W.R. Clubb, made Chairman of the Liquor Commission. I think of the late Donald MacKenzie, referred to not many days ago, who was appointed to an office of high standing; of Mr. Rhodes Smith, now Mr. Justice Rhodes Smith, who went to the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission and now a distinguished member of the Court of Queen's Bench. I think of the late Ewing McPherson, who went from this front bench to become the Chief Justice of Manitoba, a post in which he served with great distinction. Now, I cannot, I regret, call to mind or to memory all of the people who have been called in this fashion, but I hope it is clearly understood that I make no criticism of this practice. The point I was wanting to make was that it has been done. It is in effect part of our political and public tradition, and I would say that there's certainly nothing wrong with it. The point I wanted to make was that in the appointment of Mr. Christianson nothing was being done that hadn't been done many hundreds of times before and that I would look and anticipate that Mr. Christianson would be able to distinguish himself in his work despite his having served in this Chamber, just, indeed, as the others had done in their own time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend is quite wide of the facts in his presentation because the comparison was undoubtedly meant to be that here we have a government in office appointing one who has recently sat on their front bench and the implication I certainly took from my honourable friend's remarks was that the immediate predecessor of this government, the one that I headed, had done the same thing and had appointed somebody from their front bench -- and I ask anybody to read the remarks when they come out in Hansard and see if that isn't a clear implication. And not one of those gentlemen that my honourable friend speaks of, not one of them was appointed by the previous administration -- not one of them. And everyone of them, except one, was appointed, not by this government at all, but the Federal Government; and the one that was appointed by this government goes back two administrations before mine, and was appointed then only because Mr. Bracken in that day decided that because it was wartime, in 1940, that the government might be made to look more non-partisan, and he arranged a Coalition Government and Mr. Clubb left the front bench to make way for one of the Conservative members of the House that he was bringing into that place. Not a single one of the rest was appointed by the Manitoba Government, and that one was two administrations before the predecessor of this one. I just want to make it plain, Mr. Chairman, that the government that I headed did not do this kind of thing -- interjection --

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . I'm enquiring about the appointment of the Chairman of the Royal Commission on Liquor. This is surely a similar situation to the one of Mr. Christianson. The appointment of Mr. Bracken, which was widely approved, is a similar one to the appointment of Mr. Christianson.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . . by the time we appointed him, was from another political party. Mr. Bracken had so far fallen from grace by that time, that he had been the leader of my honourable friend's party in the meantime -- and we appointed him in spite of that.

MR. ROBLIN: That just shows your good judgment in that instance.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well it just shows a partisanship that doesn't exist today -- a lack of partisanship that doesn't exist today.

MR. ROBLIN: Now, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend, I think, in his calmer moments will recognize that that's not a very fair implication, nor is it a just one.

MR. CAMPBELL: It's completely justified. I'm simply saying that it's exactly the opposite of the situation that we have today. We appointed somebody from the opposite political party, Mr. Bracken. My honourable friends appoint somebody from their own political party -- and not very long off the front bench.

I had no intention of raising this point but when my honourable friend the Attorney-General brought it up and left a clear implication with this House that the preceding government had done this same sort of thing, I thought it needed a reply.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask some general questions still on the Minister's salary. I'm referring to some conferences that were held earlier this year in Ottawa -- or I should say in the fall of last year. This is a news clipping from the 14th of

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)... November, indicating at that time that the Canadian Teachers Federation had been to see the Prime Minister and had asked the Prime Minister, or had spoken to him about the severe imbalance in the quality of educational opportunity, because some provinces are far less developed than others economically. The Prime Minister had replied that he was very concerned about this, that there should be a national study, but since education is a provincial field, the provinces would have to take the initiative. Now subsequently, the Manitoba Teachers Society approached the Leader of the House, the Premier, and asked him to urge on the Dominion-Provincial Conference to set up a committee of this sort. This is a news clipping of the 25th of November, indicating that the Manitoba Teachers Society had spoken to the Premier of the Province, and I wonder if the Premier could report to the House on whether he acted upon this recommendation and what was the reaction, what is to be the likely results.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't mind dealing with this subject, Mr. Chairman. I must point out that in my view the constitution clearly leaves the questions of education within the realm of the Provincial Government, and I rather fancy that the federal Prime Minister was perfectly justified in suggesting that if there was a need for a conference in education that the provinces ought to take some interest in it.

It happens that various factors, aspects of education, are from time to time discussed by the premiers at their annual meeting, and I have been informed that the Premier of Alberta intends to raise this general matter of education -- one aspect of this matter of education with us in due course, and we fully expect to take our part in those discussions.

I report that I made no such request to the Federal-Provincial Conference for the reasons stated, but we are more than willing to co-operate with the other provinces in investigating any matter of mutual interest with respect to education, and I fully expect this will be on the agenda of our next premiers' meeting.

MR. MOLGAT: So the Premier did not act upon the request of the Teachers Society?

MR. ROBLIN: I've given the answer.

MR. MOLGAT: The answer's no. I'd like to ask another question of the Minister. Who is allowed to enter school buildings in the Province of Manitoba without the authority of the school board? Can anyone go in? Can any government official, or can anyone else proceed to go in, or do they have to obtain the permission of the school board concerned? Or what is the rule in this regard?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, taking the Leader of the Opposition's last question first, I just happened to be reading the Act one day -- and I stand to be corrected tomorrow if need be -- but as I understood it, the Act states: the minister, the deputy minister, any school inspector, any clergyman and a school trustee can walk into a school, go into a classroom -- interjection -- MLA's -- well I think that would probably cover the waterfront.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to answer a few questions briefly. The splendid program mentioned by the Member from Seven Oaks in the community evening program, which is operative in that district, I found to be a very wonderful thing. I had an opportunity to make a tour of that with a couple of school division trustees, and it is part of the answer to the Honourable Member from Rhineland where this community school effort, with the use of the schools in the evenings for sewing, gymnastics, all sorts of skills for the children. There are 2,100 adults using the schools in the evening -- adults and senior children -- and that's a very splendid program.

With respect to adult education, I would say that in the university estimates there are here -- about \$76,000 of the university's appropriation is an extension in adult education. I would also point out that another example is the program in your annual report on Page 97, evening classes the Manitoba Institute of Technology runs around 400-447 people per month. And of course the school districts and divisions can give grants for evening classes along the lines as practiced in Seven Oaks school division. They get grants. There are of course the correspondence courses that are grafted onto this. These are some of the examples of the actual expenditures in adult education. I can get some more examples if the honourable member would like them, but I think by perusing the annual report he'll see examples of them. Other than the grants to school divisions and school districts the university spends the amounts of money that are mentioned.

With respect to the member from Ethelbert Plains, I just had some figures in my text

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli) cont'd)... here that I just knew would make him extremely happy, and I appreciated his remarks very much because I think all of us in Manitoba are coming to realize the advantages of larger schools, and I know that all of us in this House are hoping for the best for the children. However, my honourable colleague, the present Attorney-General, I think can take some satisfaction from the fact that in this past year at the present time in the winter training school for teachers there are more teachers training this winter than at any time I believe in the department's history, 894, made up of 587 folks at the Manitoba Teachers College, 125 at Brandon College, and in the Faculty of Education at Brandon 15, the Faculty of Education University 167. I think we can all be pleased with those figures. Other interesting figures are between '57 -'58 when there were 30,647 high school students in Manitoba. Today there are 51,672. The holding power of the school system has increased from 20 to 46 percent in five years. The one-room high schools have gone down from 151 to 36, two-room from 53 to 9, three-room high schools from 47 to 22. Collegiate institutes have increased from 66 to 153. I think these figures are quite impressive, despite the comments from time to time.

With respect to the kindergarten, I will have to take that particular question under advisement from the Honourable Member from Assiniboia and try and report to him a little later. Also, if there are any actual expenditures I can point out with respect to evening and adult education classes, I will try and do that also, but I think that brings me up-to-date.

.....Continued on next page.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, what steps is the government taking to assure the Province that there won't be a teacher shortage next year with regard to high schools. Next year, as I understand it, a number of students who might have gone on to university from Grade 11 will be taking Grade 12 because of a change, and there is some concern that this might cause a teacher shortage in the province as a result of the increased number of Grade 12 students, and I'm also interested in knowing from the Minister why the number of permit teachers has increased substantially in the province. At the last session the former Minister gave us every assurance that he was trying to reduce the number. This year we have 200 permit teachers whereas the year before we had 160. This certainly isn't a reduction.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . . . planning and vigour of the department and the former Minister resulted, as I just said, in the largest Teachers College enrolment in the history of the province, despite an increase of 31 percent for the fantastic rise in the -- I'm not sure if that's the figure -- in our school population or the even larger figures.

With respect to the percentages of actual enrolment of children in the schools, despite these great rises, I understand that -- the Department advised me it appears that the supply of elementary is likely to be adequate in the coming year of '64 - '65. The other indication I can give the Honourable Member is that whereas there has been roughly a 12 percent increase per year in university enrolment, it will be down to about 5 percent this year because of the children having a compulsory Grade 12. So, it hasn't got the impact that one would think. Of course, the battle continues, as it does in other jurisdictions across the country, to raise the standard of teachers, as I understand it. As you know, it has been necessary to issue elementary permits in the past year. The cause was due to the standard of admission to Teachers College was raised to complete Grade 12 in the fall of '62, and this was associated with a decline of 102 in enrolment. This of course was reversed again in the fall of '63 when the enrolment increased to 733, 31 percent higher than for the previous year. As a result of this they hope there will be enough elementary teachers. There is a slight increase in secondary permit teachers. However, as I've pointed out earlier, with the present high enrolment in the Faculty of Education they're hoping to greatly reduce the number of permit teachers next year. But this hiatus in the increase in qualifications has caused this temporary imbalance, but you can see from the figures I've given you that the situation should improve drastically from here in.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister made this prediction that the number of permit teachers would be reduced, surely he was aware of this situation that the Minister speaks of. That's a big increase when you jump from 160 to 200 in one year.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I just gave you the facts.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister has taken my first question under advisement. I would like to ask a further question. Why was the request of the St. James school board to establish kindergarten classes turned down last fall sometime?

MR. JOHNSON: I take it under advisement.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman I'm advised there was a teacher from Great Britain that applied for a teaching job at the Department of Education, and when he submitted his application he said he had six years of experience. Through some error in the department they credited him with 10 years of experience and of course he got -- the Winnipeg division was compelled to set his pay schedule on the basis of 10 years experience. Then they found out later that he only had six years experience and when the Winnipeg School Division brought this to the attention of the government and wished to reduce his salary the teacher naturally opposed it as did the Teachers' Society. And I am told that between the School Division and the government it cost them an additional \$1,000.00 a year. I'm just wondering how often does this happen in the course of a year that these mistakes are made?

MR. JOHNSON: I understand that -- I don't know anything about this case, but I'll look into it. I imagine it must be extremely rare that a thing like this would happen but I will get the particulars. I don't know of the case at all.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I can give the name of the teacher. His name was publicized so I don't suppose there is any harm in mentioning it here. His name was Peter Press.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, if it's not convenient for the Minister I will submit an Order for a Return, but if he has the information available I would appreciate it. I would like to know the failure rate in Grades 11 and 12 history and mathematics. I would like that failure

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . rate given in two ways: (a) as the final rate, and (b) on the basis of the raw score. In other words, I would like the failure rate for those two subjects and those two grades given (a) as it comes out upon marking, and (b) after all final adjustments are made and the scores sent out to the pupils. For 1961 and 1963, or any two-year period.

MR. JOHNSON: What subjects?

MR. SCHREYER: History and mathematics. If it's not convenient I'll submit an Order for a Return.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the papers failed in mathematics: the number of papers 7,638 -- 34.9% failed in '61; in '62 8,355 papers -- 36.1 failed; 1963, 9,615 papers and 19.8 failed. Social studies, would that be the other subject? In 1961 8,078 papers, 31.2% failed; in '62 8,612 papers 31.4 failed; 1963 9,324 papers and 31.7% failed. Pardon me -- those are in Grade 11. Did you want Grade 12 too?

MR. SCHREYER: I think that I will submit the Order in any case but . . .

MR. JOHNSON: All right.

MR. SCHREYER: Could the Minister tell me if two sets of figures are kept? I take it these are the final marks, after adjustment. What about before adjustment? In other words, the raw percentage.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I don't know anything about that. These are the only figures that I have that I'm aware of, but I'll check into the Honourable Member's question.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I had asked the Minister earlier about who was allowed in schools without the authority of the school board, and the reason I was asking is because I've had some complaints in this regard, partly about people who go in and partly about questionnaires. Now the particular questionnaire that was brought to my attention was one sent to school children apparently, by one of the groups involved in alcohol education in the province. Now, there are so many of these groups, I don't know which one it is, but I've had complaints that these questionnaires were sent out, asking some very personal questions about the parents of the children, and I want to know whether the Department of Education has authorized these questionnaires, and whether the Minister could supply the House with this information and the authority granted for it.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I understand the former Minister of Education, my colleague the first Attorney-General, tells me that in this particular instance there was no permission and these people were stopped. I may share with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that this came up some years ago when the Member for Lakeside was the First Minister and another minister occupied this seat, and he did, on occasion, to groups in the voluntary field, give a letter of authority or a letter introducing the person to the person concerned which he could take to the principal and it was up to him to decide whether he would let the person in the school. I don't know. I could find out what the practice has been with respect to the particular organization he's referring to, but my understanding was that the most the department has done at any time in the past with respect to these associations is, if this was in receipt of the Department of Education grant, was they gave them, the people, a letter identifying them to the principal of the school. But I understand in the particular case that my honourable friend mentions this was stopped. However, I will get a more complete answer at a later date.

MR. MOLGAT: So, the final decision as to who goes in the school is certainly up to the local school board, then, insofar as the Act, as the Minister explained to me, lays down the people who are allowed in automatically -- beyond that, the Minister can give a letter of introduction, but the decision must be made by the school board.

MR. JOHNSON: I think that's right, but I would like to be more . . .

MR. MOLGAT: And the particular questionnaire in point had not been approved by the Department of Education, or had been approved?

MR. JOHNSON: I don't know of the questionnaire, but I don't know of any questionnaire that has been approved by the Minister. I may be in error. If I am, I'll report same.

MR. MOLGAT: Fine. I have asked some questions Mr. Chairman, yesterday about -- Friday -- about the Island Lake School. Could the Minister indicate to me whether the school is still operating, and the number of students attending the provincial government school there?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, the school is still operating. Unfortunately, I had a complete file on it out, but I didn't bring it with me. I'll be glad to report on this again. The school is still

(Mr. Johnson, Cont'd). . . . operating.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a) (b) (c) (d) passed. Resolution 24 passed. Item 2 --Education Grants. (a) School Grants.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, on the subject of school grants, during the last session, our group asked the government to consider the speeding up of payments of school grants. I don't think this was done. I think the resolution was turned down at the time, and it still hasn't been done. I understand that this involves a great sum, in the neighborhood of 15 million annually that the school districts are expected to carry until the grants are paid, and the school districts therefore are obliged to borrow money which costs them, and I don't think that they like that too much. Grants for January, for instance, are paid in November. Grants for September are paid in March. And that is in both elementary and the secondary schools. I would suggest the speeding up of payments, say, grants be paid at least quarterly. This involves an average waiting period of six months. I think the grants should be sped up and paid at least quarterly. Has the Minister got anything to suggest to us, or any explanation of this? Is there a change of policy?

MR. JOHNSON: Grants are now paid in advance.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could tell us, in reference to the University of Manitoba general grant, how much of this grant . . . . . Are you not dealing under Resolution No. 25?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 2 (a). Item, University of Manitoba, is Item 2 (c).

MR. SMERCHANSKI: You're now dealing with the Resolution No. 25 as such?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, this is an interesting point. When you're on an item, Resolution No. 25, isn't it permissible to ask any question under that number? . . . . . No, but you're still dealing with Item No. 25.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (a), School Grants, passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under the general item, I would like to ask the Minister about the specifications on school buses. It is my understanding that the specifications in Manitoba are higher than in any other province, and I'm told that some of them are needlessly so, that they don't really add to the safety factors. For example, I'm told that there must be a different speed axle in buses with larger carrying capacity, and so on. And this has been pointed out to me as an item adding to the cost of school buses in the Province of Manitoba without adding anything to the safety of the vehicles. I wonder if the Minister could explain to me if this is so and why it is that we are different from the other provinces, and should we not arrive at a standardization so that we could keep the costs in line?

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I'm glad the Honourable Member brought this thing up with respect to school buses. The department has been very careful with respect to The Public Schools Act in drawing to the attention of the various divisions and districts, through the medium of the Department of Education bulletin, the various requirements and regulations concerning school buses, and I think that from time to time -- I don't think we can be too careful with respect to the maintenance, and rules and regulations with respect to these buses, because of the fear of the responsibility, I think, of the department and the administration feel in paying their share of bus grants. Certainly, we can't -- I don't specifically know of any unreasonable standard that is required. I think that through the Department of Public Works have a man inspecting these buses on a routine basis. A complete inspection was done in '61 and it was repeated again this spring, and I have on file in one of my books here, if I can find it, the breakdown of the letter from the Department of Public Works, outlining a very complete inspection that was made again this year, because so many buses have been replaced, new drivers had come on, they're all driver tested, the machinery's tested, and I have not heard any reference to a statement that we might be too fussy. I don't think we can be too fussy in our harsh winters and the long distances that some of our buses have to travel with such precious cargoes, but I would draw to the attention of the committee that I have three bulletins here of October, this year and November, each outlining in detail some of the regulations and drawing to the attention of the school divisions and boards The Highway Traffic Act, the minimum standards that the Department of Public Works, our advisors feel are essential, and excerpts here again -- every division is sent excerpts from The Highway Traffic Act,

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . pointing out that certain equipment has to be -- lights, etc., have to be handled in a proper fashion. And safety rules for the operation of buses are very detailed and sent out to everyone, and the department advise me they feel this is absolutely essential to avoid any criticism whatsoever that we're not doing the very best, and Mr. Del Begio and Mr. Duggala who is the man seconded to us, are riding herd on all these buses for defects and routine checks and driver testing. However, if there's any indication that we are asking for unreasonable standards, I certainly will check with the department concerned.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, certainly none of us would want to see any safety standards dropped if they are for safety reasons. The complaint that was brought to me is that we were different in this regard from the other provinces. It seems to me that all the way down the line, whether it be on text books or curriculum or safety standards for buses, that we should at least try and work together with the provinces here in the west. I quite realize that it would be difficult to attain uniformity across Canada. It will be a long time before we get this, but surely with Saskatchewan and Alberta, provinces having the same type of problems as we have, the same climatic conditions, that in a number of cases we can get together with them and arrive at a standard satisfactory to the three of us, and presumably have more efficiency and lower costs. I wonder if this has been checked with the Province of Saskatchewan, and Alberta. Has the Minister or his department got together with them to arrive at standards?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the provinces have a very close working relationship in this regard, but I can check it again. However, I have just found -- I have a very complete report on file in response to my recent inquiries in regard to our buses in general, but with respect to the -- other than the fact that there is a close liaison between the other provinces, I don't know anything outstanding, but I will certainly take it under advisement.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of getting up last year on this subject that I am about to mention to you and that is, I wondered if the Minister would take under advisement the extending of grants to high school bands throughout Manitoba. I say this in all sincerity, by the fact that we did have a problem in Swan River. I'm not going to labour the notoriety of that band -- there are 52 members of them, and it has been quite an expensive project. It's cost something in the neighbourhood of \$3,000 for uniforms and some \$10,000 for instruments. They have travelled a good deal and I like to feel that they have brought some credit to the Province of Manitoba. I'm sure there are other high school bands in the same category. I've watched this band grow with interest, and I feel that it's done a great job for the community. It's kept the children off the street, it's given them an interest, and they've done a grand job all round. The mounted police have taken an interest in the band and taught them precision drill, and it has been well received everywhere. We did arrive at the situation where our bandmaster -- it's an all time job with him I should say, and he made his living from tuition fees from the various band members and also the Band Booster Club gave him a grant each month. It came to the stage where the town had to step in and they did, and the town council, only a few weeks ago, for the first time, made a grant of some \$1,500 toward keeping that bandmaster in Swan River. The situation has arrived now where they require new uniforms; prices have been asked for and it's going to cost the community something in the neighbourhood of \$3,500. I feel that something might be done in this respect, not only for Swan River, but other communities that have established bands. It is done quite extensively in the United States, and I think it should be fostered and encouraged. Somehow or other I feel that these bandmasters that do take an interest are good men, do a good job, there is a place for them in a community such as ours and elsewhere, and that if a grant could be forthcoming I can assure you it would assist the community at large, and would help to keep something that is developed into a community effort that has been well worthwhile, and should be kept up. If the Minister would give consideration to that, not only myself but the community I represent and probably other communities, would appreciate the interest of the government in the youth in this regard.

MR. TANCHAK: Further to the question I asked about grants. The Minister indicated that the grants were now being paid in advance. The government must have really acted fast on our resolution last year, but somehow I'm not too clear on that answer. When did this change of policy occur?

MR. JOHNSON: I can't find the exact spot in the annual report which I was looking at last evening, but the grants I believe, are paid on advance, that is -- and I stand to be corrected but this was my understanding -- that since the new grant structure came in they're paid on as soon as received now and there is a portion paid on advance. Now in the annual report here, and I can't find the spot, but it shows that with respect to the payments that have been made up until this report is compiled for example, we're pretty well on balance. We can't pay accounts we haven't received, but they were pretty well up-to-date in the last check I made on this report, and I stand to be corrected, I'll look it up further but this was the information I had.

MR. TANCHAK: My information is that they're not being -- of course I accept what the Minister has to say but my information is that it isn't right. Of course the source of the information may be wrong. I would like the Minister to clarify that later, if possible.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, the Minister should be able to tell us whether there has been a change in this regard or does it remain the same, that is the grant holdbacks? I know the former Minister of Education will recall a delegation from the Beautiful Plains school division that met with him a year ago, I believe, this month, on this very subject matter, in which it was pointed out that it appeared that the school divisions were borrowing agencies for the province. Now a sum of \$15 million was mentioned by one member here tonight as being the amount of money that is presently borrowed by the total school divisions in the province. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that there either is or is not a change in the policy of the government in regard to these grants. Now on the subject of grants, I wrote a letter to the department, a pretty short one, this one. It won't take long to read it if you want it read, Mr. Chairman. But I asked a very simple question of the government -- are there grants available to students wanting to take -- grants and / or bursaries -- taking training at MIT or MTI, and would they send me regulations and so on and so forth. I couldn't seem to get the information that I wanted from a school inspector. I finally received a very short letter and regulations under The Regulations Act from the Gazette of September 28th, 1963. And the letter simply states that they hope that I'll be able to interpret the regulations. Well, I can't do it, I'm sorry to say. The loans for technological training, and it all seems to be left entirely in the hands of the Minister. 98 -- These are the regulations -- 98 -- Loans known as and entitled government loans for technological training are hereby established. So they've set them up, that's 98. 99 -- A government loan for technological training may be made to a student enrolled in a course designated by the Minister as a technological course and taken in any vocational school designated by him -- I guess that's the Minister -- or with his approval, in any other institution, and it goes on and on and on and it says that even the application for the loans can be established by the Minister -- the amount of the loan can be established by the Minister and so on and so forth. I think it would be good, Mr. Chairman, for the records, to have the Minister outline in pretty definite details what is available, because we have a multi-million dollar institution out in the west end of Winnipeg now, which I don't mind saying I think should have been built in rural Manitoba, preferably in Neepawa or Gladstone, but anyway I would appreciate it if the Minister would give us some more information on the loans that are available.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll have to -- I don't know if I can give the Honourable Member from Neepawa enough detail on this. He probably wants a lot more, from the question he asked. I'll be prepared to get the necessary information. In technical education last year there were 196 applications and \$23,305 was given out in bursaries to technical students. I'll have to however, I'm afraid, pull this together with respect to the total amount of loans given. These appropriations are split up in various sections of my folder here.

MR. SHOEMAKER: . . . . . I appreciate the remarks of my honourable friend but in addition to the information that he intends to give me, I would like to know what the qualifications are, and the maximum loan available, and so on. Because it does -- I don't think -- I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that I would not want to be the Minister that would have to rule on every application that is sent in for a loan and it looks like the -- if I interpret the regulations correctly here, everything seems to rest entirely with the Minister, whether he'll get a loan or whether he won't, the size of, and so on.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Minister a question about grants. I understand that there are no grants paid at the present time in regard to supervisory

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.) . . . positions, that the grants are paid on a basis of ratio of 1 to 15 for ungraded classes, 1 to 30 for elementary, and 1 to 25 for high school classes. Now, because there are no grants paid to these supervisory positions, the tendency is to crowd. In other words, school boards who had the tendency to place more pupils in these classes in order to cover the salaries of these teachers in supervisory positions. Now, in the school division that I am familiar with, there are a lot of supervisory positions. But I'm thinking of the rural areas now, where they have few, if any, supervisors, or superintendents I guess I should be saying. There's no incentive for school boards to appoint people to these supervisory positions, and I can understand that to have a full grant for these teachers might lead school boards to have too many, but I would think that there should be some incentive grant. Some portion of the salaries of these supervisors should be paid to encourage school districts to hire supervisors, because after all, good supervision is the key to any good organization and I would think the time is ripe now where the government should be considering some type of incentive grant to school boards in order to acquire teachers in a supervisory position.

MR. JOHNSON: I believe that at the moment the grants are paid for supervisory staff as mentioned, but on the basis of the number of teachers, are they not? But I'll look into it further.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) general grants passed

MR. CHERNIACK: On (b), general grants, under student aid which was (1), I would like the Minister to tell us how much was actually expended and whether the bursaries are still limited to three or five hundred dollars each, and whether there is any change made in relation to the method in which the loans or bursaries are being made by the government in this year. And one other question -- has there been any change in the regulation which stipulates that a bursary shall be given to a Canadian citizen or British subject, unless the Minister rules otherwise?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, in the matter of bursaries and loans, can the Minister tell us if any amount was left unused in the last year, and if so, how much?

MR. JOHNSON: I don't think I can answer the -- I don't know of any change in regulation concerning a British subject unless the Minister rules otherwise, but I can take that under advisement. The vote here of \$350,000 -- last year a total of \$200,000 was appropriated to bursaries and scholarships; \$186,000 was actually spent. We actually awarded more than \$200,000 in bursaries and scholarships, but in some cases students who were awarded bursaries were unable to attend university, and in other cases students who had received the first half of the bursary in the fall term didn't receive the other half because their work wasn't up to a certain standard. Under the present system, of course, most bursaries are outright gifts, but some are in the first instance loans which may be cancelled if the recipient returns to the service of the province, or if any organization is supported in whole or in part by provincial grants.

Then with respect to loans, I'll have to get the -- there was a total of bursaries in all fields -- this was in all fields -- just a moment here. I'm sorry, the correct figure for this year is \$224,000 that was awarded, \$11,000 in scholarships and medals. I don't know where my loans are. Oh yes in general, loans to university students have not exceeded \$300.00, loans to Teachers College go as high as \$450.00, and then of course, the nurses' loans as in the past. We have been examining for some time, and I have under advisement at the moment, revision of the bursary and loan program, with a plan to extend more generous terms of -- amounts of money if the student needed it, and we were in the process of examining this loan thing when we heard of the legislation in Ottawa where the federal government is proposing some student loans to be made from the federal level. When we hear more about that I think we'll be in a position to examine the loan system.

Now, the number of loans awarded, Teachers College loans totalled 124 for a total of \$33,000; university loans, there were 160 this -- that's 62-63 -- for \$42,000; and the 12-week Faculty of Summer School loans, 29 for \$42.50; university loans of 154 for \$43,170; Teachers College loans, 135 for \$38,585; 12-week Faculty of Education summer school loans, 21 for \$3,300; and Technological Training loans of five approved to February 3/64 of \$1,450.00. These are the bursaries and loans that I have in this particular appropriation. We are looking at bursaries -- have been looking at this for some time -- and loans, and I think possibly

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . . deserving students -- in general terms which I can't reveal the details of what we actually hoped to share with the committee by this time, but we would like to see what the federal legislation is going to provide. Loans to university students are made by the Minister, of course, on recommendation of the representatives of the various faculties or the schools at the university, colleges and some departmental officials, and again I say, university loans have not, as I understand, exceeded 300, and Teachers College go as high as 450. Quite outside the ambit of these particular loans are those bursaries given to social workers through the welfare appropriation, and those bursaries and loans given to -- or bursaries, rather -- given to medical and dental students to the David A. Stewart and E. W. Montgomery funds. That's quite apart from anything I have mentioned here.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I realize it's awkward to probe after detailed statistics and data in regard to many items on these estimates, and I don't want to plague the Minister with any more requests for detailed data, but I want to ask the Minister to make it a point to look at this particular area of student aid with particular concern, because it strikes me as something being amiss here, because we are allocating no more this year than we did last year, and yet it is a fact that student enrollment at the university is surging, and that's about the only way one can put it. So, if in fact in previous years a good deal that was allocated was left unexpended, then there was some excuse; but on the other hand, perhaps, if there was a good deal left unexpended, it's because our program of letting students know the availability was falling short of doing a job. In other provinces, and speaking now in terms of proportionate population, and so on -- in other provinces, per 1,000 population and so on, the amount that is allocated for student aid is quite a bit higher. Now, without being too specific and getting down into statistics again I suggest to the Minister that somewhere here there is something amiss and I would hope that in the next 12-month period he will have occasion and the opportunity to look at this with a magnifying glass.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask you this. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead suggests that there is no increase which he thinks shows that there is something amiss. I am missing now a corresponding entry for (b) (4) which appeared last year under Education Loan Fund, \$150,000, so that unless I misread these estimates or unless there has been a reclassification of them, there seems to be a reduction from what was set aside last year in that there is that item that I don't see that appeared last year under (b) (4). Now it may well be that it's not needed because this may be a revolving loan fund and there might be a very nice substantial amount in some kitty somewhere waiting to be used; and that is the reason why I ask the Minister if there was any change in the procedure, because we learnt that the way these loans were handled, was that a loan was made to a student and had to be repaid after the following summer, which really didn't mean much of a loan -- it was a pretty temporary sort of a thing -- and I'm pleased to hear from the Honourable Minister that they're looking at the question. I must only inform the Honourable Minister that his predecessor told us eleven months ago that he was not happy with this arrangement, that he, too, was looking at it, and even suggested that they are working on a complete revision which, if we are successful, we may have before the legislature next year. It would appear that the department was not successful in that there is no indication that there will be anything before us in connection with this manner of handling loans and bursaries, so I would like to urge the Honourable Minister to look into this question quickly enough and with enough enterprise to hopefully bring something forward before the session is over if he needs legislative approval for it, because the students are not waiting; they are either going ahead or they are not attending university for financial reasons, and loans of this type should be made as quickly as possible to help them in their studies.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . . point out, I am finding my way a little better in the book here now. There's no funny business here; we're just combining the former \$200,000 with the \$150,000 we had for loans and calling the whole thing Student Aid, and they have been combined this year as the estimates show. I should say that last year you voted \$350,000, and there's another -- in addition to that there's a total of \$62,000 in loans that show up in other appropriations. They include the technical teacher training bursaries of \$15,000, the technical education bursaries of \$15,000, and the Institute of Technology bursaries of \$20,000, plus the \$12,000 which we get through university bursaries. Now, of all these monies I have outlined that not quite all of this was spent in the last year; that we have been lumping this together mainly to

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . continue with the present bursary -- hoping to bring in an enhanced bursary and loan program. As I say, our details have not quite been finalized, but we would like to see what the federal authorities have in mind as announced in their Speech from the Throne, but I think I could indicate to the committee in general terms, it'll take the form of more generous amounts of money being made available with easier repayment schedules.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the remarks of the Minister are very interesting, particularly his last remarks, and I think it's indicative of the government opposite, for once again they're waiting for the government in Ottawa -- seeing as they did announce in their Throne Speech down there to set up student loans. Now, I would like -- I have been listening with great interest to the question of student loans, and it appears to me that -- I can appreciate it because after all our honourable friend has just got into the harness of education. He may not have all of the answers insofar as education is concerned. Don't expect him to have, at this time, but I would like to hear from my honourable friend, say, a full and detailed report as to the number of loans that were requested, that is student loans that were requested for university training, the number that were granted, and the amount. I can't find that in the report, but I would like to just read an excerpt from the speech of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer of the Province of Saskatchewan again, our sister province to the west of us, wherein there they have recognized fully the desirability -- indeed, Mr. Chairman, the necessity -- of a comprehensive student loan program. And the minister there, in reference to student loans, on page 21 of the budget address in Saskatchewan, says this: "In addition to providing educational facilities, we must eliminate the possibility that some students may be deprived of an education because of the lack of funds. It is for this reason that I have already stated you will be asked to vote \$2 million to increase the student aid fund up to a permanent endowment of \$5 million."

Now, I would imagine by this, Mr. Chairman, what they mean is that they have set up a student loan fund of \$5 million now, from which possibly the interest is used annually on a loan basis. I think this is the way it would operate. I did have an opportunity a year or two ago of having a full report. I referred it to the then Minister of Education and he was going to look into the matter and bring forth a report. I'm still awaiting that. I earnestly suggest to my honourable friend the present Minister of Education that he look into this whole matter of student loans, particularly at the university level, because I'm convinced that we are not doing sufficient here in the Province of Manitoba in this regard, and in the past I've had a considerable number of young men and women, not only in my constituency but others as well, who have asked me to intercede with the authorities here for a reconsideration of their applications for loans. On a number of occasions they have told me that without loans it will simply be impossible for them to continue their education. Now, I don't know exactly the basis on which the committee works. I do know that they have to take into consideration the financial circumstances of the families, but as they were outlined to me, in some instances at least, it did indicate that here were areas in some cases where further consideration, and if the money had been available -- and I think this is the main point, Mr. Chairman -- that if the money had been available or made available to the committee who sits on bursaries and scholarships and loans, as a result of governmental action in the estimates so that there was a greater amount of money available to the committee that makes the award, then possibly more of our younger students would have been able to pursue their advancement in education. . . . . want to ask the Minister, if he will give us the information as to the number of loans that were made, the amounts, the total -- I can't see it in your report -- up until March 31st. I don't want it tonight. I can get it again.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, earlier on we were informed on the bursaries and scholarships that were given out last year. When these scholarships or bursaries are won by students, how long are they valid? Should they decide not to take university after a year or two are they still valid and can they still get them at that time? Then, also, I would like to point out that actually we're spending less in education grants this year than last year. Last year we spent 26 percent of our budget in education grants. This year it's down to 24.8 percent so actually we're spending less, percentagewise. The Honourable the Leader of the NDP referred to Saskatchewan and if I might refer to B. C., I know that the teachers in B. C. get much higher salaries than the teachers in Manitoba do. I think there is almost a differential of an average of \$1,000.

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) . . . . Therefore, I would like to know from the Minister, have they considered or are they contemplating revising the salary grant scale that is in effect in Manitoba, probably in a year or so?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, no change in policy of the grants, and the percentage is probably affected by the vast increase in the Technical Vocational . . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Before we leave the matter of the bursaries, I wonder if the Minister could give us the requirements from a person applying for a bursary. My understanding is that on the forms we ask, for example, what property is owned by the parents so's to establish whether they are in need or not, but we do not ask, for example, if the parents own any stocks or any bonds, or money in the bank, and so on. Now, if it's based on need what is the policy of the department in this regard? Surely it isn't simply whether you own a house or whether you don't. How is need established and what checking does the government do?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to supply the member with a copy of the regulations and application form for Manitoba Government bursaries, scholarships, prizes, and loans. As I understand it, when a person applies for a bursary, he makes out an application here giving this -- it merely says with respect to his personal assets: married, the amount the wife or husband can contribute, the estimated amount the applicant can contribute from employment, and the total resources available. This is really all that is asked of a bursary applicant. The parent or guardian in these cases must give the assessed value of real estate owned by the person asking for the loan. This is quite a detailed statement, but on balance I think that any student who shows -- who in the opinion of the committee have need -- and the committee is made up of the faculty representatives -- if they feel he -- the basis of need and satisfactory progress he gets a bursary. It isn't on scholarship so much as on progress plus need. In addition to the bursary, of course, there are the loans. Now it might be better to just pass the copy on to the Honourable Member. It would assist him in asking further questions. I don't know if this may be what he wants. Would you give this to the Leader of the Opposition? These are available to the Honourable Members on request.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) (1) passed? (2) passed? (3) . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I note that this is up a considerable amount of money, about a quarter of a million dollars. In view of the oft-made statements opposite of the great advance that education has been making in the whole of the province of Manitoba, particularly when they compare five years back or ten years back, it would seem that over these years that the undeveloped areas of Manitoba should be rapidly coming to an end rather than finding it necessary to increase the appropriation. I wonder if my friend would indicate the increase in this expenditure.

MR. FROESE: Might I also ask whether this includes any portion of the Little Colombo, that plan we had at one time?

MR. JOHNSON: No, I believe the Little Colombo is under teacher training, isn't it? Yes, it's in another appropriation. This estimate is set because every year the Department and the Province are doing more for the Indian and Metis in out of the way places especially. This as you . . . see is quite a substantial increase. Salaries make up \$53,000; \$40,000 of this is for twelve additional teachers; \$13,000 increase in salary scale; and new construction is \$165,000. I reviewed the other night in the House when we were talking about this on my salary on the first item -- I outlined the thing. These estimates make provision for the provincial share of the cost of operating, and where necessary constructing and repairing the following schools: 22 one-room schools; (Now these are in remote areas) six two-room schools; four three-room; one four; 1 six; three eight-room; and one eleven-room school, a total of 38 schools and 91 teachers. The construction projects planned for this year are: a classroom at Earrows; a classroom at Brochet; a new classroom at Pine Dock in the wonderful constituency of Gimli; two at Stedman; a new classroom at Wanipigow; a teacherage at Anama Bay, Crane River, Herchmer, Hill Ridge, a teacherage at Moose Lake, two at Pelican Rapids, a new school at Easterville, two teacherages at Easterville; and the whole objective of this program and the emphasis here is to try and reach more and more the out of the way areas in the provinces with teachers and staff and no thought of segregation. I should some time take the opportunity to share with the Honourable Leader of the NDP the Duck Bay family development plan in wood-working and the results it has shown in the community, and the Department are dedicated to a real effort in the north.

MR. PAULLEY: I assure the Honourable Minister I'd gladly go up there with him.

MR. SMERCHANSKI : I'd like to find out from the Honourable Minister what is the relationship between the money that's spent on this grant in establishing these individual schools as related to the Indian Schools that exist in the area and are administered by the Indian Department, and why is it necessary in these instances to have duplication of schoolrooms?

MR. JOHNSON: I'm not an expert on the subject, but I can tell the Honourable Member this, that the Department of Indian Affairs build and operate the schools on Indian reservations. On the edges of reservations and where we have the Metis problem --or not Metis problem but the people of Indian ancestry who do not follow the Reserve way of life and who live on the edge of Reserves-- largely are the responsibility of the Province, and these are about equal in numbers, as you know from the Legasse report on community development. When the exhaustive study was made this was what was revealed. But the Department of Education and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Affairs, and National Health and Welfare work closely together more and more now in planning schools in Indian settlements around the edge of Indian settlements. And we are dedicated to a policy of integration and working in the closest co-operation with Indian Affairs in this regard.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Honourable Minister's reply is well intended but quite frankly this is not what's taking place, and I think that this government could possibly show leadership in looking into this matter and instead of having the Provincial Government building separate schools and then the Indian Department going into the same area and building a separate school, and having to maintain these separate schools with separate teachers; and I think that much can be done in solving the difference of Indian attendance as well as white childrens' attendance in these various places, and in particular I'm referring to God's Narrows, Island Lake, Oxford Lake, Little Grand Rapids. I think that if the Honourable Minister looks into this problem, it has been far from being co-operative, and I also think that there is an unnecessary duplication of services and there is an unnecessary expenditure of public funds, because this is completely uncalled for and somebody somewhere along the line is not doing their work on the lower echelon in the Department of Education. I only bring this to your attention, not primarily as a criticism, but also primarily as something that I think should be looked into, improved, because it does exist in a number of isolated areas and this has a tendency to divide the attendance of white children away from the local Indian children and I think that this is something that we certainly seem to advocate, at least in this House, that we should encourage more intimate interchanging of school attendance in these schools; and I think that this is something that is outstanding in our northern sections of the country and I do think it's a waste of money and duplication of services which is uncalled for.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, before we finish I just do want to answer this question because what the Honourable Member has hit on is something that I would like to up-date him.

We are building and spending these amounts of money because we have to meet the need where it exists. We have to educate these children. We have provide the teachers and the schools and we're working more and more towards larger areas wherever we can with a policy of complete integration. We have made strong proposals, repeated proposals, to the federal authorities, both in health and education, telling them that more and more the province in these jurisdictions should be carrying the program and developing an integrated program in total with the federal department making grants to offset their prorated share of their costs. And we are co-operating more and more with Indian Affairs along this line, but it does require the full co-operation of the two partners. This partner is ready, willing and able and wherever opportunity that the Honourable Member has mentioned we are doing what we can to build the one school. Sometimes local factors arise which litigate against this --local conditions-- but the Department advise me they're having more and more understanding in this area and we are dedicated to an integrated educational policy for this province, and great strides are being made.

MR. ROBLIN: I move the committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for

MR. MARTIN, Cont'd) . . . . Dufferin, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

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

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.