

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, March 14, 1966

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 31--passed.

MR. PAULLEY: at 5:30? Were you speaking, Mr. Minister? It's your pleasure. I don't want to interrupt you if you were Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't want to interfere with anything the Minister was saying at 5:30. I must confess that I skipped school two or three minutes ahead of time and that the Honourable Minister was not speaking when I left. I also confess that I thought, Mr. Chairman, you might have at that time called it 5:30. --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon? Oh, it's a short speech.

But I feel inclined, Mr. Chairman, to make a remark or two in regard of a situation that is prevailing in the Windsor Park area of my constituency regarding the building of a twelve-room elementary school. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface has raised this question on a few occasions in the House, and while he is a constituent of mine in Radisson, I wondered whether or not the members of the House might be under the misapprehension that this was a topic that I, as the representative of the area, was afraid to touch on here in this Assembly, because it dealt with the very important subject of the bilingual nature of our Dominion.

I want to assure all members of the House that such is not the case; that I have no fears of any statement which I make in this House regarding bilingualism, multi-lingualism, bi-culturalism or anything else. I have no fears at all in regard of any matter which may or may not affect me personally in the conduct of my duties as a member of this Assembly and also as a resident and a taxpayer in the Province of Manitoba. I don't think that my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface intended to imply this at all, but he did make certain references from time to time of the fact that I had made requests of the Honourable Minister of Education for information and the tabling of correspondence regarding the school.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable member, on a point of privilege, would let me just say this: that I certainly didn't intend this and the only time that I referred to that was because I was interested in getting the information myself. I can assure him of that - I never even thought of that.

MR. PAULLEY: That is just what I said, Mr. Chairman, in essence, that I didn't think my honourable friend implied that at all. But I do feel, Mr. Chairman, that it is due time for me, as the MLA for that area; to say a word or two in connection with this matter.

Now I have asked the Honourable the Minister of Education to table correspondence between the school board, the Citizens Committee of Niakwa and Windsor Park, and also between any individuals other than these two groups, and I am sure that in due course the Minister will be tabling the information. But I think, Mr. Chairman, that lest anyone feel that the Honourable the Member for Radisson has not been in touch with the situation, I think I should place on the record, pending the laying on the table of the correspondence by the Minister, one or two pieces of correspondence. Because, Mr. Chairman, when the correspondence is tables, members of the House will note that the Member for Radisson - and it is in that capacity that I speak now and not as the Leader of the New Democratic Party - the members of the House will know that I have not ignored the situation.

May I first of all, Mr. Chairman, refer to a letter I received on November 15th from M. C. Carson White, Chairman of the Citizens Committee of Windsor and Niakwa Park. Mr. White writes as follows: "Dear Mr. Paulley: Attached is a copy of a letter sent to the Honourable Duff Roblin, Premier of Manitoba, by the Citizens Committee of Windsor and Niakwa Parks. You may know the Citizens Committee is pledged to the betterment of the education of our children. Our committee, however, does not approve of the construction of a school which through accident of birth cannot be attended by 90 percent of the children of our area, and we feel that construction of this school for the students of French mentality only is not within the spirit and intent of The Public School Acts of Manitoba. Your interest in and support of our cause would be greatly appreciated, and we humbly request your assistance in helping our committee draw to the attention of the people of Manitoba the fact that schools are being built within the public school system that cannot be attended by the vast majority of our children. This so-called public school will, however, be paid for by the ratepayers whose children cannot attend, and to have such schools provided with grants from the public purse is considered a gross travesty of our Public Schools Act. Your truly, C. Carson White, Chairman; Citizens Committee of Windsor and Niakwa Parks."

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....

On November 24th, Mr. Chairman, I replied to Mr. White - - incidentally, he had attached a letter addressed to the Honourable Duff Roblin, Premier of Manitoba. However, on November 24th I replied to Mr. White as follows: "Dear Mr. White: I am in receipt of your registered letter of November 15th which I received Friday, November 18th. The delay was due to the letter having been re-addressed to me from the Legislature. You enclosed a copy of a letter sent by your committee to Premier Roblin regarding the building of an elementary school in the Park. I note you have asked a number of questions of the Premier regarding the authority by which a French option school of the nature contemplated could be built. I too would be interested in the answers to the points raised in your letter. You may be aware that a resolution to allow French as a teaching language was rejected at the last Session of the Legislature. If the school to be built is to be operated as you visualize, then it appears it would in fact be a French school. This would not be in keeping with our School Act. You ask me to give my support in protecting the spirit and intent of the Public School Acts of Manitoba. You may be aware that I have in the past spoken against any encroachment of the present Schools Act and I am ready to continue. I will be pleased to meet with you or your committee to discuss the problem and await your pleasure.

"Having said this, I am sure you would agree that where it is practical and feasible, French option might be taught as a separate course during the school day. I trust the above outlines my position, and again, I will be pleased to meet you and your group. May I suggest that this be done after you hear from the Premier or the Minister of Education."

Following that, Mr. Chairman, I have met on a few occasions with representatives of the committee and I wrote on December 28th to the Minister of Education as follows: "Dear Mr. Minister: I am writing in connection with the building of a new school in Windsor Park area of the constituency of Radisson. I understand the school will be used solely by students enrolled in French option classes. I am informed that a group of citizens in the area have discussed this matter with you and have questioned whether the purpose for which the school is being built may be in conflict with The Public Schools Act - the purpose being the use of the school by one particular group. The group referred to have contacted me in this matter as well. I would appreciate any comments that you may have in this matter and would be pleased if you would send me a copy of all regulations and orders regarding the French option courses. You are aware, no doubt, that I am not opposed to the teaching of French or French option courses, but as the building of a school for the purposes mentioned appears to be a new departure in the field of education in our province, I would like to be fully informed. Your early consideration of this letter would be appreciated. With kind regards, Yours truly."

The Minister replied to me, Mr. Chairman, outlining the regulations of the Public Schools Act, as I had requested of him, and also sent me brochures dealing with the respective courses.

Now Mr. Chairman, this very broadly outlines the position that I have taken in regard to this. When the Honourable Member for St. Boniface was speaking this afternoon, if I heard him correctly he made reference to a bill which he had proposed before this House last year, which was seconded by the then-Member for Brokenhead, Mr. Ed Schreyer, MLA for Brokenhead at that time, and I would like the Honourable Member from St. Boniface to correct me or otherwise, because as I listened to him I thought he said that the seconding of the motion by the Member for Brokenhead at that time, indicated acceptance of the resolution by the New Democratic Party as a political party.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, to help out my honourable friend, I didn't mention anything about seconding for the bill last year. I said that the bill that I brought in in 1963 - not '65 - the Honourable Member from Brokenhead seemed to have been talking for the party. This is not the same thing at all; not the same bill and the same thing at all. Nobody denied it when he spoke in the House at the time.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, all I want to do, Mr. Chairman, is to make it clear that if that was the impression of my honourable friend, it was certainly not a matter of policy insofar as the party is concerned, because this matter has not been discussed

MR. DESJARDINS: What bill am I talking

MR. PAULLEY: French - the provision for French as a teaching language.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, I'm not talking about that.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, my honourable friend rambled so much this afternoon, I didn't know what he was talking about. And, of course, this is typical. However, Mr. Chairman,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). I am awaiting with anticipation the tabling of the correspondence between the Citizens Committee of Windsor and Niakwa Parks, the School Board of St. Boniface and the Government of Manitoba. I'm also awaiting with interest the reply of the First Minister or the Minister of Education, or both, to the brief that was presented by way of petition to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce by the same committee from Windsor Park a few days ago. I asked the Honourable the First Minister when he may be replying the other day. I know he's been busy with the forest industry; however his reply was that the matter would be given consideration and in due course we would be made aware of the government's attitude towards this whole problem.

Also Mr. Chairman, I have received from time to time photostatic copies of communications, some communications between the Committee and the Park and the Minister. The latest one I believe dealt with the question of the school boundaries and whether or not someone may have illegally or otherwise voted in St. Boniface School District when in effect it appeared at one time that they were in the Norwood School District.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I thought it would only be proper for me, as the representative of Windsor Park, seeing as we have had the matter before us on a couple of occasions, to let this Assembly know that I haven't been sitting back. The matter has been of prime concern to me, and the citizens of Windsor and Niakwa Parks are anxiously awaiting more information from the government. As a matter of fact I only received a phone call this evening before I left Transcona as to whether or not any progress had been made.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I just wish to first of all deal with the matter raised to some degree by the members from Radisson and St. Boniface and I'm sorry I haven't tabled this correspondence yet but I hope to do so possibly tomorrow. But I would like to say something at this time to try and bring the problem into proper focus.

First of all, I would hope that I have not in my capacity as Minister embarrassed the St. Boniface School Board, or anyone for that matter, because there is something about this matter which was not anticipated. Incidentally I believe the Premier has not replied as yet but I'm sure he will be very shortly, and I'm sorry that the material -- when it's all before the honourable members and they can review the correspondence that we have had in this matter, what I say tonight may assist them in the interpretation of that correspondence.

I would say that, in my opinion, under the Act - and that's my job as Minister to interpret the Act and to deal with these matters from day to day - in this particular matter the St. Boniface School Division applied, as you will see in the correspondence, for a 12 classroom count elementary school in that area and this was approved. I then noted through the press, the objections raised by some to the charge of a French option school. Now we must reflect for a moment, the Français course and the French Conversational course have been grossly enhanced in most recent years, as we know, and they're both very excellent courses. As a matter of fact the French conversational course, the revised one, just went into being this Fall. The Français has been in effect since about 1955 but this new revised program from 1 to 12 is a recent revision and a very excellent course.

In designing that course, it was designed as a more challenging course in the French language, and the difficulty that we have suddenly fallen upon, both the Board of St. Boniface and myself, is the fact that -- and this is something we did not anticipate; as a matter of fact I must admit I hadn't seen certain directives, and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has a good point this afternoon when he touches on this matter, namely, that the Français course both in the directives issued by the department and in the curriculum guide, explained the course as for people with langue maternelle or French mentalité - that is, they pointed out this was primarily designed for people from French-speaking environments. And I think this has the root of the problem because both the Board, in their circulars, and myself in replying to the Honourable Member from Radisson, and in replying to the other people, persistently defended the course as an excellent course designed for people from a French background, and literally translating the directives in my correspondence. Then at the same time, in my letter to the Board, which you will see, I pointed out that in couching the Français in this descriptive term, while it in itself is not a violation of The Public School Act, certainly it could lead to the charge of de facto segregation on the basis of race; and I think both the Board and I discussed the matter and I think we both agree that this was not the intent. It certainly wasn't the intent that I had in mind, and we both realized maybe we were trying to be on both sides of the same fence, and - I'm being frank with you - frankly I didn't appreciate the description of the course. Following a discussion with the Board, I have written to them pointing out -- and we must

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd).....remember that a school division or board have the right, within the Act, to say where the site of the school shall be; I don't or the Department doesn't pick the sites. Secondly, as I pointed out to the honourable member and in certain correspondence, school divisions have the right to say where the General Course will be, what schools will offer Latin, and so on, and this goes on all the time. You may say, well, this is a degree of segregation, if you will, but I think we agreed, certainly I stated to the Board that in spirit the Public School Act did not anticipate the segregation of people by race because of the emulants that may surround the description of a course, and I made this clear to the Board and the Board have acknowledged this and this will be tabled. And I think if there are any further questions after the tabling of this correspondence, I would be happy to explain what I can to the honourable member. But I must say that in fairness I think the difficulty has arisen around the description of the Français. The only condition which should surround the introduction of a course, of course, is its academic excellence, its ability, or its content. I have since ordered the removal of these curriculum and redirections to be sent out to the various people offering the Français program, pointing out that this course must be open to all. I will table that hopefully tomorrow if I can get my papers in order again.

I would say to the Honourable Member from St. Boniface that in the introduction of Français and French Conversational I think it was the unanimous opinion of this House that this language, these courses should be developed in Grades 1 to 12. This was communicated to the department. I should point out to him that all professional matters of this kind go to seminar groups and curriculum committees or the best people in the field they can find to develop courses; they in turn recommend to the Advisory Board who are made up of both professional and lay people at large - chosen from the public at large - and they in turn recommend this to the Minister. I don't think that with all this advice and so on that goes into these courses the Minister is really in any position to say it shouldn't be this textbook, it should be another one. We have to go on the best available judgment of our professionals in the field and this is what has been done. However, I can assure the House that with respect that the Français program I think is -- this misunderstanding surrounding it has been, I have issued directives to the department concerning its universal use.

Now, in connection with the teaching of French I would say that we really need - there's been a tremendous increase in interest and activity in training people to teach the French language. I would share with the honourable members, especially from St. Boniface who raised the matter this afternoon, we just need an awful lot more people too to teach it. This is one of our problems and hopefully this will come along. But I want to end that matter for the moment, if I can, until correspondence is tabled and the honourable members, especially the Members from Radisson and St. Boniface, have had an opportunity to review it. I think they'll see how this evolves throughout my correspondence and I would assure you that I don't blame the school board for the description which they gave, which I myself gave before realizing in fact what we were attempting to do, saying it was open to all and then putting these emulants around it that really effectively blocked that.

Now while I'm on my feet I would like to answer a couple more questions. We produce all our own radio programs here - we have our radio outlet here at the Ford plant; and with respect to television this is certainly the coming thing - educational television - and there's a tremendous amount of activity going on. I would welcome honourable members interested to come out to the Ford plant. Many of you were not able to go through there the last time - 1181 Portage Avenue - when I made an open invitation to the House to see this facility. I think there, too, one could see all the textbooks that are authorized and the teaching aids, visual, film strips and what have you, which is just an exploding division. The CBC - we're after them, of course, all the time for more and more time. They pay for all the costs of production; we provide the educational fees to experts who we get to produce courses on television, and so on; they pay for all the technology. We've had wonderful co-operation from private stations and CBC in this area and of course we're most anxious to expand it and are interested in seeing what is done with respect to the Fowler Commission report which calls for even more effort in educational television.

I'll look into the matter of appeal raised by the Member from St. Boniface. There's a change in the Act coming in for your consideration this year again which calls for greater co-operation between divisional boards where they see fit to share in programs, and the matter of appeal is something I'll have to look into a little more closely.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd).....

I haven't got a certain answer to the Member from Rhineland concerning that \$610,000 he mentioned in the TRAF fund. Offhand, the Deputy Minister, I spoke to him in the break, he wasn't sure what we were referring to and I would like to look into that a little more closely.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I rise, certainly not to prolong the debate but rather to thank the Honourable Minister for his candid and very honest remarks. I think that he hasn't been trying to dodge anything and I think his remarks vindicated the school board who were just trying to follow the rules - and again this is no attack on the group citizens committee. I think that partly -- their complaints are partly answered also by the Minister who recognized that the terms were not correct. I think that the Minister said that he has given instructions or orders to change that and that the policy of the government, I wonder if the Minister would correct me if I'm wrong, but the government now will strike out this business of this course only for those whose mother tongue is French and that it will be those that are ready to take this course. I'm very pleased with this, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, if that particular aspect of the discussion is completed, I'd like to come back to some of the matters that we were discussing the other day with regard to the Interlake area and the pilot project there and its possible ramifications in other parts of the province. I understand that under the white paper the official trustee position ends, and that the responsibility for schools that have been to date those of the official trustee, will now be transferred to the division. If I'm incorrect by the way, in any of these statements I would hope that the Minister would correct me before I proceed with the argument because I think that the effects of these changes will be very serious indeed for certain of the divisions in the province.

A good number of the schools that were under the official trustee, were schools that were on Hutterite colonies. Those of course, are scattered throughout the province without any particular geographical status. It happens to be wherever the colonies are and there is no connection there between the financial ability of the division in which they find themselves at all. Most of the other schools under official trustee however, are schools that have come under the official trustee for the very plain reason that the local situation was such that there weren't really funds enough or people in the area who could set up a board and operate the school. In most cases we find that these are in the marginal areas of the province. They are on the fringe of settlement. My honourable friend the Minister himself I am sure has a number in his own constituency as has the Member for St. George, the Member for Fisher, as I have across the far side of the lake, my colleague the Member for Ethelbert Plains and so on - all of us who have constituencies that are on the margin of settlement in the Province of Manitoba, I would think have most of the schools under official trustee.

Now the government intends to transfer the responsibility for these from the official trustee to the division. Is this correct? If so, are we not in fact transferring unto those divisions that already have the greatest problem, because they are in the marginal areas, by and large they have the largest area, geographically, with the lowest tax base, and here we come along and we add onto their present problem, a further problem, that is the responsibility for the elementary schools that were so far under the official trustee. Now it's true that there wasn't any additional grants to them because they were under official trustee, they still had to levy their own, but now the division will have to provide these areas with services. I'm sure the divisions will be anxious to provide the services but unfortunately those divisions that have this responsibility given to them are the ones who are least able to support it. They are the divisions who are presently having trouble even with their responsibilities of secondary education let alone with the added responsibilities of elementary education in those specific areas where the official trustee so far has been operating.

So I would like to know from the Minister what he intends to do in those particular divisions insofar as additional grants for transportation in particular, additional grants in some cases for other services in lieu of transportation, additional grants for construction, because quite obviously these are the same areas that presently have a transportation problem. I mentioned to the Minister the other night the situation of Turtle River Division where there is a massive transportation problem now. If you add on top of that the elementary program, for the official trustee, then will they not find themselves in that much more difficulty with that much more to cope with and no extra funds to deal with it? Unless, I repeat, the Minister has some plans whereby he intends to increase the grants to those areas. So far I haven't heard him make that commitment. I'm looking forward to a statement from him in that regard and

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). I'm sure those divisions will be very happy to have it. Unless there is some additional assistance I fear that there will be some very serious problems in those particular areas. I wonder too, what this might mean from the standpoint of central services in a number of these divisions. Will they be able to supply the services that the government apparently intends them to supply from now on, or at least will encourage them to supply? I would like to know from the Minister what his intentions are in that regard.

Moving onto other fields, but somewhat related to the same problem, is that of the regional technical schools that I understand will now be established and operated on a division basis. I am very pleased to see that the government is moving in this direction. We have urged them in the past to make more use of the technical school program and to diversify this program across the province. There is a great tendency to centralize things in Winnipeg. This doesn't always provide the service to the province that is needed. I would like to know from the Minister if it is the intention that these regional schools be department controlled or whether they will be controlled by the division boards in the area concerned. At the moment, the technical vocational school or the Manitoba Institute of Technology I should say, in Winnipeg, is a provincial institution operated by the department. This is really a post-secondary school. Presumably the one at The Pas, the one in Brandon will be post-secondary schools as well. We come along to these regional ones, I presume that they will not be post-secondary but rather part of secondary school program. I would presume in that case, and I would encourage the Minister that these be operated as part of the divisional program and not become a provincial operation, because I think if they are to be successful they will have to be tied right in with the local division program. It may mean that one or two divisions may have to get together on a program but still I think that the interest of the people in the area would be better served if it were in fact locally administered in conjunction with the other responsibilities of the division in that particular area.

Then I would like to find out from the Minister, Mr. Chairman, exactly what the priorities of the government are in the field of education. We understand from the frequent statements of the First Minister that education has the first priority. I must confess that I don't always see that in the action of the government but their statements certainly are that education has priority one. I'd like to know from the Minister what are the priorities within education? What does he want to see done first in education? What is the likely course that we can expect in the next year or two or three in the development of education in the Province of Manitoba? Last year the government brought in Bill 39. We pointed out to them at that time the very grave difficulties associated with Bill 39. The government persisted in their view that this was the proper thing to do. It hasn't worked out and not a single piece of action has been taken as a result of Bill No. 39, no area has proceeded to have a vote. I would like to know from the Minister now, because it seems to me that from the statements made to date the department is pushing consolidation rather than having the movement that Bill 39 seemed to indicate as government policy, that is, that the elementaries within a division would become part and parcel of the division operation. It seems to me the government has shied away from that, that in fact they are pushing consolidation instead.

I listened carefully the other day to what the Minister had to say about what would be done in the Interlake, where I take it, under the pilot project the government is going to take the leadership. In the other areas they will leave people to do as they wish, but in the Interlake the government is going to take the leadership, and if I remember correctly, the Minister spoke at all times in the Interlake about consolidation. He didn't speak about having the elementaries come under the division board, but he spoke rather about consolidations all the way through. I understand that consolidations really are the negation of Bill 39, or the action that Bill 39 was to promote, and that in fact, the more consolidations you have, the more difficult it is, the less likely it is that you will have a movement towards integration within a division whereby the elementaries become part and parcel of the whole structure and there is one board operating all the way through. I'd like to know from the Minister if these are his intentions - is he in fact, pushing consolidation? Because if he is, how then does he relate the balance of his program to what he is doing in that field? How does he relate for example, the development of regional technical schools with a program whereby there is not within the division an amalgamation of elementary and secondary.

If you are going to have regional technical schools, if you are going to have regional schools for the retarded, isn't it essential that you have a combined program starting right from the elementary moving up to the secondary under one board? If you don't have that, are

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).....you not in fact making it extremely difficult to develop a regional technical school or a regional school for the retarded? If you have to be dealing with a great number of elementary schools all with their own variations as to what they want to do, isn't it likely that we'll have some very great troubles in moving along and getting these regional developments proceeded with? It seems to me that this would be the result. That is why I ask the Minister what exactly are his intentions and what are his priorities? Is he going to push consolidation or is he going to push the idea that within each division, with the choice of the local people, on a vote, that they have the right or be encouraged to set up one board and then move on from there to the next developments which are the regional developments. I'd like to know from the Minister on that score as well, what exactly are his intentions?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, . . . strict to the questions asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I think we are saying here that as I said this afternoon, terminally, that Bill 39 was really the adoption and operation of the Dauphin-Ochre scheme. If you recall when the Michener Commission report came out last year it called for certain powers being left with the local boards. At that time, we considered the matter carefully and thought this is a method, and still is a method, by which school districts within a division could give up their fiscal authority to the central authority and remain with local caretaking duties at the elementary level, and certain other duties, and these were outlined in the bill. It was really the adaptation of the Dauphin-Ochre scheme but it complied with the Michener recommendations. It's true we have tried it. At that time, a year ago, it was by a marginal vote that one of the major trustee organizations even went that far, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will recall, at their local conventions. I think, however, in the past year it has become even more evident to everyone in the field of education in the province that bold measures will have to be taken to correct the situation re local administration across the province and especially the introduction of a province-wide regional vocational high school program. I think our objective should be, wherever possible, to centralize under one board within a division, both elementary and secondary education, for the simple reason that one board must have maximum use, be able to utilize the available facilities to the maximum and look seriously to their future construction at the high school level, because our target of building regional vocational schools over the next five years could mean up to 25 to 40 percent of the high school population coming into regional facilities.

The -- (I'm just trying to read a note here from above at the same time) At the local level, with respect to the divisional high schools, it is the tentative plan, and the department are still working on site; they're still working on combinations of divisions; the plan is to build these and equip them one hundred percent; that is, the province will build and locate and develop 100 percent, will build them, capital and equipment. With respect to operating costs and the operation of these schools, details have not been finalized but tentatively the plan is that combinations of divisions would jointly appoint board members to an administrative body to administer that school. It should be an inter-divisionally administered school. At the present time the plan would be that the province would share the operating costs of such regional vocational high schools in concert with the divisions, and hopefully set up administrative units, and as I say, trustees from each division as the administrative body of a particular regional facility. In that connection I should point out to the Leader of the Opposition that I certainly solicit his support. These are secondary high schools; this is a secondary high school program as opposed to the post secondary and trade and apprenticeship and development program.

The Ministers of Education across Canada, we've met now two or three times most recently about a month ago, with the Federal Minister of Manpower Development, because at the present time in the current operating costs of vocational high schools in Canada there is a ceiling with is about \$162,000 in this province, whereas at the secondary level there is 50 to 75 percent sharing of operating costs, and the Ministers feel that the same kind of support, 50 to 75 percent support of the operating costs of such facilities should be shared by the Federal Government, because after all we at the post secondary level are encouraged with these large grants as indeed we are at the high school level to produce these kinds of facilities, and they have the whole matter under consideration at this time. The Ministers across Canada were unanimous in this request.

With respect to the -- the central services. I would like to, when this legislation is before us with respect to those measures we're taking -- and may I point out to the Leader of the Opposition what are the priorities. I'd say the whole field of education is a priority. I think our target priorities in the coming year are to work with the trustee and trustee organizations

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd).....in bringing to the attention of the people at the local level the impact of a regional technical or vocational high school program, the tremendous changes which are occurring in the elementary curriculum at this time and curriculum development which is really coming to the point where, without a graded school, these children just are not going to get the opportunities open to them to conduct these courses.

We hope to go on an active campaign in bringing these benefits to the attention of the people. Quite apart from Bill 39 we feel that we're going to be presenting legislation to you which calls for various methods of -- I could describe, say, two methods, major methods of bringing about this local administrative revolution, as I call it. One is that in transferring provincial official trustee districts to divisional boards, I believe there are about 155 or so official trustee districts which are now operated, as you say, by the department, and also there are many closed districts. These, if they're put under the divisional boards, although there'll be no extra grants to the division for these districts, there have not been -- I should put it that way while they're under official trustee. The divisional board will get the teacher grants and so on. We believe that in many of these cases, as the honourable member has said, that in many official trustee districts there are the people there who have the ability to form a board and they haven't done it, and we have continued to operate. And I think they can do a first class job of handling this. If we create, for example, a single district division through the process I will outline to you, then of course they get the increased establishment grants; they get a 10 percent increase over their present grants in total operating costs. I think that we're going to, first of all, in transferring closed districts from official trustee districts under this method, we then permit an individual district on a local petition of 20 percent of the ratepayers within a single district, to petition that they give up their fiscal authority and so on to the division; the Minister can refer this to a Board of Reference who will decide assets and liabilities there. There'll be a hearing, an award. There's room for an appeal in the legislation coming before you. Under this method it's entirely possible that in certain divisions with the trustee and closed districts opted in, with individual districts allowed to come in, that we think when we get 50 percent of them in by this method we should have a referendum in that district to see if they won't all come in. If up to two-thirds under the proposed legislation decide to come in this way, the Minister can declare it a single district division. It's another method of achieving what we're trying to get at.

Secondly, we will also on petition of any division, for example Beautiful Plains or Evergreen, if 20 percent of the people in the district petition for a single district division, or after the actual . . . or on the Minister's volition, that is after we have had a campaign in the area and had a series of meetings and informed the people of what we think is the wisdom of this type of procedure, we will call for a referendum in that division. In other words, we feel these are the steps which will be very positive and place the government in a very definite position of working for a goal that we think is necessary and giving two or three ways of getting to that goal.

The idea of the Boundaries Commission will be -- as the honourable member may know, in many divisions -- in my division and other divisions -- the divisional people are most anxious that elementary schools be rationalized within their borders. The Boundaries Commission is a method by which an independent group can go out into a division; they can advise wherever they do go in, they will advise on what they consider the ideal number of schools, where they should be located in that division, and they can recommend on these boundaries within there. They may recommend that in one division 10 elementary schools in certain locations would solve the problem. This can then be presented to the people.

We think this multi-pronged attack is necessary in many divisions before we might achieve a single district division, that is, a rationalization of the elementary facilities in the area.

Within the Interlake, I explained the other evening, as I explained at that time, the thought is here as a pilot project, because there's been a lot of work done with the people at the local level, and they felt mandatory legislation advisable, we're going to suggest that the Boundaries Commission would first go into this area, map out the elementary school form, alter or dissolve one or more consolidated school districts; for example, declare any of them to be single district divisions; define their wards or alter the number of the wards and additional grants made available to them. In the operation of it in practice, the idea would be that a division -- when you see the legislation I think it will be clearer, and I can ramble on quite a ways here which I don't want to do, but the Interlake's been chosen because of these factors. The Boundaries Commission can go into, say, the Interlake Division and map out what they consider an

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd).....ideal elementary school setup. And they can recommend that either eight consolidations occur or that a single district division be made out of that, and whatever they present to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, he cannot alter. He can send it back but he can't alter the recommendation of these people. Now, for instance, in the Interlake, the Boundaries Commission may recommend eight consolidations, I don't know; and supposing elections are held and these are brought into being. The consolidation might then well give up by its own accord and if any 20% of the electors in that consolidation want to come into the division board they can do so. They may decide this six months later. On the other hand, going into Interlake, say there's 20 official trustee districts, 4 closed districts, and they have made their survey and they have chosen a pattern, based on geography and as the member knows certain factors, and recommended as large schools as they can, ideally at least eight graded classroom count schools, they may decide in their wisdom that this should be a single district division and so recommend it to the Minister who shall declare it a single district division.

Now I feel this way, that we have made it abundantly clear that this is a pilot project to see how this attack works, to see if we do bring about the rationalization of education at every walk. It has the very lowest assessment, I'm advised, in the province. There are over 100 one room schools. It's a big challenge. I'm not minimizing it. We are going to ruffle some feathers, if you want to put it that way. If Turtle River, as we work on this, if Turtle River are interested in that kind of an approach. I think we have to sit down and seriously consider it. In the Interlake situation, we are planning a certain equalization formula to a degree, to encourage and bring about this kind of consolidation. In the other areas, the opting in of proposed and official trustee districts, we think may be the incentive that will bring about a single district division. I think there are also certain divisions - and I'm being perfectly frank - in this province, who in the last four years -- I know of one division that's created about five large consolidated school districts, within a division. These people have come a long way. They are not quite ready in their own minds to give up their authority to a central divisional board, but I think the main function of the Boundaries Commission is a rationalization and a plan for every division, starting with the Interlake, and I hope the legislation will call for them to deal with school division matters posthaste. I think we can launch an education campaign giving these alternatives to divisional boards, at the same time pointing out the very real need, ideally, with the implementation of regional vocational setup for a single district division wherever we can get it; but educationally, large consolidations are sound, They're sound, educationally, and I think we have felt after much discussion and thought in the department that these several methods of bringing about more rationalization, as I say, of the administrative setup at the local level, would commend itself to our people.

The priorities, therefore, in education would be this matter of local administration, the creation of regional vocational high schools, and I have not had the master plan presented to me as yet. The department are working on this and we are getting the population figures in each division and so on. A great deal of this work has been done but no final decision has been made as to where these schools will be, etc. The next great thing is, the amendment to the Act will be introduced again, of course, with respect to regional vocational high schools to provide for the division trustees to be appointed to the board of the region, and have them hopefully, anticipate them being run as regional boards running these vocational centres. They will be able to operate the school in effect. This is our plan at this moment.

Next to regional vocational facilities, and this plan, of course we have a great deal of action and consultation going on with respect to the Council of Higher Learning, rationalizing our position there, our pattern, post secondary education, the role of the affiliates in the future and the development of junior colleges. I think you can get a concept of the junior college and the community college depending on which expert you last listen to, but they offer a very real challenge in that area and a tremendous amount of material has been gathered and these excellent people are giving it every attention.

The next problem of course is going to be the introduction of the takeover of the trainable mentally retarded, and this is going to require a great deal of consultation with the local associations. It's not mandatory for a year but again this will be legislation that will be before us for further discussion. These are the priorities just off the top of my head that are I think most meaningful at the local level. In addition to this, of course, we have priority on curriculum development, introduction of alternative courses, and teacher training - This is the other big thing this year, is to get on with the job of recruitment, and the department -- we have a full-

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd) time man working on this now and he will be discussing with the teachers and trustees various methods of bringing more young people into the profession. Then, of course, in manpower development it seems now the sky's the limit. The Federal Government is, of course enhancing its program in this area, and we, as I said in my introductory remarks, have reorganized the department, so that one of the Assistant Deputy Ministers will have under him three main branches: 1) One full-time Director of Regional Vocational High School Development. 2) One full-time man in charge of post-secondary trade and technology, schools, planning and so on, MIT; and a third man on special projects. And we have three first class people in these capacities working with federal, local and other departmental people in taking as much advantage as we can of opportunities to train and re-train our manpower. I think the latest meeting I had with the Minister of Manpower Development, they are proposing increased allowances in this regard to the House at this time, and if these go through I think they will be very wonderful because this will enable a team from Manitoba to pick out people and situations without reference to the NES initially and get them into training or relocation into other activities. I think literally, in every branch of education today I think, as I have said so many times, it is challenging and it's exciting, and I think we have some very good people to help lead us through our difficulties.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask a very simple question of the Minister, in view of his statements on priorities. What in his opinion and that of the government is the better plan; a consolidation or a single board district or division?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister answers that question I would like to ask him another question. I take it from the Minister's remarks that we are going to have an opportunity of fully debating the legislation which is being brought in dealing with mental retardation, and what I would like to have is the Minister's assurance that when that legislation is brought in that we will not be confined to the subject matter of the bill itself but that we will be allowed to debate the whole field of mental retardation.

MR. JOHNSON: Mental retardation yes; I hope we can debate the whole field during the discussion of that legislation because the Minister of Health will have a large part of that too. Ideally, single district divisions. Ideally, administratively, from the educational point of view. In practice I think we can best achieve this by going to our people with the various alternative methods of achieving this and opening the Act wide up, and that's precisely what we've done.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister not feel that by pushing consolidations, as he is presently doing, that in fact he is retarding the development of single district areas which are necessary if he is going to proceed with the other things that he's proposing.

MR. JOHNSON: pushing consolidations, we are going to go out and help division boards plan adequate elementary setups, and if they do form a consolidation and six weeks later have a petition to give up their authority, fine; but let's make every avenue open and let's be practical.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, that the Minister rejects the position that the trustees of the province and the school teachers of the province jointly have recommended, and that is to have a province-wide referendum on one specific date in all divisions, giving each division the right to vote for itself and prepare it by an education program handled by the government. Is this rejected?

MR. JOHNSON: not accepted at this time. We want to work with these groups in the coming year to bring this to the attention of the people. It may very well happen that by the time the year is up we'll have a certain number of divisions in. It won't be necessary to have a province-wide referendum.

..... continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 31 (a) passed (b) passed (c) passed (d) passed.
Resolution 31 passed. Resolution 32 (a) passed (b) --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under 32, item (a) (2) the School Tax Rebate - this is an item that should not appear under education estimates at all because it is not in effect an education matter and whenever a comparison is made between what Manitoba gives to education and what other areas give to education, by putting that under this heading gives a false impression as to the assistance we are in fact giving education. This is a rebate of taxes to the taxpayers of the province and rather than appearing here, should appear under the department of the treasury, which is its proper location. Then we would have a comparison that is meaningful. So I would like to move, Mr. Chairman, that that item be struck out of education estimates and transferred instead to treasury estimates.

MR. PAULLEY: Speaking to the motion, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated during my remarks in the Throne Speech, it appears to me as though the official opposition have come to the conclusion that now this bad gimmick is here, that it's acceptable as far as they are concerned. At that particular time I drew attention of the House to certain discussions that took place at the annual meeting of the Grit Party, and that at that particular time after some consideration and according to the news report, a division led by the Honourable Member for Selkirk and the Honourable Member for Lakeside, were able to prevail upon the Liberal convention that now this bad child was with us we'd better accept him and keep him, only put him in his right place. So I agree with the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that there is no relationship at all insofar as education is concerned and the tax rebate. It gives a false impression insofar as the total amount allocated to education is concerned and has no right being considered in the Department of Education. We go further than that, of course, Mr. Chairman, in saying that it has no right being on the statute books of the province in any case.

But I do note, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable the Minister in his Estimates anticipates that the school tax rebate will increase by a million dollars or, about ten percent more than was allocated for last year. I am not a mathematician. The Honourable Minister for Education was speaking the other day about feeding materials into computers and the necessity for educating our young folk in the new technologies in bookkeeping and the commercial course. I wonder if my honourable friend would take this million dollar increase and feed it into a computer to see how much greater increase there is going to be in local taxation for school purposes, this year. --(Interjection) -- Pardon? -- (Interjection)-- I think this would be interesting, Mr. Chairman, because after all, the ten million dollars represented a rebate of \$50, or 50 percent of the school taxes on property. I would imagine that almost without exception, in the urban areas of the Province of Manitoba, the taxpayers received less than 50 of the school taxes back as a rebate. In other words, the school rebate was far - the \$50 represented in many cases, a quarter of the over-all school tax. Now then the Honourable Minister is asking the Assembly to increase the amount of the school tax rebate by a further million dollars. He doesn't appear to make any provision for any lessening of school costs on local property. This in effect then means that by and large the people of the Province of Manitoba, the taxpayers, are going to be burdened with an ever-increasing school tax load. It must follow this way.

The Honourable the Minister of Education proposes in his grants to pay to local districts, areas and divisions, approximately \$5½ million more by grants. Already we have had reports from a number of school districts in the urban areas, that their tax load is going to increase, on residential property, notwithstanding the added contributions from the Provincial Treasury. As I say, in addition to that, in addition to that, my honourable friend the Minister of Education, by the suggested increase of a million dollars, is now in effect telling the rest of the area of Manitoba, who weren't qualified to receive the full tax rebate, that now because of increases in taxation, they are going to be able to receive back a million dollars more.

That's why I say, Mr. Chairman, I would like the Honourable the Minister to get a hold of one of those machines and see if the computer could come up with a figure as to what this million dollars in increase in rebates on the local tax level, means in terms of increase at the local level. I think it would be interesting; I think it would prove conclusively that notwithstanding the added contributions from the Provincial Treasury, as I say of about 5 million, 4 or 5 million 5, that the educational tax burden at the local level will be increasing far more than the proportion which is being paid by the Provincial Treasury.

The Honourable First Minister quite frequently talks to us of priority in education. I think it's revealed here, Mr. Chairman, in the grant structure as suggested and proposed to

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . us by dollars and cents, in this Item (a) of 32, that the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer and the Government of Manitoba says "yup, there's priorities in education, providing you people at the local level pay for them." And I predict that on a percentage basis, Mr. Chairman, that when the reports are made for this calendar year the percentage of provincial contribution to education in relation to that of local contributions to education, that the provincial contribution will be less than it ever has been in the past.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I guess the Honourable Minister has not had the opportunity yet to tell us what the \$11,000 - oh, it's \$11 million - school tax rebate. I was confused there. What it has cost to handle the rebates. Or where do we find in the Estimates, the cost of making the rebate in the fashion that it is made today? I made the comment the other day that it was quite conceivable that it would cost a half a million dollars to make the rebate - that is the processing of all of the applications and the mailing out of all of the cheques and the mailing in of all the applications. While it isn't a direct charge to the government, according to the Order for Return that was tabled with us on March 11, the Department received in the year 1965, 365,000 and they have a further 35,000 to be dealt with. So that there is in total, something over 400,000 - something over 400,000. And there will be more because there's no doubt about it, there are a few people in the province that have not yet paid their '65 tax and made application for rebate.

The other day I said it was quite conceivable that the cost would be a dollar per application and that's how I arrived at the half million dollars as a cost of processing the rebates in this fashion. I wonder if my honourable friend the Minister could comment on this when he gets up to take part in the debate. I understand there is a motion before you at the moment, Mr.

Chairman, in this respect. So perhaps my honourable friend could enlighten us on this subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion before the House is Appropriation No. 2 (a) (2) school tax rebate, be deleted from Education Estimates and transferred to Treasury Estimates as this rebate is not in fact an education grant but a rebate of taxes already paid and at present distorts the education grant figure in Manitoba. Moved by the Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson.

All in favour of the motion . . .

MR. TANCHAK: I'd like to make a small comment on this. It will be very very short. I had figured here that postage alone, one way, from the Department to the different taxpayers would amount something over \$20,000 - postage stamps alone. But the complaint that I have to make is that in my own area, right at Ridgeville, there was a slew of these tax rebates sent in, with insufficient postage and every recipient had to - before he could get his rebate, had to pay two cents - one cent extra and one cent for penalty. Although it is a very very small sum and probably it was an error in the Department, I do not know, but I think that this is very unfortunate and I would like the Minister to see that this never occurs again because it really irks the people when they come to the post office and here they have a letter, a cheque, their tax rebate, and there wasn't sufficient postage applied on it -- from the Department. A four-cent stamp instead of a five-cent stamp. They could have refused it --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Member from Brandon says "They could have refused it." Usually people don't like to refuse that. But I do not think that this should be allowed to happen again in the future. Unless the government was broke.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. MOLGAT: Ayes and nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas, 16; nays, 27.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion lost.

2(a) (1) passed; (2) passed. (b) --

MR. MOLGAT: Under (b) there's a very substantial decrease here in assistance to schools in remote settlements. I presume that part of this bill will be because of the development of the new Frontier Division, but will it in fact reduce the total amount by that much or is there any further planned reduction in the development of the remote schools?

MR. JOHNSON: All but \$161,000 goes to the transfer of - 27 of these schools were transferred to Frontier Division last year. This is the whole decrease, 500 and some odd thousand. The material that's left, there are - it says "with the permission of Frontier Division, 27 of the original 35 special schools administered by this appropriation were transferred to that new authority." And this of course accounts for the substantial drop in the budget.

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd) Left in this now are 35 - 53 teachers are employed by these special schools. These are special schools as the honourable members knows where there's no tax assessment whatsoever to go by.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I realize what the schools are - what surprises me is that there should be a difference of some half a million dollars because I was under the impression a good number of these special schools were elementary schools and not secondary schools. There were some secondaries that is true, but is there that much of a change? Out of a total amount of 675,000 was a half a million strictly secondary?

MR. JOHNSON: Frontier is a single district division - the 11th one in the province, my honourable friend.

MR. MOLGAT: Ah, so Frontier will be operating the elementary schools directly, in that case. Ah, well, this explains the development.

Will this mean then that the post of the man who is in charge of special schools now disappears? Be no longer in effect?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, there's one, I think one less position in operating special schools this year and this will probably disappear as we opt local schools in.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to delay the work of the committee, but I would like to say a very brief word then in that case about the office of the gentleman in charge of special schools and a number of us who had occasion to work with him I'm sure would want to thank him particularly for the work that he did. He didn't have an easy job by any means as I'm sure the Minister appreciates, but those of us who had the opportunity of working with him were most appreciative for the interest and the devotion that he showed to the particular problems with which he is dealing. I'm sure he will fit into the other work of the department in some other phase quite properly, but he certainly did render an excellent job to the Province of Manitoba.

I'd like to say as well that the people who worked in the department of the Official Trustee, while they don't come under this, I would also like to express to them my own special thanks for their work. They were always prepared to take care of any problems that came up. It was never too much trouble to ask them to come to a meeting, to meet with the public and do whatever they could to satisfy the people with whom they worked. Once again because of the fact that there was no local board, the same way as with the special schools, they were faced with a very particular type of problem, because when people do not have representations themselves on a board they are sometimes inclined to be more critical of those who have the authority strictly by appointment rather than by election. In both cases I think they've rendered an excellent service to the province and to the people for whom they were working.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, is this item where we could discuss the bursaries - it says Student Aid and Miscellaneous? I think so? Maybe the Ministers remembers that last year I complained to him about some prevalent evidence of discrimination in providing bursaries to elementary students. At that time the Minister drew my attention to the regulations which have certain restrictions as far as non-public school students were concerned and I asked the Minister to change the regulations. Were the regulations changed, Mr. Minister, or is the same ones still in existence as were before?

MR. JOHNSON: No. I don't think there's any discrimination in the issuing of bursaries. I have full confidence in the committee. I think primarily they take need into consideration, need plus merit and give the moneys out as judiciously as they can. The emphasis of course in the bursary section is with respect to people entering university, university entrance students and in the first couple of years of university life. A great deal of further attention, in discussing with the bursary selection committees - first the university's represented on our University Entrance Committee group. I don't think there's any charge of discrimination.

With respect to the bursary brochure, this is being rewritten at the present time. We just didn't have it ready for this Session. That is the description of the bursary pamphlets we send out. Within the monies made available for bursaries you'll notice a \$200,000 increase, and in addition to this we give out \$150,000 in technical bursaries, in technical education. Any charge of discrimination or anything of that nature I'd be happy to investigate.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me I get the same answer as I did last year and he says that need and merit is being concerned but I'm talking about the students who did not attend public school and last year they did not qualify for bursaries because they attended separate school or parochial school or any other school and regulations forbid them or disqualified them. I asked the Minister at that time to see that those regulations were changed and I gave him the reasons why. I think the government has had a year to consider these changes and

(MR. TANCHAK, cont'd) . . . according to him I understand that the changes have not been made. In my opinion I would say it's time to do away with this discrimination. There's enough discrimination in different fields, even besides this one.

The intention of the bursaries as the Minister has pointed out, is to help and encourage deserving students to continue their studies in higher learning. Now a student who attended a school other than public school, may qualify in all respects, and like the Minister said it's need and merit. He may qualify for the bursary, but just because he did not attend public school the previous year, then automatically he's disqualified and he does not qualify for a bursary. That's the way I understood it is. I think that we're dealing here with an individual not a group and why punish the individual when in most cases, this individual, this boy or girl did not even have freedom of choice on selection of the school. I think - in my opinion this is discrimination against that student. It should not make any difference, I do not think, whether the child attended a public school, private school, separate school, parochial school, whatever it is; the child met the requirements, or the student met the requirements and I think he is entitled to a bursary. He proved himself by qualifying and the Department of Education accepted him and gave him certification according to his grade. He has complied with all the rules and regulations set by the examination board and so on, and just because he did not attend a public school previously, the year previously, he is disqualified; he's punished. I think that is discrimination. I would ask the Minister is this fair play? I'm sure it isn't. Then I'd simply say why in common sense if that's the way our regulations read isn't it time to change those regulations and not punish these students who haven't got freedom of choice because being under age they're sent. They wish to attend other schools that their parents choose for them; they qualify under the regulations as I said before, examination and so on, and because they wish to go further in their schools they are denied the bursaries that other people get. I think it's time that these regulations were changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) passed; (c) --

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under (c) I think we're dealing with the University grants here. I have a copy of the Annual Report of the University before me and I notice from this report that in 1965 the grants to the University roughly amounted to a little better than 50 per cent of the revenues, and I'm referring to Exhibit (b) of the statement of Income and Expenditures, General Account. Their total receipts amounted to \$13,859,000 out of which the Government of Manitoba roughly contributed \$6,906,000,00. I'm just wondering from the figure that we have before us that we're allocating to the University in grants a figure of \$8,995,000.00. Is this any decrease as far as percentage of the contribution that we're making? I do not find any budget within this report so I don't know what the budget actually will be for their operations this year, but I would like to have some indication from the Minister as to what percentage this will amount to.

Then I notice on Page 4 of that Report, also under the statement of Income and Expenditures, that they make this comment after referring to certain percentages that have been established as far as receipts received from students amounting to roughly 20 percent. But then they make this statement: "With such information available it was only logical to feel that the tuition fees at the University of Manitoba should be increased in 1965 - 66 to approach the national average." Is the University increasing their fees or have they increased them or what is the state of affairs now?

Then also on that same page earlier on, they report disposing of certain lands that they've sold. They mention 150.5 acres, sold to Lands Limited for \$327,000.00. How was this sold? It mentions that this was done in concurrence with the Government of Manitoba. In what way were these lands disposed of? Did they receive bids and what were the bids, if any others were received than the one that it was sold for?

I think I would appreciate getting some information on these items.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the answer to the first question, approximately 50 percent, it's 51 percent; fees account for 17.3 percent; and the increase of \$1,099,000 along with the increase of monies expected through the rise in the Canadian Government grant has met the University's budgetary requirements for the ensuing year.

The sale of this particular piece of land - I would have to look into that. I haven't got the precise detail in front of me but as you know the University have the powers to control, dispose of assets and so on. I'm sure this is completely in order. I just have to refresh myself on that point.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm interested in (c). I note that we have a new heading here called University and Higher Learning. I don't know whether this indicates that we now have ventured into another "first" in Manitoba, that we are going into higher learning than the University. Possibly --(Interjection)-- oh it's the council. Thus when we get down to No. 3 we find out what is meant by the heading. The heading says, Mr. Chairman, that item (c) deals with University and Higher Learning and I suppose some of our friends in the University would rather question the statement of that nature feeling that being in University or graduated from University they might be in the field of higher learning.

However, Mr. Chairman, we in this group here have always maintained that education should be based not on financial ability to pay, but on one's intellectual ability to absorb knowledge. We seem to be having a pretty tough job trying to convince the Minister of Education here in the Province of Manitoba that this is the basis on which entrance into University should be based. My honourable friend the Minister of Education is lief to talk to us in this Assembly of Manitoba firsts. --(Interjection)-- My friend says hear, hear! I say to him, Mr. Chairman, that one thing that there isn't a hear, hear, or a first as far as Manitoba is concerned, is the opening of the doors of the University to students, based only on the ability to absorb knowledge.

If memory serves me correctly, this first in Canada goes not to Manitoba but to Newfoundland. It seems to me that the last province that joined Confederation is the first to recognize what Dr. Deutsch said in his reports that the emphasis must be placed on higher learning. So I enjoin my honourable friend the Minister of Education to try and persuade his colleagues on the treasury benches that if we can't be first, for heaven's sakes let's not be the last, because we have been the last here in Manitoba in so many instances, that it's not funny. It's tragic as far as Manitoba is concerned.

I think one of the steps that the Minister can make is to reject the recommendations made in the Blayden Report. I know last year, students from the University of Manitoba and the affiliated colleges, attended at this building and met with the Minister of Education and tried to persuade him to start on the path of "Open Sesame" policy to higher education by the elimination of student fees. If memory serves me correctly my honourable friend rejected this, based on somewhat "Well we'll wait until the Blayden Commission report comes in". Well the report did come in and the report itself rejected, rejected the contention that student fees should be eliminated, but this doesn't mean to say that because the Blayden Commission rejected it, that this government should continue the policy of charging student fees.

It's interesting to read some of the comments in the report on the question of financing higher education in Canada where it deals with student aid. On page 47 the report says "No subject produced a greater range of opinion than the roles of fees and student aid in university finance. All agreed that academic ability should be the sole factor in determining admission to university. The financial resources of the student should not be a limiting factor. There was however, wide variance in how to achieve this objective." And I frankly confess that there's room, lots of room for argument.

The report goes on to say that one strong segment of opinion of which official student bodies, such as the Canadian Union of Students were strong spokesmen, claims strenuously that fees are a serious deterrent to equality of opportunity. The case for free tuition was argued as follows: "Fees constitute a serious psychological barrier for parents and for many potential students. The higher income groups are over represented in university populations. This is likely to continue despite efforts to raise student aid, especially if fees continue to rise as they have done here in the Province of Manitoba."

The report goes on, Mr. Chairman, "Canadian fees are already amongst the highest in the world for public universities. The social benefit of education outweighs the private benefit - and this has already been recognized in primary and secondary education. Graduates will more than repay society's investment in their higher education by increased incomes and therefore increased taxation in their working years. Elimination of fees will decrease dependence upon parental support and therefore give the student greater freedom in choosing a career. The student is already making a major contribution to the cost of his education through summer employment and through foregone earnings. Some students went further and argued that free tuition is not enough. The goal should be free education."

So we have it, Mr. Chairman, from the students themselves who made representation to the Blayden Commission of how this very important question of finances was affecting them. The Blayden Report suggested increased bursaries and loans and the likes. But I don't think, Mr. Chairman, this is quite enough. Time after time we are having drawn to our attention the

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . need for higher education in all levels, and while we have financial barriers to higher education we are failing not only our present generation but future generations as well.

Now I presume that the Honourable the Minister of Education has had the opportunity of reading the Blayden report, because as I said at the offset of my remarks, if I remember correctly, in answer to the students that came to see him, he said, well we'll wait until the Blayden Report comes down before we give this matter any more consideration, or at least, further consideration. So I wonder now, apart from the question of fees, whether or not the Minister could indicate having read the Commission report, and can inform the committee as to the Provincial Government's attitude to the recommendations.

Further recommendations to the provincial governments in this report, Mr. Chairman, is that provincial governments adopt some method of determining university operating and capital grants as will permit a more rational forward planning by the University. The reason I think that the Blayden Commission put this in was so that we wouldn't have a situation, or it wouldn't have been possible to have a situation such as prevails at the University of Manitoba that we have at the present time, namely, so many complaints about our cafeteria and our eating facilities. Had the government of Manitoba progressed its grants for capital purposes to the University of Manitoba, the University would have been in a position that as the student enrollment at the University grew, so would the facilities required by the students, such as the cafeteria. So I would like to know from the Minister now that some recommendation of that nature has been made to the provincial governments, what is our provincial government going to do about it?

There are many other suggestions made in the report respecting the provincial government, Blayden says, he recommends that they recognize, that the provincial government, that they recognize the essential role of research in the University and make provision for adequate research facilities and in particular for the development of good research libraries. How much guidance has the Province of Manitoba given to the University in an area, say, of research in connection with the Department of Labour? I know that the Honourable Minister of Labour often tells us of research that is going on, or the desirability for research. The Honourable Member for Springfield the other day, dealing with the resolution on automation and cybernation, suggested that this is a matter for research. I ask the Minister of Education, how much research is going on insofar as the important question of automation and cybernation at our University?

Now Mr. Chairman, the hour is getting on. There were a considerable number of specific recommendations made by the Blayden Commission respecting provincial governments and their relations to university, and I would love to hear my honourable friend, tomorrow if possible, give us a synopsis of what was contained in the Blayden report on the financing of universities, to tell us, or through us to tell to the Blayden Commission, "This is what we have done as a result of the excellent book that you produced by way of a report."

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Minister tomorrow who are the members of the Council for Higher Learning, and what expenditures are envisioned which will require \$25,000 of expenditure. Now on that happy note, Mr. Chairman, I cease.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted a resolution and requests leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, 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.