

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday March 15, 1966

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 34 (a)

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I believe we have now reached the item curriculum revision and I must begin by saying what I have said for the last four years in a row that my remarks could be made under either the subject of teacher training or curriculum revision, but because of the speed we're making just before dinner adjournment, I decided that I would wait until this time.

I'm sure the Honourable the Minister will not be astonished to hear that I intend to make a few remarks with regard to authorizing at least one text for use in the schools on the phonics or phonetic system of reading. I'm sorry to have to take some of the time of the committee once again, but I find that in spite of the very courteous reception that I have always received from the former Minister and the present Minister when I have spoken on this subject that not as much progress as I could have hoped has been made.

Now, let me give a very brief history of the background. It's more than four years ago, Mr. Chairman, that the Royal Commission on Education recommended very strongly the use of articulated phonics or phonetics. I could take the time to read from their Brief and it points out that they gave a lot of attention to this matter. They argued their case with quite considerable conviction and they arrived at the conclusion that regardless of the strong presentation that was made by those who advocate what is called the "Look-say" or sight-reading method, that the Commission unanimously arrived at the opinion that it would be in the interests of education to have the phonetic system used in the schools as well. And I emphasize "as well", Mr. Chairman, because there's a great - a great misapprehension in the minds of a lot of the public in regard to this question that appears to - whether it is really misunderstood or whether it is an attempt to confuse the issue, there is a feeling among a lot of people that there is an attempt to substitute the phonetic method for the present method or any other method that is or may be in use. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the suggestion, the suggestion is that the phonic method should be used in conjunction with other methods. It is not intended to supplant anything else or to take the place of something else. It is to be used optionally and at the suggestion of the teachers themselves who after all, should have all the tools of the trade available to them and I can't stress that too strongly that this is not a campaign to try and throw out everything else and institute holus-bolus a phonetic system.

This is what the Commission recommended more than six years ago, and recommended it very strongly and unanimously. Almost five years ago, four hundred delegates at the Trustees Convention unanimously, unanimously recommended the same thing. Then two other very prominent persons in the educational field recommended the same matter - the Honourable Member for Pembina and myself because when I brought a resolution before this House urging that the House should appoint a committee to study this controversial subject which had been before the public for such a long time and made my few modest remarks upon it, the person who made the best speech by all odds of the day was the Honourable Member for Pembina. And I want to refresh the memory of the House by just quoting very briefly from something that she said, I'm not quoting word for word in some cases, but I think she will agree that this is what - the sense of what she says. She said, "We cannot stress too loudly or too long, Mr. Speaker, the many advantages of results from the ability to read well. In my estimation, it is the very foundation on which our education system is based." And I agree with that wholeheartedly. The Honourable Member for Pembina also said, "I too, feel that the use of the phonetic system in our schools would be the answer to many of the problems that have arisen in our educational system. I have always been very thankful", she went on to say that that system was in use at the time that she was teaching. But she also said that we need the two systems. She made the same point that I am making that the teacher should be free to use any and all systems and to use the one that best suited the purpose.

Then I was disappointed to find though that after giving such unqualified support to the principle of the resolution that she suggested that it would be a better way inasmuch as the Department of Education Act had been amended to provide for an enlarged Advisory Committee, and to assign more work to that committee that - more responsibility - that this question should be referred to the Advisory Committee for study. And recognizing that the Honourable Member for Pembina was on that occasion undoubtedly speaking for the government, I recognized that that was the amendment that was going to pass, and I accepted the situation with as good grace as I could muster at the time and I said that although I would have hoped to have seen the Committee

March 15, 1966

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) .... set up, that if it was the decision of the government that this was to go to the Advisory Committee, then so be it, and I hoped that they would show the same objective approach that the Honourable Member for Pembina had, and that they would use as good judgment and logic as she had used in her argument and that they would show more initiative in dealing with this matter than had occurred in the past.

That's four years ago, Mr. Chairman. That question has been before the Advisory Committee ever since. And where are we? Well, we've made some little bit of progress. I must confess. Some progress, and for some of it I certainly give the present and former Minister their share of education. But we haven't made enough, in my opinion, for us to feel satisfied with this progress and that's the reason that I am bringing it before the House now.

I have never pretended to be an expert on this matter but I have been coached in it by people whom I believe are experts. I have the authority to name at least three of them; Dr. Andrew Moore, Robert Bend and a Mr. Lyle Patterson, who is the principal of the elementary school in MacGregor, Manitoba. From what I know of those gentlemen personally and in their professional capacities, I consider them to be three of the outstanding educators in the Province of Manitoba. The latter may not be quite as well known as the former two, but I can assure the committee that he doesn't suffer comparison with them at all.

I have also, as my honourable friends know, been conferring with the group of ladies who are headed by Mrs. Johnson and Mrs. Carsted and others who have taken a particular interest in this matter. Now as I say some progress has been made and I am not wanting to take any of the credit from the government for what has been done. I do give the department credit for financially supporting the Winnipeg School System experiment with the Phonetic Keys to Reading System. I do give them credit also for instituting a course at the Teachers College for the teachers who are in training, because obviously if there were going to be any progress made in this matter at all, the teachers themselves should be given some instruction in it. Those things are progress in my opinion. But the Manitoba Teachers who want to use articulated phonics textbooks must either purchase the text themselves or persuade their administrations to ask the school board or the local parents for funds to provide these books.

Now surely, Mr. Chairman, surely this is not a satisfactory state of affairs. If we approve of this at all surely the teachers shouldn't have to buy the textbooks themselves or be in the uncertain position of having to persuade the administrations to take them out of the grants that they're given. Many school boards at the present time are waiting for the department to take the initiative of authorizing reading texts for next September. Some of us were very hopeful that we would have this for last September; now we are hoping for next September. But when the parents approach the local school boards, they're usually told, I think, that it's up to the Department of Education. Surely, Mr. Chairman, it is time that at least one articulated phonics text is included in the authorized list so that the professional people that want to use it can order it out of the government grant and use it to the extent that they wish.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister may remember that at the last Session of the House, (I've been bringing this up for four years now regularly) at the last Session of the House I asked the Minister why there were no articulated phonics texts in stock at the Manitoba Textbook Bureau. The Minister told me that large quantities of phonics workbooks were sold by the Bureau and that these workbooks were kept in stock. I have since checked into this matter and I find that the workbooks in question do not teach articulated phonics. At the back of the text "Reading Through Phonics", one of the so-called phonics workbooks, the teacher is told, and I quote: "Have the words read several times, asking the children to listen to the sound at the beginning of each word. Do not teach this sound in isolation." That's the end of the quote. Exactly contrary to the basic system that we're talking about. Vowels are not taught at the Grade 1 level.

Also, Mr. Chairman, the other phonics workbook mentioned by the Minister does not teach articulated phonics; these workbooks merely give the children more practice in the same indirect method contained in the authorized reading program Curriculum Foundation Series. They do not encourage the pronunciation of separate letter sounds as recommended by the Manitoba Royal Commission on Education. Mr. Chairman, I am not blaming the Minister for the situation because I know that with the tremendously heavy responsibilities that he has, that he has to be guided by the experts in the department and the professional help, I'm sure that the information that the Minister gave was completely correct as far as he was concerned but I am told that these are the facts.

My information further is that there are currently no articulated phonics textbooks in

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) .... stock at the Textbook Bureau. These books must be specially ordered and it frequently takes a month or more for the books to arrive from the publishing company. In the February 1966 issue of the Department of Education Bulletin, this item appears: "Curriculum Branch, Manitoba Textbook Bureau. Our order desk and retail store have received numerous requests for teachers' editions and answer booklets. These should be available to teachers only. When ordering these publications, teachers should identify themselves with their school district or division." Does this mean, Mr. Chairman, that parents will no longer be able to order the teachers' editions of the Hay and Wingo text for home tutoring and that lay people will not be able to purchase guide books to reading programs in order to see what method they contain? I think it would be most helpful if we could have an assurance from the Minister that the Textbook Bureau will stock some articulated phonics texts and that the public will be permitted to buy them.

Now as to the research. The 1962 - 65 Winnipeg Phonetic Keys to Reading Experiment was, so far as I know, the first scientific reading experiment conducted in Manitoba for 20 years. You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that last year I suggested that the Department of Education get early test results from this experiment so that the advisory board could come to a decision before school opening in September 1965. That didn't happen. I'm urging now that a decision be made so that that can be done in September '66. I understand that the Department did not even ask for the official report when it was published in June of 1965 and that it was not received by the Department until the last week of August. The Winnipeg administration - and by that term, I mean the professional educational staff as differentiated from the school board - gave the statistics of that report a relatively negative interpretation. They implied in their conclusions that at the end of Grade 3 there was very little difference between the results of the two methods. On the other hand, a majority of the school board itself thought otherwise. They pointed out that the Grade 3 classes which had had the Phonetic Keys to Reading training for the full three years, were given three tests: first, level of comprehension; second, reading vocabulary; third, spelling. The same three tests were given to the fifteen counter-part Look-Say classes which had learned under the curriculum foundation series. This meant that the two sets of classes were compared a total of 45 times. The Phonetic Keys Grade 3 classes proved significantly superior in 17 out of the 45 comparisons. The results from the other 28 comparisons were "statistically non-significant". The Look-Say curriculum foundation series classes did not make a single significantly superior score.

This being the case, Mr. Chairman, how can anyone say that there is no difference in the results obtained by the two methods when the statistics favour the phonetic training 17 to nothing, out of 45 comparisons at the Grade 3 level? The Winnipeg administration's interpretation of the statistic has already been challenged by Dr. Andrew Moore in his minority report to the Winnipeg School Board, and I understand that in December 1965 this report was sent by the board to the Minister of Education. I would like to ask the Minister if this report has been distributed to members of the sub-committee on primary reading and to the advisory board and has Dr. Moore been invited to discuss the matter in person with the Advisory Board? I would urge that he be so invited. Though I personally consider Dr. Moore to be one of our province's foremost educators, some people will say that he is, on this question, a partisan. I would recommend therefore that in addition to Dr. Moore, and of course any other specialists or experts whom they wish to consult, the Department of Education have this very important research from the Winnipeg experiment examined by an independent statistician. An objective summary of the statistics could be distributed to elementary teachers, principals and inspectors throughout Manitoba. And I think that would be very helpful.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a lot of newspaper clippings. I do not intend to read many of them. I would like to have the time available to read what the press reports say with regard to Dr. Andrew Moore's minority report because I think it bears out completely what I have just recorded. But one thing I would like to read briefly is from the Winnipeg Free Press of September 4th which reports a meeting that a group of ladies had with the Honourable the Minister of Education. And even this one, I don't intend to read at any great length. This is not in quotes but it is part of this quite full report of the meeting that the Minister had with this group of ladies - it's headed by a very nice picture of the Minister at his desk and quite a large group of ladies sitting around. The report says that the Minister spent two hours with them and knowing how courteous and how diplomatic and charming the Minister can be, I am sure that they enjoyed themselves greatly. But this press report says: "Dr. Johnson explained Friday, the Department had in fact given permission for Winnipeg schools to continue using the

March 15, 1966

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) .... Phonetic Keys to Reading material now in its possession. It could not see its way clear however to give blanket approval to the use of the articulated phonics program as a "replacement for the curriculum foundation series currently used" etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Minister didn't say that because nobody was asking that; nobody asked that it be a replacement for the series. This is not the question. What is being asked is that it be authorized to be used in conjunction with all the other types. I shall refrain from reading anything from the other press reports that I have here.

Now, Mr. Chairman, not only the Royal Commission on Education and the school trustees and the Honourable Member for Pembina and I, distinguished as all of those people and organizations are we're not the only advocates for a return to the use of this system in conjunction with others. The Manitoba School Trustees clearly stated their position on the subject in November 1961; the Winnipeg School Board has showed further support on August 24, 1965 when trustees voted 8 to 4 in favour of making the Phonetic Keys to Reading series optional for all Winnipeg teachers. And that, Mr. Chairman, is what we would like to have - Optional for all Winnipeg teachers and teachers throughout the province.

I think you are aware, Mr. Chairman, that so far as teachers in other parts are concerned and in other parts of Greater Winnipeg as well, that a great many of the teachers have continued to use the phonetic system, have continued to use textbooks - and I give the Department of Education credit for not trying to prevent them from so doing. But so far as the Winnipeg School Division is concerned, it's been with very great difficulty that teachers have been able to do that because the administration referred to a little while ago, certainly does not seem to be sympathetic to that approach. Some of the trustees - and by the way, I have the clipping here that tells of that trustee report. It's very interesting and I would recommend it to the Minister and to others who are interested. Some of the trustees who opposed the motion stated that they did so because they thought the program should be mandatory not optional. I don't know of any of the folks that I'm speaking of that suggested it should be mandatory. All of them say that they are convinced that it is useful, very useful, when used in combination with the other systems, but they certainly do say that it should not be barred from use. Professional people in Manitoba have stated on many occasions, their dissatisfaction with current reading standards. Statements appear frequently in the press to the effect there are far too many poor readers at every level and that remedial reading instruction is necessary, though not always available, right up to and including the university level.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, surely the time has come for the Manitoba Department of Education to take positive action in this field. It is not enough to provide phonetic teacher training; we must also provide teachers with the tools to train children in the classroom. There is no need to wait for the conclusion and evaluation of the current experimentation with new reading programs. No matter which series of sight method readers are eventually authorized, we will still need supplementary phonetic training to reinforce them. I would strongly recommend to the Minister that he authorize at least one articulated phonics text for Manitoba public schools. This should be included in the official authorized list of textbooks so that teachers could order phonetic texts at their option out of government grants. This would open many more classroom doors next September to the practical basic training in phonics which was recommended by the Royal Commission, seven long years ago.

Mr. Chairman, as I draw near the end of my remarks, I am constrained to say that wouldn't it be a tragedy, wouldn't it really be a tragedy, if after all the attention that's been paid to education in this jet age, after so many people agreeing that it should be given the first priority of all, after all the money and effort that have been spent on buildings and on instruction, on higher salaries for teachers and in so many ways, because of the importance attached to education, wouldn't it be a tragedy if all of that failed to achieve its full potential because of a basic flaw in the reading program.

The reading program is as important as the Honourable Member for Pembina and I were indicating four years ago. Those four years haven't been lost completely, but there certainly has not been much progress made in the meantime. Some, I admit, but certainly not enough. And I will say again, Mr. Chairman, that I recognize that this is not the fault of the Minister. I know that the Minister is not likely to make unilateral decisions which run contrary to the advice of his own experts and the people, the advisory board and the others who are advising him on these matters; but I do say that the advice that he has been getting has not been making the progress that we were hoping for a few years ago and I suggest that it be speeded up drastically in the interests of education in this province. And I make this suggestion to my Honourable

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) .... friend - I don't want to have to keep on arguing this matter every year and I'm sure that the Committee doesn't want me to be in this position, but I believe I was right four years ago. I believe the right thing at that time would have been to have had an independent committee of this house. I believe that it's only some body like that that will call the different people together and make a judgment between them, because it's difficult for the people in the Department of Education to do and I think it's almost impossible for the Minister himself to do. I say now that regardless of whether this event that's been prophesied so often takes place this summer or whether it does not, regardless of what the outcome of it is, if it should take place, regardless of whether I'm back here or not, if it takes place, regardless of which side of the House I'm sitting on if I am back here, I'll still have enough connection with some of the Members of this House, that I'm going to say now that if there isn't more progress and greatly more progress made than there has been in the last while I'm going to see to it that there is again a resolution introduced into this House asking for this question to be decided by a committee of this House because I believe that that's the only way that we will break the log jam that exists - and, Mr. Chairman, there is a log jam and that log jam is operating to the disadvantage of the students of the Province of Manitoba. If I need to say it again, I say it once more, that because he is so busy I'm inclined to exonerate the Minister as I did his predecessor, but we can't let the matter go on much longer, so action before next year or I will be speaking once again.

MR. JOHNSON: ..... The Member from Lakeside I appreciate his interest and the statement he has made this evening but surely I don't want to be in the position of Minister of recommending certain texts and courses to be taught in the schools of Manitoba. We have the machinery, we have a department, we have the best people I am advised in the elementary reading field, on an elementary seminar reading committee who have been working very hard examining the results of the experimentation to date. As Minister I'm in this position that the matter has been referred to the Advisory Board to the Department of Education which contains many educators and many lay persons. I have kept the Board fully informed on all developments plus all materials which have been given to me by citizens at large and by everyone who has made a submission to me. The curriculum branch has also been given the information, and all this material has been passed on to the Advisory Board, the professional committee examining reports and they will of course refer their recommendations to the Advisory Board through the Directory of Curriculum. When it receives a recommendation from the professional committee, and passes to me - you know the Advisory Board passes the recommendation.

Now during the past year I have made direct enquiries as to what we could announce at this session when it was coming up. I pressed the Advisory Board; I was informed that they have been fully cognizant of the material that I have sent to them. I invited them to have these interested people appear before them if they so wished and I have waited for this report. Now we have, I have the understanding and can report to the House, that the professional committee, elementary seminar committee, who were reviewing the reading matter for some time, anticipate recommending a Basil reading series to the Advisory Board this spring for implementation in the fall to replace the curriculum foundation series. It is also my understanding that this will be the first recommendation of eventual multiple authorizations, and it means I understand, two or more series and authorizations, both or all, and of course the teachers will have a choice.

With reference to this whole matter I have done my best in the past year to understand it, the rather controversial attitudes of many people. I have listened to outstanding educators, as has the Member from Lakeside, express opinions and they are quite variable. I find that this goes back to the days of Egypt; the process of reading has been debated since then.

I understand that there is an articulated phonics series, Mrs. Turner's series at the Teachers College. As you know, this has been brought to their attention, and the teachers have been introduced to articulated phonics. My understanding is that it is the intention of our elementary reading committee to prepare a curriculum pamphlet on the teaching of reading which will outline in detail the basic philosophy of teaching reading and some fundamental principles of methodology and they intend in that pamphlet to include reference to as many known and basic methods and materials as possible. Initially they will supplement this pamphlet by a Basil reading series, a good one in the spring, and it's intended to replace the 40's edition of the curriculum foundation series. The present curriculum foundation series was adopted I understand in 1947 by all the Western Provinces. Subsequently the committee will recommend other series as I indicated to complement the initial authorization and reading teachers will have official access to two or three different authorized reading series as well as a number of

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd) .... supplementary series including PKR which will be listed in the pamphlet we expect for use in handling specific difficulties and should the teachers wish.

Now this is the information that I can give the House at this time. I would point out though that with respect to articulated phonics texts, as I said last year the Department only carries in stock those books which are in sufficient demand to justify them being carried in stock. We have numerous stocks of books, and only limited space of course. When the demand for articulated phonics texts rises to a point the department advise me they will carry these, as we do carry such articulated series as Hay and Wingo and others.

The comment the Honourable Member from Lakeside made from the bulletin I understand refers to arithmetic texts which are often mistakenly purchased by parents or by others for children who use them in place of doing their arithmetic homework and teachers ask us to insure that children don't have free access to mathematics answer questions. I just want to emphasize that no restriction is placed on the purchase of any reading or other material. As I understand this, the recommendations and interpretation of the PKR experiment - what I have done as I said, is referred it to the committee having received it the Thursday before school opened and we were asked by the City of Winnipeg if we would want to make it optional, which we did for the current year, and my understanding, and the best understanding I can get in talking with all advocates of the PKR method, and noting Andrew Moore's last comment, that no particular method in itself is the total answer, my understanding is from Dr. McIntosh, whom I met this summer, who is the head of Public School Education for the City of Glasgow, who made the statement to me, or to the Department, that in their city various methods are adopted, the PKR method, the ITA method and he said the kids all read in Grade IV. He said we use all the methods that come along.

But I would like to emphasize and underline my position in this matter, that we have pursued this vigorously; the Department are very mindful of the controversy. We have excellent people looking at this, first class people in the reading field; took one of the top people from the City of Winnipeg School System who is now assistant director of our curriculum branch. In this area we have our advisory board. I am pressing them for the very answers as to where the different methods fit in. I'm assured that the University is introducing reading methods including articulated phonics to our teachers and I can advise the honourable member that in anticipation of the report to the advisory board, this spring, and this report will be a report to the Legislature, but we are hoping to -- in order to develop a strong awareness among the general teaching bodies in Grades 1 to 9 of the development reading skills, a period of in-service training will be necessary during '66 to '68 to coincide with the introduction of new reading programs. A special course to train teachers who could work in the school district as instructors and consultants will be offered this coming summer. We think it's wise to pick out top people, introduce them to the work that's being done, the various reading series and the supplementary materials including PKR and others, and with the help of superintendents and inspectors, these teachers will organize meetings within the districts during the next year or two.

It is also hoped to arrange for some television telecast time this fall to review the primary reading skills for teachers and interested parents and the hope is that -- the elementary seminar committee of course will have to get all this through the Advisory Board and until it goes through that body and comes into my office, I can share no more with you as to the final decisions. But I can assure the Honourable Member from Lakeside that I have probably spent more time in the past year trying to understand all the different problems with respect to phonics and I just say to him that I feel this is certainly something that must be left to the experts. I do know that the Advisory Boards are concerned and have been given all the materials that - everything, and attitudes -- material that has come to hand.

I thought the Member from Lakeside with his particular interest in phonics might be interested in a small pamphlet I found most interesting, which is published by the United States Department of Health and Education which is another attitude to reading. I found this rather informative and would ask him to look it over.

However, I can assure the honourable member that all the experimentation to date and attitudes and the charge of rigidity within the department, it's attitude towards the methods and texts used, as I say to you the elementary seminar committee are thinking of different authorized texts, different supplementary materials and hope to recommend this to the advisory board in the near future, followed by in-service training and some public enhancement of this.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I can understand how difficult my honourable friend the Minister must find this subject. Certainly it has been a long controversy and certainly it must be frustrating to find the experts with such violently differing opinions. But surely, that is where it needs the firm hand of some higher authority to take ahold of it and say there's been enough experimentation, we're going to do something concrete on this. And would my honourable friend the Minister be surprised if I told him that I am informed, I am informed that of the six new reading texts, whatever the correct designation is, that have been, shall we say recommended or authorized (I don't think they are authorized yet) but recommended by the Curriculum Committee on reading, that of the six that have been recommended or supported, not one single one of them is an articulated phonics textbook; not one. Now, isn't that rather remarkable in itself, Mr. Chairman? After all the time that's been spent on this.

I don't want to attack anybody and for goodness sake I don't want to add to the difficulties of the Minister in this complex and controversial subject, but is he not aware that there is a resistance in the Winnipeg School System - and by that I mean the administrative staff as distinguished from the School Board - that there is a resistance to the introduction, in any degree, of the phonetic system and somebody just has to say that the experimentation that's before us is sufficient; sometime we've got to move on this thing. If the department feels that it can't do it, then for goodness sakes let's have a committee of this House and let's have a group that will sit around and call these different people in front of us and let's make up our own minds. It'll be an easy thing I think for the committee to decide. Because this is tremendously important to the young people of this province.

The Minister mentioned, Mr. Chairman, and quite properly, the excellent book on phonics that is authorized for use in the Teachers College, the author being Mrs. Turner. Is the Minister aware, I'm sure he is, that the department doesn't publish this book at all or sponsor its publication - Mrs. Turner has to pay for that, for the publication of it out of her own resources. Where are we going to be if there isn't something done and if Mrs. Turner decides that she can't continue to do that? This is a most unsatisfactory way to leave such an important question. Once again, I'm not trying to embarrass the Minister or blame him but I certainly am trying to say that we must try and get some more progress in this matter, Mr. Chairman.

The largest part of my library is what I have on the phonics system of teaching reading.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll send you some more.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, I'd be glad to have them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions on curricula for the Minister but I thought that I would like to say how much I appreciated the remarks of the Honourable Member for Lakeside and when he says that there is a log jam, I heartily agree with him because I realize the complexity of our education system today. I said on the Minister's salary that it's taken us a long time to find out the value of the phonetic system of reading. Now when we talk about education explosion and the Minister the other day talked about the educational revolution, I think that we have to do something to break this log jam.

I think the presentation of the Honourable Member for Lakeside was a reasonable one because he said that we were not trying, those of us who believe in the phonetic system of reading, were not trying to force this system to the exclusion of any other. My mind goes back to the days a few years ago when I was attending evening classes in psychology. I'm saying this because the other day I made mention of the fact that I thought we should have more psychologists in the schools. I said that when a group of six years olds start school, we find they have mental ages running from four to eight years of age. This gives a teacher considerable difficulty. It is not just that simple either. When we were being tested at university, eight or nine numbers were called out and we were asked to repeat them; and when we repeated these nine numbers the professor wanted to know how we did it. He said "Did you hear them in your mind's ear or did you see them in your mind's eye?" I had never thought about this but it didn't take me long to realize that I had repeated them because I heard them in my mind's ear. Now perhaps this is where we should start. For instance it's a well known fact that people who read very fast are sight readers. That's why I say I say I'm not prejudiced against one system. I read with my ear; I actually hear the words over again; therefore I'm a slow reader. But when we find these things out in children, and when they're starting school, we have a chance to use the right tools. I say this is the proper approach. We need more than one tool. Perhaps we're going about it, we're putting them all in the one category and trying to force a

(MR. WRIGHT: cont'd) .... system on them that's not working out.

Now I find the greatest criticism in my area is this very thing of reading because it was simple in my day, going to school and learn to read. I had a mother tell me the other day that her child could read before she went to school at age 4½ by being taught the phonetic system and when she was playing with other children who were trying to learn the sight system, the other children couldn't understand when she was pronouncing the syllables and that. So you see it's quite a hodge podge this business of reading. But what people can't understand it why it's taking us so long to realize that there's value in the phonetic system and it should never have been washed out completely. It has its place.

Now I wanted to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, with all this talk about the knowledge explosion and the education revolution and all this. We heard the other day members say that with the constant need for curriculum revision -- this is a continuing thing today, not just a matter of bringing out a new textbook every year or so or every three or four years now, it's a continuing thing -- and there will be an acceleration in learning in regard to central concepts of each field. This is why we have to have this constant curriculum revision.

Now we have our teachers hired for, I suppose they are hired by the year but they actually work ten months. When I hear the other day that a new course was about to be offered and that the teachers hadn't seen the course until they started in September, I was at a loss to understand this. I believe that this would probably be an exception rather than the rule, but I want the Minister to tell me just what control he has when they are setting up a new course. We have our teachers in the summer time, some of them going back to summer school - this is good; some of them are marking examination papers. What call have we got on the teachers' time to make sure that they are well up on the subject they are about to teach, especially when we have curriculum revision? I know that a teacher's life is very arduous and I'm not begrudging them their holidays, but I am at a loss to understand why a new course should be presented at the beginning of the fall term and that the teachers haven't had sufficient time to make themselves aware of the course.

Now while I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to briefly ask the Minister - I bring this up every year because I'm one of the people who believe that schools are loaded against boys. I have read this to the House on various occasions - an article from McLean's Magazine back in '63, written by a superintendent of schools where he believes this - he said that when boys go to school they would function much better with male teachers, get away from this Dick and Jane idea of readers and to talk to them about something more manly.

I reported last Session of an experiment in separation that was being carried on in Vancouver by a primary supervisor who has a Ph. D. from the University of Alberta. This experiment started in December '63. I would like to know whether it's good in the eyes of the Department of Education in Manitoba or whether it's not. It's a well known fact that anthropologists tell us that boys mature slower than girls. The reason that we have -- well we're getting back to the subject of reading -- it's a well known fact that boys are much poorer readers than girls, sometimes because the whole school setup is designed for girls - the female teacher; they're playing with paper cutouts and things like this. Now this experiment promised great results. It's being done in more than one place and in this day and age when we are constantly needing to streamline our educational system I think that we should be told that our department is aware of what's going on in other places. I don't want to, like the Honourable Member for Lakeside, keep on asking these questions. I think that we have competent people, certainly more competent than I, to ask them. I'd like to know if he's aware of what's going on in this segregation in regard to teaching and what he thinks about it.

MR. JOHNSON: I don't know what the honourable member is -- what course he's referring to, but I have six children in the public school system; I think they're getting a pretty darn good education. They're getting far more outlets than we ever had as kids. They're being introduced to new mathematics in Grade 4 - Cuisenaire, all the various mathematical teaching methods and so on. And certainly it's not an easy thing when four or five years ago we had one consultant, one stenographer in curriculum and suddenly being challenged with approaching almost every subject - in fact every subject in every grade - plus having designed a completely new high school program in the last couple of years.

There's a tremendous challenge to the teaching profession. I'm not underscoring it but this is why we have not been able to proceed with the implementation of certain courses as rapidly as we originally had planned or our seminars had anticipated, namely that we have a massive retraining program and to this effect we have had the new sciences which pose a very

(MR. JOHNSON: cont'd) . . . special problem in in-service training at the university last summer. Certainly it takes the teacher back into university in the summertime. We pay the fees and give small bursaries, provide the instruction, because this is simply a matter that has to be coped with. Also we have very definitely been trying to recognize it even more this year where-with respect to in-service training for teachers we're going to try and arrange with various divisions, methods by which we can conduct certain in-service training during the day. I don't know, when you say the system's loaded - I wouldn't care to comment. I'm not that - I've tried to understand what's happening - it's loaded against the boys, cutting out paper dolls and so on. I don't know just what the honourable member's referring to.

And with respect to reading, let me make it abundantly clear I'm not going to be put in a position of saying what reading series is the best. I have to depend on the best review of people I can get. But certain divisions, teachers have sat down with their superintendent, picked up a certain phonetic series, or certain complementary phonetic series to their reading program and are completely satisfied that they're giving the right type of a reading program. This is within the ability of a division to accomplish; and all over the world, all over the world various school systems are experimenting with different reading series, phonetic approaches, and with different students these series, certain students benefit more from a more articulated type of program as I understand it, but certainly we need our eyes, ears and even our nose to read properly. And gee whinikers, I don't think it's all that bad.

I do say that the department are most concerned about the present reading series but these are highly professional people and they're not going to be stampeded into recommending a program in the schools that's going to be here for some time unless they're convinced it's absolutely the best one available, from everything they can determine. I have that feeling, that this is precisely what they are saying to me and through me to this Legislature. I think we have to have confidence in someone. It's no different than taking out a gall bladder. I'm not going to tell a doctor whether to do a transverse incision or a vertical. I think that's up to the --(Interjection)-- well, I would with the Honourable Member from St. George anytime he wants but - I don't know that I'm going to get into this kind of interpretation.

I don't want to minimize for one minute however the problem in curriculum. This is after all, as the member has said, the heart of the Department. I think that one thing that is very evident, it's just virtually, as I said earlier, exploding, in that every course is under critical review. And I think this is a good thing. I personally may have certain prejudices but that's not - I have to listen to the experts. I am convinced that after two or three years of Cuisenaire, a kid then goes into problems - he doesn't know if he's in the room or out in the hall. You know, the transition hasn't been worked out, in my opinion. But in the hands of the able teacher who knows the tricks of the trade and the skills it's another matter.

I think there were certain problems last year. Last fall we were very disturbed with respect to certain textbooks not arriving on time. Now we've placed these as early as we can and I have a list of the individual texts that did not arrive in time - new texts for teachers to get into the classroom with - but this was due to certain problems with the publisher not coming through on schedule. However, I would say that we have a continuing problem in working with the teaching profession, to introduce all the newer concepts and programs. I think you can see from a glance that once we get into the newer mathematics at Grade 9 - we were into it in Grade 4 last year - we have to go in with pilot classes to iron out the difficulties and to see just what the problems are; and I think those pilot classes have paid off. However, I have a list of the various numbers of courses of teacher-in-training which occurred last summer at the university. There were something like 3,200 teachers back at university last summer which shows a tremendous degree of responsibility in meeting this challenge that's before us. We haven't got too much precedent to go by, especially in Canada where we are all in the same boat at the same time. But our directors are meeting constantly and regularly to share these difficulties and we're in very close touch with the teaching profession in this matter.

March 15, 1966

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, recently the Minister tabled the Manitoba Study of Handicapped Children which was prepared by John A. Christianson. Could he tell us what the total cost of this study was? What the salary was paid Mr. Christianson and what his expenses were?

MR. JOHNSON: I haven't got -- I can get that exact return for the honourable member. I believe it was around \$11,000 but I'll check - for the whole thing. The honorarium paid to Mr. Christianson was \$3,000 for the study which took 15 months; that was based on the time spent by the members of the Royal Commission on the same pro rata basis. I used that as a guideline.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The \$3,000 included expenses, or what were the expenses over and above that?

MR. JOHNSON: There was a research assistant and certain expenses. They weren't heavy. I'd be glad to get a full detailed account of that.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, one more question. The Minister told the House about the educational program he has outlined for the Interlake area. There was one question that wasn't dealt with and that was the capital costs of the schools. Will there be a different formula?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on the resolution dealing with instruction and not capital costs of schools.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, is - would you prefer I dealt with it on No. 5 then?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pardon? We're on Resolution 34 (a). 34 (a)--passed. . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I've been reviewing what the Honourable Minister had to say about the General Course and the Matriculation Course, and I've been trying to appreciate his problem and that of the Department in coping with this matter which apparently is into its fourth year. I looked at the reports of the Department as at last June, and I'm afraid that there isn't the kind of information from which I could come to any conclusion.

I'm looking at Page 47 of the report, and 48, and it speaks of the growing acceptance of the General Course in terms of number of classes, and indicates that although the Grade 12 course in 1965 consisted of 38 classes, by now the Grade 10 course is up to 122 classes. Unfortunately it doesn't give the number of pupils, which makes it somewhat difficult to relate to the academic records which show up on Pages 55 and 56.

Now here we have, "number of students who undertook examinations" and we find again, Grade 12, Vocational Course, 869; then we have the Grade 10, 11 and 12 High School Leaving Course and Vocational Correspondence lumped together - so I don't know how many of those are Grade 12 - and on Page 56 we have Grade 12 University Entrance Course and General Course lumped together, in June, of 11,043; Grade 12 University Entrance Course and General Course, August 1965, 5,600 - and I imagine there is duplication there because August supplementals are supplementals and therefore I assume that -- can I assume that out of 11,000 students who wrote the exams in June of 1965, 5,600 wrote supplementals? Is that a fair assumption? Can it be that half of the students who wrote Grade 12 exams in June had to write off supplementals in August? Can that be? And if that is so, or if the figure is anywhere approaching that proportion, and assuming, as I do, that the vast majority of them are University Entrance Course students, do we then find that students who are taking University Entrance Course are failing a large number of subjects?

The other statistics that I find, on Page 135 under Provincial Statistical Tables, would indicate that in the province, in Grade 12, in 1965, there were 9,643 students. And if I read that correctly, do I then relate 9,643 students in Grade 12 of whom over 11,000 wrote exams? Am I then to assume that well over 1,000 in June were students who were no longer in Grade 12, and writing Grade 12 exams?

I wonder if the Minister understands my problem because I have difficulty understanding his figures. Therefore, being unable to work with these statistics, I must therefore generalize and raise again the problem of this General Course. I am given to understand that the General Course is an outstanding course. I am told that it is very well designed, very well conceived, and that teachers enjoy teaching the course. They think very highly of it. And yet the Minister, in the fourth year of the course, is appealing for help in selling the course. I'm looking at Hansard, Page 919 and 920, which is only yesterday, when he appealed to us: "Help me in selling this." He addresses the honourable member to whom he was directing his answers. He says, "I hope he gets out and sells it with the rest of us."

Now to whom are we to sell it, assuming that we are all on his side - and I think most

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd).....of us are on this General Course? To whom do we sell it? Do we sell it to teachers? No, teachers are well impressed with the course. Do we sell it to principals? No, principals complain bitterly that they can't get enough children to take the General Course. I have been told that 12.7 percent of the students are taking the General Course. I am under the impression that it was originally planned that of those students in the academic field about 20 percent would be taking the University Entrance Course and the balance would be taking the General Course. And here we find this great imbalance which apparently has to be sold in some way. Well I suggest to the Minister, if he hasn't yet cottoned on to it, that the wrong people are taking the General Course, and by the same token, as a corollary to that statement, obviously the wrong people or the wrong number of people are taking the University Course. And the result is, as I understand it, that those who are taking the General Course are not getting the benefit out of it. I hope the Minister will tell us how many who are taking the General Course had supplementals. How many were upgraded? I recall that he didn't know what I meant when I spoke about raw scores and he was going to find out what I meant, when I asked how many examinations were marked and then the pass mark arbitrarily or mathematically calculated to be raised in order to provide a satisfactory number of passes.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that although there is a problem here, this is the fourth year and we are apparently - when I say we, the Department or the Minister - is still apparently trying to sell the university on the General Course. And I find it difficult to believe that the university, which is I guess about ten miles from here geographically but should be much much closer to this building in terms of interest, should have to be sold on a course which academic people have recognized as being very valuable, and certainly as the Minister said, that he thinks that as the university accepts the General Course in certain areas, we'll see more and more outlets.

Well the fact is that the General Course, as I understand it, is a terminal course. There is nothing which a student expects to go on to after having completed Grade 12. Well, I am told -- the Minister has interjected saying "Oh, no." Well then, I wonder if the Minister would clarify it? The minister has told us now that he has six children going to public school. Suppose one of these children wants to become a nurse. Is that prospective nurse going to be able to take the General Course and the benefits derived there, or will the Minister have to say to his daughter who is going to be a nurse in my analogy, "You have to take the Matriculation Course. You will have to take the mathematics involved in the Matriculation Course." Now you may not be - I'm not now speaking of the Minister's child because I don't know the ability in mathematics, but there are many students who want to be nurses who may not be able to cope with the mathematics course on that level in the University Matric. Does that then mean that if the nursing fraternity requires the University Entrance as a prerequisite that that student is barred from nursing at a time when we need nurses?

Suppose a student wishes to become a chartered accountant. Does that person have to qualify for the physics and chemistry involved in the Matriculation Course? Is it essential for a chartered accountant to be able to cope with that? It seems to me that if we don't get this adjustment pretty soon, where we realize that a student who is an average student may not be inclined to one or other field of the University Entrance Course, may be barred from proceeding further into a profession which in itself may not need some of these subjects which are found difficult. Is it only a question of selling the University, as the Honourable Minister seems to indicate, or is it a much more adaptable course which makes it possible to switch around one from the other? I would like to suggest that the Matriculation Course should be considered an intermediate course. Apparently - the Minister speaks of the status involved - it would be well to consider whether or not the student at high school taking the Matriculation Course should be told, "Well now you're not through; when you are through with Grade 12 you must move on, because your education is not completed. You haven't yet acquired the right to say 'my education has been completed' at Grade 12." Now I think that with the General Course many are given the graduation ceremony, saying, "You are now going out into the world," but the Matriculation Course, being designed for university entrance, is not a "now you are going out into the world" deal, it's "now you are just moving onto your next grade" and I would like to consider with the Minister just how it is being sold. Is it still a status or should it be just an indication of incompleteness of studies?

I could not find in all my material here the number of students that entered the University of Manitoba last year in the first year, which I assume is now called second year. I wonder how many graduates there were -- interjection -- pardon? It's now called first year. That's

March 15, 1966

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). . . . . the year, the first year of entrance into university. How many students entered university in 1966 compared with the number that graduated from the University Entrance Course in 19 - I meant of course, I meant how many entered university in the fall of '65 out of the number that graduated from the University Entrance Course in the spring of '65? Are we not still groping for this salesmanship when the fact is that children's futures are being affected now while this plan is going on and all this selling is going on, and the Articulation Committee is meeting with the University people. How many childrens' studies are being affected and their qualifications for progressing are being affected whilst we are going through this transition period which is four years? Does that mean that we have affected the lives so far of two Grade 12 years and are we into the third Grade 12 year of having children confused as to which course they ought to be taking in terms of where they are going, and have we a right to accept the wording in the departmental report which says that "care is being taken to incorporate into new programs or courses as much flexibility and subject content as possible that will enable students to develop to their fullest capacity and permit teachers to take into account the individual differences in abilities and rates of development amongst pupils?" Is that a fair statement to make in the light of the fact that apparently some children are taking a University Entrance Course they are not capable of absorbing. Other children, because they are in the General Course, cannot aspire to take certain fields - and I used the example of nursing and I think there is something in prospect about that particular field - because they haven't acquired the courses as a prerequisite that are required.

The introduction to the subject on General Course in the departmental report says that the General Course represents a three year high school education program, "designed principally for those students whose interests, abilities and inclinations are such that upon leaving school they do not normally enter university." All right then, I ask this specific question. How many graduates in June of 1965 were there in Grade 12? How many entered university in the fall of 1965? How many University Matriculation students failed at least one subject in June of 1965? How many of those writing exams in 1965 in Grade 12 were General Course and how many were University Matriculation. How does the Minister reconcile my problem with the statistics which appear in his book, where we have 9,600 Grade 12 students compared with exams written in June and August of some, was it 16,000? 15,685.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister rises to answer this - I only have the one question. Yesterday I suggested that a new course should be started to help the young people. For the lack of a better name we could call it the Homemaker Course, where the young people would have a chance to learn things that might help them when they are married later on, something about the tax structures of our country and something about mortgages and so on. I haven't heard anything from the Minister. I wonder if he could tell me if the reason is because he thinks it's not feasible, that there's no merit to it, and if not, I wonder if he would endeavour to have his experts study this in this coming year and maybe come with a report at the estimates of next year, providing of course that he and I are still occupying our seats.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the reason I made the plea for some understanding of the General Course is that it is a good course. I'm surprised -- you may be wondering why I suggested that maybe we should show more tolerance towards a new course, but it hasn't enjoyed, frankly, the prestige of the traditional matriculation one stream course that existed in this province for so many years, and we have had a high school leaving course, of course, for many, many years, but in the Speech from the Throne the honourable member's Leader said with reference to the General Course, "a disaster of the magnitude of the General Course - an excellent course not being used by the proper people. It's not being used, there's no opportunity to go to university if the student changes his mind. The Provincial Government didn't enquire before it inaugurated the General Course to see what profession a student would enter."

Well are we going to continue to debunk this course? Are we just going to have one course at high school? Is that what you want to say to me? I'm trying to explain as simply as I can, and it's pretty hard for me to be simple in my explanations as you know. The General Course is an alternative course. Originally it was not designed as a university entrance course. It was designed as a course to attract, a good challenging course, more everyday mathematics, more everyday English and so on, and physical science, designed to lead on to the trades and technologies. There are twelve technologies now to which a General Course student can aspire. We graduated our first group the year before last. We have explained it to business. We have had it endorsed by the businessmen of Manitoba.

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

We have been working, especially in the last year, at going to employers, when we heard certain charges that when a chap goes up to look for a job, they ask him if he's General, the University Entrance Course, and they'll take the former over him. We're trying to break down that attitude and we have to work -- we've gone to the top management of banks throughout the province and talked to them. Many of them have hired them, the Hydro and other people, and as a matter of fact, in realizing there should be even more outlets for these boys that have completed Grade 12, we have been having with our Articulation Committee and now professional people who are teaching these courses in the high schools both at the General Course and Matric level, meeting with the University authorities who are examining alternative courses. They think this could lend itself -- and I'm not going to predict their outcome but at the moment, as I indicated, the senate of the University has directed each faculty to look at the academic excellence of these courses to determine whether they could serve as admission to those faculties, and we are going to pursue this. I am most concerned that it gain the prestige and frankly until we have more graduates from this course entering business and technology and possibly other areas, we are not going to -- it's going to take time to build this image. In Grade 10 at the present time there are 5,029 boys and girls in the province taking the course; in Grade 10, 2,737; Grade 11, 1,585; and this year 707 - the department estimate about 7% of the Grade 12 enrollment.

For example, the General Course, in Commercial in Grade 10 there are 1,874, Grade 11 about 1,643, 11.8% of the Grade 11's taking vocational-commercial which is the General Course content; Grade 12, 897. In vocational-industrial there are 514 in 10; 324 in Grade 11; and 215 in Grade 12. And I would hope that we can -- mining technology that will come in at The Pas this year is another challenging course. Chemistry, as you know, was added this year, the chemistry technology, and I'm excited over the fact that the lab and x-ray technology are looking at this with us closely now, and the nursing profession are looking at it. --(Interjection)-- Well, now, I'm not going to -- the schools of nursing determine their standards for admission to their schools, and we have discussed recently with the MARN the course in depth. I wrote them some time ago, I wrote them a year ago and told them to sit down with my professional people and academically look at the academic content of their course, as to why the General Course wouldn't meet their needs. I have received a brief which said, "We approve of the sciences. We still think the children should have University Entrance English subjects." I have asked them to sit down again with my academics staff which they are doing at the present time, and again as I said, the nursing profession is looking at a departure from the traditional methods, and I think this will come out in the Minister of Health's committee. I am hopeful, and the nurses did tell me that last year 93% of the girls that they took into nursing had the University Entrance standing. I understand this fall that one of our hospitals will be accepting the General Course, but we have to have the Manitoba Association accept this challenging course, which I think is fine.

Now one other quick one. The number of students this year, those coming in from high schools to the first year course in the university proper, increased from 2,106 to 2,721, or 29% increase this year. That is quite apart from the 600-odd at the University Department of Education facility.

MR. CHERNIACK: What percentage, Mr. Chairman, if we know that 27 went in from Grade 12, how many were taking the University Entrance Course in Grade 12?

MR. JOHNSON: Last year 7,000 -- no, that's the number of papers, I'm sorry. I have the total number of papers written. I haven't got that - I don't know right offhand. I can get that.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the Honourable Minister know the explanation for some 15,000 examinations written out of some 9,600 students enrolled?

MR. JOHNSON: How many examination papers did you . . . . ?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well I find in the departmental report that Grade 12 examinations written in June 1965, 11,043; Grade 12 in August, 5,600, which I read as a total of 16,685 as compared with the number of students in Grade 12 shown on Page 135 of the book, as 9,643. I was assuming from that, possibly wrongly, that 9,600 students wrote 16,000 exams, which seems to be an awful lot of supplementals being written; and if so, I wonder how many of those students that were taking University Entrance Courses had failures. And while the Minister's looking for that it seems to me that this is an indication that a number of students who are not able to accept the University Entrance Course are taking it in spite of the fact that they're

March 15, 1966

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd).....getting supplementals. I'm wondering if that's right and I'm wondering whether that in itself is not an indication the students are being allowed to pick a course without being able to indicate that they are able to handle it. The fact is only 2,700 were admitted to the University. How many were taking it and hoping to get in?

MR. JOHNSON: I'll have to get a further breakdown but the only figures I have in front of me are those who wrote a complete Grade 12 of five subjects. At the last set of examinations in '65 there were 7,500. The failure rate was comparable with previous years. We have the breakdown, the failures per paper, number of papers written in Maths, Chemistry, Physics and so on. We haven't got the over-all failure rate. I believe that about 58 percent - I'd rather double check that figure.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, if the failure rate is comparable with previous years, then isn't that an indication that the students who are supposed to be the most select taking the University Entrance Course were not doing any better than the previous years. It seems to me that those taking University Entrance Course should not have a failure rate comparable with previous years. They should not have a failure rate to speak of because they are the select students who are expected to enter the University, and if they're not able to pass Grade 12 University Entrance how are they going to be able to handle University?

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

MR. PAULLEY: Just a minute before we pass. I'm always interested in having a little debate with my friend the doctor from Gimli, and as I mentioned early in the Session I was glad to get from him a confession of failure insofar as the General Course was concerned. Now my honourable friend tonight has said that negotiations are being conducted with the nursing fraternity and others, and also with business and professional people - (interjection)- that's right. I told my honourable friend that at the outset of the General Course that this is what he should be doing. Now four years later --(Interjection)--oh, since you took the department. Then your predecessor, the present Attorney-General, shares with you then the blame for the present situation in education regarding the General Course. You still haven't sold it.

My honourable friend the Minister mentions that he has received many nods of approval from the business fraternity in the province, acceptance of the General Course. I would like to see some of them. I would like to know how many actually there are because it has been pointed out here in the debates that so far, during the consideration of the estimates of the Department of Education, that there is a vast selling job still has to be done, but more important than the selling job is the future of the course is not what it should be.

Now then, Mr. Chairman, according to the information that the Minister has laid before us for the future in education, among other proposals that he suggests for our consideration, or what he is going to do in this dynamic forward-looking jet-propelled approach to education in Manitoba, my honourable friend is going to set up another course that has to be decided early in the student's life -- The General Course, Grade 9. Still the student in Grade 9 and his parents have not been informed fully as to the significance of the General Course. I'm happy to know that the Honourable Minister is working on a brochure. I hope he has that brochure in time for September or better still for June of this year for the students who are coming out of Grade 8. But there's another course now, according to the information that the Minister has laid before us, that the Occupational Entrance Course for Grades 7 and 8 will be established in a number of schools.

I want the Minister to assure us here now that he's starting another course which the student has to decide as to whether or not they're going to take early in their schooling - and I suggest Grades 7 and 8 surely are early, has he got all the material necessary in order to inform the students, their parents and their teachers what is the full significance of the Occupational Entrance Course. I think this is very important. The Minister tells us that we're going to start another approach insofar as junior vocational schools are concerned. How widespread is the information respecting the junior vocational schools? We note that there is one to be built at the foot of Salter Street Bridge, and there's been some controversy of course over that one because it's near some of the exports from the great village of Gimli, namely the fish and - Pardon - (Interjection)- no there's nothing wrong with fish but I think there's something wrong with a school being next door to a fish factory. I'm sure that the Honourable Minister is fully aware of that fact; if he isn't he certainly should be. --(Interjection)-- Yes it is a fishy deal.

MR. JOHNSON: I lived three blocks from a fish plant.

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon.

MR. JOHNSON: I lived three blocks from a fish plant and practiced medicine and never got very much trouble.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, but your ancestral background equipped you for that.

MR. JOHNSON: Superior note.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, certainly superior - I mean nothing derogatory when I say that.

MR. DESJARDINS: He says it smells better than here.

MR. PAULLEY: But in all seriousness though, Mr. Chairman. Dealing with this Occupational Entrance Course, what type of a selling job has the Minister started in respect of this course? Where is a student who in Grade 7 or Grade 8 who chooses the Occupational Entrance Course - where will they go? What will be their future? In what niche of this forward-looking society of ours will these young boys, possibly young women as well, find returns and rewards for taking the course that has been suggested by the Minister?

I don't want the Honourable the Minister of Education saying to the representative from Radisson, whoever he may be, four years from now, we are starting to provide a brochure so that the students and the parents know what the course is all about. I'd like to know from the Minister now the information that is going to be made available to the students for this Occupational Entrance Course which is going to have to be decided upon apparently in Grade 7 and 8. What is it?

MR. JOHNSON: Written by the experts. Written by the experts. The characteristics of the pupils who enter the Occupational Entrance Course has been planned as my friend knows, to meet those pupils who are referred to as slower learners. They usually find difficulty, according to my information, with the normal program and have lost one or two years before the end of Grade 6 and by assessment of IQ and by the progress in the school, the superintendent of the school or the principal would in a case like this, recognize possibly this child is a under-achiever. Apparently a number of emotionally disturbed fall into this category or it may be cultural deprivation but in any event the assessment of the child in the initial instance is the big one. The purpose of the course is to provide an effective, a type of program that the child can follow and it's more a 'learn by doing' type of program.

Now I could share with the honourable member the basic outline of the course, I'd be glad to give him a copy of it, I have quite a dossier on it here, but basically it is meant to give an outlet to that child who now remains - if you go around to some of our schools you will find a teacher with a child in Grade 8 he just doesn't dare move on into the higher grades. He knows that if he fails again it's more demoralizing and so on and there's no outlet for him. They are going to have three levels, it's seven, eight and nine - a child may move into the junior vocational type of thing at any one of those three levels. They give him an academic program, they spend a lot of time on remedial course reading skills, comprehension, word analysis, word attack and so on; speech, spelling, library; they try to enhance his communicative skills and by way of vocational aspects they're - just see if there's any of the ideas here - there's home economics, shops, and these are described. But in general terms I think the joint committee of the City of Winnipeg and ourselves, and the Occupational Entrance Seminar Committee made up of teachers who have been teaching children of the junior high level are going to recommend this new type of program and I can assure the honourable member that it is hoped that our first venture in this junior vocational setup will get under way before we meet again. I can assure him that initially, much like the General Course, I think maybe we're going to have some difficulties getting people to accept this decision to move a child into these courses. We have to sell them. We have to assist the principal and supervisors in this area by means of brochures. In all of these courses, I don't think - you can do an awful lot of producing of brochures and material but do people - how much do they read and how much do they understand what you are trying to achieve. I think we have to have successful graduates from these institutions before you get the kind of acceptance in these courses that you and I are looking for. But certainly the plan is to produce this material under the guidance of these people who have developed the course and with the City of Winnipeg in this experimental project, but I think it means a lot of individual counselling of both the child and the parent at the time you initiate the move to place the child in such a program. I'd be happy to send a copy of the material on it to the honourable member. It's quite a comprehensive thing but it's really a very practical program for this type of child.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, . . . we're still on education, I wonder if the Leader of the House would consider adjourning a little earlier. The CBC, I am told, has quite an educational program starting at 10 o'clock. I think it's the Munsinger Story. I wonder if we could . . .

March 15, 1966

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his offer of a brochure, preliminary brochure I presume it to be of what we can expect in the Occupational Entrance Course and I will be pleased to see it. I don't agree with him that we should institute courses and then sometime later make an assessment of them because in the meantime harm may have been done to some of our students and our pupils in the province. I note that as I read his brochures about the educational revolution in the Province of Manitoba, quite frequently it gets bogged down insofar as pilot projects are concerned.

But dealing specifically with the Occupational Entrance Couse, the document that was laid before us states that the Occupational Entrance Course for Grades 7 and 8 will be established in a number of schools. Now if I understood the Minister correctly, he was talking about the Junior Vocational School as being the starter and I wonder whether that interpretation of his remarks is correct or otherwise. I don't think, Mr. Chairman, and far be it from me to argue with the experts, the professionals in education. I've only had some limited practical experience insofar as occupational trades are concerned in schools. But unless after reading the brochure of the Minister, my mind is changed, I don't think it's possible or feasible, Mr. Chairman, to have occupational courses in a number of schools. I'd like to hear from the Minister what does this mean, this Item No. 12 when it talks of an Occupational Entrance Course in a number of schools? If he is corelating these to the junior vocational schools, does he mean that there is going to be a number of junior vocational schools for these pupils who decide in Grades 7 and 8 to take the Occupational Entrance Course? Are there going to be a number of them all over the province? How are they going to be operated? I think these are very pertinent questions. I appreciate the fact that the Minister may not have the answers available but it could be that after his Estimates and he has a little more time to study, that he might be able to compile a brochure for the edification of the Member for Radisson so that we don't have a fight if we're both here four years from now, as to why the course didn't pan out the way the Minister thought it should in '66.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I was quite pleased with a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne this year and I read: "My Ministers recognize that the automated society into which we are rapidly moving places unprecedented stresses on the young people of our province. A new youth and manpower agency will therefore be established to design appropriate ways of involving our young people more directly in shaping their own future within the province and to co-ordinate manpower development policies generally." I have been looking through the Estimates, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps the Minister could help me to find the item where this amount would be shown, to carry on this agency.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I take it we are still dealing with instruction and I have been informed that quite a number of our high schools are just giving one course, either the General or the Matriculation Course. How many schools do we have of the secondary schools that are just offering one course? And then also, the matter that I am coming up to is that apparently where they are just offering one course and students want to take another course, they have to go to a different school within the division, if it's offered within the division, and that as a result of pupils having to be transported for long distances, that they will not take the course of their choice but rather take the course that is offered at the school that is closest to them, and as a result, a good number of our high school students are taking the General Course who would prefer taking the other one which would qualify them to enter into professions and enter university later on. I think this is a matter that is of importance because I think we have spoken so much of equality of opportunity some years ago and now we find that there is not equality of opportunity and that our students should have a choice as to which course they are taking. What is the score on this? Could we have some information on this?

MR. JOHNSON: The last member speaking, I can hardly believe my ears. You claim that the small school, the other day I understood you are not in favour of larger school units or single administrations; you're in favour of the smaller school. How do you expect to offer these courses in the smaller schools?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think the matter of one district divisions has nothing to do with this. Even one district divisions can offer, may have smaller schools . . . .

MR. JOHNSON: . . . .achieved in the last 90 years in your area by way of vocational outlets and alternative courses . . . .

MR. FROESE: I just hope that we do get some technical schools. I have been after these for the last three, four years. I've requested them every year in this House and there is not the slightest indication that we are going to get one. As I already mentioned, the

(MR. FROESE cont'd).....Federal Government apparently decides for this government how many technical schools we'll get in Manitoba. I think this is also a very poor way of getting technical schools in Manitoba. Certainly we should do much more than we're presently doing. We haven't been told as yet how many divisions will have to get together in order to be a region in order to get a technical school. All this information hasn't been placed before us. What are our divisions supposed to do? Where is the leadership coming in this direction? Certainly we should have some information here as members on this point as well.

MR. JOHNSON: There'll be a bill coming before the House on regional vocational high schools and I'll try and deal with that further. Could the honourable friend tell me of a province in Canada that has almost spent as much in the last six years as was spent since the beginning of time in redeveloping and developing the schools that we have in the last six years? The high schools? Could he name a province that has trebled its high school enrolment in six years? Would he have been willing to support a comprehensive vocational educational complex in addition to all that? Would he have sold his taxpayers without that - on that? Without the development of any courses? The academic content of those vocational schools wasn't developed. There was only the Matric Course to offer kids, if you were going to build. Heck, after listening to this, the - one member of the House has said, "And where is all the money coming from?" Manitobans have spent \$80 million on schools in the past six years, which was the total value of all the schools in the annual report in 1958. There has been a tremendous advance in education in this province and that white paper is spelling out there's going to be more; there's going to be provision made for divisions to join together and set up the administrative machinery to run a regional vocational high school. We think we have the academic content of that program worked out. We are busily training vocational teachers and we're going to - as that paper says - do the job.

With respect to the Occupational Entrance program, this can be offered - there is the academic - I think you'll have to see the program, it's very detailed, but it spells out that there are really about three levels at which any board can offer the Occupational Entrance Course: a Grade 7 curriculum level, and 8, 9 and 10. And then leading to, hopefully, the experiment of the junior vocational school, the development of those shop skills and practical skills which these boys and girls can find permanent types of employment in, on termination. But it is really a terminal high school program. That's what the old program was called. This is a new adaptation of this compiled by teachers who have been teaching terminal students for some time, with other consultants and so on.

The Member for Rhineland, I would point out that I think it's entirely possible to offer the Occupational Entrance Course to a certain percentage of the students, but really again you need larger school units to accomplish this because only about - my guess is that 10 to 15 percent of the boys and girls would take this type of course or fit into it - I believe it's around 10 percent. With the General Course, we hope to have more and more acceptance of this as first graduates - after all it only came out last year, and as they make their way in technology and as new outlets are open to them, I think these are good things. So you're going to have three basic courses and as I indicated earlier, even more flexibility at the high school level now that the Articulation Committee is working with the university in this area. That's all I have to say . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just one last question to this portion of the Estimates. The Honourable Minister, as I understood him correctly, a few moments ago said that this Occupational Entrance Course is to attract the slow learner --(Interjection)-- Well you used the term, Mr. Minister. I am only using your term. The slow learner. And yet the slow learner, Mr. Chairman, according to the proposition of the Honourable Minister, in Grade 7 - the slow learner in Grade 7 is going to decide whether or not they're going to take the Occupational Entrance Course. How ridiculous!

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to answer the Honourable Minister when he says what other provinces have done. Well I pointed this out to him the other day, that we're spending \$6 million on vocational education and out of that 6 million, the Federal Government contributes 4.4 million. So we're spending roughly 2.2 million in Manitoba whereas B.C. spends 26.7 million, in B.C. There is quite a lot of difference. And if you even take the population into consideration, that they're away ahead of us.

And while I'm on my feet, I think I should bring another problem to the Minister's attention and this has got to do with teacherages. This is where our divisions are experiencing trouble too. That they are unable to get good teachers because they come into a smaller town

March 15, 1966

(MR. FROESE, cont'd) .... and they are supposed to buy property, a home. Very often they find that good living quarters are not available as far as renting is concerned and they are supposed to buy a home. Well too many of them haven't got the means, and secondly, it's a problem, once buying property and then later on maybe two or three years disposing of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's 10 o'clock now.

MR. EVANS: ..... to my honourable friend that I move the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN; Madam Speaker, the committee has adopted certain resolutions and asks leave to sit again.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the 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 o'clock Wednesday afternoon.