



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Volume IV No. 18

February 11, 1960

2nd Session, 26th Legislature

DAILY INDEX

Thursday, February 11, 1960, 2:30 P. M.

<u>Introduction of Bills:</u> Nos. 77, 78	429
<u>Committee of Supply:</u> Civil Service Commission	430
Civil Service Commission	434
Civil Service Group Life Insurance	436
Purchasing Bureau	437
<u>Department of Education:</u> Administration	441

The Progressive Index of Votes and Proceedings will be
published on Tuesdays on the last page.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, February 11th, 1960

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees

Notice of Motion

Introduction of Bills

HON. GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Health & Public Welfare) (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 77, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Insurance Act.

HON. C. H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources) (Flin Flon) introduced Bill No. 78, An Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act and The Statute Law Amendment Act 1959.

MR. J. A. CHRISTIANSON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I would beg the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand over.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand.

Orders of the Day.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Before the Orders of the Day, and on a point of privilege, I would like to make a very brief statement to this House. The Jewish people of Manitoba and the world over are now celebrating the 75th birthday of the President of the State of Israel. I feel it is my duty to mention it to this House and to congratulate a man who, over half a century, has pioneered a movement for the realization of the prayers and hopes of the Jewish people for centuries, and for the establishment of the free and democratic State of Israel, the most democratic and free country in the near East.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I'm sure that we would all wish to join with my honourable friend in his expression of good will to the President of the State of Israel on this auspicious anniversary and I am very happy to express that sentiment to him now.

M. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Monsieur l'orateur, avant les ordres du jour je desire souhaiter la bienvenue aux eleves de l'ecole superieure de Notre Dame de Lourdes. Elles sont ici avec quatre de leurs professeurs compris de l'ordre des Chanoinesses des Cinq Plaies. Je desire leur dire monsieur l'orateur en francais que lorsque le Manitoba joignit la confederation du Canada en 1870 la langue francaise etait officielle autant comme langue parlee que langue ecrite mais qu'en 1890 une loi fut passee dans cette chambre bannissant l'usage due francais comme langue ecrite mais conservant les privileges du francais comme langue parlee. Je puis donc aujourd'hui m'exprimer librement en francais pour souhaiter aux professeurs et aux eleves de l'ecole de Notre Dame de Lourdes la plus cordiale bienvenue dans cette chambre.

Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to welcome the students of Notre Dame de Lourdes High School. They are here with four of their teachers from the Order of the "Chanoinesses des Cinq Plaies". I wish to tell them in French, Mr. Speaker, that when Manitoba joined Confederation in 1870 the French tongue was official, both spoken and written, but in 1890 a law was passed in this House prohibiting the use of French as a written tongue but preserving the privileges of French as a spoken tongue. Today I can therefore speak freely in French to wish the teachers and students of Notre Dame de Lourdes school a most hearty welcome to this House.

MR. ROBLIN: Monsieur l'orateur j'exprime aussi la bienvenue du gouvernement a nos jeunes visiteurs de Notre Dame de Lourdes cette apres midi.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to welcome, on behalf of the government, our young visitors from Notre Dame de Lourdes this afternoon.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Monsieur l'orateur..... pour ce parti je voudrais offrir des felicitations aux eleves et aux professeurs de Notre Dame de Lourdes.

Mr. Speaker.....for this Party I want to offer congratulations to the students and teachers from Notre Dame de Lourdes.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that Manitoba can expect some real competition in the Canadian curling finals to be held in Fort William next month because a former

(Mr. Wright, cont'd)...West Kildonan High School student, John David Lyon, has earned the right to represent Newfoundland in the Canadian finals.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to correct the statement that appeared in the Tribune last night in connection with a discussion of the indemnities. The Tribune reported that M. A. Gray supported the amendment - the indemnity. I just want to correct it - - 56 other members did the same thing.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, if I may just before the committee starts its session this afternoon say a word as a result of yesterday's happenings. I didn't raise it as a point of privilege when Mr. Speaker was in the Chair. I didn't have Hansard and I thought it would be proper to just briefly mention it while we were back in committee. It is alleged in this morning's paper that the Leader of the CCF Party left in a fit of temper yesterday evening at 5:30, and I believe the words are ascribed to my friend the Leader of the House, the Premier of the Province. I want to assure him and all members of this House and the public generally that the Leader of the CCF Party did not leave the House yesterday in a fit of temper but only trying to establish what are his rights and the rights of his party in the committee and in this Legislature.

MR. ROBLIN: I haven't Hansard in front of me and I really don't think I was quite as harsh on my honourable friend as that, but, regardless of the particular situation in question, one understands very well from experience that things happen that sometimes are the result of pressure of a hard afternoon's work, and I for one certainly accept my honourable friend's statement in the matter and if in any way I've been guilty of provoking him I hope that he will not assume that it was done with any malice.

MR. PAULLEY: I assure my honourable friend that there's no malice between the two of us. As a matter of fact, in a jocular vein, in the corridors of the building this morning a number of individuals asked me how the dickens are you going to get back in after what you did yesterday? And I suggested that possibly I'd better give a call to my honourable friend and ask his forgiveness for walking out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're off to a happy start.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, as I recall it when we had our little conversation last night with the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party and the First Minister, I was asking questions on the matter of the civil servants' personal use of government cars and I was hopeful that we would have Hansard today so that I could check back on what had been said earlier in the discussion yesterday, but I notice that yesterday's Hansard isn't in yet so I cannot do that, so I will have to retain that for later. However, I would like to ask some further questions of the First Minister in this regard in the absence of the Provincial Secretary. Could he tell us what is the actual estimate that this will bring in in the course of a year? Now the newspaper reports at the time that this was changed were that \$50,000 would come in under this and that \$8,000 was the figure that came in under the previous arrangement. Now could he tell us whether those figures are right or wrong?

MR. ROBLIN: I think the estimate would be at least \$50,000. It's a very hard thing to be sure about because we don't know who's going to accept the arrangement or who wish to give us a statement that they're not using the car, but it will be at least that much we estimate. The other figure is also I believe, approximately correct.

MR. MOLGAT: Now it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that yesterday in his second statement the First Minister told us that this was the better method. Now in his first statement he told us that he didn't think the government was getting everything that they should

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd).....have got from the civil servants. At least that was my understanding. Now when he says that this is a better method I have grave doubts that that's the case because I think that the present system does not take into account at all the amount of use of the car. It's a flat charge and regardless of whether the car is used a little or a great deal it makes no difference. The government doesn't get any further amount. Now I'm not one to suggest that the civil servants should not be allowed to use government cars for personal use. I think it's the same in the civil service as in any business. If the business, or in this case the government, is supplying a car I think it's unfair to expect that the civil servant would have a second car strictly for personal use. You would be putting him to a great deal of expense for that purpose alone and I don't think that would be fair, so I think we simply have to accept the fact that civil servants will be using their cars for personal use. It's the only fair thing.

Now the next thing is then whatever they do on personal use, again the arrangement must be fair to the government and to the civil servants. Now the previous arrangement, where it was so much a mile for whatever they used on private use, would seem to me the fairest arrangement because those civil servants who use their car a considerable amount on private personal use paid for that use; those who didn't were in the same position. We must remember there are civil servants scattered throughout the province. There are a great number here in the City of Winnipeg who may not have occasion to drive as much for personal use as others, say, out in country points. The present arrangement discriminates completely against those. It says flat \$20 whether you use it or whether you don't. It seems to me that the system as now set out far from being an advantage to the government is going to be a disadvantage, because it seems to me that it would be a reasonable reaction for a civil servant to say, well if it's going to cost me \$20 in any case for the use of the car I may as well use it to good extent. And why shouldn't he? He has no incentive whatever to keep his personal mileage down to any particular limit. He's being charged a flat amount. I think it's not a good procedure and I can't see any reason why this was changed, but I would like to have the views of the First Minister on the subject.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, we're going to try it and see. We think that this represents a reasonable arrangement. It was discussed with the Civil Servants Association before it was put into force and they agreed with us that it was a reasonable arrangement. We'll try it and see, and if the fears of my honourable friend prove we've faulted we can always change it, but I think we should give this a trial and see how we get along.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, for this \$20 the civil servants I understand, get all the gas they want provided they use it within certain miles, is that correct?

MR. ROBLIN:.....to that matter there is no change from the previous system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 (a)

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, before you leave the matter of the Civil Service Commission I think there is one point that perhaps has become a little confused in the course of our discussions, because in reading the newspaper reports of the debates I find that there is a point that I'm duty bound to clarify, and that is in connection with the increase in the civil service. The report that one reads in the paper, and I can only assume that this represents their impression of what was said in the House so I'm not making any complaint about that, but the report reads that "there has been a 19% leap in civil servants -- 755 added to Manitoba payroll in 25 months", and then it says, "there has been a 19% increase in the Manitoba Civil Service since the last year of the Liberal administration, it was shown in returns tabled in the Legislature Tuesday." And then in another story this morning it says, referring to the discussion yesterday, "Liberal members based their attack on the 19% increase in the civil service which has occurred since the Roblin Government came to power. They call the increase alarming." Well, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that experienced members opposite, particularly the Honourable Member for Carillon who is familiar with these things having been Provincial Secretary, that he would never make that statement. He would never make that statement and he shakes his head -- I'm glad to see he's in agreement with me because that is not the correct analysis of the case.

The information and I suppose much of the discussion yesterday was based on the return that was given in the House. And what did the return ask for? The return asked for the

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd): . . . number of civil servants on the payroll of the government on November 30th, 1957, and that was given at 4,003; and it also asked for the number of civil servants that was on the payroll on December 31st, 1959, and that is given at 4,758, being an increase of 755. No quarrel with that, but I think it should be pointed out that the present administration did not come into power on November 30th, 1957. It came into power some seven months later, and in that intervening time of seven months there were certain changes in the strength of the civil service which were not brought out in the return because naturally that question was not asked, but I feel that I should make it clear that there were increases in the civil service between the time of the return, November 30th, 1957, and the time the present administration came into office. And the number of civil servants employed in that period or following out from policies put into effect by my predecessors, we will find that the number of civil servants is actually 348. In other words, out of the 755 civil servants, the 755 increase since November 30th, 1957, we must point out that 348 of those flowed from the results of my honourable friends' opposite policies and from their activities during that remainder of their term of office. I would like to just state how that number of 348 is arrived at so that there can be a clear understanding of the matter. I'm only going to deal with two categories. There may have been others that would boost this total but I'm not going to bother with them because I don't think they affect the general argument. The Manitoba Hospital Service Association was brought in during that period, and included in the 755, and I believe properly ascribable to the former administration, is the number of 265 people who were brought in in order to put in the policy of the Manitoba Hospital Service Plan. That was a policy that our predecessors established and these people were required to operate it. Also during that seven month period they made changes in the work week reducing it to 42 hours which called for the employment of another 83 people, so that gives us a total of 348 people out of our 755 that are, in fact, people who were employed by reason of the activities of the previous administration.

Now that leaves a number of 407 to be accounted for by the present government, and of that 407, 77 were employed because the 40-hour week was introduced, so it leaves again the sum of 330 new employees who were brought in during that period in order to give effect to the policies which this administration is responsible for. So while it is perfectly correct to say that there has been an increase of 19% in the period mentioned and that the number is 755, it is not, I think, correct to assume that the full responsibility for those should be ascribed to the present administration. The figures that I have given indicated that 348 at least, and there may be one or two more but let's not worry about them, could in fairness be ascribed to the activities of the previous government, while 407 could be ascribed to the activities of the present administration. And of that 407, 77 to take care of the 40-hour week and 330 to take care of the new policies that have been introduced. So I think that in order to keep the record straight and to make it perfectly clear what has happened we should make that statement. I would also like to point out that the 348 refer to seven months of the administration of the previous government whereas the 407 refer to the 18 months of responsibility that the present administration has enjoyed. So I want to make those facts clear, Mr. Speaker, so that the public and those who are interested in this matter may be able to form a fair assessment of the facts of the situation.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I can go along with the First Minister but only to a certain point. I believe that in my speech yesterday I stated that I did not think that there was a 19% increase, but I do not go along with the First Minister when he says that there is a number of some 300 and some odd attributable to our administration. I have analyzed these figures and I find 117 that might be allowable to our administration previous to July 1st, 1959, and I think the story that first appeared in the Free Press - I didn't see this morning's story, I haven't had a chance to read today's papers, but the first story that appeared some two or three days ago was a correct one. Now we have more confusion being brought about now by the statement of the First Minister to the effect that to institute the 40-hour week it required 77 persons. Now this conflicts directly with a statement made yesterday by the Honourable the Provincial Secretary when he told us that it took some 160-odd persons to bring about the 40-hour week. That was a statement made yesterday, so I'm more confused than ever, Mr. Speaker. I would say that figures are confusing. We can make figures prove anything we want

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd)but I believe that the first story in the Free Press was substantially correct as far as I'm concerned.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I can explain to my honourable friend the figure of 160 because that includes 83 which were brought in under the previous administration to introduce the 42-hour week and 77 that were brought in under the present administration to introduce the 40-hour week, so that gives a total of 160. But I want to go back to my point that I think the facts I've given the House are correct. And I'm quite happy if when we get the Public Accounts Committee, if any honourable member would like to get the Civil Service Commission to verify these figures and explain just how they're arrived at, well that would certainly be quite in order. But I think you will find that some 265 of the total increase of 755 are accountable by reason of the Hospital Service Plan and that 83 are accountable by reason of the 42-hour week, both of which policies I think I can fairly say, were the responsibility of the honourable gentlemen opposite. Now don't misunderstand me, I'm not complaining about that because we agreed, we agreed to the Hospital Service Plan and we agreed to the 42-hour week, and I'm not complaining about that. I'm merely trying to be as accurate as I can in describing the circumstances which led to this increase of the 755 new civil servants. We take the full responsibility for the balance because they were brought in on account of policies which we recommended to the House and which the House saw fit to adopt. So I trust I'm giving this committee accurate information. To the best of my knowledge and ability I am, and if you want to cross-examine anyone in the Civil Service Commission further then it's open to do so.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I'm still quite confused when I think of the figure mentioned of some 340-odd new persons since this government took over. We have the report tabled two days ago telling us that there were 485 new positions created in 1959 alone. Now possibly those are not all filled but certainly the vast majority of them must be filled. So if there is something approximately 485 in '59 alone -- 485 -- certainly in 18 months -- it certainly must be more than 348.

MR. ROBLIN: Of course, as was explained to my honourable friend yesterday, a number of those changes are on account of provisional positions being made permanent. That's why we get into such a hassle about these figures in trying to reconcile all the different categories of people that are given to us. But I think that you will find on examination that that situation is correct. Now I won't disagree with my honourable friend if he says there are a number of established positions which are not filled, and which of course are not included in a tabulation of those people that are hired, and there may be more later on when those establishments are filled. I'm sure there will be, but my honourable friend will also, I think, be able to confirm from his experience that that is a customary thing in running an administration, that you do have a number of positions not established that are not filled. But the figures can all be reconciled and I think the figures that I have given dealing with this increase of 755, which is the point that I was concerned to clarify, will be found correct on examination.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to know that we will have a chance in Public Accounts Committee to go further into this problem. For the time being I think that the House will agree that both the Prime Minister and myself have won our points.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, not in the way of criticism at all but just to keep the record straight, the figures given by the Honourable the First Minister do not include the positions to be established under the estimates that are before the House now. The way I read the estimates there are provisions there for additional positions if the government should want to implement them; that is, the figures given by the Honourable the First Minister do not cover any of the positions that may be created under the estimates before the House today.

MR. ROBLIN: That's perfectly correct. The figures that we have been dealing with through this discussion have been the actual number of people who are drawing pay, and that is substantially less than the establishment of the administration, and one finds that all the way through. I remember when I was on the other side, looking into the Department of Public Works for example, and finding that while they had an establishment of about 170 engineers there were less than a hundred on strength, and we wanted to know at that time why they weren't filled in that particular case. But it is true that you get that situation so I agree with

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd).....my honourable friend that the figures that I have been discussing this afternoon are those of people who are actually employed, and that figure differs again from the establishment. That is perfectly correct.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, just an additional question. Could the Honourable the First Minister give us any idea as to the number of positions that are open at the present moment?

MR. ROBLIN: Well I haven't that figure at my fingertips but there are a good number -- I would say several hundred.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)-passed, (b)-passed, (c)-passed. Resolution 18, Civil Service Commission...

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in (c) -- in regard to Workmen's Compensation, the government is a self-insurer is it not, within the Workmen's Compensation Act?

MR. ROBLIN: We are self-insurers to the tune of around \$35,000 under this heading.

MR. PAULLEY: A couple of years ago it was \$45,000. The \$35,000 then would reflect a more favourable accident ratio, is that correct?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, that's a very happy circumstance, that we don't have the accidents.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)-passed. Resolution 18, Civil Service Commission, \$113,725 -- passed. Item 5, Resolution 19, Civil Service Superannuation Act, \$895,000.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: One moment Mr. Chairman, have there been any increase in the rates under this item or is that just the additional staff that makes the increase?

MR. ROBLIN: This thing is tied in to the salaries. Now it's an interesting point because it indicates something which members are aware, and that is of the escalator effect we have in these various things. I know the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition will be the first to point this out, but seeing he isn't here today perhaps I could undertake to do it myself. In the return that was filed the other day, and to which the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains has already made reference, you will notice that the salaries of the civil service have increased by \$2,450,000 in the period since November 30th, 1958--1957. That's a lot of money, but I don't think the House should draw the conclusion that the main reason for that is because we have more civil servants. Undoubtedly it is an important reason but I would like to point out that since that particular figure was set, in 1957, there has been no less than six incremental increases to the civil service we already have -- no less than six. And as I indicated to the House previously, the cost of an increment this year is well over \$600,000 all things considered, and so one can see that six times -- let's say half a million or some figure in that neighborhood, indicates the increase in the salary bill due to the policy of annual increments, to say nothing whatsoever of whatever extra staff that we would employ. And in addition to that, last year, as the House knows and as the House voted, we raised the whole basis on which the civil service salaries are being paid by an appropriation of some \$900,000-odd. So one can see that in that two-year period, while there has been that very large increase of two million, four hundred and fifty-odd thousand dollars in the pay of the Civil Service, I would say without any qualification that by far the major part of it is simply due to the policy of increments that has been in effect for some time, and is due to the raising the base on which all employees are situated in last year's estimates. So I think that point should be made known and it bears on the figure that is before us now, because the figure that is before us now is based on the salaries, and if there is an automatic increment goes through as there is, as there has been six times since '47, and if we have a raising of the whole floor as we had last year you can expect this item here to increase very drastically, and so it has, because the actual appropriation for the year '57-'58 was only \$551,000 and now as you see it's \$895,000, and that is tied in to the whole of the salary problem and the costs of running the administration. So in order to be clear on this point and to indicate that there are a very -- that the most important factor in this is really not the increase in staff, although I'm not backing away from that for one second, there it is, and we are ready to stand up to that, but at the same time the major portion of this increase is accounted for by the normal process of events within the salary ranges.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I don't think I could agree with the last statement of the Honourable First Minister. According to his calculations pay increases account

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd).....for two million four approximately.

MR. ROBLIN: I'm not making any positive statement on that so don't base any calculations on my off-the-cuff approximation.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Well, we'll just take that in round figures approximately. I'm not going to hold the Honourable the First Minister to this figure. But according to my calculations, and I've been pretty careful in them and I think they're fairly close to being accurate, the increase in salaries to civil servants since March 31st, 1959 amount to five million five, and if you deduct the two million four from the five million five, you have three million one to account for, and the only way, Mr. Chairman, that I can account for it, and I stand to be corrected, is that that many more civil servants were added to make up the three million one.

MR. ROBLIN: No, Sir, my honourable friend's arithmetic is at fault somewhere. I don't know where he gets his figure from but the figures that I used of the total increase in wages, and I'm not adding in this particular item at the moment, the total increase in wages of \$2,450,000 was supplied to the House from the office of the Comptroller-General, and, therefore, I'm inclined to think that it's right. I don't know how my honourable friend gets his figures but we, I believe, are supplying what we believe to be completely accurate figures obtained from that office.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I'm not quarrelling with the figure of two million four, but I'm just pointing out that according to my calculations the increase in salaries since the 31st of March, 1959, is five million five, and I would like to know how you account for the difference. I'm not quarrelling with the two million four.

MR. ROBLIN: Well that's the basis of our quarrel because we say the increase in salaries is two million four and we say that figure was given to us by the Comptroller-General. Now I can't get any closer to it than that. If my honourable friend has some other figure I'm at a loss to explain it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 19 --

MR. MOLGAT: On this item, are these pensions transferable? Now there's a great deal of that coming up in industry today and, as I recall it, they were not transferable in the Provincial Civil Service. Now I presume the answer to be no. Has there been any project, any plans, any investigation of the possibility of making this transferable?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend does raise a point which is receiving a good deal of consideration these days. These pensions are not fully transferable. They are only transferable in the sense that after you've been there a while you can get your own contribution out, but you cannot get the contribution of the government out. The contribution of the government remains in the fund and eventually winds up by, I understand, in the pensions that are drawn by the civil servants who stayed the full length of their term with the government and actually draw their pension. In other words, the government doesn't get that money back but it remains in the fund for the benefit of the pensioners of the civil service. Now you have to consider whether that is the right thing to do or whether it should be withdrawn and taken away by the employee concerned, and I'm frank to admit there's some argument that that should be the case. I don't really -- I'm working on my memory but I think I'm right in saying that no real suggestion has been made to us by the civil service that there should be portability in these pensions, but as we're going to look into the whole fund anyway I haven't the slightest objection to looking into that point, and if it should be found desirable we can give it some consideration. But no real suggestion has been made to me yet that I can recall, that there should be this portable pension.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, on that point I think it's fairly obvious that the organization of the civil servants tends to be one in which the people who stay are the people who are the most active in the organization and therefore not very likely that they are going to raise the question of portability. At the same time I do think that we are having -- this is not only the case with the provincial civil service; across Canada we are getting much more mobility amongst employees than we have had in recent years, and I do think that if this whole question of pensions is being discussed and thought about, that the government ought to give some thought with the civil service organization. I certainly don't believe in a unilateral decision but I think that the whole question of portability or partial portability should be given consideration. It is becoming more and more the method which is used by industry in general.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 19 - passed. Resolution 20, Civil Service Group Life Insurance, \$50,000.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a few questions on this item? I would like to ask whether this will be a contributory system of insurance for the civil service or whether they will be asked to contribute to this plan, and in that case, what percentage will be asked to contribute? Is it 50% or what is it? I would like to ask also whether the plan would be available or would it cover the Cabinet Ministers, or the Speaker, or maybe the MLAs whom the plan will cover?

MR. ROBLIN: The answers to all those questions can be found in the Bill that my honourable friend voted for last year.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I'd like you to refresh my memory, if you be kind enough.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think that I could possibly refresh my honourable friend's memory.

MR. MOLGAT: The honourable member did raise one point however which may be in the bill, but it escaped my attention if it is. What is the situation of the members of this House insofar as the -- are we covered or are we not? And what is the situation if, by force of events which sometimes we do not control, we only stay here four years and then we're no longer here. What is the whole situation?

MR. ROBLIN: Well I can understand my honourable friend's apprehension, but I don't know whether I can fully relieve it. The position is that if he wants, or any member of the House wishes to join this fund he can do so, but he pays the full premium himself. No portion of it is paid by the public treasury. I don't want to appear as a salesman in this matter but I think it's a pretty good deal because there's no examination and you just enter as part of the group, and it might be well worth considering for any member that wants an economical form of insurance, but he has to pay the whole bill himself. And then I think that if he should leave this hallowed horseshoe at any time, I think he can continue, but I'm not positive on that point.

MR. MOLGAT: I see. Well I really wasn't worried about members of our group, Mr. Chairman. My concern was actually for the honourable gentlemen across from me, and insofar as the matter of medical examination we're all very healthy over here, so there's no problem. I wonder if the Minister could give us a progress report at this time on this matter of the insurance. Now this was passed last summer and I believe the government has proceeded since then to do some investigations and so on, and I think they have appointed someone as an advisor in this category. Could he tell us exactly what is going on and when we may expect this to start?

MR. ROBLIN: The answer is very soon. When this was approved after the House rose last August we appointed a technical advisor to work with the Civil Service Association in setting up a plan that would meet their convenience and that fits into the general type of policy of this sort that is developed. When that basic requirement was decided upon, we then issued a bid for tenders and I think some 20 or 25 different companies have tendered. These tenders have been --, were received in public, opened in public, annotated in public, and the whole matter has been treated in the usual way for a tender of that sort. The insurance advisor is now in the process of sorting out the different tenders to decide which one seems to be the most attractive from the point of view of the government and the service, and that process is not yet completed. It's well advanced though. I understand that we, the government, should be in a position very soon of knowing the various kinds of bids that have been made for this kind of service. When we do we'll be able to select one. I think that should be very soon now. This is a pretty tricky matter. It's a highly involved technical matter and we remember the difficulties that another government body got into on the very same matter in trying to make sure that all the technicalities were complied with and correct and everyone was treated on the same basis, and a reasonable comparison made, so that we could be sure that all the proper facts were on the table. Now that takes time, but it's almost completed and I think it should be available for the civil service very soon.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Minister if it's not so that already employees of the Civil Service have received a document outlining the plan to them and possible costs, and attached thereto, if I recall correctly, was an application form.

MR. ROBLIN: I'm not sure of that. There may be two different things involved here. I believe the civil service canvassed their people on the type of plan that they would want. There are different alternatives that could be provided in a plan of this sort and one of the things that the government wanted to know is what do the employees want, because this is being designed for them and it obviously makes sense to ask them, and we asked that question through the Joint Council, and my understanding is that a considerable amount of discussion and enquiry took place within the ranks of the civil service in order to find out what they wanted. And of course it is possible at such a time to give a rough approximation of what the costs might be although they are not refined. That depends on the tender, but you can have a rough idea. Now that's as far as the thing has gone to my understanding. I'm at a loss to explain any suggestion that an application form has been given out unless it's to say if this sort of thing were available, would you like it? If that kind of an application is what's referred to then I can quite understand it, but a final application, sign here on the dotted line and you're in, I'm positive that hasn't gone out because it can't go out until we've settled the matter that we've just been discussing.

MR. PAULLEY: I won't say anything further on that particular point, Mr. Chairman, until I clarify what it was, but it was my understanding that it was a little bit more of a firm decision to be made than illustrated by my honourable friend.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Will they all be covered for the same amount or will there be different coverages?

MR. ROBLIN: That too is in the bill that was passed last year and if my honourable friend will look at it he will get the details.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as it has been now established that the members may apply for this insurance and pay the full premium themselves, which is understandable, is it the intention of the government to forward application forms to the members when the plan and program has been designed?

MR. ROBLIN: We would be glad to do so if there is indication that it would be desired.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I'd like to suggest that it would be well worthwhile because being in the insurance business we do know and appreciate the fact that there are many persons who might obtain insurance coverage through this program that would be uninsurable otherwise.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, when the Honourable Minister said soon, he gave us some details about what had been done; that all the tenders were in and so on. Is there a good possibility that this will be done before the House rises? I know he can't assure us when the House is going to rise, but by normal expectation it could be some time in March. Is it possible or probable that he will have the details before that time?

MR. ROBLIN: It is possible, but I can't commit myself on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 20 - passed. Item 7, Purchasing Bureau, (a).

MR. GRAY: I would like to direct a question to the Provincial Secretary, but as he is not in his seat and judging so far I think that the First Minister almost runs every department, may I direct a question to him now? What are the duties of the Purchasing Agent? To whom is he responsible? Is he making all the purchases on his own, by tender or otherwise, or is he consulting his Minister or any other member of the government? In other words, whether he has full control over all purchases, because after all he is purchasing millions of dollars a year, or is there some control over that? The reason I ask this question is that I am informed -- and I'm not going to state that this is correct. As a matter of fact, I probably think it is not correct but nevertheless the information around the city is that some people, merchandising articles that the government buys, and sometime they have no chance even to get to the front door. Now I'm not -- I'm making this statement with reservations. Chances are that the man, the people that told me that are not correct, and that's the only reason I ask this question as to his responsibility as a purchasing agent for the province, which is a very very big job. If the First Minister cannot give me the information I'm prepared to wait until the Provincial Secretary takes his seat.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should have stated earlier on today that my honourable colleague is fighting the good fight for the Province of Manitoba before the Freight Rate Royal Commission this afternoon. He is -- my colleague the Minister of Agriculture is making a statement in respect of agriculture, in particular elaborating our views

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) . . . on the Crow's Nest, and my honourable colleague, the Minister of Industry and Commerce is doing the same thing for industrial development and northern freight rates. That's why he's not here today. But I undertook on his behalf to clear the easy part of his job, the small balance of these estimates that are here, with the House. I must say I don't envy him his experience this afternoon because we sometimes think that the cross-examination here is intensive, but at the risk of wounding the feelings of some of my honourable friends, let me say that we're a bunch of patsies in here compared with the kind of a grilling you get when you're up before the Royal Commission on Freight Rates. So I don't know when I'm going to see my honourable friend again. But in the meanwhile, let me try and answer the question. If my honourable friend will refer to the Act that governs the government purchasing bureau he will find the answers to the questions that he seeks about the powers and duties and responsibilities of this particular branch of the government. I would draw the attention of the committee to the fact that this has been transferred recently from the Department of Public Works to the Department of the Provincial Secretary. Our feeling was that it would be more advisable to switch this from a heavy purchasing department, where there might perhaps be some suggestion of control, to a non-operational and non-purchasing department like the Provincial Secretary where the Minister can certainly take a completely independent view of the purchases. Now that's not been done because we were really dissatisfied with the present arrangement or really felt that now or in the past that there had been anything to complain about, but it just seemed to us to be a little bit more logical to transfer it to the Provincial Secretary, so that's what we've done.

Now what did this man do? Except for the Queen's Printer and the Provincial Library and the Provincial Architect and The Text Book Bureau, he does the purchasing for the government of Manitoba. It's centralized; he's not responsible for the boards and commissions, like the Power Commission and the Liquor Commission and the Telephone System and the Hydro-Electric Board, but he is responsible for the government purchasing. And the way it works is that anyone that wants anything makes out a requisition which has to be approved by the appropriate department official, the Deputy Minister or somebody else in there, and once it has received departmental approval it then goes to the purchasing bureau. He then places the item on tender. Now there are two ways of placing an item on tender. The first way is to advertise it in the newspaper, in which case everybody has a chance to see it and that is done in most important types of contracts. The second way is that when the possible circle of suppliers is known, that possible circle is invited to tender. And it may very well be that somebody new comes into the business and says, "I ought to belong to this circle; why am I not invited to tender?" If anyone who feels that he's in that situation will simply make himself known, we'll be glad to see that he is invited to tender, because the object of this whole process is to allow the widest possible circulation of invitations to tender on the part of the government so that we can get the lowest price, because our policy has been -- and I must say in fairness that I fully believe it was the policy of our predecessors -- our policy has been to accept the lowest tender, all other things being equal, and I can recall of no instance in our term of office where that has not been done. That's a pretty sweeping statement but I believe it to be correct, and I know that on occasions the Treasury Board has been presented with certain suggestions that there might be some reason to depart from that principle, but we have never approved of it. We feel that the lowest tender is what should be accepted, and to the best of my knowledge that is exactly what is being done. So I think that gives a rough idea of what happens in the Government Purchasing Department. I would be rather surprised, as I'm sure my honourable friend is himself, if it were correct that anyone had been prevented from tendering. But if there is anyone who feels that they're not fairly dealt with, all they have to do is ask for an invitation to tender and we'll do our best to see that they get it, because we want to make sure that everyone has an equal chance.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, of course I'm not sure whether it's correct. I think your statement will clarify to them of the situation. That was the purpose of my question.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, do we take from the words of the Honourable the First Minister that all vehicles are purchased through the purchasing bureau also? And if so, is the lowest tender accepted in all cases?

MR. ROBLIN: The lowest tender is accepted in all cases. Now I want to -- if it

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)...isn't, heads will roll, because that's our policy. Now there's one point that perhaps I should refer to, and that is, that it has been the custom, and I think I'm correct in saying that we made no change in it when we came in, that in the question of automobiles for example, that in some instances the invitations to tender may be restricted to an area. For example, if a car -- the people in Brandon may say -- there may be 20 or half a dozen dealers in Brandon; they say we can't possibly compete with Winnipeg prices; we pay taxes, therefore, we should be entitled to get some of this business. That's an exceedingly difficult problem to solve, to be fair to the public interest. So what has been done in days gone by is to say well, on a certain amount of business we'll restrict the invitation to tender for people say within a 50-mile radius of Brandon, and that will give us - I don't know - 10 or so bids on the item and the business is dealt with in that way. Now I'm certainly open to conviction -- open to persuasion that we shouldn't do that, that the only thing to do is to say anyone in the Province of Manitoba on an item like cars, and perhaps we'd sell them all to one firm here in Winnipeg. But it has been found advisable by, as I say, our predecessors, and we have continued to deal with that type of business in the way that I mentioned. So to be perfectly candid with the committee, I think I should put that fact before them as well.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, could the First Minister indicate when I'll get my Order for Return regarding the tenders on the purchasing of automobiles for the government?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, my honourable friend asked a very great deal of information. You mustn't be impatient; we're doing our best.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, this matter of purchasing of course is a very difficult one I know, when you're buying for as large an organization as the Provincial Government. Now what is the policy insofar as tenders? Are they public, or do they remain the property of the purchasing bureau? Can an unsuccessful tenderer come and find out what the other tenders have been? Or for that matter, can the successful tenderer find out what the others have bid? Can someone who didn't tender but who may be interested in the product come in and ask for information?

MR. ROBLIN: That's a good point. I remember dealing with the same thing when I sat in the very seat that my honourable friend sits in, and I remember the then Provincial Treasurer telling us that, no, they really couldn't do that. I was never very convinced that his answer was a sound one, and I'm not convinced today. My own view is that if anybody, any citizen of this province wants to come in and see what the price or a bid was on anything the government purchased, he should have the right to do so. Certainly if he can't get it in that way, he can always get someone to ask the question in this House and the information will be produced. The purchasing people, however, are very shy of this and I'm never entirely convinced they're right on it. They say that this might have a tendency to promote fictitious bids or bids that are not strictly kosher, to coin a phrase, and they've got some reasons of experience that lead them to feel that this might not be a good thing. But I'll tell you what we do. We have not issued any blanket instruction that I'm aware of to the purchasing bureau saying, show. But if there's any member of the public or any bidder who really feels keenly enough about this to come and ask the Minister or myself, we will certainly, at any time, make sure that that information is disclosed to him. Now that's a kind of a compromise between the two points of view. It seems to work out all right but I'll admit that it's a funny situation.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, what is the situation on tenders in outlying points? Let's assume, say, the Provincial Government has a survey crew up at Thompson or in various points throughout the province like that. What are the policies there insofar as purchasing?

MR. ROBLIN: With respect to local purchasing?

MR. MOLGAT: In respect to food and other requirements for, say, the crew, and the gasoline.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh. In most cases of course those expenses are paid for by a contractor and they don't enter into the government account. But in remote areas, the tender principle is one that is very difficult to follow. If there's only one supplier in the point, obviously you haven't got much choice but to go and see him if he's 100 miles away

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd).....from somebody else. You run across this thing for example in social allowances, or in social welfare -- get into an Indian settlement or an isolated northern settlement; there only is one store, so obviously you've got to give the person, if you're dealing in vouchers, you have to give the voucher on that particular store. So you're in the situation where you pretty well have to use your head as to what's reasonable. Our principle is tendering, but I agree that there are certain instances of that sort where obviously it would not be a very practical thing to do and people just have to use their good judgment.

MR. MOLGAT: I appreciate the difficulty in outlying points; that's the reason I asked the question. Supposing a number of establishments were -- let's take the case of gasoline -- let's go back to the survey crew because we do have provincial survey crews working directly for the Provincial Government in various parts of the province. Now if there are a number of places where they can purchase, what is the policy of the government and what instructions are they given as to their purchasing?

MR. ROBLIN: A commodity that's the same price as gasoline, we try to exercise a certain discretion in making sure that nobody gets entirely overlooked. But really these matters are small in their nature and I can't speak with authority. I'd have to go and ask the Department of Public Works just what Joe Blow does up at Wabowden or wherever it happens to be. But I imagine that these matters are pretty well left with the man concerned to be reasonable about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 21, Purchasing Bureau, (a) passed, (b) passed. Purchasing Bureau, \$58,810 - passed. Department V - Education - 1, Administration.

.....Continued on next page

HON. S. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, it is interesting and significant that today, when we begin our consideration of the estimates of the Department of Education that it is also National Students Day, which has been observed by the students of the University of Manitoba, and indeed this morning they held here in this place what they called a "revolutionary government". I have with me the Speech from the Throne which was delivered this morning here, and from which I would like to read just one paragraph because of its bearing upon the matter which we now have under consideration. This is the paragraph, and I quote, "The motto of this session shall be 'Education is the Nation's Greatest Asset' and it shall be the goal of the members of this House to keep this motto always in their minds and to be aware at all times that what they do here to improve education, they are doing with the even higher aim of making this country of Canada truly great and enlightened--a leader among the nations of the world". I thought that that might make a fitting introduction to our consideration of the estimates in the Department of Education.

A MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. McLEAN: There are two or three things, Mr. Chairman, which direct our attention in a--I think a dramatic way to the things which have been happening in the field of education in this province since we last had the occasion to consider the estimates of the department. The most dramatic of course is quite clearly in the printed estimates themselves, where on the last occasion we asked for school grants in the amount of some \$18 million. We are this time asking the committee and the House--the legislature to approve proposed grants in the amount of something over \$24 million, an increase of some \$6 million. That, of course, overshadows in every other consideration and in any other manner the changes and progress that we are making in this important field. But I think it is also illustrated, when one considers the increase in the number of classrooms, because it is in this matter and similar matters that the money is translated into actual work in the field of providing educational services. Whereas in the calendar year of 1958 there were 387 classrooms and classroom equivalents approved for construction in the province, in the year 1959 there were 908, more than double, almost three times--I shouldn't say almost three times--more than double the number of classrooms--and that in this year, to date, from the first of January until the present time we have applications for approval of 300 classrooms and classroom equivalents. That is in a period of just a few days more than one month. It is also demonstrated in another area, related to the transportation of students to schools, when we note that as of the 31st of January, 1960, there had been purchased some 63 buses for the transportation of students to school and practically all of those purchases made after the approval of our estimates last year, and that of those buses, 57 had been purchased by school divisions for the purpose of transporting students to the high schools or high schools within the division; six purchased by school districts, and that some 14 divisions had purchased buses. And not only in that number of--that amount of equipment purchased for transportation, but the number of van routes. Whereas on December 31st, 1958, there were 871, one year later, December 31st, 1959, there were 1,139; and there were in addition, 245 contracted van routes in the school divisions. That's in addition to the buses that are operated by the school divisions. I mention these matters and they'll be matters of particular discussion and concern as we proceed, but I mention them to indicate the changes that have taken place and are taking place in the educational field in the Province of Manitoba.

Now to return to some statistics, and because of the interest in this House on the matter of number of persons on staff so far, I want to give and I trust that this will resolve this part of our consideration, without too much difficulty, the number of persons employed in the Department of Education. One of the difficulties in reconciling figures as has already been indicated is the fact that there were when we came to office, and indeed of course there are still, a number of what are known as provisional positions and we have been engaged in making a number of these so-called provisional positions established positions, because the fact of the matter was that the provisional positions had existed and were filled for many, many years. But taking the total number of persons employed in all kinds of positions, both established and provisional in the Department of Education as at December 31st, 1957, 273; on December 31st, 1958, there were 299; and December 21st, 1959, there were 300. Turning to the establishment as between the estimates of the current fiscal year and the establishment for the upcoming fiscal year, the figure stands at an even 300. That is to say, our estimates for the fiscal year 1959-1960

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . provided for 300 persons in the Department of Education and the estimates which are now before this committee provide for 300 positions, so there is no proposed increase in the total number of positions for the Department of Education. That is not to say that the exact number of positions in each branch is exactly the same because we have done some shifting as between the various branches, and there are some pluses in some of the branches, but a corresponding decrease in others, and coming to 300 positions both for the current fiscal year and the fiscal year for which we are preparing. I may give you, and perhaps it would be advisable to do so now, the various branches looking at the estimates sheet under 1(a) the salary item--in the current fiscal year there were 38; in the upcoming fiscal year 46, or an increase of eight. In 3(a)(1)-Teacher Training Administration, there are this current year, seven. We are asking for ten, an increase of three. In 3(b)(1)-Manitoba Teachers College, 55 in the '59-'60 year; 53 in the '60-'61 year, a decrease of two. In the 4(a)(1) group-Curriculum, 11 in the current fiscal year; 13 being asked for in the estimates now before this committee for an increase of two. When we come to the vocational item, (b)(1), we have 80 this year; 67 only in the upcoming estimates for a decrease of 13. Vocational, (c)(1)-I'm sorry--Instruction, which is (c)(1), 84 in the current fiscal year; 85 in the estimates now before the committee, for an increase of one, and in Special Services, 25;--we're asking for 26, an increase of one. And as I say the total number in both cases, 300. I wanted to give that statistical information to the House on the matter of the number of persons employed in the department.

However, while speaking on the matter of staff, there is one other thing that I should like to say by way of appreciation to the deputy minister and all those who have been associated with him in the work of the department. In the report, which members I am certain have read, from the deputy minister to myself, he concluded with this paragraph, which I should like to read, and I quote, "The year provided great opportunities and satisfaction, but they were attained only by great efforts and devotion to duty on the part of your staff. Burdens fell most heavily on senior members of central staff and on school inspectors, but constant and unusual demands were made on every branch and every category of staff. The seemingly unending succession of deadlines could not have been met except with the willing and enthusiastic help of clerical and stenographic staff. I assure you that you have every right and reason to be proud of your staff". And I do want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, the appreciation which we have to the staff because they have worked indeed far beyond the call of duty in the tremendous amount of work that we have had to do during the past year--indeed during the past 18 months.

The grand total number of students in our schools as of June 30th, 1959, in Manitoba was 187,957; and we have now approximately 7,500 teachers in the province. Teacher supply is reasonably good. We were able, as the committee knows, to dispense with the course which for a number of years was given during the summer for permit teachers. We dispensed with that; did not hold it last summer and we have a relatively small number of teachers in the province teaching on permit and letters of authority. We have a good enrollment in the Teachers College and at Brandon College and an excellent enrollment, almost a hundred percent increase in the number of students in the Faculty of Education at the University. It is there that those who are to teach in the secondary schools, in the high schools, are trained; and this increase in their enrollment is indeed very encouraging because it is in that particular field that we have perhaps the greatest shortage of qualified people. Not only is there an increase in the number in the Faculty of Education but in the, what is called the short course in the summer given at the university for university students for training for high school teaching, there was a substantial increase in the enrollment in the summer of 1959 and we are looking forward to an equally large enrollment in the summer of 1960.

The officials of the department report to me that there is an encouraging interest in our high schools and in the university from prospective teacher-people who will be coming to our Teachers College and to the university next fall; and we have every hope that we will be able to very quickly overcome the shortage that we have of qualified teachers both in the elementary field and in the secondary field as well. Mind you, the task, particularly in the secondary school grades, is not alone a matter of making good for the replacement of those who retire and go to other work and drop out, but it is also the problem of keeping up with the increase in the number of students which is substantial and will be very substantial in the immediate years that lie ahead of us.

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . I've mentioned something about building and there are indications of a very considerable amount of building to be carried on this year. I would not wish to hazard a guess as to the number of rooms but it will certainly be the largest year of building in the--so far as schools are concerned, that there has been in the history of the Province of Manitoba. I have been urging, and I say this here and now because reference was made to it on a previous occasion, I have been urging school trustees that they should exercise the greatest possible care in ensuring that their building plans are within the financial means of their own people, and indeed within the financial means of the Province of Manitoba. I see no benefit to be derived from excessive expenditures on schools, and that is the policy which I have taken and which I intend to pursue. I take the attitude that the job is one of providing adequate and proper classroom space for the pupils, and that beyond that our responsibilities really don't extend very far. One of the interesting developments during the year which is under review, or at least that has passed, was the receipt of the complete and final report of the Royal Commission on Education, and as you know, Mr. Chairman, this matter--the recommendations made by the commission are under the careful study at the present time by the government and, I would hope, by all others who are interested in the welfare of education. I make this comment about the report, that while one might not accept in full all of the recommendations made by the commission, and there will be differences of opinion, on the other hand, I think it is a useful report in that it does direct our minds to many facets of our school system which need to be thought about and considered and wherein many improvements can and should be made. I think that it will serve a most useful purpose in that context. Associated with the report of the Royal Commission, I of course also associate in my mind the report of the Physical Education and Recreation Committee that was carried out some time ago and whose report has been in our hands now since July of 1958. Because in a very real way both of these must be read together, as they both deal with things that go on in the classroom and should go on in the classroom. And in our consideration of the Royal Commission Report we include our consideration of that other report which is important and which, of course, needs very close scrutiny to determine what benefits can be derived from implementing the recommendations which that report makes. When I presented the estimates of this department last time I mentioned to the committee the proposed reorganization of the staff of the department; the establishment of the branches as we hope to have them and that of course was provided for by the addition of certain established positions which were approved by the committee and by the House. That staff reorganization has been completely in the official sense although not all of the positions have been filled. Two important positions, namely, the position of Supervisor of School Buildings have not been filled although we have called for applications for that position, and the position of Supervisor of Transportation. Both, as I say, were provided for in the establishment approved last year and we hope that those positions will be filled at an early date. The position of Supervisor of Transportation, of course, emphasized again the important aspect that transportation has come to have in our school system. And the Supervisor of School Buildings emphasizes the increased responsibility which we have in that particular field, and the fact that the Chief Inspector who has been responsible for that work is really not able to now carry on the duties that are now attached to that job as well as carry out his other important duties.

I do not need to repeat--no purpose would be served by repeating this story about the establishment of school divisions. When we last met we had this division established in all parts of the Province of Manitoba with the exception of four proposed divisions where on the original vote the establishment of divisions had been defeated. At that time I said that we were prepared to give a second vote if it was indicated to us that the people concerned were interested. The two of the proposed divisions did ask for a second vote in 1959. In the case of the proposed division of Hanover, the majority of the people by their vote approved the establishment of the division and that division was established. In the case of the proposed division of boundary, the vote was held but again rejected by the voters of that proposed division, with the result that we have one additional division established since this House last met. No request was received from either of the other two and there the matter stands at the present time with 43 divisions established in the province and three territories or areas where there are no school divisions. The balance of the school districts in the province which lie in remote parts of the province have been, of course, all declared what we call, for the purpose of the school act, remote

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . school districts and they receive grants which are on the same basis as grants paid to school districts and school divisions within divisions. In every case of course, the remote school districts being one far removed from any adjacent or adjoining school districts.

One of the things which was discussed when we met last was the subject of merit rating which had been recommended by the interim report of the Royal Commission on Education and again referred to indeed in their final report. And the committee will remember that I informed the House of my intention to have a committee study what should be done in connection with that recommendation. There is a considerable difference of opinion about the subject of merit rating and I felt that it would be advisable to have some group let us have the benefit of their views with respect to it. The committee was established representing trustees, teachers and the department. And I have here today with me the report which is a unanimous report which that committee has brought in to me. Perhaps before reading the report and I wish to do so in order to have it a matter of record in these proceedings. I should say that I think perhaps the different people approached the subject of merit rating from different points of view. Some people are of the impression that merit rating will save money. From certain studies that I have been able to carry out myself, I'm now satisfied that merit rating in itself does not save money insofar as teachers' salaries are concerned; indeed, has been shown in every instance where it has been implemented to cost more money--not less money. Other views are expressed and it is a matter upon which perhaps there's strong opinion but no very unanimous opinion. However, I would like to read, in quote, in full, the report--not too long--which has been given to me by the committee on merit rating. And this is the report, and I quote, "Merit rating for salary purposes is an attempt to relate pay to performance. As applied to teaching, it is based on the principle that good teachers should receive higher salaries than poor teachers. The deceptive simplicity of the general principle of pay according to performance leads to increasing perplexity when some of the practical problems of implementation are examined. 1. The extreme difficulty of defining and measuring teaching competence in other than subjected terms. 2. The consequent difficulty of obtaining uniformity and consistency in the rating of teaching. 3. The variability in teaching situations and conditions. 4. The problems of staff relationships when rating is attempted by salary differentials. These problems lead to the conclusion that no simple formula can be readily found by which the principle of merit pay can be implemented. Furthermore, it is doubtful whether any scheme externally contrived can be successfully imposed upon any group of teachers. In the opinion of the committee, the recommendations of the Manitoba Royal Commission regarding the payment or withholding of salary grants on the basis of merit years completed do not constitute a true merit rating plan. The committee is unanimous in the opinion that it would not be feasible to implement a system of merit rating on a province-wide basis at this time. In addition to the practical difficulties already cited, this view is supported by a rather extensive and comprehensive review of information relating to experiments which have been carried out in this connection in the United States and Canada. Recommendations: 1. It is recommended that an experimental project in merit rating be undertaken in a Manitoba school division when the following conditions have been met; (a) the concurrence of the school boards and teachers concerned and the approval of the Department of Education; (b) sufficient administrative and supervisory personnel available; (c) accepted full salary schedules; (d) at least 75% of teachers qualified for the positions they hold; (e) development of an acceptable system of evaluation of teaching performance. It is understood that the Department of Education would undertake to provide such assistance as might be requested by the school boards and teachers concerned". Then there is a note here, "a minority of members of the commission"--"committee", rather "believe that no experimental project should be instituted until basic principles of evaluation of teaching performance have been agreed upon by the provincial committee representing the teachers' organizations, The Manitoba Teachers Society, the Department of Education, and possibly citizens at large"--sorry, "trustees' organizations, teachers' societies, Department of Education and possibly citizens at large . 2. It is unanimously recommended that even if an experimental project is not undertaken, a provincial committee should be set up to study teaching evaluation and to formulate principles for such evaluation. This committee should include representatives of the trustees' organization, The Manitoba Teachers Society, the Department of Education and possibly citizens at large." And then the report has been signed by the many members of the committee and

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) .. that is the end of the quotation from the report.

And I should like to inform the committee, Mr. Chairman, that it is our intention to adopt the recommendation of the committee and to endeavour to have an experimental project in merit rating carried out along the lines which has been recommended by the committee. I must say that the report has only just recently been received and that no steps have been taken at the moment to carry out that recommendation, and I mention only of our intention to follow the recommendation which they have made.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, would the minister be willing to give us the names of the committee members at this time?

MR. McLEAN: The members of the committee were the following: Mrs. W.A. Trott, a trustee; Mr. W. T. Wherrett, trustee; Miss S. F. Shack, teacher; Mr. W.R. Gordon, who represented the teachers; he is a member of the staff of the Teachers Society; Dr. J.M. Brown, who is the Dean of the Faculty of Education at the university; Mr. R.W. Lightly of the staff of the Department of Education, who was the chairman of the committee; and Mr. A. F. Kerr, a school inspector of the Department of Education, and who was also the secretary of the committee. I think, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps in a general statement, I need not say anything further except to extend two invitations to the members of the committee. I'm a little sorry that I'm not just able to give the detail, but if the committee keep me here as long as they did last year, I'm sure we'll have time to work this out. I would like to invite the members of the committee to visit the University of Manitoba. Arrangements could be made to have a tour of inspection of the university facilities starting at approximately ten in the morning, concluding with lunch in the cafeteria of the university at 11:45 for which of course the members of the committee will pay. Also I would like to say that we would like very much if the members of the committee could also visit the Manitoba Technical Institute. Approximately the same amount of time could be usefully spent in viewing the facilities which are available there, again to be followed by lunch in the cafeteria of the institute at the--I think the price is a little lower at the institute, but in any case--in both cases the members would be required to pay for their own meals. Now I'm mentioning this now and if there seems to be any interest, I will ask the Whips to inform me if there are sufficient number and we will endeavour to see if we can agree upon a suitable time. I had it in my mind that we might visit the university tomorrow morning, but that was when I thought our estimates would be beginning a little earlier and some other things have intervened to prevent that for tomorrow. I want, however, to say that I think that both visits would be helpful to the members of the committee in a consideration of the estimates that are before you for the university and for the technical institute as well.

Mr. Chairman, that is all that I wanted to say by way of a general statement and I'm sure there will be a number of questions and we will be glad to answer them as best we can.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, just to start off the questioning which the Honourable Minister expects, he referred to the sum of \$6 million and I think that this statement probably requires a little bit of clarification. Some may be led to believe that the \$6 million represents an increase in the annual grant or on the basis of one year. If we refer to the last estimates we find that the \$18 million shown there was only for part of a year. And you will see a statement there that's appended to this particular page stating "on the full year basis, new grant system will require \$21 million three, so actually the increase on an annual basis is \$3 million, not \$6 million, because we did not have a full year in the past school year. Now there's some information that I'd like to obtain from the minister. He may not have it on hand at the moment, but I'd appreciate receiving it before his estimates are over and that is--the number of elementary teachers; the number of secondary teachers; the total grants in each case; provincial grants for divisions--Dauphin-Ochre area, remote school districts and all other school districts; the total amount of provincial grants to elementary teachers and to secondary teachers in those four classifications.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman,, the honourable member is asking the grants for elementary teachers; grants for high school teachers in divisions and remote districts.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Separately in divisions--in the Dauphin-Ochre area, remote school districts and all other school districts and all other, of course, would be the three proposed divisions that didn't accept the plan.

MR. McLEAN: You mean that you are separating out the Dauphin-Ochre school area?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: I am, because I have reason to believe that the grants are not the same as they are in the other divisions and if they are then--

MR. McLEAN: But they are.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Well if I obtain this information I'll be satisfied and draw my own conclusions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to direct one question to the minister at the present time. This afternoon we had put on our desks a report which is called "Summary of the Report of the Manitoba Royal Commission" and I looked through it very quickly. It seems to me that it's not merely a summary. It is in some respects at least an interpretation of the report. This is my impression on a very quick reading--I have the impression that in some cases it's sort of blunt--some of the things which the commission says--and the question is, if the minister can tell us, who wrote this summary? Is this the official position of the department, and so on?

MR. McLEAN: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I might just refer to the point made by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains first so that it won't escape my attention. What the honourable member says is correct, that the estimates last year pointed out that if the new grant system were in effect for the full year of 1959-60 that it would have required \$21,310,000, although the actual amount asked for was \$18,758,000. Now it's not particularly important to me how you interpret this but the fact is that the amount of money--the additional amount of money required in this upcoming fiscal year for school grants is an increase of some \$6 million. That's the fact. And the other--it is true if the new grant system had been in force before last year, then the figures would have been twenty-one and if the figure was twenty-four this year, the increase would have been \$3 million. But the fact is that the actual increased amount asked for by way of increase is some \$6 million.

Now the Honourable Member for St. John's--the summary was prepared by the secretary to the Royal Commission on Education. It is intended to be a "thought" summary--I believe that's an expression that is used. You are not in any way bound to read it or to be guided by it. I thought the members of the committee might like to have it. It was prepared by the secretary of the commission.

MR. E. I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, I would like to first of all extend my congratulations to the honourable minister in the past year for a job that has been very well done--a very tremendous job to provide a system of education for all the children of Manitoba. I do not agree with him to all extents and purposes in regard to all decisions that have been made but I go along with his very great desire and effort to spark plug a system of education within the Province of Manitoba that will give all children an equal opportunity. I do have some concern, Sir, in regard to some of the mechanics of the Act. I'm in the fortunate position that it can't be thrown at me that "you didn't do it when". I am one of the neophytes of the House and therefore I am going to base my remarks on the education system of Manitoba in regards to the mechanics.

First of all, Sir, we said a little over a year ago, in the promotional scheme to sell the system to the electors of Manitoba that we were going to give all children an equal opportunity; that we were going to lighten the load on real property tax; that the Provincial Government was going to assume a larger share of the cost of education.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, when we were promoting the plan of school divisions, we did not make any promise of lightening the load on the local taxpayer.

MR. DOW: Well, Mr. Chairman, Hansard doesn't bear that out. However, it is a concern of the municipalities, towns in particularly the rural parts of Manitoba that they are going to pay a much greater tax for educational purposes. I think, Sir, the concern can be shown by various petitions that were--resolutions that were unanimously passed at the Union of Manitoba Municipalities here a few months ago. And they're more concerned--their concern in the Union is the increase in taxes to provide roads. I could read these resolutions into the records, Sir, but I think most of you have those resolutions. But it is their concern that there is no provision that the municipalities have at the moment that they are going to be subsidized in any way to provide schoolrooms or buses. Apparently, the choosing of the roads comes down to the opinions of the Division Board and in some cases--and I would say maybe in a lot of cases--these roads do not travel the established roads that are already there. It is a thought by municipalities that they do have a problem inasmuch as there is no guarantee from one year to

(Mr. Dow, cont'd.) . . . another that the bus route will travel that particular road and therefore it's a charge against the municipality.

Might I point out, Sir, that there seems to be--I would think in my opinion--a very pathetic view taken by ratepayers in regards to the spending of large sums of money? Today's Tribune, "River East Votes for New School Bylaw--\$945,000 money bylaw passed with ten percent of the ratepayers voting". I think, Sir, that they have taken so much for granted to get so much money that they really haven't too great an interest. I would point out, Sir, in these few remarks that I am so interested in the fact that this system be a good system that I'm thinking that the mechanics are creating a disturbance throughout the rural part of Manitoba to a point that we eventually could disrupt the system and if we ever did it would be a very backward step. I might point out just one school district. Possibly the minister has some notice of this. If he hasn't, he will have very shortly. I will give you the school district--the school district, Elgin school district--I'm sorry--I haven't got the number, but I think the honourable minister knows the one I'm talking of. Five years ago they built a modern school to include all grades up to Grade XII. It was a 20 year debenture and they are now--they have paid four or five years. On the establishment of the school division this particular school had to relinquish their Grade XI and XII students to the larger school in Souris and they were notified a few days ago they were also going to have to relinquish their Grade IX and X students. Now, Mr. Chairman, if you will look up the results of the vote in that particular school district at the time the division was promoted, you will find they almost has a unanimous vote in favour of the new school act. But as of last week, a petition was circulated in that same school district of which it was 95% signed by the electors to make some revision somewhere so they could establish and keep their own school operating within their own school district. To those people and the members who reside in larger cities and areas, this does not seem to be a problem, but to the smaller communities it is a very serious problem that the smaller two, three and four-room high schools are closed to transport their pupils some many miles to a central school. I might point out too that by this system of transportation, it does away with all the recreational movements and recreational organized games within the school they are attending. When you stop to figure the children do start at a reasonably early hour in the morning and they're not home 'till later in the evening; they'll also cut out recesses; they have a shorter noon hour; and they leave at 3:30. Now this is a serious problem in community life within the smaller districts and I think will have a tendency to go a long way to undo what we have been trying to do to get a better system of education.

The Minister, I was very interested in, giving the quotations of the various buses, vans and so on but I have another problem and I say this, Mr. Minister, I hope in the spirit that I'm trying to promote. Maybe you don't know these things. In travelling No. 2 and 3 highway the past two or three weeks--it so happens to be in the morning when these vans are en route to schools--I find in several instances that children are being transported in half-ton trucks with a plywood box in some cases with no rear view in the back and just plank seats. Now if that's progress in education it's a long way from when I went to school because we didn't go that way. In the wind the other day we followed two of them. The wind was such a point that these were just rocking to a point that you didn't know whether the plywood boxes would stay on the truck or not. Now I think that's a serious situation. Great stress was made, Mr. Chairman, at the time of the promotion of this bill that these pupils would start from sheltered points. Whether the minister knows this or not I'm not prepared to say but my observation is that if he will go out in the mornings he will see many occasions where children are standing on highways behind trying to get some shelter from telephone poles. Maybe it's a circumstance of their own parents' desire but to me it doesn't look proper to see teenagers trying to get shelter from these various poles along the line. Might I also point out, Sir, that the actual results of the school divisions and I hope they are what I think they should be that they will be an improvement in standards and in grades and in education of the pupils--cannot be determined for the next two or three years when the results are known but there are one or two things that I think we should take into consideration that the credit for increased attendance is not altogether the result of school divisions. According to the Winnipeg Free Press on January 21st, 1960, the Honourable Minister of Education, speaking before the Manitoba School Trustees' Association, said that in the fall of '59 after establishment of school divisions, high

(Mr. Dow, cont'd.) . . . school enrollment jumped to 35,232 an increase of 11% over the previous spring. He went on to say there was an increase of teachers and so on but what I'm trying to point out, Sir, that that is only a normal increase. If you will take your records of enrollment in your annual report of the Department of Education as I have it on page 167 of 1958 that it is evident that in 1955 the normal increase of high school enrollment was almost 13%; in 1956 it was almost nine percent; in '57 almost seven percent and in '58 over seven percent so I can't see that the increase of 11% in '59 was really such a jump that could be credited to the school divisions--(interjection)--pardon me?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): reverses the trend.

MR. DOW: Could be, but I would suggest, Sir, that it is likely to come from the urban divisions and not from the underprivileged hinterland. If however, this jump in enrollment is the result of increased high school opportunities in the school divisions in rural parts as claimed by the minister then I think, Sir, it should occur mostly in Grade IX. Those results will prove themselves as time goes on.

Now, Sir, I am concerned as you know to the mechanics of taxation as related to the tax dollar and to some of the mechanics which can be straightened out in regards to the collection of the fee of the taxes as demanded by the school division. I think, Sir, that there is something that can be improved greatly is the present principle of asking the school division to ask for monies from municipalities, towns, cities and villages and to retain it and have the local school board have to borrow money to continue on. That's another added fact to the overall facts. For your information I have the certified receipts, Sir, from one school district. It happens to be a suburban one and the figures are such--of \$575,000 paid to their account and as levied for by the River East school division No. 9, only \$239,287 has been turned over to the local board. This is as of January 20th, 1960 and as a result the taxpayer of East Kildonan has been called upon to pay interest to the bank so the local board could meet their commitments even though they have already paid the required school levy in full. This I think, Sir, is a mechanical feature that should be changed in the Act

I would like to impress the fact that we, when I say we in the rural area, are not altogether and I personally am not, sold on the idea that all schools must be centralized in rural areas. It's too much town, political enmity between the towns to start with. I can mention many towns that are not going to agree that they should give up the rights of a larger school to another town and therefore, Sir, I think that some consideration should be given that when it can be proved that the rights are there that they do have the opportunity of being able to reduce it. One thing, Sir, I would like to ask before I sit down is in the estimates I find there is no provision made for commission and studies. Now I take, Sir, that that amount of \$24,500 paid last year was to the Royal Commission but is it not the Department of Education's intention that they continue the studies of education along to other years or is it going to be dropped now that we have this one report and for how long will it go? He mentions, too, Sir, and this may be erroneous, this may be erroneous--I stand to be corrected but one of the school trustees mentioned this fact that some consideration had been given by the department, either by a direction or Order-in-Council, that a teacher of 20 years service was going to be paid an extra salary over and above the schedule. Now I'm asking that for information, Sir. If it is true it sets up a very very hard bargaining point to school boards to bargain with this sum of money in mind, that that teacher, that length of time, is going to get over and above all increments.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman--

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, if I might just correct or speak to one point only because I wouldn't want it to escape too long. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain made reference to the school district of Elgin. I now have the report from the chairman of the division board in which he says that the closing of the high school rooms at Elgin has not even been considered and that in the next year there will four high school teachers and four grades. There's no truth in that point.

MR. DOW:

MR. McLEAN: I notice, however, that has never even been considered.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, as I take part in this debate I am fully aware that some of the members of this House might think that I am unduly critical but I'm fully conscious

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . also of my responsibilities as a member of the opposition and as such I think that my duty is to oppose and try to bring in also some constructive suggestion if I possibly can. I will start by opposing and I will, I think, bring some useful suggestion. Mr. Chairman, last October--a year ago last October the 27th the Honourable the Minister of Education moved a second reading of a Bill in this House and he made this statement: "This Bill adopts the principles and general recommendations of the Royal Commission on Education as outlined in their interim report". Quite a lot of water has gone under the bridges since that time and I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, to try and prove that we have not now a system of school divisions that follows the recommendation of the interim report of the Royal Commission on Education. And I intend to prove that it doesn't follow the recommendations because of political considerations that entered the picture as the months went along and I maintain that we have now at the present time a system of complicated administration of small high schools in the Province of Manitoba--complicated system of administration and a costly one. In order to prove my point, Mr. Chairman, I must refer back to a couple of years ago. The present First Minister when he was sitting on this side of the House came out at different times with plans with respect to education although at no time did he tell the House whether he was favouring the Dauphin-Ochre plan or the plan for larger schools at the secondary level but he advocated both at different times and got big headlines.

MR. ROBLIN: That's not correct.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I think I'm correct.

MR. ROBLIN: No, sorry.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I was bringing a quotation if you believe in what the papers report and I've been in this House and I listened to the honourable gentleman time after time. And the Honourable the present Minister of Education before he occupied that position had been a strong advocate of the larger unit system along the Dauphin-Ochre area plan. When the election was called in 1958 the Conservative Party had no program with respect to the administration of the schools--it had only one program we will give 50% more for education in the province--increase the grants by 50%. That promise was made all over Manitoba. Election was held, the Conservatives came back with the largest group of 26. It was just too bad it was not enough to carry on--it was the Diefenbaker Ottawa situation of 1957 I believe. Now something had to be found. Some better proposition to offer the people of Manitoba had to be found in order to re-elect the government in that future election with an overall majority. Well, I suppose the government was looking around. There was a Royal Commission on Education that had been appointed and was working. I have suggested in this House that a hint was given to the Royal Commission to bring out an interim report. It has never been denied. I hint again today that the interim report was the result of a hint by the government then in power because it doesn't seem to me natural and normal that this Royal Commission would have come out with a interim report at that time if it had not been asked to bring one. Well it did bring out an interim report and in that report there was a recommendation with respect to larger school divisions. And then what did we see? We see a government that was very happy, very happy. They had found the secret to turn the electors their way in Manitoba. They were very very happy to have this because how would they implement their promise of 50%--they had no program, no system, no suggestion. They had not offered any suggestion to the people of this province but here was something worthwhile and I've been thinking since then of the famous, great scientist Archimedes. The members will remember I am sure that he was famous scientist and he was working on the problem and suddenly while in his bath he discovered the secret and he came out not fully clothed and walked the streets and he said, "Eureka, Eureka I have found it". Now they have found it. The Conservatives had found it and you were quick to act. I never saw a greater display of energy than that shown by the government of that time and the government that we have now today with certain changes than was shown with respect to the implementation of the interim report. Yes, very energetic and they arrived at a timetable, a very good timetable and I've got it here. The timetable was this immediately as soon as it was possible to prepare a Bill--call a session--this was done at the end of October, beginning of November. Immediately appoint a Boundaries Commission and give them as little time as possible, but it required time for the Boundaries Commission to establish the boundary. Of course, it facilitated the problem. It divided the Commission in two so that it would meet the deadline of December 31st and there was a

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) .. deadline. These two months were fully occupied by this Boundaries Commission and then there was another action taken. It was the time to take the vote on the divisions--January and February. That was the timetable. Session November, Boundaries Commission November, December--the vote January, February--March the session--May the election to slide in on the school divisions. Absolutely and it was a timetable that it was difficult to meet but it was met. Of course I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the government thought the divisions were pretty large when the Boundaries Commission made their recommendation. I am sure that the government, and I'm sure that if I had been the government I would have said to that Boundaries Commission--well it's impossible to have one high school or two high schools of 12 rooms as the Royal Commission recommended in this large division. It's impossible, it can't be done. We should have smaller divisions. The government had no time to give instructions to the Boundaries Commission to go back to work although they had the power to do so, according to the Act that we had just passed. Subsection 3 of section 494:--The minister may refer or report back to the Commission for inclusion therein of further details or clarification of any part thereof that he deems not to contain sufficient detail or to be ambiguous. And watch this--and he may request a further report or an amended report. I say that if it had not been for the timetable I'm quite sure that the government would have asked that Commission to work at it some more but the government was squeezed by the timetable--it was imperative that everything should be on time.

Mr. Speaker, a word about the legislation that we approved in November 1958. Many things recommended in the Royal Commission were not brought into legislation. The Royal Commission had recommended and the whole basis of the report respecting the divisions is based on the necessity of having more pupils to attend the high school. I'm quoting from page 21--quote "to meet the demand for more diversified education it is necessary to secure a sufficient number of pupils in each attendance unit". On page 22 quote--"adequate secondary school facilities can only be provided if the number of pupils in attendance is large enough to justify a diversified secondary school program". On No. 23--"The desirability of a division large enough to provide a satisfactory attendance unit for the secondary grades is particularly apparent". Same thing on page 24--"it is the opinion of the Commission that the ideal is one school, high school, per division". And the members know very well that the fundamental principle behind this and the recommendations made with respect to inducement grants. Inducement grants were suggested by the Royal Commission for one reason only and I will quote from page 46 ". 75%" and that's one of their recommendations. 75% of the approved actual cost of building a new high school or of adding to an existing high school if such construction is necessary to consolidate a number of small present high schools. That was the purpose of inducement--to consolidate a small number of present high schools not to build a better high school with an auditorium in some places. No that was not the recommendation of the Commission and with respect to the city, here is a recommendation in the case of cities and suburbs to add 75% was recommended in order to add to an acceptable present high school to accommodate high school pupils from territory added to the schools, to the city or suburbs by the Boundaries Commission. It was not to provide a new school in a city, only it was to provide for added pupils. That's the recommendation of the Royal Commission which was ignored. Now the government--(interjection)--I'll come to that if you just have a little bit of patience.

MR. McLEAN: I wonder if I might ask the honourable member a question. I'm not too certain that I'm following. Do I understand that the honourable member is presenting an argument that he favours one high school in each division?

MR. PREFONTAINE: You will find my argument as I go along. I say that the recommendation of the Commission was not followed by the government and when we passed a bill we passed a grant system for secondary high schools proposed by the minister from 40 to 80%. I have his speech here and I agree with the Leader of the CCF Party when he mentioned that the government was ready to go along and give up to 80% to high schools without this rider of the Commission which says it's only to add to schools--pupils that are brought in especially in the cities. He was ready to give 80% for every high school in the City of Winnipeg or Brandon or other cities. The minister said to this House that he was proposing that the grants should be from 40 to 80%. Now this was not a recommendation of the Royal Commission and I defy the minister or anyone to look through the recommendations of the Royal Commission and they

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) .. would not find anything at all except 12 classrooms, not any kind of rooms--12 classrooms. This was the brainchild of the government--this sliding scale. The government could foresee that in the election it was a good thing to seem to allow four-room or a five or a six-room high school. They paved the way. It would be more popular. They could feel beforehand the reaction of the people and they paved the way by making that motion. I voted for the new system of equalization of money for all schools in Manitoba--there were two main principles and I declare to rise on the floor of this House but when before Law Amendments Committee, Mr. Chairman, we discussed this sliding scale two men stood up--my leader, Mr. Campbell and myself to say that we preferred the flat grant and we stated that this looked to us like to be weighted in favour of cities where there's a huge population and against the country where people are living far away from one another and they couldn't have the 12 rooms or the larger rooms and we opposed it and wanted a flat grant but we didn't get our way we were just as popular as skunks at a garden party. It wasn't popular. Oh no, the popular thing was the sliding scale, the larger schools. We didn't get our way, but we did improve it a little bit by reducing, not us but the ex-Premier and myself--our friends took an active part to see to it that the maximum was reduced from 80% to 75% and that a little more would be given to smaller schools. But at that time, Mr. Chairman, we were thinking only in terms of classrooms. The boundaries made their recommendation and we had an election. Things happened in this election. There was a scuttling during the election of the recommendations of the Royal Commission. I will quote now--Yes, I will prove it. The Royal Commission recommended 12 classrooms. Now the department published regulations in the Manitoba Gazette of June 3rd and I wonder if they had a right to make this publication. They should have defined what classrooms meant in the Bill that they presented in November to us but no, they defined the classroom by section 29, page 31, The Manitoba Gazette for the purposes of determining the number of classrooms in a school (a) every room in the school designed as a classroom of the traditional type shall be deemed to be a classroom but (b) every room in the school designed and used for a library or a laboratory and that has an area of at least 700 square feet shall be deemed to be a classroom (c) every other space in the school designed for the instruction of students and consisting of at least 700 square feet not included in any other calculation of space for a classroom shall be deemed to be a classroom.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, is the honourable member suggesting that that was a new regulation?

MR. PREFONTAINE: Yes, as far as I'm concerned.

MR. McLEAN: That was the regulation long before we were here.

MR. PREFONTAINE: A new regulation this sliding scale for grants to secondary schools--

MR. McLEAN: The one you're reading. That was enforced long before we were here.

MR. PREFONTAINE: No, no. And I'm trying to explain that there was a change. We were led to believe in this House that this sliding scale would apply to classroom and that was the term used in this House--(interjection)--Well I can read the Act.

MR. ROBLIN: Go ahead, read the Act.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I can read the Act, Sir. There's only one word mentioned not a library room for the cost of each new secondary school building (a) 50 and five, ten percent thereof if it contains five classrooms--not auditoriums (b) 57 5/10% thereof if it contains six classrooms--not auditoriums or library rooms. A horse is a horse and a cow is a cow--it seems to me very plain. I don't think I'm as dumb as some of the members want others to believe. This is clear in here.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman--

MR. PREFONTAINE: When the vote was taken on the division--my time is passing. When the vote was taken during the time of the division the government appealed to every person in Manitoba to support this plan, to those who wanted centralization 12-room high schools, 12 classrooms, and to others who favoured their own little system and small classrooms. They came all over the place. When they were asked well if we maintain our small class high schools we'll have only about four classrooms look at the number of children we have in our locality. "Oh", the minister said, "you can build an auditorium and that may count for four classrooms and you can build a library room and that'll count for another one and you can build a home economics rooms and a typing room and you can build all those--you don't have to be afraid--you'll

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . get the 75%--you can build a big school in your little village, absolutely. And this was told all over the place. I think the members know that I'm right in this matter. It was to try and make this plausible to everyone--those who preferred to keep their little schools in their own town and their village and it was also right for the newspapers who wanted the centralization and the publicity they were getting all over the place, they were trying to be amiable to everyone in Manitoba to get a nice big vote and they went all over the province and they made good speeches, they made themselves very popular with the money of the taxpayers of Manitoba--promising \$6 million within the present tax structure. It was stated in the town of Steinbach--I can bring a quotation from the library any minute--"within the present tax structure" and it was said right in St. Pierre by the Minister of Education, "this could be done within the present tax structure". Absolutely, what did it mean to the division that I'm in? It meant \$1, 920 per authorized teacher and that was quite a bit of money. And there are other things. The Royal Commission had recommended that the government should give \$5, 000 advance grant. Advance grant to help the new divisions to get organized. An advance grant of \$5, 000. The government called it an establishment grant to help the divisions because they were creating a new level of school administration and they had no bank account, they had no money. I haven't made that speech. I'm making it again if it doesn't happen to please the Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: not supposed to be listening to me, these asides, you're not supposed to hear that.

MR. PREFONTAINE: And what was done, the government was very generous, an election was coming \$10, 000. The Royal Commission had made no recommendation that it should be given to the City of Winnipeg, or St. Boniface or school district of Norwood. No, it was an advance grant but the \$10, 000 was made available and I'm sure that some of the honourable members representing the City of Winnipeg were glad to announce to their voters at election time that this was done by a generous government. It meant quite a bit of money, it meant quite a bit of money.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): You voted for it in the Act.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I voted for the new system of schools and the Mr. Chairman.

MR. LYON: And the grant.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I said in the House and I repeat we could not divorce one from the other.

MR. McLEAN: No and you still can't.

MR. PREFONTAINE: And I say that when the Cabinet Ministers, when the Cabinet Ministers went out all over the country they were scuttling slowly but surely the recommendation of the Royal Commission with respect to education. But they were gaining votes, all over the province, and it cost quite a bit of money. And there's a further thing, what about merit rating we've had a report, a good report. I think that it was loaded with teachers or ex-teachers possibly, I say that was not a recommendation of the Royal Commission, not to implement merit rating. Of course the government would not announce it before the election, of no, to have 5, 000 pretty well satisfied teachers siding for the government that's a good thing when the time for an election approaches. The schedule was published in time--(interjection)--And there are these teachers, Mr. Speaker, who had been hired already at a certain salary were told that this plan would give them an increase right from the first of April for three months. The election was timed to of course they had a chance to get one cheque I suppose, before the election was held. Well I say that there are many other things the Royal Commission recommended that the Boundaries Commission should promulgate the place where the high schools should be built inside a division.

MR. McLEAN: in favour of that.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I don't say I am I say that --(interjection)--you scuttled the report, you made a statement which I read that you were following the recommendation of the report. --(interjection)--Please leave me enough time to carry on, I pray.

MR. PAULLEY: Well we'll consider this a second speech.

MR. ROBLIN: How many minutes is it in committee anyway? 20 isn't it?

MR. PAULLEY: No he speaks as many times as he likes in committee. All I would suggest is that if he wants to go for an hour and a half, every 40 minutes all that he has to do is sit

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . down and start a second speech, which would then be within the rules of the House.

MR. ROBLIN: Very sound.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Now, Mr. Chairman--(interjection)--Thank you you're very accommodating my dear friend. --(interjection)--Some are laughing very heartily and others not so heartily, I'm quite convinced. But the election was held and the government slid into power on the school divisions that they had implemented. --(interjection)--Yes I should say so to quite an extent. They had become very popular with public funds, \$6 million, \$1,900 per teacher in every school division, that was very popular. But I said at that time when I saw that the minister was going out and saying to the people, you can have an auditorium you can have this and that room and when they were saying that all over I was thinking that the government had the lion by the tail. The lion would take the government into power. O. K. But they couldn't let go of the tail, the lion has become a real monster at the present time. And I think that the minister is finding that out day by day. He's meeting difficulties. Didn't he meet difficulties when he's reported in the paper, he was quoted by my leader, already after saying that the trustees had government money to spend it raises the question of whether there might come some pressure for greater control by the province on the activities and monies spent by school trustees. Well that's quite a threat. It shows that the minister is worried. We have now reached--I carry on quoting: "We have now reached a stage in the administration of financial affairs where the people of Manitoba generally will expect you"--he was speaking of his trustees--"to exercise the utmost scrutiny in the expenditure of money under your control". Once you reach the position of over 60% it's right, it should have been right also in February and March and January, February when the vote was taken but at the time the government was not thinking of money it was thinking of votes and making all kinds of promises. Indeed more than the quest for a greater degree of control by the province "I hope", continued Mr. McLean, "it will never be necessary for us to ever think about that in a serious way. Auditoriums are important", he says, "but we are not engaged in the business of providing community centres". The minister is guilty of having stated that auditoriums could be built, is guilty of having stated that in the Province of Manitoba, in many places his colleagues stated that also, to please those who wanted to preserve their small school in the community, in their villages. Absolutely! The minister doesn't seem to be worried. I think he must have been worried when he goes to a trustee convention and used this language And of course there was news emanating from the government that I quoted the other day, "A crisis in education, rising cost of education reform" says the Winnipeg Tribune in a big headliner story. The Free Press says in a big headline, "Money Crisis May Force Government Control of Teachers' Pay". That's pretty serious. That's no laughing matter at all. It is a very serious matter. Now the Honourable the First Minister doesn't seem to be worried. Full speed ahead. But we should see that we are spending the money properly and I'll come to that a little later.

MR. McLEAN: say to the trustees.

MR. PREFONTAINE: We have a costly system of administering the schools that we have. I know of a division where one trustee has to travel 80 miles to come to a meeting if it is held at the other end of the division. And if the meeting is held at the centre, the two have to travel 40 miles each way--that's 80 miles--that's \$8.00--and that's quite a bit. And these costs--it's a costly system that we have, and we have a man who lives 80 miles away to come and administer a school. He doesn't know anything about it. In my speech last year--the honourable members remember--we remember--those that were here in the fall of 1958--we remember that I stated that I could foresee that the people of Oakville would want to keep their high school--they would be in a division with Portage; that the people from Crystal City would want to keep their school--and they are right close to Pilot Mound; that the people of St. Malo would like to keep their high school--and they are nine miles from St. Pierre; the people of Grunthal would want to keep their high school. And I stated that if they were going to keep their high schools, it would be better economy to have these high schools administered by the local people. But when we think of trustees coming from 80 or maybe 100 miles to administer a school that they don't know anything about, I think that is costly and not wise. We are into this system. The minister is bound hand and foot now, and he can't back out. He can't tell these people, "Oh, the auditoriums are not going to count anymore,--oh, no--that were the time of the

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . election. But now we can't allow you to construct auditoriums. That can't be done". The minister can't back out. Certainly, he can't back out. People all over are expecting that he will live up to his promises that he made at that time.

I have a recommendation--two recommendations to make to him. One is that the regulation that I quoted, with respect to the floor space, might be changed to make it permissible for a school division to build a library room for instance, or a home economics room, with a floor space of say 500 feet rather than 700. You would save a little bit of money. Now if that school only has four teaching rooms--traditional classrooms--there will not be the number of pupils to fill a room 24 x 30--but just about. Now the regulations could be amended and you would save money if you adopt this recommendation. The same thing goes with auditoriums. The floor space might be lowered so that by building a little smaller auditorium, which will cost less money than a larger one. The district--the division could get the 75% anyway, if they built a smaller auditorium; or a smaller library room; or a smaller typing room where the girls will type. There might be only ten or 12. If there is an enrollment of just only 100 or less, I think these rooms would be large enough and money would be saved.

Second recommendations is contained in a motion before this House, to which I will speak when the time comes--to give 75% to smaller schools. That will save money both for the government and for the Department of Education and the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba. And I think that should be done. I think it is a good suggestion. There are restrictions put on the amendment. I approve of them but I for one didn't think it was absolutely necessary. I have confidence in the school trustees that have been elected and I don't think they would go out of their way to build too big rooms. But I say that's a suggestion that will save the department a lot of money--I believe that it would if it's passed.

Now I will not speak any longer. I'm sorry I've outworn my time. I have stated, after mentioning that the First Minister said there's no stop sign as far as education is concerned--we'll go full speed ahead for our children. Now, Mr. Chairman, I love our children as much as anyone, and I say that money should not be saved, we should do everything we can, but we should be sure that we spend that money the right way. And I would like to finish by quoting from the report of the Royal Commission on Education: "It is a simple matter to spend more money on education. It is a more difficult task to spend it in a manner which will improve education. There is considerable evidence and frank admissions by outstanding Americans, that while they spend proportionately more on education than any other country in the free world, it has not bought them the best education of all".

Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry if I took so much time. I think these are important matters. I tried to possibly arrange it in some kind of a jocular way at times -- I was stopped by many hecklers. But it is serious--very serious. It's my duty as a member of the Opposition to raise these important matters, and I have no apology to make. Thank you.

..... continued next page.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister began by quoting from a speech from the Throne which a group of students read here this morning. He said, where they said "Education is the nation's greatest asset." We in this group have always believed in this, we in this group have always believed that if we are to develop the kind of society which we believe in, that we must spend substantially more money for education than has been spent in the past. We certainly have no objection today, nor have we had in the past sessions with this government; nor indeed when the previous government got religion very late during its term of office and decided to increase grants, did members of this group take exception to it. But Mr. Speaker, members of this government promised the people of this province that the cost of education, the increased cost of education would be met by the province and that the cost to the local taxpayer would be reduced. Now the Minister has denied this and I'm not going to talk Mr. Chairman, tonight, today about what was said on the hustings because people very often don't take what is said on a political platform too seriously. But I want to quote just a couple of lines from what the present Minister said here in the House on March the 18th, 1959 and if he wants to know where he said it he'll find it in Page 95 of that Hansard. Here is what he said and I quote, "this plan will provide equal educational opportunities for children throughout the Province of Manitoba, particularly with respect to high school education. It will relieve in large measure the real property from the burden of school finance, transferring a larger share to the taxpayers which we have in the Province of Manitoba." That's exactly what the Minister said, Mr. Chairman. I pointed out in that session that while we recognized the fact that the provincial government was proposing to spend more money that in fact the amount of taxation and the percentage to the local district would not be reduced. I pointed out then that the basis for the increased grants to these divisions was on the basis of the recommendation of the Royal Commission on the basis of \$50.00 a year per teacher, and that in fact nearly all these school districts had negotiated increments of \$300.00 a year to their teachers, so that inevitably not only would the percentage not drop immediately but in fact the increase to the local district would get more each year. Now the honourable member for St. Vital who's not in his seat at the present time took it upon himself to tell me that I was wrong, took it upon himself to tell me that this wouldn't happen. Well we've been in business a little while since this plan started. The Minister the other day quoted some figures, he must have looked very carefully to find school districts that would fit his needs, he quoted a number where the tax rate had gone down. I tried today to get some of the figures of what has happened in the urban centres in and around Winnipeg, in case the Minister doesn't know them I'm going to take the time to give it to him. Here we are for the City of St. James, in 1958 their school costs were in round figures \$1,360,000 in 1959 that had gone up to \$1,765,000, over \$400,000 increase and this year I am told that it is estimated the school costs will be \$2,000,000 for the year 1960. Here in East Kildonan, in 1958 their school costs were \$550,000, 1959 \$650,000, and increase of \$100,000 and for 1960 I've been told that they will be up probably a similar amount. West Kildonan, 1958 school costs \$530,000, 1959 \$639,000.

MR. MCLEAN: Mr. Chairman would the Honourable Member also give us the increase in total enrolment in these school districts and the increase in the assessment in the municipalities concerned.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman I haven't got that here, I could get it, but in each case the mill rate is up, so if the Honourable Minister is arguing that the total for education isn't the whole picture certainly the mill rate is an important factor. The mill rate is up in each case. -- (Interjection) -- It is up in West Kildonan.

MR. JAMES COWAN (Winnipeg Centre): Ask your, ask the man in the next seat to you and he'll tell you.

MR. ORLIKOW: It is up in West Kildonan, if the member says it isn't so I'll bring the exact figure tonight Mr. Chairman. -- (Interjection) -- For education yes. Transcona, 1958 school costs \$261,952, 1959 \$317,000. All right, the member was talking about West Kildonan, here are two other areas in the new, areas included in West Kildonan. In Old Kildonan the mill rate went up 11 mills in 1959 over 1958. In West St. Paul it went up 7 mills in 1959 over 1958. Here we are, St. Vital, about which the Honourable member from St. Vital talked in a recent session. In 1958 the mill rate was 24.6 for schools, in 1959 it was 25.97, an increase of close to 5%. Fort Garry, '58 the cost of education \$1,171,000, 1959 \$1,289,000 and last Mr. Chair-

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) ... man, the City of Winnipeg which the member from Winnipeg Centre also represents as I do, 1958 costs in the City of Winnipeg \$9,685,000, 1959 over \$11,000,000 and I'm told that the estimate for 1960 is over \$12,000,000. I'm not objecting to this Mr. Chairman, I believe in education and I know that better education costs money but I object to the Minister making these statements and making the suggestions and what he said here Mr. Chairman, was mild compared to what the candidates for his party were saying during the election. I object to their making the statement that it would reduce the cost to the local district it hasn't done it and it won't do it, the cost will go up and not down and this is the fact. Now Mr. Ch.....

MR. MCLEAN:

MR. ORLIKOW: Well you picked them very carefully, you picked them very carefully. Now Mr. Chairman -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman I want to talk about some of the things about which the Minister did not talk about today. I want to say in my opinion his report today is very weak, very mild and very standpat as compared to the report which he gave to the last session of the House. It's true that the educational grants are up very substantially but this is based on what was done up till that time and what was done up till that time was only the first step in what is needed to make a good educational system. Now Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that you get a good educational system simply by building good schools. I believe that the educational system will stand or fall depending on the calibre of the people who take teaching, the calibre of the people who do teach. I want to point out to the members in this House Mr. Chairman, that in the Province of Saskatchewan -- (Interjection) -- Well, we always come back to this, in the Province of Saskatchewan, teachers now must have two years of training beyond a senior matriculation level in order to qualify for a permanent certificate. This must include one year at teachers' college in Regina or Saskatoon and five University of Saskatchewan classes or two years in the college of education at the University. In the Province of Saskatchewan you cannot enter the teacher college unless you have a clear grade 12. Now, Mr. Chairman can anybody imagine that if we were, that the University of Manitoba or any other University would accept these students in a field as important as let us say, engineering or as important as medicine -- would permit students to enter those fields unless they had adequate academic training? Of course not. Buildings are important, human beings are important. I want to suggest to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that nothing is more important in the people who attend our schools and yet, Mr. Chairman, if you turn to the report of the Department of Education which we have tabled now, page 104. Here we have a report issued by the Minister, not by me Mr. Chairman, issued by the Minister, at least under the authorization of the Minister. Here are the people attending the Manitoba -- the students who attended elementary teacher's training classes at Tuxedo and Brandon, 1958-1959. Total enrolment 723, those attending who have a complete Grade 12, 293, those attending who have a partial Grade 12, 430. I want to suggest to you Mr. Chairman, that this may have been necessary when the teachers of Manitoba were getting the miserable salaries which were permitted by the former government but that we have now established a system of salaries which is adequate, which is fair and that we can now begin to establish the same kind of qualifications which they have already established in Saskatchewan and which they have established in the Province of Ontario and yet we have well over half of the students attending the Teachers' training courses who haven't got a complete Grade 12. And here I think is another very significant thing. Those completing the course successfully, 529, those who failed 6. Mr. Chairman, that is just over 1% failed. I would suggest to the Minister that it is about time we started to tighten up the standards and it is about time that people who can't meet the training offered don't pass. (Hear, hear) Well, hear, hear, it's about time the Minister started to do something about it. Now I began by quoting what Saskatchewan said should be done. Now I am not, Mr. Chairman

MR. MCLEAN: Other members are complaining about me being too energetic.

MR. ORLIKOW: Well I think you lost your energy in last year. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman I am not merely the supporter of the Royal Commission which some members in this House seem to be. I think that in many respects their recommendations are conservative with a small "c" and I would say they're in some respects reactionary. But I want to thank the Minister for putting this on our desks because if he would turn to the first page of this report I'm going to take the time of the House to read a couple of pages because it deals with this particular thing which I'm dealing with, and here is what they said. And if the summary is wrong,

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) . . . it's the secretary of the Royal Commission who summarized it, the Minister has already said it. Here's what they say, Chapter 5, The Manitoba Teachers' College. 1. The Commission finds that the Manitoba Teachers' College, the entrance requirements are too low, the professional courses are not demanding enough, certain of the faculty are lacking in academic and professional qualifications and some facilities either need improvement or are lacking altogether. 2. According to regulations the minimum entrance requirement is Grade 12, entrance to Teachers' College which is significantly weaker academically than a Grade 12 senior matriculation. The Grade 12 entrance to Teachers' College permits a student to enter without a second language, mathematics no more advanced than Arithmetic 3 and with no Grade 12 science. It goes on further to say this: "In the five year period 1954 - 1958 on graduation, only approximately 4 out of 10 teacher trainees met minimum Grade 12 requirements and only 3 out of 10 graduated with Grade 12 senior matriculation. 3. Few teacher trainees failed completely or were denied any form of certification for teaching. In the 5-year period 1954-'58 only 26.7 of the graduates had a clear Grade 12 standing plus a clear standing in professional courses, only one-half of 1 percent of the total graduates were denied a teaching certificate. 4. The Commission feels that the minimum academic standing for teaching training should be at least one full year of training beyond that available in the public school system. To make this possible the Commission recommends that entrance requirements be raised to a clear Grade 12 entrance at Teachers' College by September 1961 and to Grade 12 senior matriculation by September 1963. By 1965 the minimum academic standing for teacher training should be complete second year university. Well, this is what the Commission has reported, Mr. Chairman if you turn to the part of the estimates dealing with teacher training you will see that there is practically no increase in the cost and I suggest to you Mr. Chairman that this is proof of the fact that the Minister has no intention at the present time of moving on to a real reorganization of the teacher training program, because if he has he certainly hasn't provided any money to do it properly. Now Mr. Chairman I want to deal with only one more aspect in which I think this, these estimates show that the government is not prepared to move. If you turn to the Education Grants, Mr. Chairman, and look under 2 (b), General Grants. You will see Item 1, Scholarships. Last year the government, we appropriated \$173,000, this year we're appropriating only \$200,000. When you go down to Item 4, even that increase is washed out because the Education Loan Fund which last year was \$140,000 this year it's reduced to only \$100,000. Mr. Chairman, I believe and it is now, I think, accepted in most countries in the world that if we are to get a proper educational system established there must be greatly increased state responsibility for higher education. In most countries the trend is to complete or almost complete subsidy of university training for top students. I'm not suggesting that this can be done by this province alone. I realize that we have difficulties; I realize that nearly all the provinces now accept the principle that the Federal Government should accept a much larger responsibility in this field. But, I want to suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this government by refusing to increase the grants for scholarships and loans

MR. MCLEAN:

MR. ORLIKOW: Yes, but you've washed it out by reducing the loan fund.

MR. MCLEAN: And you're anticipating something that hasn't been done yet.

MR. ORLIKOW: Well, this is what you're proposing and you have the majority so I'm assuming that this will be what this House will accept. I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that what this government has done, knowingly or unknowingly, is to adopt one of the most reactionary, hide-bound suggestions which was made in that report of the Royal Commission, when the Commission said, and I quote, and this will be found on Page 259 of their report, "In a sense, education is an accumulation of capital and one might well ask what obligation the public has to contribute to the accumulation of capital for any individual even in the form of education". Well, Mr. Chairman, this country is falling behind in the job of educating the young people of this country; we're falling behind not only other countries like Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries which are much poorer than we are in a total wealth or in a per capita wealth, we are falling so far behind what is being done behind the Iron Curtain and I certainly hold no brief for them, but we're falling so far behind that I'm going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we are in danger of losing the war without an actual war being fought. And I want to say Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion this is a although this shows a very large increase in educational

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) ...costs in some of the most important facets, this is a stand-pat program of the worst type.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, this being the opportunity for one to deal with the estimates on this department in general terms, I rise to offer, I hope, some constructive ideas and perhaps some criticism, I being in the Opposition, with regards to the program, with regards to the statement and with regards to the estimates before us in this department.

First of all, of course, I would like to concur with the Minister when he concurs with the general sentiments of that excerpt paragraph as read from the University Mock Parliament Throne Speech here today. I think, however, that all of us are certainly well aware of the ever more increasing importance of education in this modern and complex society. I would like to, first of all, say to the Minister that I hope he will not be subjected to a barrage of criticism from the Liberal group as regards the number of civil servants in his department because I notice, in doing a little bit of calculation, I notice that his department staff is set up on the basis approximately of one staff person per 600 student population. And approximately this is within the scope or within the range of that which is considered desirable. I think that in most jurisdictions, both in this country and in the United States, where education was perhaps a little more planned and advanced than it was here until 1958, that was the approximate ratio.

Then, too, insofar as teacher supply is concerned, I would take from the basis of computation that we have in this province approximately 180,000 students and approximately 7,000 teachers. This works out in a ratio of 26 students per teacher and this seems, too, like a quite reasonable average. However, I would like to point out to the Minister and to the government benches that while they can take some comfort for some of the things that have transpired during their term of office that they should not allow themselves to be lulled into complacency by just merely quoting statistics to themselves because if they investigate and compare with other provinces they will find that we do not stand too high on the basis of students per thousand of population. I think that the Province of Manitoba has approximately, I believe it's 150 students per thousand of population and this is exceeded by the two provinces immediately to the west of us and not to mention, of course, Ontario -- I couldn't say that Ontario's higher; I don't have that information. But, nevertheless,

MR. MCLEAN: Certain factors other than the educational system enter into that.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, I'm quite aware of that but nevertheless what is the ultimate aim of education, Mr. Chairman, if not to have the largest number of students going to school and to be getting the most out of it. That is a consideration, but I don't think that it explains the whole story because I don't think that the people of this province are necessarily less fertile than the people of other provinces. Now, what I have to say at this point, I wish to say very carefully because I do not wish to be misunderstood or misquoted but when we speak about the staff of the Department of Education, I think we all should agree that they have been doing a fairly good job and a very competent job when one considers the amount of work that had to be done in the last year, what with the re-organization and so on. But what I wish to convey to the Minister is that for some reason among members of the general public with whom I have been in contact, I think perhaps the reason comes partly out of the fiasco that resulted with the marking of papers last year and the subsequent 'phone calls and all that. But I've had many people ask me if the moral of the Department of Education was very high. I did not have any opinion but I would like to point out to the Minister that here is something which he certainly should watch and something which should be of concern to him, if he is not already in a position to know that it is quite to the contrary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is now 5:30 and I shall leave the Chair until 8 o'clock.

MR. SCHREYER: Very well, Mr. Chairman.

ADDRESS IN FRENCH, February 10th, 1960.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Monsieur l'orateur j'aimerais pouver aux distingues visiteurs et visiteuses d'aujourd'-hui que l'on parle francais a l'assemblee legislative due Manitoba. Je desire souhaiter la bienvenue a une institutrice qui est la soeur d'un agronome distingue dans la province du Manitoba Monsieur Joseph Lafrance.

English translation of above: Mr. Speaker, I would like to prove to today's distinguished visitors that French is spoken in the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. I wish to welcome a teacher who is the sister of a distinguished Ag Rep of the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Joseph Lafrance.