

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, March 16th, 1965

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Morris.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN, (Morris): Madam Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Brandon, whereas Manitoba produces food products that are superior in quality and flavour; and whereas several foods are characteristic of Manitoba and have made this province famous; and whereas good food and local dishes can be a powerful tourist attraction; and whereas Manitoba Restaurants and Hotels have an opportunity to give further prominence to local dishes on their menus and further publicity to the high quality of Manitoba food products; therefore be it resolved: That this House go on record as favouring the utmost effort by all concerned to promote the development of local dishes in the restaurant trade and the publicity of the high quality of Manitoba food products of the Farms and Fisheries.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SHEWMAN: Madam Speaker, may I say at the offset of my remarks I mean no reflection at all on those who are growing, processing, and serving the public in a well planned and developed eating establishment. It is only to create a greater interest in the members of this House and the people of this province of the high standards of products that are produced in the province. I have contacted a good many people that are interested in producing these products and also the people that are furnishing and supplying the finished product to our public. Manitoba has long been established as an agricultural province and longer, most likely, than some of these other provinces. The history of Manitoba goes back a good many years and it's since the time of the first settlers, the Lord Selkirk Settlers and others that came into the province that bought these seeds and produced them and brought them to a stage where we in Manitoba today have something to crow about as far as the high quality of farm produce that is produced here in Manitoba.

Now I think Manitoba--the Manitobans are losing something here that is very important to the industry, the farming industry of the Province of Manitoba by not talking and advertising the wonderful farm products that are produced on our land here in Manitoba and it is one of the leading industries in the province and it's been built up over the years through hard and intelligent efforts of the people that have stayed farming, and will stay farming in the future. Now we have grain, No. 1 Manitoba wheat, lots of it in Manitoba; and our livestock is of the best of any place in the Dominion of Canada; and our dairy industry is one of the best; and our vegetables are of the best, growing on our farm land in Manitoba.

Now we have a few items that have reached fame one might say in North American continent but there hasn't been enough publicity given to other products. We have the Winnipeg Goldeye which is well known throughout the North American continent as one of the finest fish in the world. Then we have our Manitoba Northern Whitefish, and it is not getting the publicity that it should be getting, even from ourselves in Manitoba, Madam Speaker, but it is featured in such cities as Detroit, Chicago and New York as a real delicacy. When you get down there and order Manitoba Whitefish -- are you trying to ask a question or just being obnoxious? (Interjections) And then we have the pickerel which is of the very best in the world and it is also featured on a good many American menus. But we hear very little about our fish that's produced in our lakes, freshwater lakes in Manitoba. Now we have to go outside of the province to hear these stories, and I think it is the duty of every member of this House and the people of Manitoba that are serving our food to feature this wonderful fish that we have. And our vegetables that are grown in Manitoba are the very best, very high quality, and the standard is very good.

Then we go on to the beef that is produced in Manitoba and it is the finest on the North American continent but we don't hear very much about it, and in this sense I am not criticizing the boys, the men, and the women that are catering to the public in our restaurants, in our hotels, dining rooms, but I would like to say this that when you walk into some of our leading restaurants in the city here you see Prime Ribs of Beef and that is all there is on that menu, and I am pleading to the people in the restaurant business and those that have dining rooms in the hotels just to put Manitoba Prime Roast Ribs of Beef. And we go on down this menu here and we will see broiled ham steaks. Why can't it be broiled Manitoba Ham Steaks? And we go on down the menus, and I have several here, and there is one here that I picked up the other day that caught my eye and I think a restaurant such as this should be recognized through some merit program one way or another, but this is a very small notice but it reads, "Everyone's

(MR. SHEWMAN cont'd) Favourite -- Roast Prime Ribs of Beef selected from Manitoba's finest Red and Blue Ribbon beef." Now I would like to see more of this on our menus and I think it is our duty -- yes, I'd like to table it -- and I think it is our duty in this House to ask and work for the people who are feeding our travelling public.

Our Manitoba butter has been recognized the world over as number one butter, the very best in the world. And our cheese is of the very best that is manufactured in Manitoba and it demands, when you get outside of Manitoba, it demands space on their menus featuring Manitoba cheese. Then our poultry is of the very best and in driving the other day, the other evening, across the cross-town highway and just south of the cross-town bridge over here there is a sign -- I imagine that it is 10 feet high and 20 feet long -- and on that sign is Southern Fried Kentucky Chicken -- and I look terrible in a panama hat, Madam Speaker, but I'll bet anybody in this House that that Southern Fried Kentucky Chicken is Manitoba raised and produced chicken. Now these are the things that I would like to bring out to the House, and the public at large, that we should be featuring our Manitoba products.

Now around turkey time, which is holiday time, you will go into any one of the stores in Winnipeg and other places, not only Winnipeg, other places, and you will see them featuring New York dressed turkeys. Well I don't know, they are still Manitoba turkeys. Why can't we feature Manitoba dressed turkeys, Madam Speaker? And these are the things that I would like to -- the thought that I would like to leave with the House and the rest of the people of Manitoba.

Now we have in Manitoba, in years gone by there's been settlers from other countries that have settled in Manitoba and they still feature their own dishes, the dishes of their native land, and they are native Manitoba products, produced in Manitoba. And they are good dishes, no two ways about that. We've got the Irish Stew and I imagine if anybody eats an Irish Stew or has the beef that's produced in Manitoba and also those vegetables grown in Manitoba, and we don't want to take anything away from the name of Irish Stew but we would like to feature Irish Stew saying that the beef and the vegetables in that Irish Stew was produced in Manitoba.

Then we come to Scotland, and I am sorry I didn't have time to contact the Honourable Member from Lakeside. I am going to mention haggis, but I'm hazarding a guess now that the ingredients that go into making this haggis is produced in Manitoba. Then we go on to England and -- (Interjection) -- I apologized before I started -- I was sorry I hadn't contacted my honourable friend to find out just what they were. Then we go on to England: we have the fish and the chips that England is noted for; also the Yorkshire pudding that goes very well with our roast beef, and to make this Yorkshire pudding, it's got to be made of No. 1 Northern wheat which is produced in Manitoba and therefore I think we are on solid ground. And we go to Germany, and we have sauerkraut, and I'm very fond of sauerkraut -- ask my wife about it -- she'll tell you all about the sauerkraut I make. And then we have sauerbrauten, which is made out of the products produced in Manitoba.

Then we go on to France -- Quebec for instance, they brought some wonderful food with them when they came to Canada -- pea soup, and the farmers in the Morris areas have made a lot of money out of supplying peas to the rest of Canada to make this good French Pea Soup, and we should be featuring Manitoba French Pea Soup. Then we go on the Polish and central European countries over there: you've got holopchi and borsch, which is all made of Manitoba produce. And then you go on to Iceland and you've got vinaterta which is very good, made of No. 1 Northern wheat again, and made of sugar which is produced from the beets grown in Manitoba. So we have nothing to be ashamed of; we should be featuring our Manitoba products.

Madam Speaker, I think that it's our duty to feature Manitoba products produced in Manitoba, and we should say that we're able and willing to sell Manitoba to the travelling public through our foods as one of the many ways which we can do, and the tourists will take trips into Manitoba for more reasons than one. He likes to go hunting, he likes to go fishing, and while he's in Manitoba he likes to partake of our splendid Manitoba products in the line of food. Now we can do that with a very very little effort and still reach the end that I think that we owe to these people who are producing this wonderful produce that is produced in Manitoba.

The tourist likes to visit historic sites and we have several within a short distance of Winnipeg where we could feature Manitoba hamburgers, Manitoba onions served on a hamburger. A short two years ago I was in to a restaurant in Wisconsin and there was a sign on the wall of the restaurant that met you when you went in the door -- and I just forget the figures but they were enormous -- and painted on this wall on this sign was: "We serve thousands of pounds of Wisconsin beef in our Hamburgers;" and went on to state how many thousand pounds of onions

(MR. SHEWMAN cont'd) they served grown in Wisconsin; how many pounds of potatoes they figured in potato chips; all in this sign. Now it wouldn't cost very much to paint a sign in some roadside hamburger stand, as we call them here, and we should push this thought to sell Manitoba as I said before through her produce.

Now mentioning what they serve in other places, we know that if you went to the east coast that they would be featuring down there their fish that they catch along the eastern coast, and the same thing at the western coast in Vancouver, B.C. The Province of British Columbia, they feature their salmon. I think that the least we can do here is to feature our own produce grown in Manitoba. We go into a restaurant and we see on the menu there, crisp bacon and eggs. Why can't it be crisp Manitoba bacon, Manitoba fresh eggs, things along that line? I know that we can do it, and I say again with all sincerity that I would like to see this House go on record of featuring Manitoba produce produced on her farms and sell Manitoba through her own good food.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I think this is the type of resolution that pretty well all of us in this House can support, and maybe we should thank the Honourable Member for Morris for its introduction. I think that he has indicated to us by this resolution that we in this Assembly better take over from the Department of Industry and Commerce who haven't done the job of publicizing. Despite all of the efforts of the propaganda department, the Department of Industry and Commerce apparently have failed and it seems perfectly okay as far as I'm concerned that we in this House -- that we in this House go on record as favoring the utmost effort by all concerned to promote the development of local dishes in the restaurant trade and the publicity of the high quality of Manitoba food products from farms and fisheries. I think this is good and I suggest to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, particularly insofar as the Department of Tourist Attraction is concerned, that the department give consideration to erecting huge signs down at Emerson and Tolstoi and the other places where our traffic trade from the south enters into the province, around Elkhorn area where we come in from the West and other areas from the West, and Kenora from the East.

Imagine, Madam Speaker, along the line of the member for Morris, what lovely signs it would be possible for the promotional department of our Tourist Trade -- what a field they would have -- Manitoba-made Pizza Pie, Manitoba Pastrami, Manitoba Shepherds Pie, Plum Duff -- and of course we don't mean Plum Duff Roblin but English Plum Duff -- Manitoba Haggis -- learn the secret ingredients of this, recipes on application to the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

Why eat habitant soup when you can eat Manitoba soup? Gaffelbiter, the choice dish of Manitoba; Gelfilte fish, typically Manitoban; Holopchi made only as Manitobans can make it; Tripe -- Tripe as compiled by the Department of Industry and Commerce of the Province of Manitoba, add a few onions and you will have a dish unexcelled anywhere else in Canada or the world. Transcona Stew; whale meat -- this would be a pretty good one to put on Highway No. 10. Typical Manitoba whale meat -- why go elsewhere when we produce our own? There are lots of others, such as good old Manitoba goulash and borsch.

Madam Speaker, to me this seems to be almost an invitation for the Provincial Secretary to take under consideration a further investigation of this resolution into compiling an over-all Manitoba stew, because his section of the administration in this government was to help, with the assistance of very valuable people, in coming up with a Manitoba tartan. Now we know in the Manitoba tartan that we have done a pretty good job. It's a pretty good tartan and I don't belittle the tartan, but within that tartan we have our racial ancestors all into beautiful pleats of cloth and our heritages and our lands and our wheat fields and our forests.

Now how, I don't know, a cook or a connoisseur would be able to compile the dishes as suggested by my honourable friend into a typically Manitoba dish I don't know, but the Minister of Education, we are dealing with his Estimates now, he's concerned and deals in the MIT, the Manitoba Institute of Technology, and I understand out there there are courses in cookery, and possibly this might be a project for some of the proteges of my honourable friend in MIT.

So, Madam Speaker, without belabouring the point too long I think we should thank our honourable friend for the introduction of this very important subject here. I accept his criticisms directed toward the Department of Industry and Commerce. I implore the Minister of Education to get the staff at MIT Cookery Division to see what they can come up with and then possibly the Minister of Education will invite we who are members of this Legislative Assembly to a meal before the session is over to partake in a typical Manitoba stew, a combination of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) tripe, haggis, gaffelbiter, goulash and borsch.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, when I read this resolution, quite frankly I was at a loss to understand why it was on the Order Paper, but after listening to the Honourable Member for Emerson and the speech of the Honourable Member of Morris and the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the NDP, it would appear to me that the mover of this resolution was just trying to make a hash out of the Department of Industry and Commerce, out of the Tourist business, and out of everybody in Manitoba who had an thing to do with the furtherance of the use of Manitoba products.

Quite frankly, Madam, I'm at a loss to know whether this resolution is a forerunner of a bid to establish another committee or commission, or whether it's a trial kite being flown for the Department of Industry and Commerce preparatory to that department issuing another branch called the Gourmet Branch. If it's for neither of these purposes, Madam, I don't think the resolution serves any useful purpose because I don't think anybody in this House or anybody in this province has to be sold on the excellence of Manitoba products, either of the farm or of the lake, and I think this resolution constitutes an effrontery to the hotelkeepers and the restaurant keepers of this province who are not aware of the excellence of our products.

Now I do not accept this resolution in the light in which it has been delivered, namely, that it is an indictment of the Department of Industry and Commerce or of the Tourist Branch, because I don't think that there is any product, natural product in this country better known than the Lake Winnipeg Goldeye, nor do I think that there is any product in this country better known than the Lake Winnipeg Whites. In fact, I think the fresh fish from our Manitoba lakes, both our inland lakes and our northern lakes, are unexcelled and I think that our restaurant keepers here are doing a tremendous job in pushing them and thereby attracting the tourist trade.

Quite frankly, I cannot see the reason for this resolution at all. It would appear to me that we haven't any confidence in our Tourist Bureau; we haven't any confidence in our Department of Industry and Commerce; we haven't any confidence in our Department of Agriculture; we haven't any confidence in our Department of Mines and Resources, the Fishery Branch. It would appear that all of these departments are simply having money voted by this Legislature and doing nothing to earn it.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Chairman, I wish to apologize to this House for taking part in this discussion, but I think that the Honourable Member from Morris has not taken this resolution so lightly. This discussion will probably bring out other matters which perhaps the Department of Industry and Commerce and the Tourist Department will take a serious look.

In the first place I agree with this resolution, but it doesn't go far enough. What about the thousands of Manitobans that have not seen Manitoba. I think that if a poll is taken you will find that probably half of the population of Manitoba have not seen Manitoba. They don't know what Manitoba is. Now the honourable gentlemen concentrated on the food. Now in food he must realize one thing that more than half of the year we must import vegetables, fruit and many other commodities from somewhere else, otherwise we haven't got it here. If somewhere else also is expected to import fish or other commodities from Canada, so we cannot concentrate all our efforts in Manitoba without finding a market for export. Take Gold-eyes: it's mostly 90 percent of the best Goldeyes are being exported and is sold in Chicago and New York for less money than they sell it in Manitoba. Now there's no inducement for this. The same applies to other fish. And even the fish that's left over from the export market and is being consumed in Manitoba, the price is so high that some of the restaurants cannot afford to buy it from the retail stores and serve it to the customers at a reasonable price. This is a problem. It's not exactly the problem you eat Manitoba food. Everybody eats Manitoba food if at all possible, but many times during the year we cannot get it, and we cannot get it at a reasonable price. So if you are going to advertise Manitoba, Manitoba products, and Manitoba foods, first we have to do is sell Manitoba; secondly, we have to do is why the fish that is being caught in Manitoba just about 60, 70 or 80 miles from here, are being sold by retail here at such a price that sometimes it's impossible for the housewife to buy. Where is the profit comes in? This should be a part of the resolution.

If you take the money loss, between the amount paid to the fisheries who are producing the commodity and it finally comes to the home, we lose more than half. This should have been the main object of the resolution. Give the Manitobans an opportunity to use Manitoba food, but unfortunately it is so commercialized, as he mentions here, for handling the food,

(MR. GRAY cont'd) find a better market outside of Winnipeg than in Winnipeg. So while I think that the resolution is a good one -- no one can object -- but we've got to take into consideration the other items and particularly if we do not export, we cannot import. In other words, half of our table food is being imported at the less price than we get the commodities which are grown in Manitoba, right here. This is something for the department to think about. This is something for the department to finalize it and explain. So I said, while there's no objection to the resolution which unfortunately was taken so lightly, is a good one. At the same time, I say that if you want to sell Manitoba products to Manitobans, you help the people of Manitoba to get familiar with Manitoba.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): In listening to the Member move the resolution tonight, I was wondering how a man could stand up here for fifteen minutes and introduce a resolution such as he did, speak on the fine foods of Manitoba, and still be able to hide behind the stock of No. 1 Manitoba wheat. Now, if we took the Member for Churchill, for instance, I think the plea would have been much more effective.

But, Madam Speaker, I do agree with our Member from Morris in many ways. Firstly, being in the restaurant business myself, I do realize that we cater to many people not only in Manitoba but tourists by the thousands and we're not selling our stuff, and we're not selling our products. We would rather use a menu with foreign names. And I would suggest that this would have the support of the Restaurant Association and the Tourist Association who have both passed resolutions in the past pleading to business places to support Manitoba products, and advertise Manitoba products. And, Madam Speaker, all we have to do is watch the months go by -- I believe there's a promotion this month on cheese, Canadian cheese.

And I am surprised, I am really surprised at the Member for Selkirk taking the stand that he has. This resolution is an important one; it is an important one to the Department of Agriculture and to the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, and for all people who produce, package and sell Manitoba products. If we're not going to talk about them ourselves; if we are not going to boost and brag about them ourselves then who is going to know about them? We've got to have Manitoba tags on Manitoba products, and Madam Speaker, I feel that we have got to go about selling our Manitoba products in a commercial way. We have fish. In the north we have fish coming out of our ears, I think. And they're good fish, the best fish that can be produced in the North American continent. And recently, at Industry and Commerce expose, one man was given the tribute for selling Manitoba fish, not in Manitoba only, not in Canada, nor the United States, but through the different countries in Europe, and over into Africa. Certainly, Madam Speaker, we should be proud of Manitoba products; we should be out selling them every day. And I would go a little further. I think that we should be promoting them in our super-markets, so that our own wives and mothers could do the real selling. Their buying of Manitoba products -- are more conscious of them.

I can recall a couple of years ago the people in British Columbia decided they wanted to sell salmon to raise funds. What did they do? They brought car loads of salmon, British Columbia salmon, down to Winnipeg and sold them. And they got rid of it. And I think we in Manitoba must go out and sell our Manitoba products.

We have opened up a new industry in Churchill. If the Member for Selkirk thinks it's going to be easy to sell Churchill whale, then let him go out and sell them. But our people up there are going to make a concentrated effort in selling them.

And, in closing, I was listening to the Member for Transcona -- he was wondering how to group all these products together and sell them, and I would say maybe we could have "Trout, Transcona Style" and include everything, the products that are hard to get rid of. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I would move, seconded by my honourable friend from St. George, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable the Member for Hamiota.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Madam Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the Honourable Member for Wellington, and I'm sure if anyone wishes to speak in his absence it'd be quite okay.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, if the House would allow this matter to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Elmwood, that whereas it has been generally agreed that real property taxes have been carrying too great a burden of school taxes, and whereas The Revenue Act 1964 was passed to give relief in this regard, and whereas The Revenue Act 1964 unfairly discriminates against tenants whose monthly rent absorbs the school tax, and whereas the School Tax Rebate despite its disadvantages is nevertheless law; therefore be it resolved that this government give consideration to the advisability of making amendments to The Revenue Act 1964 whereby the occupants of rented premises will also derive benefit of this School Tax Rebate.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, much of the substance of this resolution has already been discussed in the Estimates. We heard the Honourable Member for St. George tell the story of Steep Rock and how the people there, while owning their own homes, nevertheless will not qualify unless some change is made because the Canada Cement Company will be receiving the tax bill. We heard the Honourable Member for St. John's point out that the Act was designed to look after the landowner and makes no provision for tenants who are also taxpayers.

We heard the Honourable Minister tell us how a farmer could take a section of land, divide it up into four parcels and receive four separate tax statements, thereby qualifying four times for the school tax rebate. The Honourable Minister also agreed that the Act was designed to relieve all real property taxpayers, not just the home owners -- he stressed that, Madam Speaker -- but he didn't know how the 400 owners of the co-operative housing development were going to qualify in order to get this tax rebate.

Now, Madam Speaker, if the government really intended to follow the recommendations of the Michener Commission that real property taxes have grown out of all proportion and that some relief should be given in regard to the school tax, then why did it not adjust the school grant formula, thereby making it possible for local councils to reduce the mill rate? I received from the Council in West Kildonan, Madam Speaker, a certified copy of a resolution duly moved and seconded, and I'll read it to the House: "Whereas 60 to 65 percent of the total West Kildonan mill rate is required to pay for the cost of education, Resolved that the Council of the City of West Kildonan lend its support to the Seven Oaks School Board in urging the Manitoba Government to revise its present grant formula to a more realistic level." I mention that, Madam Speaker, because this is the thinking of the municipal people. They can't see why it couldn't have been done much more simply than what it has.

I don't know whether this government conceived the idea of a school tax rebate on the motive of suspicion, whether it didn't trust the local administrators or whether they just wanted to play "Big Daddy" in this case in making a school tax rebate to a select group of taxpayers. The imposition of recent taxes, and these taxes are of such an insidious nature inasmuch as they are paid by people, thousands of homes will not qualify for the rebate.

Madam Speaker, every session I tell the story of the only privately owned senior citizen housing development in Canada, which is in West Kildonan. I always remind the House that here is private enterprise with a failure. The dedicated citizen who developed this area does not qualify under The Elderly Persons' Housing Act for a grant because it is privately owned and was built on a limited dividend proposition, thereby the rents in the senior citizens development in West Kildonan are higher because of this than they are in the Kiwanis Club of St. James, and so on. The owner of this development has offered to put in writing a request that if he should be given some relief under The Elderly Persons' Housing Act that he will use this money to reduce the rents of these people in these 80 suites. He feels very keenly that they are being discriminated against.

Now while this government didn't trust the local authorities to make the rebate, it was concerned over making payments to those in arrears of taxes, and after being assured by the local councils that they were not worried about it, the government has eliminated the December 31st deadline. As you remember, Madam Speaker, taxes at the beginning had to be paid by December 31st in order to qualify. I believe that this has been waived now.

Now I get back to this housing development in Kildonan. Here we have 80 suites occupied by our senior citizens. Now surely they are paying the taxes on their utilities. These

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd) are the people that are not going to be able to qualify and I think this is the very group of people that we were trying to help.

Well speaking of local government, Madam Speaker, the municipalities are concerned over the tax sale property. They would like -- I believe it is the law now that the municipality must purchase all property in tax sale that's not bought up by other people, therefore they are asking that they should get the rebate because after all they will acquire title to it. This seems a reasonable request.

Just as people who are renting homes are allowed to vote on school money bylaws, we must also recognize that they, through the payment of rent, are certainly paying the school tax. This government by imposing taxes, and especially on those who can least afford to pay it, those people who cannot qualify for the school tax rebate, are finding it's very unpopular -- the government is very unpopular at this time. In fact, Madam Speaker, many people with whom I talk have -- in fact they are prepared to nominate the First Minister for an early trip to the moon and there are even those who have suggested a place of much warmer climate. I'm sorry about this because I think this could have been avoided, Madam Speaker, by having the courage to tax income rather than reduce the taxes on it. Here we have a government reducing income taxes and applying these other taxes which I name insidious.

Now by applying a revenue raised to a new formula of school grants this certainly would have in my estimation been a much more practical, much more sensible way of handling it. But now that we have this confusing situation, where we have even the legal beagles perplexed because they don't seem to know just how we -- I believe the intent and I think the government was probably sincere at the beginning, they really did intend to carry out the recommendations of the Michener Commission in trying to give some relief to real property taxpayers -- it has ended up in confusion and I submit that if the government was as concerned as they would have us believe, why did they not see some of these inequities at the time?

Well if they have simply made a mistake it can be corrected. I believe that if they see that this is not going to work out, where people who are members of a co-operative who in fact own their own homes but by reason of technicalities cannot qualify, I think that they should admit the mistake and see that legislation is put through that this can be remedied.

I think that we had the other day, Madam Speaker, someone telling us, I believe it was the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, that a third of the people, a third of the wage earners of Manitoba earn less than \$3,000 a year and one-half of them earn under \$4,000 a year, and that makes a total of five-sixths of the working population earning under \$4,000.00. Now this is the class of people that probably rent more than the rest because of the limited income. Now if five-sixths of the working population are earning less than \$4,000 and they are paying rent, then surely this is the large group that we want to get relief to. I think that if we carry out the spirit of the recommendations of the Michener Commission this government will be big enough to see the mistake and to get legislation through at this session to remedy it.

MR. ALEXANDER: Madam Speaker, I am afraid I can't go along with the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks because there seems to be still some, using a charitable word, confusion in the Opposition ranks as to what the principle of the government's action is in this regard. The principle to me, Madam Speaker, is simply that we are transferring a large part of the burden of education costs from the property owner of Manitoba to the far broader base of the tax facilities that are available to the province, and I think we have heard in the past -- I know I've been in favour of it -- that property should not be paying the costs of education to the extent that it has been or that some people seem to feel it should continue to pay in the future. They say we are standing on the principle that education costs cannot continue to rest to the extent that they have rested in the past on property and the owners of property in Manitoba. This transfer of taxes and tax financial responsibility is taking place in Manitoba this year to the tune of \$10 million. The Leader of the NDP when talking on this matter said that we were over-charging the Manitoba taxpayers -- and he still nods his head, I'm glad he's still with me -- \$10 million in taxes so our conscience bothered us a little bit inside and we thought we'd better hand it back to them.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question.

MR. ALEXANDER: Go ahead.

MR. PAULLEY: Does he not consider as being property owner or holders those who have to pay the five percent utility taxes in order to create this amount of money that you're giving back?

MR. ALEXANDER: Madam Speaker, it might be possible in some cases.

MR. PAULLEY: That's fine -- that's all I want.

MR. ALEXANDER: That's fine? Okay. Because, Madam Speaker, this attitude, and I would now use one of the expressions that the Honourable the Leader of the NDP is using quite a bit, to me it's just absolute poppycock -- absolute poppycock -- a very superficial, narrow approach to a very broad and basic principle. The Honourable Member says it's the same taxpayer. It is in some cases and in some cases it's not. Surely the Honourable Member for the NDP is not going to tell me that the same basis of the municipality when he served on the municipal council was used for taxation as what the province uses. Sure there's a difference in taxes available to the province that is not available to the municipal government. Municipal governments charge on property. We have a far broader tax base to collect money from, and if the Honourable Member for the NDP doesn't know that -- (Interjection) -- You know, Madam Speaker, I'd say to the Honourable Leader of the NDP that he uses far too much of his own time to talk, let alone using some of mine as well.

Madam Speaker, I come back to the point that was raised by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks. He said this was only helping a select group of taxpayers, and this is quite right. This is the point I am trying to make to your leader, that this burden of education has been bearing on a select group of taxpayers and we don't think it should bear on this select group of taxpayers to that extent. -- (Interjection) -- Madam Speaker, I can assure the Honourable Leader from the NDP that his brand of hash would never overcome me in a month of Sundays.

Madam Speaker, I think that once the principle was decided that property should not bear the cost of education, that the rebate plan as devised by the provincial government is the best way devised of relieving this burden, and we should point out that 64 percent of the property owners in Manitoba are going to get over 50 percent of the education costs rebated. They are going to be reduced by that amount and this is very significant. I am opposed to using the tenant as a basis for paying this money back.

I think we have been accused offhand in trying to implement this policy of political bribery, and if we came down to this level of individual payments to tenants, which is away from our basic principle, we might be fairly accused. Some people say that this is fine, the benefit that comes to the landlord doesn't accrue to the tenant and this might be true, but Madam Speaker, I maintain that this is a private agreement between the tenant and the landlord and one that surely we shouldn't be interfering with here. We stick by the basic principle that it is property taxes to pay the cost of education that we are trying to alleviate -- to fix up. Secondly, if we put a rebate to the tenant there would be two rebates then available on the one piece of property, the rebate that went to the landlord as the owner of the property and the payer of the real taxes on that property; and secondly, another rebate to the tenant.

Madam Speaker, I think this principle of tax shift is sound; it's needed; it's something I know that municipal men have been asking for for years; it's something that I have always advocated myself. I could not see why we penalized property owners in Manitoba to pay for education which is of benefit to the society as a whole, and I think myself that the present plan is the most equitable one. It's not completely equitable -- you are never going to get a completely equitable tax base or tax system, but I think it's the most equitable one. I think it will be a very satisfactory one. As far as the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks is concerned and his trip to the moon, I think there will be a few members from the NDP party there ahead of us. We will find their flag up first I'm sure. This is going to be one of the issues that's going to determine who's going to get there first.

Madam Speaker, on speaking on this the other night the Leader of the NDP said, to use his words I think it was "lack of intestinal fortitude" because we didn't bring in a sales tax to carry this shift about. I would say to him, if he's got a minute to listen, that I commend this government for having the intestinal fortitude to tackle this matter in the first place, because we've been talking for quite a few years in this province, municipal men, taxpayers, politicians, political parties, about the need for taking the cost of education off of property. Now we've got a government that has finally decided to do something about it, and if the Honourable Leader of the NDP doesn't think this requires intestinal fortitude, I think he doesn't know the definition of the word, because I think, Madam Speaker, that it did and I commend this government for doing it, and I'm proud to be a member of the government which did do it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I was wondering if my honourable friend who just took his seat would permit two questions without considering that I spoke on this.

MR. ALEXANDER: Madam Speaker, the length of the Honourable Member's usual statements, I don't know whether he can make two questions without making a speech or not but he can try.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well my honourable friend said that this government had been quite a few years, or that we had been quite a few years in coming up with a solution to this burden. Now back in 1959 did he not agree, did he not agree that the government that he is a member of said that they had done that? My honourable friend the Minister or the Attorney-General said that they had shifted the -- (Interjection) -- well you said it, you said that it was the -- (Interjection) -- well does he not agree that they shifted the burden in 1959? That was what my honourable friend said. And then the other question, Madam Speaker, was this:- Does he really believe that every landowner, every owner of a tenement block is going to reduce the rent by the amount of the rebate?

MR. ALEXANDER: Madam Speaker, if I can take the last question first, I don't know how some of the tenement owners will divide up a \$50.00 rebate amongst their tenants, whether it will come to 10 cents or 50 cents a tenant or not, or whether they'll take this into consideration at the time of the rental or not, but I'd like to get to his first question. If he looks at what the province is doing in the grant system of education, I think he'll find that we are spending an increase of from \$17 million in '58 to \$51 million now and this -- (Interjection) -- Subtract ten? Well we'll make it \$41 then without the ten, and this had no effect on property tax -- had no effect. This method I think will be far more equitable and should be a real relief to the property owner of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned, and I hope the Honourable Member

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETERS: I would beg the indulgence of the House to have it stand, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Virden.

MR. DONALD M. MCGREGOR (Virden): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of this House to have this matter stand.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 59, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Jewish Foundation of Manitoba, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this bill will amend the Act that we passed about one year ago and it is brought before this House to comply with the Department of National Revenue's definition of a charitable organization and is technical in nature only. The Act provides that gifts already made will be regarded as being gifts to this charitable organization in accordance with the amendment.

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

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield), in the absence of Mr. Hamilton, presented Bill No. 19, an Act to authorize the Town of Winkler to enter into an Agreement for the Establishment of a Regional Library under the provisions of The Public Libraries Act, for second reading.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I presume the Honourable Leader of the Do you wish to speak?

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, if it is okay with the honourable member I would like to speak on the adjourned debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I rise in support --

MR. ROBLIN: I'm afraid that there is no motion before the House because we have agreed to have the matter stand, but if my honourable friend wants to speak, and I think if he has consent, that he should be allowed to do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Do the Honourable Members consent?

MR. CAMPBELL: I would doubt that it's in connection with the budget speech, is it?

MADAM SPEAKER: No.

MR. ROBLIN: on the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Listening to the speech by the Honourable Member for St. Vital the other day, I was somewhat amazed and surprised at the arguments he used in not reducing the voting age to 18. I would like to quote from Page 510 what his objections were: "When we're talking about lowering the voting age to 18, we're really talking about more than just that. We're actually speaking of lowering the age of adulthood, and I think that lowering the age of adulthood is more serious than it appears. Are we prepared, Madam Speaker, to allow 18 year olds in beer parlours?"

I would like to disagree with that point because I don't think just by lowering the voting age we allow the people to have all these other rights as going into beer parlours and the other things that he has mentioned. I think today, in the 18 to 21 age group, we have a greater possibility of achieving their full potential than they did years ago. With a more extensive educational background, they are better qualified to make a choice between a well-conceived policy and a well-reasoned program.

I think by the time an individual has reached the age of 18 he has acquired an essentially sound basic knowledge. It is at this age that he or she assumes full responsibilities of adulthood and contemplates marriage and secures employment. If one is employed he has an obligation to pay taxes. I believe a taxpayer should have the right to express his will in policies of government. The essence of democratic system is participation in government and I don't think that we should try to discourage citizens from evaluating government policy, from actively embracing the philosophy of a political party or a candidate. We effectively promote conditions to disinterest when we exclude the 18 to 21 age group.

In three years, from 18 to 21, men and women are ready to assume their duties as citizens but are denied their most important right. At 18 a person is beginning to undertake his rightful role in the business community and is given some measure of responsibility which his education has prepared him for. If a citizen's interest in government is allowed to fade by him the highest of participation in the democratic process, then there is less likelihood that he will cast his ballot when he is 21 or past the age of 21. It is quite evident that maturity is not a question of mere years; it is a question of experience. If a voter is to exercise his franchise he must be allowed to gain experience in this practice. To postpone this right until the age of 21, when at the age of 18 an individual has sufficient educational background, is to delay essential experience in democracy. Democracy thrives on an honest disagreement. If we are to keep abreast with needed changes and progress, we must allow for effective expression of new and imaginative ideas. We must remember that the choice of 21 as the legal voting age is purely arbitrary and there is no basis for it. The fact that the legal age for signing contracts is 21, I don't think has any bearing on the voting age -- it could be reduced to 18.

I think that we should be fully appreciative of the fact that many of our young people realize what is proper policy that they wish to adopt and follow with their improved education that they have acquired. Let us also acknowledge the right to vote of people fulfilling obligations of citizenship by paying taxes. If our citizens of 18 are old enough to fight for the country, I would like to say they should be old enough to vote.

The Honourable Member for St. Vital mentioned in Section 2 of the Amendment that the provision in The Federal Election Act, which has two enumerators in a polling division, was not that important. I feel it is, because it assures that the enumeration would be impartial.

In Section 3, the advisability of requesting the government of Canada to eliminate the 48-hour blackout, I think is also of some importance, because at the present time I don't think that the news media, the papers -- they are allowed to advertise, I think, during the day of the election and there is some inconsistencies as far as the paper media and the TV and the radio.

March 16th, 1965

655

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) So I would like to say that there is inconsistency in this respect and I would also agree that the blackout should be removed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion stands in the name of the Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

. Continued on next page

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I presume the Leader of the Opposition does not intend to resume the Budget debate, even though it's been standing in the Order Paper for some two weeks almost. However, if he does not wish to do so, I will move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that Madam 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.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution Number 27. 1(a) passed. (b).....

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I think that this department is just a wee bit too important to just go through it without giving it a very thorough study. At the outset, I'd like to say that I enjoyed the presentation made by the Minister. I think he and the government have done considerable good work in this department during the past six years. It would be very unusual if a government was in power for that long and hadn't done something worthwhile, and I can say that they have quite a bit to be proud of, but they also have a lot to account for.

I'd like to, Mr. Chairman, go back to the mid Fifties when it was realized that something would have to be done to meet what was expected to be a large influx of students, and that the standard of education would have to be raised, not only here in Manitoba but throughout the continent -- for that matter throughout the world. Some of the members will recall that at that time the previous government had what was known as the larger area units, and although everything was done to sell the idea of what we call a division today, votes had been taken in several districts and, outside of one, they all fell through. Because of the apathy of the public to accept the idea of larger areas or divisions, if you want to call them that, a commission was established, and it so happened that when the commission was ready to make its report there was a change in government. And that report of the commission, after a lot of study, I believe turned out to be one of the best reports that this province has had from any commission. The commission realized that there would be a large increase in enrolment in the province in the secondary schools, that because of the tempo of our advance in science and so forth, it would be necessary to offer certain courses. They also realized that we'd have to increase the number of teachers we had as well as the quality of teachers, and they made their recommendations accordingly.

Now, I don't think that we can over-emphasize the importance of our secondary education. I believe that our high school education is of all importance to the future of our children, and from every indication at present, the high school education in itself is not going to be sufficient in a very short while. I have before me, Mr. Chairman, the Time magazine of March 5th of this year, and with your permission I'd like to read two paragraphs that appear in this particular publication; and I quote: "Any high school senior in doubt about whether to seek a higher education, says Secretary of Labour Willard Works, faces an unflattering proposition. The machine now is a high school education in the sense that it can do most jobs that a high school graduate can do. So machines will get the jobs because they work for less than a living wage. A person needs 14 years of education to compete with machines. The trend toward more school after high school has this year reached the point where, for the first time, the span of education of the average U.S. job-holder tops twelve years. But automation and technology are rapidly making that level inadequate. At the same time, job competition is soaring swiftly. A million more 18-year-olds will enter the nation's labour market this year than last. Applications for college enrolment next fall are expected to leap by a dramatic 40 percent over 1964."

Well, I think the same situation faces us here. In 1959 this government went to the people, and on the pledge of an equality of opportunity in education were elected to manage the affairs of this province. And what was the promise that was made by the government to the people of the province at that time? I think we can divide the promise as follows: Children would be given an opportunity to get to school; that the school facilities would be adequate; that there would be sufficient teachers qualified to teach the courses that would be available. Now I think, Mr. Chairman, that this government has failed miserably in carrying out that promise. The first part of the promise, in getting the children to school, was partially carried out, but that isn't going to last long, as I'll point out a little later. The government has said

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd). nothing about the facilities available in many parts of the province nor about the number and quality of teachers. They stress that there are 79 percent more high school students now than there were in 1958, and they imply that this is due to the transportation policy. I have my doubt about that; I have my doubt. I have before me here a clipping from the Free Press of February 24, 1965, and part of this reads as follows: "In his report, Mr. MacDonell notes that in the last 10 years junior high enrolment has increased by 34.8 percent and senior high enrolment by 93.9 percent, but indications were that the secondary school population would now remain relatively stable for several years." If the enrolment in Winnipeg in secondary, senior high enrolment, went up by 93 percent where the program that we're talking about did not have any effect because it was here before, then I have my doubts as to whether the policy of this government did substantially increase the enrolment in rural Manitoba.

But it isn't enough, Mr. Chairman, to bring the students to a school; they are there to get an education. In order to get the education they must have the facilities, and in many parts of the Province of Manitoba they do not have the facilities and this government can take the responsibility for it. The Royal Commission made it quite plain, adamant in fact, that in order to meet the requirements, no school should be built with less than 12 classrooms. We can now see that even 12 classrooms are not going to fit the bill insofar as a two-course system is concerned, and we know that two courses are going to be offered to our collegiates -- what is known as the General Course and the University Course. Now what happened in those six years? We hear so much about the construction of school facilities. This has been talked about on the floor of the House previously and the Department of Education was warned on more than one occasion to forget about political expediency and build the kind of schools that the Commission had recommended. Instead of that, we have three and four-room schools scattered throughout this province that have cost the taxpayers millions of dollars and are going to be useless insofar as giving the rural child the equal opportunity for an education. In my own school division we have five high schools. Only one of them is anywhere near suited to give the two courses. One of them is having a hard time to give the one course, and three of them cannot give a full one course, and that's repeated throughout the province in many places. I can say quite safely, Mr. Chairman, that at this time the students in my area have less chance of obtaining university education than they did in 1958. Anybody that wanted an education in 1958 got it. Today, whether you have the money or you haven't the money, you haven't the schools to start with to start giving them an education unless they go a long way out of the area to obtain that education.

What about our teachers? What about the quality of our teachers? Well, all we have to do, you can pick up any number of brochures, newsletters and so forth dealing with the teacher situation in Manitoba, but I have here an issue of a newsletter by the Manitoba Teachers Society dated December 18, 1964, and on Page 3 in part it reads as follows: "Outside the Greater Winnipeg area only 50.5 percent of the 1,283 secondary school teachers have degrees, while the number of teachers holding a permit or letter of authority has increased from 221 in 1963, to 264 in 1964." Only half of the teachers have degrees; 264 are on a permit. Well, Mr. Chairman, if that is the situation today, what is the situation going to be when we have the two courses offered to these children? We haven't enough teachers, qualified teachers, in the Province of Manitoba today to give the one course, and I'm afraid what's going to happen is in many places, instead of equal opportunity a lot of our children will lose the material of which course is offered when only one course is offered. If you offer a University Course you are going to weed out a lot of students that will be unable to complete the high school, which we believe is the minimum requirement today to find a place in life; if you give them the General Course then you make it impossible for those students who have the ability and the desire to take a university education.

I didn't hear the Honourable Minister offer any solution to these problems yesterday. I hope he has the answer, but I'm afraid if he hasn't the answers for the problems that face him today, I don't see how he's going to have the answers to the problems that are going to be considerably bigger than what he faces today.

In many areas in Manitoba we have to start at the beginning. We have to start constructing schools that are going to be large enough to give the two courses. We have to make sure that we are going to produce enough teachers to fill these classrooms and give those children the education, and if this is not done immediately -- not at some future date -- then thousands of our rural boys and girls will not obtain the education that they must have to com-

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd)pete in this world today, and the Department of Education and the government will have to do much better, much better than they have to date.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, as the Honourable Minister is aware, I have spent some few years in the field of education. I don't know whether I can consider myself a professional educator, but the point is that I try, and because I have tried for a few years and have been immersed in the problems of education, I feel that I would like to speak for some period of time this evening on the problems in the field of education in this province, and so I ask the indulgence of honourable members and particularly of the Minister. I know on previous occasions when I spoke on the education estimates, the former Minister of Education used to be very attentive. I don't think he listened; I don't think he really paid much attention to what I said, but at least he gave the impression of listening, for which I was thankful.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the Minister introduce his estimates yesterday. I want to say at the very beginning that I consider the tone and the general direction of the education program that he is managing to be most admirable, and I think we should make that clear at the very beginning. I think, too, that in Manitoba the program being conducted in education, and the scope of education and the availability of education is much greater today than it was a few years ago, despite what the Honourable Member from Ethelbert-Plains would have us believe. But, Mr. Chairman, just because we have been given indication that we are making progress and striking off in desirable directions in education, does not mean to say that there are not some flaws, some major faults perhaps, in the education program of this government. Three things stand out in my mind, Mr. Chairman. First of all, the announcement by the Minister that the Department of Education was going to commence a program giving equal education rights and opportunities to the Indian children in Manitoba. This announcement I consider to be parallel somewhat to the struggle for civil rights that is going on in the U.S. today. It may not be receiving as much publicity but it is certainly parallel, and it reminds me of the saying attributed to Victor Hugo: "The idea, once it has grasped the public imagination, cannot be stopped; is in fact stronger than any army." I think today after decades and decades of democracy the people are finally prepared and in fact insistent upon the extension of equal treatment and equal rights under the law for all citizens, all young people, regardless of their background, regardless of their race, etcetera.

I'm also very pleased to have heard about the extension of the program of education for the retarded and the handicapped. Fields of special education must be fostered and increased, and this seems to be being done. There's also considerable emphasis, apparently, in the department towards an upgrading and increase in the facilities for skill training and skill re-training programs, and this is not only desirable but a necessity in this decade and in our times.

There are, in fact, Mr. Chairman, even though this government has done much in education, there's still much to do, not because so much of their laggardness but because of the tempo of change in our society, which simply forces upon this government and any government a constant upgrading in the quality and in the kind of education provided. We must provide for an increased education program for the purposes of skill training and re-training, and we must also begin to provide education for leisure, and specifically this has to do with continuing education for the adult population of our province.

I think, Mr. Chairman, to put my remarks in their proper context, I should start out by giving some indication of what our thinking is with regard to what automation is posing in the way of problems for education. Indeed, one could make an interesting discourse on the subject of automation itself. There is so much that is startling about it, so much that is interesting about it, that one feels tempted to dwell at length on what is happening in our society because, and in our economy because of automation, cybernation and allied matters. The Honourable Member for Logan, however, in a previous speech did give members some indication of how automation is changing the kinds of jobs available: how it is causing under employment, dis-employment in some sectors and going to produce strangely enough more jobs in yet other sectors of the economy.

There is in fact a debate, you could call it a controversy raging between the economists of one school and another, one group contending that automation is wiping out jobs so quickly that in a few short decades only 2 percent of the population will have to toil and that the remainder will be living the lives of drone bees, or some such fate. And then there is another school of economists who contend that automation will not be wiping out jobs at all, that as it

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) increases the productive capacity of our economy, that it will be bringing more and more consumption with it and therefore more and more work and that we will be carrying on much as we have been up to now. But out of this dialectic, or out of this controversy one thing seems clear and that is that certainly in some sectors there will be great decreases in the number of job opportunities, and it is equally clear that the ones who will be most affected, most adversely affected by automation are those with the least education. Now this is coming round and putting it in the context of education.

Mr. Chairman, because of the rapid change that is taking place about us and from year to year, the onus is a very heavy one on governments and officials who must administer education programs because if they fail, then the ones that will suffer are the young men and women of today, and so I hope that this government keeps an open mind to new paths in education. Education not just in the conventional sense, we are doing quite well in that regard I think, but education along new paths, having to do with continuing education for adults. Education in the sense of continuing education. And I think that this concept of continuing education is both very old and at the same time very new. Old in a sense that it has been long acknowledged that education does not stop with the last day of school but continues throughout one's life. It is new, however, in that continuing education must now be seen as requiring more co-ordination, systemization and more direct involvement by the administration. This is necessary because of the urgent need of continuing education in the age we are now entering as I have already said. Continuing education is needed for re-training, first of all re-training those men and women whose skills have become obsolescent, or whose skills have been displaced by machines. Re-training then, Mr. Chairman, followed by more re-training. It is estimated that in the course of the next two or three decades and more, that the average skilled worker will have to undergo four or five re-training phases in his lifetime, which is simply fantastic compared to what we are accustomed to and have been accustomed to in decades past, when one in his early years prepared himself for his life's vocation — in fact that was the standing phrase, prepare oneself for one's life's work. This old, and in some ways noble, concept is becoming fast outdated. It is estimated that large numbers of people will find themselves changing from one kind of work to another five or six times in their working lives.

But I hasten to add, Mr. Chairman, that re-training is only one side of the need for continuing education. The other side, and in some ways just as important, is the need of education for the sake of preparing people for leisure -- not recreation, I would hasten to add -- not recreation because that is the individual's own business. Surely this does not have to be formalized in organized form -- not recreation but leisure in the much broader sense and it seems to me at this point it is worthwhile to seek to define just what we mean by leisure. I would point out to honourable members that, I'm sure they are all aware, there has been mounting concern about this problem, as though it is a problem, of what is leisure and what do we do about it. In fact, there was a conference at the university last weekend sponsored by the Alumni Association, the theme of the conference being, "Leisure and its Implications". They had a guest speaker, Dr. Sebastian De Grazia from the U.S., and apparently according to press reports they could not come to any clear cut definition of just what is meant by leisure.

Obviously then, it is a much misunderstood term but still we must attempt to come to some understanding of what it means and what it implies. I submit that it does not mean free time or time to kill. If that's the common meaning of the term then we're in for trouble, because time will then hang heavy on people's minds and with idle time there's time to work mischief.

I think that leisure properly understood, is the most ennobling of all time that is available to the individual. It is a time for rest, for recreation and perhaps above all for individual fulfilment, which means in turn the individual must be helped so that he can make the optimum use of his free time to reach higher plateaus of understanding, of awareness, and so on. It seems to me this is the very goal of human life itself. But let me repeat, that to prepare people for this sort of time and this sort of use of time, requires a learning process which means again education and it is not good enough any more. It may have been, but no more is it good enough to leave this to the private domain. I'm not suggesting that the state should usurp this time or anything like that, but I am suggesting that there is an onus on the state to help individuals prepare themselves for the utilization of this time. It seems to me that some of the problems of our present day civilization, of our present day society, have to do with an improper understanding of this leisure time which is growing in proportion for the

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd), individual.

But, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that honourable members here do not wish to be attacked, or assailed by me on a lengthy discourse on the history of civilization, or on the semantics of leisure, and so on and so forth. So let me then at this point conclude my observations on the problem by saying that man and society are today entering into an age of automation -- in fact it has gone beyond automation, entering into an age of cybernation. And as man and society enter into this age they must necessarily then also enter into an age of reconstruction. We must do some pretty basic reconstructing, reorganizing, reforming of our institutions, and not least among them our educational institutions and facilities. Now the practical thing to do, I suggest, is for us to prepare for it. Some of these problems are still a few years away but we should start thinking now and start preparing for them now. Much of the preparation for this new kind of society has to do with education and education facilities. And what I want to say from hereon in is really the efforts of not myself, but of a group, a committee of the New Democratic Party.

Now the Leader of the Liberal Party said a few days ago that many of the resolutions here on the Order Paper were the product of Liberal Committees at work in the course of the past few months, and he said that they held a meeting at Clear Lake -- it lasted two days. They came up with this brand new idea and now they are submitting it here. Now, Mr. Chairman, these instant coffee kind of ideas, and so on, I don't know whether to trust them or not -- some of them may be good. But I want to assure the Honourable Minister that the kind of program for education that I will try to make clear is the product of seven and eight men working, meeting together every two weeks over the course of seven months, professional men, men in teaching at the university level, statisticians, one statistician, and so on and so forth. So it has been well thought out and I consider the program to be completely up-to-date with the times, in fact forward-looking, and as is normal with the party that I am a member of, perhaps a little ahead of its time, but it is in any case sound. If it does not become manifestly clear and commendable to the Honourable Minister and members, it's because of my failings in elaborating on it, it's not the fault of the program.

What we have in mind is an education program of three goals. The first goal being to upgrade and make universally available, not just elementary and secondary education but post-secondary higher education. It seems to me that in 1959 we took care of the second step there, the availability of secondary education. Although I must hasten to add, and to agree with the Member from Ethelbert-Plains somewhat, that the proportion of our school age children finishing high school is still not impressive, it's not what it should be. Forty percent as I reckon it, 40 percent of our school age children finish high school, according to the report. Now, if I have in some way misconstrued the report, I would be happy to be corrected. Nevertheless, 40 percent is much better than what it was in '59, which was then 20 percent -- an improvement of 100 percent.

So we have made progress. But now, because of the times we live in, we must start thinking immediately about universally available post-secondary higher education. Now all this is already -- the idea has come along far enough for it to be regarded as a pretty conventional suggestion and few eyebrows were raised about this. In fact, I think the Minister would argue that we already have this universally available post-secondary higher education. He would argue that with the availability of bursaries, and grants, and loans, and scholarships that any child in Manitoba who wishes to avail himself of a university education can do so. I don't think we're there yet. I think our bursary program is still administered a little bit too stringently, a little bit too high fisted. I have seen figures somewhere -- I cannot vouch for them at the moment -- but figures to the effect that bursaries are extended to students, university bursaries are extended to students with an average of 74 or over; under 74, pretty difficult to obtain. Well, we can come to that later.

The second goal of this program, which I am trying to articulate and elaborate on, is that we should provide comprehensive skill training at the senior high school, at the teenage level, and at the adult level, by way of training, skill training and re-training programs. Now the more we spend, the more we sink into training and re-training programs, the less will be our welfare costs in the years ahead. But even more important than saving in welfare will be the saving in terms of individual dignity for those people who do manage to upgrade their skills, acquire a job, and thus stay off the relief rolls. I would suggest that we should conceive of continuing education and its bursaries, living allowances, and all that goes with it, as a replacement of social welfare for all but the aged and the disabled.

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd).....

Now I'm happy to see that we are making progress in precisely this field. The Minister of Education last night intimated, or indicated to us, that Manitoba was now in the vanguard of the provinces that were providing living allowances for people enrolled in skill upgrading classes. But I'm sure that he doesn't have to be told that until last year Manitoba was one of the few provinces that wasn't providing this. In fact, I was speaking to an official from the Department of Labour -- not provincial. In fact I won't say which jurisdiction -- and he told me that Manitoba's tight fistness re living allowances or the lack of them, made Manitoba show rather poorly compared with other provinces and their skill upgrading programs.

In connection with welfare, may I suggest that possibly we can make some improvements here, in the sense that all those on welfare rolls who are not disabled, or aged, or widowed, but who are able-bodied might be induced to try and improve their lot by means of education, or training programs of one kind or another, by means of a bonus system. Now that there are some who would suggest that the able-bodied who are on welfare should be put to work, regardless of the kind of work, even if you have to make work for them, put them to work. Now this is an old-fashioned, unenlightened kind of attitude -- it's one extreme. The other extreme is the attitude that holds that pay him the welfare and don't concern society with trying to induce such people to improve their outlook on life, to try to improve their lot, and so on. Somewhere in between is the happy medium, and I suggest it might have to do with bonus inducements to get these people to attend either skill re-training classes, or else even to attend classes, a way of preparation for leisure. Anything to broaden their outlook, deepen their horizon, anything would be better than what we are doing now.

And the third goal, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest is that we should start drafting concrete plans in the department for the provision of continuing education programs as a preparation for leisure. But throughout the province, throughout the province -- and here I have in mind that we can utilize our existing divisional high schools, and I hope that I can make this clear as I go along.

And to these three goals which I have just enumerated, the New Democratic education program proposes the following specifics of action. Now it just so happens, if I may digress for a minute, that after our last convention there was an article in the newspapers to the effect that New Democrats advocate Shopping Centre Schools -- which wasn't completely misleading, on the other hand it wasn't completely accurate either. However, may I say that we don't -- at least I don't object to this heading or headline that we advocate shopping centre schools. May I say that we do advocate new outlets for food for the mind, not just big outlets for food for the gut -- if I can use that somewhat boorish expression--(Interjection)-- Inelegant, the honourable member suggests.

Before I go on to further concrete proposals for action, I want to suggest to the Honourable Minister that I am unhappy about one aspect of his department's conventional education program -- I'm referring to the conventional high school courses -- unhappy in the sense that we now have a General Course and we have the longstanding Matriculation or University Entrance Course, and then we have the other courses, commercial, etcetera. The General Course has much to commend it but it is not being accepted by students in high school. It is not being accepted by parents, and because it isn't being accepted these people, you have students who should properly be in the General Course; should really not be enrolled in the Matric Course, continuing to enroll in a Matric Course, continuing to sit through the classes of the University Entrance Course, and they are not suited by temperament, or by ability to attempting that kind of education. And we're just deluding them and ourselves as we keep on saying that, "Well, we really shouldn't discourage them from taking university entrance type education." But it's really not the best kind of education for certain groups of students and they don't get the optimum out of it. Why is this so? Why is the General Course not catching on? Why is it not becoming more acceptable? One reason is because it is a dead end course. That's one reason. And because it is a dead end course the students are insisting, and parents are insisting on enrolment in the Matric Course. What is the department doing? They've revised the matriculation program. They've presumably upgraded it. I think the word used by the Minister is that the new Matric Course is rigorous and challenging. Now, this is fine. How can it be rigorous and challenging when two-thirds of the high school population, and more, are enrolled in it? It is having to accommodate students of too diverse a capability, and so we're going to run into this problem if we persist with the setup as it is. We're either going to have to water down imperceptibly and slowly the contents of this Matric

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). Course, or else we're going to have to bonus on the examinations; we're going to have to do something to lower the standards of the Matriculation Course. And this, I suggest, is intolerable and completely unjustified. Failure to deal with this problem will mean two things, very specifically: (1). It means that the Matriculation Course standards will have to be debased or lowered. We will have to forget about the Minister's high sounding words that this new course, Matriculation Course is rigorous and challenging. Exam results will have to be adjusted or, secondly, two-thirds of our high school population will simply continue in the university entrance or Matriculation Course and then at the end of this period of time half of them will fail. They'll fail to pass, leaving them in a frustrating position, and I suggest we will have done them no favour by allowing them to continue in this course of studies for which they are not as well suited as they are suited for the general type course. We should instead provide them with a meaningful alternative to the Matriculation Course, one for which they are suited, and one which provides for a continuation beyond high school. Now, we can improve the General Course's acceptability, and if we do that it will be accepted. How can we improve the General Course's acceptability? By providing for post-General Course higher education which we have too little of at the present time. The General Course is a feeder for what. secondary courses? Very few, and I suggest that we can do something about that.

Now our specific proposals have to do with two things primarily: One is organization; secondly it has to do with facilities for alternative education at the high school and post-secondary level, and I would add perhaps a third and a fourth proposal. We must think in terms of facilities for higher education, greatly expanded facilities; and fourthly, we must provide facilities for a community school of continuing education throughout Manitoba -- community centre schools.

Now taking the proposals one at a time. In the case of organization, it seems to me that with regard to course organization etcetera, one obvious flaw is that at the present time there is too much rigidity between the different high school courses of study. Students must be given more meaningful alternatives than they have at the present time, and once they enter these alternative courses, the problem is at the present time that it's as though they enter water-tight compartments. Once they're channelled that's it, practically; and this is what scares so many of them and this is what scares so many parents. This is the big problem that the British faced when they adopted their 11-plus leaving examination system for channelling.

I think honourable members will surely admit that people vary as between individuals. Some people are bright from the first day of school; others become late developers -- they start to really develop in the learning process at a later age. And so we must inject into our course system greater flexibility, and specifically we suggest this: Those who develop late in a particular course, like the secondary course for example, should be given an opportunity to write the -- correction -- those who develop late in these alternative courses -- non-matric courses, for example -- if they place in the top percentiles of their class in these courses, they should be given the option of writing the other examinations. In fact, I would go even further and suggest that we should be advocating in Canada for a national university entrance examination system. This would really be the greatest single tangible step forward we could take, because that one change alone would inject a great amount of flexibility into our whole secondary higher education program, because if we had a Canada-wide university entrance set of exams open to all, even adults, then people would have a chance to enter university if they have done a good deal of reading in their adult years, and so on.

Let's face it, in the years ahead, there's going to be mounting pressure for educational opportunity. Some people leave school at Grade 8. They go into the business world into work of some kind or another, but they do a marvellous job of educating themselves even beyond Grade 12 standards. At the present time they can't enter university unless they go through the process of taking care of Grade 11 and 12 exams and so on. I suggest that with a national university entrance exam system these people could take the tests and if successful enter right into the doors of universities; and similarly the high school student who was channelled into the Matric Courses, into the commercial and general courses, if he is a late developer, he should be given the option of writing the university entrance course exams, and also should be given the option of writing this proposed set of university entrance examinations set by some national body. In this way the General Course student, for example, who does well will have a second chance. I think it's only humane that we give youngsters a second chance. And

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). the adult with Grade 10 or Grade 8 who has become well read in his adult years may take the university entrance set of exams and enter university as I have suggested. It is in this way that we will establish and inject flexibility, which is what we desperately need in post-secondary education today. Flexibility in all fields. I'm sure honourable members have heard of Defense Secretary McNamara in the U. S. who from the first day he took office in 1961 has had one major goal in mind, and that is that he would reorganize the American defense capability to provide for optional responses to different kinds of military threat situations. Optional responses. Flexibility. It applies in the military; it applies even more so in education.

Now, those who do not do well in the high school university entrance or matric course final exams should be allowed to opt for either of two possibilities: He should still be allowed to write the newly established university admission exams which gives him, too, a second chance, or, if he has not done well in the matric course, he may opt over to a newly created system -- and this is an innovation -- a newly created system of colleges of general education. Now the term might be completely new to some members but it can be recognized by comparing it to the so-called junior college in the United States. These colleges of general education should be regional in Manitoba, and by "regional" I mean not one in every hamlet, but rather one in every obvious region, one in every obvious regional centre, and it seems to me we have seven or eight or nine such regional centres in this province. And there should be a junior college or college of general education type establishment set up in them.

Now these regional colleges of general education. In some ways, an entirely new conceptual approach is necessary for the following reasons: 1. They would give greater flexibility to our education system as it now exists and to our students. Secondly, the college, this new kind of college will be a means of providing a grounding in the liberal arts to those enrolled now in our high school General Course. And since they will then be a place where the General Course student can graduate to, the General Course in the high school will become more acceptable and your dilemma is on its way to being solved. And this is a dilemma we have to solve, because until we get more high school students into the General Course, our Matric Course is going to suffer, and the students who attempt that course beyond their capability suffer also.

Thirdly, the college of general education will be a means of providing more effective technical and technological training. Our divisional high schools, the kind that the Honourable Member for Ethelbert-Plains was talking about; he said that in many places, many divisions, the divisional high schools have been built with too few rooms, and this is certainly true. Now I think that it is going to be difficult to salvage ourselves from this folly that was perpetrated by the former Minister of Education, but perhaps there's one thing we can do to salvage this. I don't think that our divisional high schools are big enough to provide for technical and technological training. They're not, and it's no use trying to work something into a school system that isn't suited to handle it, so what can we do? It seems to me that at the present time what have we got in technical and vocational training? We have the M. I. T., which is excellent, and then we've got the new ones at Brandon and at The Pas. Well, it seems to me that we should have a few more. Not one in every divisional high school but certainly one in every major regional centre -- perhaps eight or nine -- and these could be worked in, these technical regional school centres could be worked in conjointly with the regional colleges of general education.

And fourthly, Mr. Chairman, a fourth reason why we should establish these regional colleges of general education, these sort of semi-junior colleges. The fourth reason is because by 1975 we will be under pressure to accommodate about 40 percent of our 18 to 21-year olds in institutions of higher learning. To try and accommodate 40 percent of this senior teen-age population in our university system will simply be too costly, unnecessarily costly, and I would suggest, too much of a strain on academic standards. It will in many ways cause an almost irresistible pressure downward on academic standards in the university. So therefore it seems to me practical that we should aim for these colleges of general education, regionally situated, to accommodate about half of this 40 percent. In other words, to accommodate about 20 percent of our 18 to 21-year olds ten years from now, and the remaining 20 percent will undoubtedly insist on going on to the university system proper; and I would suggest that that itself is going to be enough of a pressure and a burden. Twenty percent. We try and cope with forty in a genuine complete university system -- I fear we are attempting the impossible. Fifth; graduates from this college of general education, perhaps the first one,

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). eventually seven or eight throughout Manitoba, could receive a degree of Bachelor of General Education in certain selected fields, towards which the students in the General Course in the high school could in the first instance aim to. Bachelor of General Education in fields such as nursing, elementary teaching, fields of technology, business, community leadership, etcetera.

And sixth; these colleges would provide flexibility for interchange, here as well as at the high school level. Those placing in the top percentile in the senior year of the college of general education should have the option to enter the next year's course at the university. He might do this by writing the university exams at the previous year level, in those courses which he intends to major in, and so -- and I would apologize to the Minister for my verbosity, but the point I'm trying to make is that with this setup we could have flexibility injected both at the high school level, where you could have interchange, and even a second opportunity for option and interchange at two years beyond the high school level, so that our students would not be denied an opportunity to change courses or to better themselves as they do better themselves. They would not be forced into a channel and left there, dissatisfied as they may be, and so on.

Having mentioned universities, Mr. Chairman, in my last two statements, I now wish to elaborate on some of the proposals of our committee for the university side of higher education, and let me say at the outset that in this regard what we propose is nothing so much in the way of innovation at the university level as mainly suggestions for reorganization of an administrative kind. Specifically, we suggest two things: First, that the administrative control of the university in Canada, in this province, is a strange one. It is in keeping with the practice in few other countries, and few other countries of the commonwealth. The administration of the University here does not make any substantial provision for representatives from the academic community being on the Board of Governors, and I suggest that the present system whereby academic representatives are excluded from the Board of Governors is an untenable position; it's going to have to be changed sooner or later, and let's think about changing it sooner. There has been a long-standing controversy about this at the University, and it is not being allowed to abate by any means, because there is a principle involved, the principle being this, that in other countries the principle is honoured that the academic community shall be entitled to representation on the Board of Governors. How can this be done? It's a matter of alternatives, but, among other things, we would suggest that the present university senate, which does include academic representation, could be reconstituted as a sort of Board of Governors or as a University Court which would be made up of representatives of different organizations including the academic community, and this University Court system as they have in Britain would be fairly large and so an Executive Council could be appointed therefrom, etcetera. This is a matter of administration and alternatives.

But the second proposal we have regarding organization of higher education is a more important one, and it seems to me that we should establish here in Manitoba something -- well, it's kind of old hat now, because the Government has proposed it in the Throne Speech, namely, the creation of a Council of Higher Education, but I mention it at this time, even though the government has promised some legislation along this line, because we have no means of knowing still just what this government has in mind by way of a Council on Higher Education. Let me suggest to the Minister that if he is going to propose a Council of Higher Education that has merely an advisory capacity, then it's not good enough. A Council of Higher Education should be a permanent body with functions just a little more substantial than merely the advisory. It should be, this Council, the planning and co-ordinating authority for all higher education in the province, and if our proposal regarding the Regional College of General Education has any merit at all, those two should come under the purview of this Council on Higher Education so that they can plan for it for all of Manitoba.

I think most important of all, Mr. Chairman, the most important thing of all about this Council on Higher Education is that it should be given a very specific function having to do with finance. At the present time, as I understand it, the University submits its budget and the affiliated colleges come to the Cabinet and they are given consideration and so on. There is provision at the present time for per capita grants to the colleges, but it's not systematic, and I'm not intending any criticism of the Cabinet here when I say that it could be improved. One college, to my understanding, gets a per capita grant of \$1,000; another one gets a per capita grant of \$79.00. I don't think this is good. Even with the best Cabinet there

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) is a temptation under the present system for log-rolling, and so I would suggest that we should establish a buffer between our institutions of higher education and Cabinet -- a buffer to whom the colleges would go with their budget submissions, and this Council, or this buffer organization, would process the submissions and then make requisition to Cabinet. I do not think it is good in the order of things for Cabinet to deal directly with institutions of higher learning, and so I think that this proposed Council of Higher Education proposed in the Throne Speech should be more than just that of an advisory body -- it should have a distinct financial function.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that the affiliated colleges are in poor financial shape. They receive grants, not under any standing law or statutory authority, but by going to Cabinet in an annual cap-in-hand, mendicant manner. Some receive a percentage grant of so and so much, and others receive so and so much -- it varies as I have said. There is no systemization, no statutory basis for these grants. The relationship is fraught with danger. Perhaps not under the present government, but even a Cabinet with the best of intentions should not take the attitude that it will always be this way. At some point in the course of events some unscrupulous advantage may be taken. It might be twenty years from now, fifteen years from now, but why lay ourselves open to this kind of possibility? I think that the Honourable Minister and his colleagues would admit right at the beginning that our institutions of higher learning must have, above all else, academic freedom and non-interference, but our present setup is not the best one for insuring academic freedom. There is no imminent danger but it exists nevertheless, and that's why we need the kind of Council of Higher Education which I mentioned earlier, not only to plan and co-ordinate but also to intercede between higher education and Cabinet, and I'm very curious -- and I think all members on this side are curious -- to see just what kind of creature this government Council of Higher Education is going to be. Is it going to be weak and anaemic or is it going to have real function?

So far, I have referred to conventional secondary and to higher education. Now the third and last phase of my party's education program has to do with what I mentioned earlier -- the concept of continuing education. This phase of our program has to do with adults. It has to do with basic re-training, with community education for leisure, with facilities for community and group recreation; and continuing education, we suggest, is a necessity that results largely from the times we now live in. It might help to start by thinking in terms of the existing divisional high schools. Many of them are not large enough for the kind of thing we have in mind here, but a few of them are, perhaps one per region and these existing large divisional high schools could serve -- are an existing core of the community centre for continuing education and leisure that we have in mind. The twelve-room and over divisional high school that exists today -- it's there already; we can make better use of it than we are at the present time. We will have to make better use of it. To it could be physically integrated a community library. Unfortunately, we've got community libraries already established some places, completely unrelated to the high school, and may I suggest that it's very poor planning to have a high school library and to have a community library some distance removed. There is one basic principle and proposition connected with libraries in the process of education, and that is that you centralize your library facilities. You scatter your library facility and it's worth very little, so we could do this one thing. Start out by integrating better library stock and facilities, by integrating a stock of audio and visual aids -- they're becoming more and more important in the education process. Projectors, maps, charts, superimposed scale drawings, visual aids, etcetera, could then be a greater practicability than they are at the present time, and I would insist still that our high school teachers have inadequate audio-visual aids to work with. This can be improved.

Besides library rationalization we should think in terms also of the adding of a block of two or three specially designed rooms to the academic core which already exists in these larger divisional high schools. These rooms by proper physical integration could be used easily by day students, and then at night by adults from the community for purposes having to do with physical recreation, gymnastics, group activity, music, community amateur activity of various kinds, etcetera, etcetera. It's nothing to brag about, it's nothing to whip and beat our breasts about, but the fact remains that regionally in Manitoba we could do a lot to improve the quality and quantity of cultural activity. One reason why we don't is perhaps because we are just coming out of a pioneer society context, but another reason is because we don't have the facilities, and whatever facilities we have are not properly integrated and co-ordinated. The concept of the community school for continuing education being built around our larger

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd).existing divisional schools is one that I feel holds promise, if we will only plan enough to make this a reality. I think the Minister would not argue very greatly if I suggested that we do not use our school facilities -- the community doesn't use the school facilities anywhere near the optimum. So, at the one time, on the one hand, we have unused school facilities, and on the other hand we have cultural deprivation on the part of many of our population. The reason we don't make better use of our schools is because we suffer a conceptual block, and also because many of our school plants were not really designed for community use in the fullest sense. I think by adding to the existing core, we can salvage the situation and provide for greater community use of our schools.

Now, how are we going to staff, how are we going to staff these community centres of continuing education and leisure? I would suggest three possibilities. First, we have in this province, for about three years now, a fitness and amateur sport program. Now we vote money for it. I don't know what it's been doing -- I've tried to follow. I haven't found out much. But I would suggest that if this fitness and amateur sports program, if it has been worth anything at all it has been, up to now, training community leaders and adult recreation instructors. If it has been doing this then it should already have provided a basic core of instructors to go out to serve as adult education leaders, group leaders, throughout Manitoba. If this fitness and amateur sport program of three years standing is not capable of meeting this challenge, then the program is a dud, and the Minister of Welfare might as well admit so. I hope it is not.

A second possibility is that in our rural communities and regional centres, that we could make some use of ARDA personnel. The Federal Government is sinking money into ARDA. The Provincial Government is sinking money into ARDA. I suspect that more money is being paid out in salaries in ARDA than there is being spent on actual improvement of the physical setting -- money being spent on sociologists and -- I heard the word the other day -- "socialanimators" are now being hired by ARDA. I don't know what socialanimators are, but I swear I heard the Honourable Maurice Sauvé say that ARDA was now hiring socialanimators. Well, if they're using socialanimators, may I suggest that ARDA make some of its professional personnel available to the regional centres which we envisage, as instructors of one kind or another. The very real possibility, it would not mean an increase in expenditure because they are already on the public service payroll. It's a case of co-ordination and integration which ARDA was set up in the first place to provide.

Thirdly, I would think that it is practical that if we ever do get around to building these, or providing these community centres of continuing education, that we could rely not just on our fitness and amateur sport instructors, on our ARDA people, but also thirdly, we could rely -- if we planned it right -- on community businessmen, on craftsmen, and professionals who do live in a large region. They would be only too happy if asked, if planned for properly, they would be only too happy to come to these kind of centres to do their part toward raising the level of general education of their region of the province.

Mr. Chairman, to conclude, I would say that my party's entire idea of this community centre of continuing education and leisure is based on the assumption that man is never too old to learn, which is what I said in the beginning. Not just never too old to learn different skills, he's never too old to pursue knowledge for knowledge's sake, which is something that could be done in these community centres. The times we live in necessitate that man must learn. He must learn at any age; young, middle-aged, old-aged. I believe that if given the slightest amount of help he will learn for the sake of deepening his understanding, broadening his horizons and lengthening his vision. Progress in three dimensions will be open to him. I believe that it's open to those with higher education: The world is not a boring or frustrating place in which to live, but it is for many people who find themselves out of work and without enough education to really give them an understanding of what goes on. All of this are goals desirable at any time, but in our time they are not just desirable goals, they are a necessity. We must start acting now in this generation. I don't want to instill the note of crisis, or of despair, or of disaster. Nothing of the kind. But I do wish to inject the note of importance, of necessity, and of obligation. And I believe that if we provide the facilities and the co-ordination, the citizens will respond as a matter of self interest, which is good enough -- if they respond as a matter of self interest; that we in the Legislature must act to provide the facilities and the organization, and I believe this to be an obligation on all of us. And if members here have the idea that what I had to say, what our party has to say, is somehow too avant-garde, too idealistic, too up-in-the-clouds, I want to say that I disagree emphatically. We are dealing with necessities in everything that I have said.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Madam Speaker, I first of all want to thank the honourable members for their kind remarks directed to the Department of Education, but I especially want to thank the Honourable Member from Brokenhead for his positive attitude and approach towards the most perplexing problems facing not only this province but the free world in the matter of education. I hope that he won't despair with the massive program he has laid before me, but I think as we go through the Estimates that he will probably gain some heart from some of the policies and attitudes that we are developing in education.

However, I can't say the same thing to the Honourable Member from Ethelbert. I was a little disappointed. I know he is a very conscientious member and I respect his remarks, but I'm frankly somewhat disappointed and -- Lord Harry, I'm not going back into old hat. In painting his picture in his mind, I think he believes it that it was public apathy in the mid-Fifties that prevented he and his colleagues from proceeding with the kind of educational facilities that were required at that time and resorted to the Royal Commission.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I was practising in a small town at that time and in respect of the member from Lakeside who was Premier at that time, I've never told this story. But I remember coming in to meet the Cabinet of the day as a representative of the Chamber of Commerce, and they gave me, a shaky greenhorn, the responsibility of requesting further grants for public school development and construction and instruction in the province. I presented those resolutions and I respected what the honourable members said. If I recall, we weren't too sure which should come first, construction or instruction. But I know I went home empty-handed and the school in Gimli was built by the local dentist with voluntary labour, and we had a pretty difficult time handling 300 and some odd little kids in the elementary school and exploding secondary population, and frankly became quite frustrated with where we were going when very few of our children were able to graduate from high school because of lack of trained personnel.

I think it's one of the things that assisted me in forming my decision to enter public life and see whether, along with my leader, we might not make some attempt at tackling these areas. Public apathy? Baloney! It was plain -- and I hate to say this -- but there was not the leadership that was required at that time. When my honourable friend says that this explosion in high school population -- we're not claiming it's based on transportation policy at all.

I think we must remember that the divisional system required, and made it a matter of right -- it became a matter of right that every child within a division could attend a public high school. Right at the beginning my colleague the present Attorney-General in introducing that legislation into the House had the incentive grants for the larger high schools -- you recall -- the 75 percent grant for the 12-room high school -- and under pressure from this House, and resolutions presented by the members opposite in the Liberal Party the grant system was changed.

So when I heard the Member from Ethelbert-Plains say tonight that he thought there were too many small high schools and he didn't know how we were going to cope with it, I sympathize with him and I think all of us in this House are only too well aware of the geographical and other factors in our province that mitigated against the development of the kind of schools that we would ideally like to see, and to have seen constructed since the Royal Commission report came in.

But when the incentive grants to build the larger schools was brought in, at that time I remember -- I have the minutes or the Votes and Proceedings of that day -- the honourable member then from Boissevain moved that the House request the Government of Manitoba to consider the advisability of rescinding the present secondary school construction grant formula and replace it by one that would provide 75 percent construction grants of all secondary schools within the division -- that is removing the incentive. A similar resolution was presented on the 30th of June 1959 by the late member from the other side. The same resolution was presented by the Honourable Mr. Bend at that time, March '59, and the member from Boissevain at that time made a speech pointing out the hardship of pupils in some divisions travelling 40 miles to go to a central school and saying we should not be penalizing the people who had to build smaller high schools.

As the Leader of the Opposition at that time said, they may end up by having a larger plant than they really need. They could conceivably end up by having one or two or three classrooms unused, but would build them in order to get the larger grant, of course ignoring the fact that our building projects committee would underline the accommodation requirements,

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) pupil counts and so on, and project them. Now looking ahead he says, "In the long run possibly that's good, because I suggest that in the interest of the taxpayers of the Treasury that a little more flexibility in this case as suggested by the resolution as amended would work out quite well. In other words, in those areas where it was not feasible to build a 12-room school and where the school division board felt that this was so, that they would be entitled to build a plant suited to the size of the district, and if it was an eight-room school and that was required -- and I admit completely there a statement made on two occasions by the Member from Arthur -- it could include the auditorium, etcetera."

Now this, I think in retrospect, shows that the support, I think, which should have been coming at that time possibly to encourage the larger schools was certainly mitigated against. The Member from Ethelbert-Plains said at that time, "I thought it was unfair to saddle the partially settled area which generally comprises a poor section of our community to bear 60 percent of the cost of construction because they could not afford to build a bigger school than a four-room, or did not need one larger than a four-room school -- saddle them with 60 percent of the cost and give the bigger districts more financially able 75 percent of the cost of construction."

I honestly think, Mr. Chairman, that the incentive grants that were proposed originally would probably have resulted in larger schools at the present time and made our task for the future somewhat easier, because I think inevitably this will be necessary through the very factors that have been expressed by both the Members from Ethelbert-Plains and Brokenhead this evening -- our rapidly changing world and the necessity of offering alternative courses which will interest and maintain our students in school. But despite this, I just thought it interesting for the Committee to note that in 1958 there were 151 one-room high schools in the province; there are now 21. In 1958 there were 53 two-room highs; there are now ten. Three-room high collegiate departments -- in '58 there were 47; there are now 19; where there were 66 collegiate institutes there are now 160, and I think that -- I quite appreciate, and only too well, as we all do here, that the divisional boards have done a tremendous job. The divisional trustees who are completely in charge of where the site is of a school, and this is a matter for their decision, are placed by geography and distance, and I think in spite of the fact that the original formula was watered down somewhat they have proceeded to the best of their ability to build as big schools as they could, and more and more I note in discussing school affairs with these boards, they are by evolution becoming increasingly aware of the necessity for bigger high schools, more centrally located, and with the improvements in the road system and so on are feeling this will come along a lot faster in the future.

But I just wanted to point out that it -- (Interjection) -- yes, the imputation was that a four-room high in a remote area, in a difficult area, realizing the local factors, with the original formula there might have been more opportunity to, while more difficult and requiring more leadership from every member in the House, by every member in the House, might have resulted in even a better story than has been developed over these few years. But I do want to point out that -- I well remember, as we well know, before the divisional plan came in, many areas had to arrange for their children to take Grade 9 at a charge of \$125.00 to the nearest high school -- that equal opportunity came with the divisional system. We opened the doors to all these boys and girls.

The honourable member mentioned the number of teachers. I thought it would be interesting to the Committee -- as I said in my opening remarks with respect to -- the percentage of teachers with degrees in the province today had increased. It would have been much greater percentage-wise but for the very large increase in numbers of teachers, and it is true in the Annual Report, and I've paid some attention to this, Mr. Chairman, because as the previous Minister pointed out from time to time, as we increase teacher standards we still have the responsibility -- and even increase the number of teachers -- we still have the responsibility of staffing the schools in this province, and having got started a little late with our vastly increased teacher training program and our divisional system, it's necessary for the province to issue a considerable number of permits. I can say to the House that the conditional certificates were eliminated this year. The conditional certificate was the person with less than a Grade 12 being given a certificate. In 1963-64 there were 91 conditional certificates; there were none this past year. One of the other reasons why permits went up was the demand for and provision of better service to students through lower teacher load. That continues to go down each year. While small percentage-wise it's down every

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) year from '56, '61 right down to '65. Today the average pupils per teacher is 24.32. There was an unprecedented increase, of course, in the number of new teachers required due to the raising of the complete Grade 12 requirement entry into Teachers College. If members would look at the Annual Report for '64, they will note opposite the numbers of permits issued, that in '62-63, of course, which was the first year of the full Grade 12 requirement for entry into Teachers College, there was the lowest enrollment in the Teachers College since '53-54, 480 jumping up to 608 the next year. The department advise me they feel that this is one of the reasons for the sharp increase in permits last year and this.

I could tell the honourable members that the number of additional teachers required each year goes up at quite a rate. I worked out the average increase per year from between '58 and '64 was 325, with that drop in '64, the lowest year in there, of 287. This is because of the increased requirements for entry into Teachers College. The for this year, of course -- we have in the last two years, despite the increase in requirements for entrance, had more applications, and this year I think we accepted 55 percent of the applicants; some had conditions and so on. Of this at the Teachers College today there are 605; at the Brandon College we raised that from 120 to 160 this year -- entrance into the Brandon College one-year course -- and they accepted that number this year in enrollment. And then we have a course -- between the Faculty at the University and Brandon College -- 199 taking the degree faculty course. And of course for next year, as you know, the building at the University is being developed for a 700-student capacity next year, so I just want to point out to the Committee that, while I am not entirely pleased by any means with the fact that we have so many permit teachers, I do point out the various reasons for this. It's a matter of catching up. I can say to the Committee, on special authority -- where these people on special authority to qualify teachers -- a great number of these are B.A.'s, or people with three to four years university training, who are operating on letter authority with less than an interim certificate but who have three to four years university training.

However, in general, I think that after a late start in putting some emphasis on teacher training it is coming along, and the only solution to this is that despite the vast -- the work in mitigating against us, an increase, as I said in my introduction to the estimates, an increase in the number of teachers from 6, 000 to 9, 000 in six years. We have more people graduating today, and better qualified people each year, and more coming into the profession each year. Despite all this we still have to staff all these schools and our staff are paying as much attention to this as they can. -- (Interjection) -- Okay.

MR. PAULLEY: prevail on the honourable member to give us the rest tomorrow?

MR. ROBLIN: I move that the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, I wish to report progress and ask leave for the Committee to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.