

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY of MANITOBA
Thursday, March 10, 1977

TIME: 8:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

ESTIMATES - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(n)(1), Salaries, \$454,400—pass? The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, we, before the supper hour were discussing some specifics in terms of programs offered by BEF and I had asked the Minister a question in connection with the A program in which the instruction is 90 percent in French and then there's English, 10 percent, I presume. That would be English as a second language as we teach French in other schools as a second language. That is one program. The other is a 50-50 program in which English and French are used on an equal basis. I was asking the Minister if he favoured one or other of these programs and if he believed that both programs ought to co-exist in the same school. Should there be a school in which one of the predominantly, 90 percent, French program would be offered and in the same school perhaps the second program of 50-50 use of French . and English as the language of instruction? I'm simply asking this to get an idea, Mr. Chairman, of the Minister's approach to this matter of Francaise programs and how he believes this could best be carried out in the schools.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the matter of how it would best be carried out in the school of course is a matter that I really believe is for local school boards and the teachers. But the regulations do provide that the time allotments for courses of study taught in either English or French shall be the same, except where English is a required subject under subsection 11 of Section 258 of the Act. Recommended reading, by the way.

For those classes using French as the language of instruction, the time allotment for English shall not exceed 25 percent of the total instructional time. That is the regulation.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I take it the Minister doesn't want to really state his view on the question of whether a program involving 90 percent French and a 50-50 program could be conducted in one school. He has pointed out that these are decisions that are made at the divisional level. I can understands perhaps why he does not wish to perhaps indicate a personal opinion on this, or perhaps it is that he hasn't had a great deal of actual experience in the workings of these programs in these situations.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister another question and it is one that perhaps he will be able to answer with less difficulty. His predecessor as Minister of Education took the stand on the question of a system of French schools, that is, French schools public and parallel to the present system. Now I wonder what the new Minister of Education's position is in respect to this possibility of establishing a second school system of French language which would be a public school system parallel to the present system.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Brandon West I believe referred to a parallel system of education. I do not ever recall the previous Minister of Education speaking of education in those terms. However, there was a document compiled, printed and distributed. That document was taken by some to be a representation of the policy position of Cabinet, that is, of the government. That paper never was adopted as the policy of the government and the previous Minister of Education, when meeting with the Norwood School Board, I believe, made that very clear and indeed the minutes of that meeting were reported, I believe, on page 1 of The Winnipeg Free Press in the middle of August of last year. My position has not changed.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder then could the Minister tell us: Was there any appropriation for research on the policy of a French network of schools in Manitoba?

MR. TURNBULL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there was an appropriation for research. Clearly there is research going on. It's reported in the press almost daily.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(n)(1). The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, there was some advance notice given of an area of questioning in which we were asking for information from the Minister. I don't propose to deal in detail with this but I think it would be appropriate and important to the present appropriation for BEF to have just a broad outline of the qualifications and the experience of the Assistant Deputy Minister who is in charge of the Bureau Francaise. We have as you know, Mr. Chairman, submitted an order for return but I think the Minister might be able to just give us his qualifications and his teaching experience or experience related to this kind of administrative post.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I know that the Conservatives wish to add to their dossier in the eventuality that they may have the opportunity of firing everybody in sight and therefore I provide them — (Interjection)— Well, the Member for Roblin says "no way" and he is likely correct because in

no way will they have the opportunity after the next election to use the dossier that they are compiling. That is correct.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have the order for return and I may as well try to deal with the question asked by the member by just dealing with the matter that he raised. I would have been filing this in any case. First of all, I think the Member for Brandon West is talking about an Associate Deputy Minister. There is no Associate Deputy Minister; he is an Assistant Deputy Minister. The person occupying the position, Mr. Hebert who is on the right of the Member for Brandon West, was appointed as manager of this particular branch. His broad administrative experience acquired in the last eight years in Manitoba and elsewhere were the reasons. Another was his knowledge and demonstrated interest in bilingualism, his knowledge of the French-speaking community of Manitoba and of Manitoba society as a whole. Further background information on the Assistant Deputy Minister is that his academic background includes a B. A. from St. Boniface College and a Master's Degree in political science from the University of Manitoba. His experience includes the following:

(1) As a member of a consulting firm based in Manitoba, he participated in the evaluation of mental health programs in Saskatchewan and New Brunswick and then became special assistant to the Deputy Minister of Health in New Brunswick in 1969.

(2) In 1970, he was appointed research director of the New Brunswick Task Force on Social Development which presented a report to the New Brunswick government in 1972 on socio-economic programs including educational programs for that province.

(3) In 1971, he was appointed to a senior administrative position with the New Brunswick government. In this capacity, he developed and implemented several educational programs aimed at improving services, particularly to disadvantaged children and adults.

4. In 1974 he was appointed Director of the Research Center in St. Boniface College where he conducted several large-scale research projects in the field of education, funded through the Department of Education of this province.

5. For the further information of the Member for Brandon West, of a total of 18 professionals currently employed by the Bureau, 14 are educators including 3 former principals with a combined total of 150 ½ years of experience in the classroom.

MR. MCGILL: I got, I think, most of the information given by the Minister. I wasn't quite sure what were the number of years teaching experience of the Assistant Deputy Minister of the department.

MR. TURNBULL: The number of years of experience as a classroom teacher and/or principal in either an elementary or secondary school prior to his appointment — none.

The number of years of experience in the implementation of new programs in education prior to his appointment as an Assistant Deputy Minister — three.

The number of years of experience in the supervision of elementary and secondary education programs prior to his appointment in his present position — none.

The number of years of experience in curriculum development for either elementary or secondary schools prior to his appointment — two.

The number of years of experience in analytical research related to programs of either elementary or secondary education prior to his appointment — two.

The number of years of experience in evaluation of either elementary or secondary education programs prior to his appointment — two. I hope I read that and I hope the member got it.

MR. MCGILL: I take it then the Assistant Deputy Minister has considerable administrative experience but not in the classroom. I took you to read no classroom experience as a teacher.

I have a bulletin in front of me, here, Mr. Chairman, that is a position bulletin from the Civil Service Commission, Province of Manitoba. A position vacant bulletin No. 152. This is for a development officer for BEF and the qualifications here are that he must possess a university degree and a minimum of five years teaching experience. This is for a development officer in that department. It says "a very good knowledge of the Franco-Manitobain teaching personnel coupled with a good knowledge of the educational system of Manitoba." Well I take it then that the requirement for a development officer is five years of teaching experience within this bureau and a very good knowledge of the present teaching personnel. Would that limit the candidates for this particular position to people already in the system. That seems to be an unusual restriction on the applications for this . . . —(Interjection)— Well, a minimum five years teaching experience shouldn't be difficult at all but it says that he must have a good knowledge of the Franco-Manitobain teaching personnel.

Now, perhaps the Minister can tell me why this particular restriction would be written in. Is this to exclude others than presently in the bureau or within the teaching system?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I would not, given the community we're speaking about, regard that as any restriction at all. What I have found in my years, both as a teacher and in my months as Minister of Education, is that the teaching profession know one another extraordinarily well. As a matter of fact, it's almost impossible to venture out without running into somebody that you know who is teaching. And I think when you are talking about the French community, that the close-knitness of that community is even greater and therefore I wouldn't regard this as any restriction at

all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(n)(1)—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure whether I missed the Honourable Minister's earlier remarks when he was speaking of a policy document and some remarks that he had made to the Norwood School Board. He mentioned, I believe, that they had been covered in one of the papers. I wonder if he would be good enough to repeat for me what was said at that time. I do not recall the news item.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I will go one better. I will provide for the member a copy of the original document and a copy of the newspaper report. And I'll send that to him. Staff present, wherever they are, but please make a note of that and send it to the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Honourable Minister. I wonder if he could maybe summarize in just a few words, what was said in that, so that I do not have to wait for the news release.

MR. TURNBULL: Well, Mr. Chairman, the debate is getting repetitious. I was very clear when I gave my remarks earlier. The report in the Winnipeg Free Press said that Mr. Hanuschak, in speaking to a Norwood Board, said that the network of French schools was not government policy.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can I ask the present Minister if that is still the policy of the department and is that policy under review?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, again that question was asked and I answered that my position was the same.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can I ask the Minister again is that policy presently under review?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, policy is constantly under review. I have said always that education in particular is a dynamic field and this policy, as the policy of decentralization, etc. etc. etc. is under review. Indeed I said earlier in this debate of my estimates that I had the department in the process of preparing various position papers on a variety of subjects.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(n)(1)—pass; 51(n)(2)—pass.

The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, on Other Expenditures there is approximately \$108,000 increase on this item. Sometimes it is interesting to know just how the Other Expenditures are broken down. I wonder if the Minister could give us some explanation as to where this money is being spent.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, my staff will try to dig up the precise detail. Much of this would be increased expense for some additional staff and for contract, some contract personnel I would think would be in here.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates \$454,000 in salaries, would the increase in staff not come under salaries? An explanation would be appreciated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the increase in staff person years would be under the salaries appropriation, that is correct. I think by far the greater proportion of the increase shown in the Estimates Book comes from the general increase in operating expenditures. I know the honourable member operates a farm and he has experienced inflation, the government experiences inflation as well but I will get, before the evening is out, the detail for him. If he wants the precise breakdown we'll get that for him.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, we find that in my experience it sometimes is very revealing and interesting to know on Other Expenditures, because I can understand Mr. Chairman, that there are many items that can be hidden in the item we call Other Expenditures. So, Mr. Chairman, sometimes I find it important to the taxpayers of this province to know where the funds are going when we talk about other expenditures because in this case, Mr. Chairman, there's an increase of \$108,400 and I would appreciate if the Minister could give us that. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister a question relevant to the exchange of a moment or two ago between himself and my colleague, the Member for Brandon West and the Member for St. Vital on the subject of the French school network. My question to the Minister would be, is he telling the committee that there is flatly and definitively no policy encouraging the development of a network of all French schools, or is he telling the committee that in his opinion no such program or policy is in effect?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, if I understood the Member correctly the two are the same. There is no provincial government policy to develop a network of French schools.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, is it possible that there could be, in the opinion of the Minister, no provincial government policy to that effect but that in the Bureau de l'Education Française there is a policy to that effect.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, that had better not be the case.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, what would the Minister say if I told him that in the opinion of a good many citizens and residents of Manitoba, that is the case.

MR. TURNBULL: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it would depend who he spoke to.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, what if I were to say to the Minister that those who I spoke to were people who live in the constituency of Fort Garry; a constituency with which he is quite familiar and particularly related to the St. Norbert area of Fort Garry.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the Member for Fort Garry was in the House when I began my remarks this evening in response to the questions raised by his colleague, the Member for Brandon West. Would the Member for Fort Garry say whether he was or was not in the House at that time please? I was not in the **MR. SHERMAN:** No, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman's House at that time. I was late arriving here and I apologize to the Minister for that and I don't wish to be redundant, nor do I ask the Minister to be redundant, but I think that there is perhaps a subtle difference between the question that I'm asking and the question that he thinks I'm asking. I'm asking whether there is a policy being pursued by the Bureau de l'Education Française that is independent, for one reason or another, of the policy that the Minister thinks is being laid down by the department.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I don't think there is a subtle difference in what the Member for Fort Garry is asking and what I think he is asking. Nor do I think there will be any subtlety in the answer that I give him, the answer is no. What I said, at the beginning of the debate this evening, was that there was a paper that was developed by people working on contract. This paper was taken by many to be the policy of the provincial cabinet, and it was not so and is not so.

MR. SHERMAN: Just one final question on this, at least final at this stage, Mr. Chairman. I'm aware that we can examine this subject again before we're finished with the Minister's Estimates but would he advise the committee of the intensity and the extent of the communication on subjects of this kind that exist between his office and this particular Bureau. What I'm posing to the Minister is a concern that has been expressed to me and to others and I'm sure he has had it expressed to him, that there is not that much knowledge on the part of the right hand as to what the left hand is doing. Or if he cares to reverse the metaphor, on the part of the left hand as to what the right hand is doing. I think that many of us want a fairly concrete assurance that the Minister does, in fact, know what the Bureau de l'Education Française is doing with its funding in terms of pursuing a separate and independent policy of its own.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I know the Member for Fort Garry realizes the seriousness of what he is saying and I think it is a serious question. I'm attempting to give him as straight and as simple and as serious answers as I can. The policy of the Bureau of French Education is the policy that I will be determining and making public in a policy paper very shortly. That policy paper will not include a reference to the department encouraging a network of French schools.

MR. SHERMAN: Will it contain any room for the department's acquiescence in the Bureau's decision to pursue that policy?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I think we should keep separate, really what we are, I suppose, talking about. There is a Department of Education as the member well knows. I am trying to overcome some of the problems that I think exist in the department that the Member for Brandon West alluded to at the beginning of the debate. That task of mine is made increasing difficult of course by the kinds of questioning pursued by the Member for Fort Garry. But I understand that he feels he must make those kinds of remarks even though they insinuate something that I do not expect exists.

Now, if it does, I will certainly try to get the staff of the Bureau in line with what the government intends. I do not think they are out of line. If the Member for Fort Garry believes the insinuations that he is making, then he should document them for me and I will have them investigated and I will get things together. But otherwise I would like him to desist from making those insinuations because it doesn't make the education in Manitoba any more easy to administer.

Let us realize though that there are in the province of Manitoba school divisions, as the member well knows. These school divisions do have local autonomy. It is the policy of the government and the Department of Education to encourage that autonomy. It is the policy of the Government of Manitoba and the Department of Education to enable those divisions to administer programs which will be of benefit to the people within their divisional boundaries. That is the intention, and the bilingual grants that are made available and the operation of the Bureau, I believe, are intended to do just those things.

Now, I would appreciate it, if he's got some specific charges to make, that he make them and I will deal with them to the best of my ability.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would just say two things: first, it is not my job to be here to help the Minister of Education's job to be easier. Secondly, I'm here as a surrogate for certain Manitobans, as all members of this House are, and I'm conveying to the Minister a question that has been posed to me and my only opportunity to seek an answer to that question is in exercises in this House of this kind when the Minister and his Estimates are under review. I regret that the Minister thinks that I'm

making insinuations; I am putting to him a question that is frequently put to me, and I would suggest to others in this House, by many Manitobans and the question simply boils down to one of whether the Minister knows what the Bureau de l'Education Française is doing; knows what its parameters are; knows what its limits are; or whether the Bureau is actually functioning as a separate and independent education department answerable only unto itself.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, obviously in my remarks I did not mean to put the Member for Fort Garry in the position of helping me — quite the reverse. Even though he made a speech the other day about not wanting to defeat the government by exploiting a political issue such as the Griffin Steel Strike, I know that that is exactly what he intends to do with that issue and this issue and every other issue he can get his hands onto.

Now, I tell him quite simply, and I have just asked the staff in front of me, I have just asked the staff in front of me, if they are abiding by the policy . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order.

MR. TURNBULL: . . . if they are . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. I will ask for the co-operation of the members. If you want the floor, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Roblin, indicate to the Chair and you will be recognized, but not while another member is speaking. . . . the Honourable Member to take some of his spare time and read Hansard and read Beauchesne and read the House rules of this House.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order that my friend is obviously referring to, I read those books before he was in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. I would say then that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition did not understand what he read. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have not attempted to heckle or interrupt the Minister. I am seeking an answer from him and I am listening to his answers and I must say that I resent, in a minor way but I don't intend to pursue the point, the fact that he should suggest there is an attempt being made here to exploit any kind of situation. If there is any situation which we are attempting to exploit, it is a smoke screen and we are trying to get through it and to get an answer from the Minister that is being asked as I suggest by many Manitobans, and I can say many Manitobans of all cultural and ethnic backgrounds. I assume the Minister is interested in Manitobans of all cultural and ethnic backgrounds, not just those which hew to a particular line. Even those who are in the minority have rights in this province and rights in this House. If the Minister doesn't want to pursue this point at this juncture in the Estimates, that's fine, I'll pursue it later on.

We haven't come to his salary yet but I am asking him if he's prepared to give us an assurance and a guarantee at this time that as Minister of Education, he can assure Manitobans that the policies, the programs, the budgeting, the philosophy, the pursuits of the Bureau de l'Education Française are monitored by his department as Minister or whether they are done in rather an independent vein and that's all I am asking him. If he wants to make an argument out of it, then he's a good arguer; I'm a good arguer; we can argue a long time.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I am always impressed by the prose of the Member for Fort Garry. It always reminds me of that speech that he made at the University about the children in Vietnam who were burned because they couldn't operate gas stoves. I want to tell him again, I will check Hansard, I thought I had answered his question that he has raised on several occasions this evening. I thought I had made myself clear. If I have not made myself clear, then I am sure he will raise the issue again as he can on the Minister's salary which I do hope the members of the Conservative Party reduce because I would prefer to be Minister of Education with no pay — never mind \$15,000 — because I love the job and I love taking on the Member for Fort Garry on this issue and a lot of other issues. I have given him as straight an answer as I can: the Bureau of French Education to my knowledge is operating in line with what they believe the policy of the Minister is. They are not monitored by somebody else in the department; they are not monitored by anybody except me. Okay? Is that clear?

Now I hope that if he's got allegations or charges that he wants to make about the staff of the Bureau going off on their own hook that he will make them and I will then have to deal with them, naturally. And I will use whatever ability I have to deal with them. I have just asked a few members of the staff in front of me if they are going off on their own and they tell me, no. So we now have three people. But if he knows, if the Member for Fort Garry knows of someone who is doing what he is insinuating, then let me know either by letter, memo, phone call or in the House and I will then deal with that specific problem as he raises it. I know this issue is one that apparently many people wish to develop and if that is the case, you know I do regret that because I believe that Bill 113 passed unanimously by the House restored a right that was taken away 70 years ago and I believe that that Bill and work done by the previous administration moved toward the restoration of those rights and believe me, I want to see those rights continued.

The Member for Brandon West had a detailed accounting question. I'm sorry, the Member for Rock Lake had a detailed accounting question which I now have information on. He wanted to know why it was that the Estimates figure shown as the year ending March 31, 1977 at \$845,800 increased this year to \$954,200. and he wanted to know on what items the money was increased. —(Interjection)— Oh, he wants the total. Well, I'll give him the net, that is the net differences on each line, there were four lines. There's first Language Immersion, French in the annexes, okay? Yes, these are four programs, okay? The increase in 1977-78 for first language was \$22,800. For the next program immersion there was a decrease of \$3,600; for French conversation there was an increase of \$1,600; for the annexes which I described the other night in the House, there was an increase of 87,600, making the total of \$108,400 and the annexes are a part of the fully recoverable items that we were discussing some days ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(n)(2). The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item on BEF, I just wanted to refer back briefly and finally to one question that was posed earlier in the day and for which an answer was given in considerable detail this afternoon. I just wanted to be certain that the terms and the question was completely understood, it was: How many new courses or programs of instruction have been written by the staff of the BEF since April 1, 1974 and that is, since it became a separate bureau and not an arm of the curriculum branch. So, you gave me a long list. I just wanted to be sure that you had understood the question, that only those courses that were written after that date were given to us.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I know what the member is driving at and I did give him a complete list of 59 courses. I tried to make clear to him that of those 59 courses some were initiated by what was the French section, before there was actually a separate BEF and I tried to explain to him in these terms that, you know, when you're developing educational courses there is sort of not a start and stop kind of thing, they are developed and they are worked on and that is the total number of courses that have been written, revised, modified, implemented by the French section in BEF, that is the people in the Department of Education that have been doing this work. To try to separate precisely at the date that he has asked for I think would be impossible, I mean it's like taking a draft four of a particular program and saying, all right, from draft five on that's a BEF program but the previous four drafts, you know, are not BEF work, I mean it's not the feasible thing to try to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, going back to the exchange that occurred between the Minister and the Member for Fort Garry, I became so confused by the Minister's attempts to defend against the examination or charges, name them as he will, about what the Bureau was not doing that I'm not so sure that we're clear anymore about what it is doing. And I have the question maybe coming at it from the opposite end of the scale and that is that my concern is perhaps the government is not fulfilling its proper role and function in properly developing the use of French language instruction in Manitoba schools and that rather than being full of anxiety as some other members of this House might be concerning the restrictions and limitations we place upon that, I'm more concerned about, particularly at this time, what are we doing in fact to go beyond the strictures that were laid down in Bill 113 which the Minister calls as being rights. But rights are only applicable when they have substance placed on them and unless there is some actual meaning given to those rights, some implementation given they simply remain on the legislative books as something to pay obeisance to but without having much real impact.

What I would like to ask then is, what sort of direction is being given to the Bureau in terms of developing the opportunities for French language instruction in the province beyond what they are now? To what degree are we making advances? To what degree is the government working with individual school boards where there are both French speaking groups that would want an extension of French language opportunities, or in those school divisions where they simply want to provide second language opportunities and rather than playing a passive role, I'm more concerned about the active role that the department and the Bureau might be playing in this particular period of time to demonstrate, I think, as should be required at this time the willingness to make this a bilingual country, and I know, but this does not sit well with some members of this House, having expressed it in past election material that they have distributed in previous times. —(Interjection)— Well I . . . to the Minister but I still don't think that in all the exchanges that we've had, that the meaning so far has been maybe you're going too far, I'm much more concerned about maybe he's not doing enough. I would like, therefore, for the Minister to express very clearly what is it that he is preparing and planning to do to make sure that this province doesn't simply tread water in this area of establishing French language programs but, in fact, make some significant advances beyond where it now is.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I do share the Member for Fort Garry's concern, however I do not wish to downplay as he tended to do, rights. The rights are in the statute and I believe they are vitally important and I have heard him speak on other occasions of the need for the implementation of rights through statute law. That statute, known as Bill 113, did in fact restore the rights of a minority group in this province and I have no intention of ever letting that be forgotten.

There have been, I think, one of the most important activities that has developed in the last while and that is the fleshing out of a program for instruction in French by way of the funding formula. I know that the Member for Fort Garry may not think that money is important but I believe that the formula developed by BEF in this province this year, I think it was this year, within the last 12 months, in '76, is likely one of the best that has been developed in Canada. It is based on full-time equivalencies and it virtually assures divisions that they will be compensated for the programs that they establish in their division since the government adopted that funding program and when we get to the grant section we can talk about it in some way, in some more detail.

Within the last while there has been a five year plan for development of both the quality and quantity of French education in Manitoba. This plan was adopted by the government in 1974. A further five year plan for the development of French immersion programs was also approved by the province in 1975. Both plans were approved by the Secretary of State for cost-sharing purposes under the Federal-Provincial agreement for the promotion of bilingualism in education.

In terms of pedagogical assistance, Mr. Chairman, the section branch has a director. It comprises of eight educational consultants. Their role is primarily to provide pedagogical assistance to teachers and principals in schools where French is used as the language of instruction and by that I mean French language and immersion schools and their programs.

In addition to revising and developing programs of studies, the team works in two specific areas in the field. First, person to person contact at the school level and (b) preparing a global approach to assist at different levels of the educational system, mainly at the school or divisional level.

The staff of this section also participates in the elaboration of curriculum for French education. Following, I can give you a list, if the member is still interested, I wish he would acknowledge if he is still interested, is a list of areas in which assistance is provided through this pedagogical assistance: curriculum, professional development of teachers, curriculum committees for revision of programs of studies, preparation and distribution of French learning materials, cultural integration programs, French libraries and, in particular, the French library of the Department of Education at the St. Boniface College, immersion programs, special services such as textbooks, child development and support services, correspondence courses, participation in various provincial and national committees.

The second major area after pedagogical assistance is development. This section employs five persons of which one is the director. Engaged primarily in the quantitative development of French education, its role is essentially to bring about development in the community school divisions and teaching profession. Each team member is assigned one or more divisions in which he is responsible for maintaining good relationships and providing all the required assistance to facilitate the development of French education at the school and divisional levels. In addition activities under this program include the collection of educational data required to pay grants to school divisions and to measure growth of French educational programs in the field.

Thirdly, administrative. The Assistant Deputy Minister heads the Bureau and provides the overall co-ordination of all sections. A person is charged with the responsibility of administering the French grants and the development of appropriate mechanisms and controls to facilitate and monitor the application of the law at the local level. Two persons are charged with the administrative matters related to the operation of the Bureau along with the administration of all annexes of the Federal Provincial agreement. Does that answer the member's question? I think there has been quite some development in this whole field in the last few years and I appreciate the Member for Fort Rouge's remarks because they contrast so neatly with those of the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, obviously there's been a very sensitive nerve touched here. I don't recall any remarks that I put to the Minister other than some questions that I asked which I repeat, I believe Manitobans are entitled to receive answers to. The Minister obviously has been stung by some events during the past 24 hours. He's also been stung by the fact that he's being questioned about an area over which I suggest many people think he has very little control and, as a consequence, he has resorted to putting words in my mouth and perhaps, at least by implication, imputing motives. I want him to know that I'm as interested as he in a respect for the rights of minorities and that includes minority groups within cultural and ethnic groups who have particular and specific ambitions of their own that lap over into other linguistic areas. That is what I am interested in and I suggest that unless he knows what the Bureau de l'Education Française is doing, there may be some members of particular groups, Francophone, Anglophone and others who are being deprived and denied the rights that he so assiduously and so pompously feels are being protected by his department.

MR. TURNBULL: I am always amused by the Member for Fort Garry because he reminds me of Churchill and one of Churchill's admonitions which was, there is nothing so exhilarating as to be shot at without effect. And that, I think, is what the Member for Fort Garry is engaged in because on this

issue of education, Sir, if I am ever stung, he is stunned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(n)(2)—pass. Resolution 51. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,702,300 for Education.

I now refer honourable members to page 20, Resolution 50, Financial Support - Public Schools (a) School grants and other assistance \$167,795,300. The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I, the other night, accommodated a suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition to defer consideration of this particular vote. I deferred it with the full knowledge and indeed the intention of allowing the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party to take the grant proposal that is contained in this vote and take it to their various researchers and advisors to have it critiqued. I hope they have had time to do that. I hope that they have a lot of information. I hope they have a lot of positions that are in contradiction or at least counterpoint to the proposal that I am about to put before the Legislature of Manitoba. It is in this resolution, Sir, that most of the money and most of the assistance that the province of Manitoba provides for education, it's in this vote that that assistance and money is contained.

There are, in this proposal, two major and I believe fundamentally important principals. The first of these is the recognition of the importance of elementary education for our children. The province of Manitoba, through its Department of Education, cannot of course become involved in the direct administration or in the direct teaching of children in school. However, what the department can do is set the tone and give direction to what the educational system should do and one of the directions that this policy or resolution contains is that of reducing the pupil-teacher ratio for the purpose of giving grants to school divisions. The ratio had been set at 1 in 28 for a number of years and the proposal here is to reduce it for grant purposes to 1 in 23. I think it is a significant change. I fault not though, in proposing this change and speaking on this principle, I fault not those who introduced the 1 in 28 principle and the 1 in 23 principle at the secondary level. At the time that that was done I believe it to have been a progressive move. At the time that that was done I believe it brought education in Manitoba from where it had been, which was very far behind, to a position of some advancement anyway.

However, it is time now to make additional changes. Time now to recognize the complexity of people who teach in the elementary schools. Time now to recognize the complexity not only of their personalities but of their jobs. Time now, I believe, to make certain that it is clear to all in education that the role of the elementary teacher is vitally important and that the Department of Education believes that a ratio of 1 in 23 is perhaps one of the more desirable ratios that could be achieved.

I do not of course think for one moment that everyone will be happy with such a ratio. Indeed I understand that there are already some indications that the ratio should be even lower. However, the proposal here is one that sets a particular direction and provides not only for the recognition of the importance of education at the elementary level, but also puts teachers in the two levels of our educational system on a par. It recognizes equity as between elementary teachers and secondary teachers. The reduction in the ratio then for grant purposes is one of the major principles contained in the Resolution 50.

The other principle is that, quite simply, of fiscal equity. There have been attempts in years gone by to establish equity, attempts made by provincial governments to bring about in our province equality of educational opportunity. Those efforts were based on the idea that there should be a foundation program and on the idea that the province should pick up 100 percent of the approved cost of school construction and school renovation. Those were good measures in their day. Since that policy was introduced, though, there have been changes and in some cases increasing disparities in the wealth-base of many school divisions throughout our province. We now have balanced assessments per pupil, which is the standard basis for comparison, balanced assessments per pupil which range from below \$5,000 per pupil to over \$14,000 per pupil. As the debate progresses on this resolution, I can, if members wish, indicate to them what one mill raises in various places in Manitoba. One mill in the City of Winnipeg \$600,000.00. In will raise well over some other places it will raise very little indeed.

There can be from the provincial government's point of view almost no accomplishment, almost no move towards equality of educational opportunity unless there is an effort on the part of the provincial government to restore fiscal equity in some way. Therefore, Sir, there have been significant increases in the equalization grant system contained in this particular resolution. The increase in the grants for equalization range from \$25 for a balanced assessment of \$14,000 and above to \$215 for balanced assessment for pupil of 5,000 and less. That will mean a significant increase in money for many divisions. It is a recognition of the need for the establishment of fiscal equity. These two principles then, the reduction in the teacher-pupil ratio to recognize the importance of elementary education and secondly, the recognition that fiscal equity and the approach to it is essential if we are to have an approach to equality of educational opportunity are contained in this vote.

Mr. Chairman, there are a great number of lines in the grants package that I can describe now but I

am reasonably sure there are many members opposite who have been awaiting the opportunity now to jump into the debate on the package and on the foundation program and I must confess that I look forward with some anticipation for the debate on this grants package. I know that some will say it does not please all the people all the time and that is true. I have never tried to please everybody all the time and I think that the package we have in front of us is one that does try to restore a balance in our fiscal financial support of the school division, to restore a balance between those divisions that are extraordinarily wealthy and those divisions that are indeed much less wealthy.

So with that, Sir, rather than going through a description line by line of all the proposals that are contained in the grant supports for this year, I will sit down and let other members of the committee enter into the debate.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, we thank the Minister for his preliminary explanations. As he suggests, there will be perhaps one or two questions that will arise from the remarks that he has made up to this point. Before really commenting on the matter, Mr. Chairman, the Minister wishes to have the floor and I am prepared to . . .

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Member for Brandon West. There was one small matter that I would like to raise. I have on my right here a member of the Bureau of French Education. It would be useful if we could discuss that particular grant now and then he could leave the floor and we could go on to the rest of the grants package. I think you've got all your answers as it is now but if you could accommodate me in that way, it would be I think more efficient.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, we might be able to do that after we had dealt with some of the generalities here relating to the particular appropriation and to the Minister's statement of March 4th. We don't want to hold the person representing the Bureau unnecessarily but I think it would be somewhat difficult to follow the train if we leap to that at this moment so, Mr. Chairman, with your permission, we will get to that as soon as we are able.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister made a statement involving financial support for 1977 and we are about to deal with an appropriation which I assume in its total does not include all of the financial support for 1977 and I would simply ask the Minister why it was not possible when the Estimates were tabled to provide us with the complete information on these new supports that he has announced at a subsequent date? I presume, Mr. Chairman, you will wish to deal with the appropriation as it is noted in the Estimates but has the Minister revised figures that he might show us to indicate where the additional money will show in these appropriations?

MR. TURNBULL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that indeed is a fair question. The main reason for not having the total amount of money in the main Estimates was quite simply that we did not have all the budgets from the divisions in, nor did I being a new Minister have the knowledge of those budgets and how they might influence the mill rates in the various divisions and municipalities. So there was quite simply a decision to close off the main supply Estimates Book and get it to print and leave me to continue working out this particular grants package that we are now about to discuss.

I am assuming that the Member for Brandon West would like me to try to reconcile where we are with regard to the amount of money which was shown in the Estimate book at — well, the Member for Roblin suggests a round figure — it's a round figure of \$167,795,000 and the total that we now are suggesting and was contained in the letter in terms of our provincial support for the foundation program and the grants program of \$183,891,343.00. That's rounded to the nearest dollar.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, if you would permit an interruption. If he could just take us from the total vote on vote 50 and then with the indented figures, \$167 million and so on down those figures, give us the new figures so that we know what we're dealing with, please.

MR. TURNBULL: The change I'm trying to give you is the change in the first vote, that is the reconciliation between Resolution 53(a) at \$167 million and the amount that I announced in the letter which I understood to be the question and as we go through that, there is \$8,597,000 that will be in capital and approximately \$7,498,000 which will have to turn up in supplementary supply. I think you'll find that that will balance.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, it's quite simple, if the Minister could just give us the new figures that apply as a result of his statement the other day so we know the amounts we're voting on when we vote them.

MR. TURNBULL: I don't know how that is a simple question. We're going to be voting on \$167,795,000.00. What I am going to attempt to explain, what I will be explaining, is the total financial package as outlined in the letter. Now, I can give some indication here if the Member wants me to with — you know, I think it would be most simple if we just got into the line-by-line accounting because if you attempt to do it the way the Member for Souris-Killarney is suggesting, I don't think it's going to be a very simple task at all. We can do it in global terms or I can go through and describe for you the total foundation and equalization program. I think what he is asking me to do is break out how much of the increase in \$23 million is contained in each line of the foundation program and in each line of the equalization program. Not the equalization but the other grants program. I can do that but that will take me the rest of the night because what I'll be doing is just describing —(Interjection)— yes,

another two weeks, I guess, on these Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that really what was being asked for is very simple. If supplementary Estimates were presented, they would be presented in a written form. All that is really being asked is to allow the supplementary estimates that will be presented to at least be brought forward and added to the Estimates that are here for discussion purposes. The vote obviously is going to have to be on the vote that's before us but in this way then you have the total package.

MR. TURNBULL: If I mentioned the total in supplementary that would be approximately \$7,498,730.00. That amount in supplementary would be made up of equalization grant monies of \$4,714,217 and it would be made up of tuition fees for Indian students of \$2,753,846 and an increase in northern cost of living allowance, two school divisions of \$30,667.00. That is our estimate now of what this department will be putting into Supplementary Supply.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, to simplify it for the Minister and everybody else, the Honourable Member for River Heights understands what we are trying to get at. If he would undertake to produce a paste-over or whatever to indicate to us what the total vote plus the supplementary is going to be on each of the items under Vote No. 50.

MR. TURNBULL: I can get a copy of that for the Member, if that's what he wants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 50(a). The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, pending the explanations and the answers the Minister is going to supply, I would like to make just a comment or two on the financial support as announced by the Minister. We did make a preliminary comment when it was introduced in the House I believe on March 4th.

Mr. Chairman, the opposition welcomes the increased funding designated for the operation of school divisions. In particular, we regard the increase in equalization grants as a positive step and the Minister noted that they have been increased from a range of \$20 to \$120 to this new range of \$25 to \$215 and similarly there are improved per pupil grants that have gone from the old range of \$100 to \$125 up to \$125 now and the vocational grants have gone from \$325 to \$475.00. So, as I say, Mr. Chairman, those in particular, the equalization grants, we regard as a positive step and one that is going to materially assist or at least move towards a greater equality of opportunity in our school system.

However, Mr. Chairman, when we begin to look at the actual effect of the change of the pupil-teacher ratio which the Minister announced as one that would have a major effect upon the elementary school system, the practical results are not quite so impressive as was first considered to be the case. As everyone now knows, the essence of the announcement was that the pupil-teacher ratio in elementary grades would be reduced from 28 to 1 to 23 to 1 and they would now be identical with those which apply in the secondary grades.

After some examination of this new program, we note that if the number of elementary teacher grants were increased by the same ratio as the change in formula, if this did happen, the change in the number of authorized grants for elementary teachers in the province would be approximately 1,300. That is based on the number 7,000 as the authorized elementary teachers on the old formula. But the government has said in its announcement that there would be some 280 additional teacher grants.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there definitely is a difference here between a straight announcement that there would be a reduction and corresponding increase of grants from a 28 to 1 ratio to a 23 to 1. The gains here are really more apparent than they are real. Again the Minister said that the change from 1 in 28 to 1 in 23 was said to be a recognition of the importance of the elementary education.

Mr. Chairman, I want to just outline briefly a hypothetical division where this new formula is applied. In this division let's say we have 2,800 elementary pupils enrolled and 1,000 secondary pupils, that is a total of 3,800 enrollment. Now it is true that in practice some divisions may calculate their grants separately for each school but I think that is not always the case. In many divisions in practice the majority do it on a divisional basis.

Well the effect of the new elementary formula, under the old system at 1 in 28 and 1 in 23. We start with an elementary of 2,800 divided by 28 and we get 100 authorized teacher grants. In the secondary we have 1,000 enrollments and we divide by 23 and we get 43 and a fraction, which gives us 44 grants. There are 8 resource grants, 2 for psychologists, audio-specialists, so on, and 1 for superintendent, and so we get a basic total number of grants of 155. But under the old system there then is the additional authorized grants covering the principals, administrative, of 10 percent of 155. So we will add 15 and a fraction or 16 and get 171 authorized teachers under the old system in our division.

Under the new formula using 1 in 23 across the board for elementary and secondary, we will divide 3,800, the total enrollment, by 23 and we get 165 and a fraction or 166 rounded out. We still get 8 resource, 2 in the psychologist and audio area, 1 superintendent, for 177. But in this case, Mr. Chairman, there is no 10 percent additional authorized teachers to cover the administrative and the

principals. So really we have gone up by only 6 teacher grants between the old system and the new system, under this new system. This is considerably different than one might have imagined if they had considered that the 10 percent administrative increase in authorized grants still applied. So actually the Minister has put some new money in but he has taken some away at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to also give three divisions in which these new pupil-teacher ratios have been applied in practical sense. And here is one where the elementary enrollment is 1,120, the secondary is 832, and this is just three divisions in which we have tried it, I don't have a name on the division. Let's call them X, Y and Z. Under the old system we work out to a certain number of teacher grants and using the new system we are up .6 of a grant. In the second one where there is 1,700 elementary pupils and 700 approximately secondary, we are actually down one grant for spring and one grant for fall terms. In a third division where the elementary registration is 2,417 and the secondary 955, we are up 4 for spring course or term and up 3 in the fall. It really works out over the year for a 3.6 increase in grants. So, Mr. Chairman, the practical effect, as we are now beginning to understand, of the new announcements of the Minister in the area of new pupil-teacher ratios is not working out to nearly as great an increase of authorized grants as we had expected.

In the area of increase in other grants for these same three divisions there is in one case \$156,000 additional money, another has \$135,000 additional and the third one \$550,000 additional.

So, Mr. Chairman, I give that information and I am sure all divisions are now busy in the process of applying the new formula, to see in practical terms what will be the allowable increase in authorized teacher grants.

The taking away of the 10 percent administrative allowance of authorized grants was something that came as somewhat of a surprise and was not appreciated until the new increases had been applied to the practical situations in the divisions.

Mr. Chairman, I would like now to, I think the Minister began to do this at one stage in the earlier questioning, I would like him to tell us now what items are in the Foundation Program and if he could name the items in the Foundation Program with the amount for each, that would assist us in understanding this point.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I think that what the Member for Brandon West has just said is recognized by everyone who is familiar with educational finance. Indeed, just so that there would be no misunderstanding I mentioned in the letter that I sent to divisions and I believe in a statement that I made to the House, which was based on the letter, that in regard to teacher-pupil ratios "It is expected that the additional authorizations will cover the costs of teachers now over grant in many divisions." However, I went on to say that the provision of these additional authorizations for teachers should contribute along with the other increases in the Foundation Program and other grant support, to a decline in the rate of increase in special levy mill rates set by the municipalities.

Mr. Chairman, in business there is a term applied to some businessmen which is called "he's a bottom-line man", he looks at the final figure, and that is what I have done. If you take the estimates of the department for various divisions, in terms of mill rates, you will find that this program will reduce significantly the increase in mill rates that otherwise would have occurred because of school expenditures set by the trustees.

In the division that the Member for Brandon West represents, for example, it looks like the increase in the mill rate will be very negligible indeed when this grants program is built in. It looks like divisions such as Hanover, when you get to the bottom line, that there mill rate will decrease substantially. As you go through the whole grants package you can find that this program with the two million additional dollars for the reduction in the teacher-pupil ratio and all the other money that is in it, will really give relief to the taxpayers in the various divisions in the province.

I make no apology for being a "bottom-line man", for looking at that last line, for looking at the line as it will affect the individual property taxpayer. I think that counts and I think that the important thing in education is to try to develop a program of provincial support that does two things: that provides sufficient funds to ensure that education is of quality in our province and secondly, to do that, and at the same time keep the property tax increases to the minimum possible. That is what I have tried to do.

The program that I have to go through now, if the Member wants the various lines, the Foundation Program. In the Foundation Program, salary in 1976 was \$76,802,000, it goes up to \$80,321,000 or an increase of actually \$3,519,000 for salaries for teachers. Now in my letter I said approximately two million, and the reason for the difference, of course, is that the \$3,519,000 actual increase includes salary increments et cetera. Along with the increased number of authorizations, the over 280 increased teacher authorizations, resulting in that total salary increase of three million five, there is an increase in maintenance administration and supply from \$21,402,000 to \$22,281,000 or an increase of \$880,000. 00, roughly. Transportation grants will rise from \$11,400,000 to \$13,000,000, that is an increase of approximately \$1,500,000.00. I am rounding these, I hope the Member appreciates that.

In capital for buses there is a decrease of \$510,000.00. That is the result of the previous year's

updating of the bus fleets in these various divisions. This item, of course, will come up in Capital Supply.

Debt servicing rises from \$22,950,000 to \$25,076,000, an increase of approximately \$2,120,000.00. The other items there are capital items.

Print and non-print will go from \$3,500,000 to \$3,500,000 (?), that is an increase of \$35,000.00.

The vocational per pupil grants will go from \$2,000,000 to \$3,200,000, an increase of \$1,134,000.00 (?).

The per pupil grants will increase from \$21,218,000 to \$26,754,000, an increase of \$5,500,000 approximately.

Small schools will go from \$557,700 to \$483,300, that is a decrease of \$74,000 because there are fewer small schools.

Declining enrollment - \$1,243,000 to \$550,000, a decrease of \$692,000.00. The decrease, of course, again attributable to the fact I think that the rate of decline in enrollment has slowed up.

There is something in here called transfers, which are \$5,000.00. This just about comes out equal.

Administration Finance Board salaries and expenses from \$50,000 to \$90,000, an increase of \$40,000.00. Charges are at \$600,000, the same in both years.

The total then from the 1976 vote is \$170,800,000 to \$186,651,000, an increase in 1977 over 1976 of \$15,800,000.00. That is the total of the Foundation Program.

The Foundation levy goes from \$34,200,000 to \$37,300,000, an increase of approximately \$3.2 million. The provincial share of this then, when you take out the Foundation levy, is 136.7 up to 149.3, an increase of 12.6 million, as was indicated in my letter and statement in the House.

The other grants have increased from \$24,200,000 to \$34,600,000, an increase of approximately 10.4 million. This accounts then for in vote 53(a) of \$160,870,000 to \$183,900,000 or an increase of 23 million and some odd dollars.

The result of all this is that the Foundation levy rate would increase a very minimal .6, 0.6, for both farm and residential and another .6 or 0.6 for commercial.

Now, I know the member is interested in this. Would you like me to continue with the other grants? And the Member from Brandon West indicates that he would. The other grants which came to the total on the page that I just listed of \$34,600,000, that is the figure I am now going to breakout for him.

Here we have, I hope the press are seeing just how long and involved and complicated this Program is. The Equalization Program in 1976 we voted 10.2 million, in 1977 we are estimating 18 million and the increase 1977 over 1976 would be 7.8 million.

Special Revenue School — \$145,000 to \$150,000 or an increase of \$5,000.00.

Frontier Special goes from \$5,600,000 to \$5,200,000, a decrease of \$385,000 and the decrease there.

Tuition fees for Indian students goes from \$2,100,000 to \$2,800,000 or an increase of \$644,000.00. Tuition fees as it is identified here "non-Indian," \$390,000 to \$916,000 or an increase of \$526,000.00.

Special grants goes from \$552,000 to \$842,000 or \$290,000.00.

The northern cost of living goes from \$624,700 to \$712,000 or an increase of \$87,000.00.

School nutrition goes from \$180,000 to \$200,000 or an increase of \$20,000.00.

Bilingualism Française goes from \$2,045,000 to \$2,027,000, which is a decrease of \$18,000, but then we have the French conversation course which is in here which stays at \$375,000.00.

Winnipeg Special goes from \$700,000 to \$1 million, an increase of \$300,000.00.

St. Boniface College goes from \$100,000 to \$125,000, an increase of \$25,000.00.

Shared services goes from \$312,900 to \$344,700, an increase of \$31,800.00.

Something called "Other," which I am sure the Member for Brandon West will want to question; certainly I would if I were in his position, goes from \$38,500 to \$73,000 an increase of \$34,500.00.

Special Needs increases from \$484,000 to \$705,000, an increase of \$221,000.00.

Native para-professionals increases from \$335,000 to \$376,200, an increase of \$41,200.00.

Sacre Coeur increases from \$41,250 to \$60,000, that's an increase of \$18,750.00.

Local Parents' Advisory Committees, this is a new program, Mr. Chairman, which will assist parental involvement in the schools. It is designed to give support to parental groups who wish to become involved in their neighborhood schools. It is designed to bridge the gap between the school and the home. There is \$180,000 available here.

There are some other programs which total \$230,000.00. Evening schools, those are new programs, evening schools increased from \$146,000 to \$170,000.00.

Establishment increases from \$250,000 to \$177,000 or an increase (?) of \$72,500.00. This makes an increase in other grants under the vote 3(a) from \$24,200,000 to \$34,569,885 or an increase of \$10,370,000.00.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of new programs — not new programs but additions to programs — in this budget. The most important of which, I suppose, in terms of its impact is the Winnipeg Special which is now for this year \$1 million. An extra \$1 million for Winnipeg School Division No. 1 to recognize that that division has particular problems because within its boundaries

are contained the major urban core areas of the the city. A million dollars does enable that division to carry out a number of programs; a million dollars is equivalent to approximately 1.5 mills. It's a kind of program that I hope will be used and has been used in the past both to lessen increases in mill rates and to improve education in certain areas of the city that do have, without any question about it, particular and very special problems.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that that is the detail that the Member for Brandon West would want. I did provide to him and others as I recall — and if I didn't I will — the equalization grant, he likely has it via his pipe line anyway, which shows the increase in the per pupil grant for divisions with particular balanced assessments per pupil that range from \$25 to \$215.00. If he hasn't got that, I can get him a copy.

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for those details on the Foundation and other programs and I was going to ask him for the balanced assessment figures for the province for 1977. Does he have those balanced assessment figures, that is (a) for farm and residential and (b) other?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, apparently the staff don't have them with them but, you know, we can certainly get those estimates for the Member for Brandon West.

I was wondering if now that I have given him the detail and the reconciliation in global terms if we could turn to the BEF grants — I believe there are people in the gallery that are interested in these and certainly I would like to, if he could accommodate me on this and we could discuss that particular grant and then cover the rest of the program tomorrow and the weeks following.

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. For the BEF grants, we wanted to find out what the total amount of money received from Ottawa was for the 1976-77 fiscal year and I believe you gave me that but you were being cut off by the Chairman at that time and would you just confirm that figure: the total amount that's payable from Ottawa under the Federal Minority and Second Languages Program that comes to the Department of Education?

MR. TURNBULL: I know the Member for Brandon West will keep in mind that we're talking about two different things here; we're talking about the grants program and we're talking about the estimate appropriation we just passed for BEF.

For grants, in terms of recoverable on grants, we are recovering \$1,976,000 and the figure that I indicated was in the Estimate for 1977 for these programs is \$2,027,000, plus the amount for French conversation of \$375,000.00. So we recover \$1,976,000 and we pay out the total of the latter two figures that I gave him.

MR. MCGILL: Can he tell me then how much goes to the Bureau for administration?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I am trying to keep separate, not only for my own sake and clarity but for the sake of the Member for Brandon West, that we are now on the Grants Program and these are grants to schools. The amount of money that I gave him there, those two sums, the \$2,027,000 and the \$375,000, they go, as far as I know, right through to the school divisions.

MR. MCGILL: Well, then Mr. Chairman, can he tell me how much of that is going to the school divisions for Française? And the next question would be: How much goes for French as a second language, so that we can split that?

MR. TURNBULL: I have given the Member for Brandon West the figures. I thought he was asking a different question. I gave him the Bilingualism Française \$2,027,570 and for French conversation \$375,000.00.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, what is the per pupil amount received by the divisions for (a) the Française students and (b) FSL students? That's the per pupil grant for each type.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, that comparison is somewhat like comparing apples and oranges, but for the FSL it's \$47.50 per pupil — I'm sorry, for FTE, per full time equivalent, it's \$47.50 per full time equivalent. It's \$357.00 for full time equivalents. Now do not forget that we're talking about apples and oranges. The French conversation course is, you know, the children of the Member for Souris-Killarney are getting twenty minutes of French at the neighborhood school. Okay? That's French conversation at \$47.50 per FTE. The other amount, \$357 per FTE is five hours of instruction in French per day and that is what accounts for the difference in part. You know, it's a totally different program.

MR. MCGILL: Just as a matter of information. There is a formula I believe of a point system when you are applying to Ottawa for these fiscal supports based upon so many points for a Française 50-50 and so many for French as a second language. Can you just give us the detail on that point system, the way in which you make your application for these grants?

MR. TURNBULL: You know, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Brandon West, he reminds me of an undertaker in many ways. I always think he's got his shovel out and he's digging a hole to try to get people to fall into it, but I know he's got all kinds of reasons for these questions I'm sure and I am very happy to provide him with the answers.

This information he sought through an Order for Return as well, which I likely will be filing as soon

as I can get it all typed up. The point system you are talking about or the point system he is talking about, Mr. Chairman, is the federal formula payments which are determined by means of the following formulas. (a) Nine percent times the average annual cost per student times the number of full time equivalent students taking French as a language of instruction. (b) Five percent times the average annual cost per student times full time student equivalent count in French as a second language. (c) One and a half percent times the average annual cost per student times the potential Francaise enrolment as determined by the Federal Government. I think those are the points that the Member for Brandon West is referring to. I hope he has many late nights working out the various formulas.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I know that the representative from the Bureau is anxious to get away. I have no further questions in relation to the grants to the BEF. If anyone else has . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 50(a). The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, we asked for certain information and we got some additional information from the Minister about mill rates to raise the division's share, that is, 20 percent of the Foundation Program. I believe he said that there was a .6 increase in the farm and residential and a .6 increase in commercial. I wonder if he could just confirm that specifically? Is the farm and residential rate for 1977, 4.7 mills? And is the mill rate for other, 35.6 mills? I wonder then could the Minister indicate if these rates produce a sum equal to 20 percent of the Foundation Program?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, within some margin I'm told of about 100,000, these rates as I've mentioned, indeed it's the other way around — as the Member for Brandon West mentioned, I've mentioned the rate of increase; he's mentioned the actual rates. These rates will raise within \$100,000 of the 20 percent of the Foundation program.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, do I take that to mean that they will be short of the 20 percent by about \$100,000.00?

MR. TURNBULL: I think likely it will be short by about that much, yes.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, is the department using a reserve fund to cover this shortage of \$100,000 or is it budgeting for a deficit in this case?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, that is a question that I could answer by saying it is a policy matter which will be announced in due course, but you know one would have to make just that kind of determination whether or not it will come out of the reserve or not. The chances are quite high that a good part of it would.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he can give us some idea of the government policy on money earmarked for the construction of schools? or Can the schools expect any pronouncement guidelines on limitation of spending for capital purposes?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, that is a capital supply item and I'll have to deal with it then and it's also a matter of policy that really I will have to announce at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 50(a). The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I think this really falls into the Financial Support area for public schools. I think there is some reason for considering the matter of the policy of the Minister in respect to the construction of schools, particularly it is a matter of some concern to the school divisions to be able to determine or to receive some announcements or guidelines on whether or not there will be limitations for the school construction. They would, I think, be greatly assisted in their efforts to conduct their business and make their plans for future expansion if and when it's required, if they had some idea of the policy that is going to be adopted by the Minister. We're dealing now with Financial Support for Public Schools, why can we not have some idea from the Minister as to the way in which he is going to advise the school divisions, the way in which he is going to make decisions when requests for the capital spending permissions are received from the school divisions?

You see, I think, Mr. Chairman, the school divisions are somewhat in the dark as to how applications should be made and whether it depends on the one who gets there first and makes the most noise as to whether or not that division will receive the most attention. Perhaps the Minister could indicate whether it depends on the aggressiveness of the division and should it be the policy of the divisions to submit notices of intent months in advance in order to be on the list for consideration? These are things that I think are concerning school divisions.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, as far as I'm concerned, school construction is built on the basis of need. It's as simple as that. I don't know what the previous administration did but that's the way I approach it.

The item that he is talking about, as I say, is a Capital item. We are on Current Expenditures and I am not discussing Capital until we are on the Capital Supply bill.

He did ask earlier for the balanced assessment and in totals: Farm and Residential, \$1,842,162,800; Other, \$802,864,660, for a Total of \$2,645,027,460.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, in the moments left to us I think there are some questions that were passed over fairly quickly in relation to the new formula, on the one to twenty-three ratio that

still need further explanation. I would not want to see us pass this appropriation before we have got some fuller answers on it.

One of the questions that come to mind to begin with, Mr. Chairman, is, on a question of the ratio of one to twenty-three designed as it is presumably to improve the offering of education in the elementary system, there are already many school divisions which are about that ratio in the elementary schools presently and paying for it out of their special levy. I would assume, Mr. Chairman, that the school boards and the school divisions, being what they are, they would not necessarily follow the dictates of the Minister and increase teacher appropriations, but would in fact just absorb the money and reduce it from their special levy. So one of the questions I would have for the Minister, of course, is to what degree is the end result of this grant really going to be in actually expanding the number of teachers in the elementary area so that they are in fact — is there going to be any policing or perhaps maybe in a more gentle way, any sense of instruction given to the school divisions in relation to these kinds of ratios so that the school boards would not simply look upon this as found money and as a way of keeping their mill rates in line?

A second question which I find somewhat curious, Mr. Chairman, goes back to perhaps the philosophy of it. I have heard the Minister expound to some degree about how learning takes place in the early years and that this is the critical stage in a child's formation and where education should put its primary emphasis. If that's the case, I find it somewhat curious that the Minister would eliminate from any consideration at all any application of grants for the introduction for example of nursery schools in the school level. In School Division 1, for example, there are a number of nursery schools for which there is no support received and they are told they can again draw it out of special levy.

Surely if education is important at the age of six, it's equally important at the age of five and the fact that there is no support given whatsoever in these areas seems to indicate that again we are providing some arbitrary divisions as to where learning occurs. I am wondering whether in fact any consideration has been given to providing for those schools which are prepared to offer nursery school training. —(Interjection)— I'm sure that there have been a few lacerations encountered.

I would say that I agree in large part with the philosophy. I hope it doesn't mean to that extent that we are going to ignore the secondary schools but certainly the emphasis should be put on those early learning years. And if that's the case, it would seem to me that the arbitrary division at kindergarten or Grade 1 does not fit the philosophy as expounded by the Minister. So a second question I would have in relation to the emphasis, or the new emphasis he is putting in his funding program is whether or not there should not be equal kind of support for the introduction of the nursery schools in those divisions where they find it particularly appropriate?

So perhaps if the Minister would like to answer those now. I don't know if the wish of the Chairman is to continue on past the ten o'clock hour, I have several other questions, but they would remain until tomorrow.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, in philosophical terms I can't disagree with the Member for Fort Rouge when he speaks of the need for funding of nursery schools. I can't disagree with him either when he says that there have been some arbitrary decisions made about what will be included in the public schools system. On both points I have to agree with him, but these arbitrary decisions have been made, I'm not certain when, 50, 60, 70 years ago. I believe it's time for a change but I can tell him I've got all the money that I'm going to get and there just isn't any more for current budget for education. I think we have been remarkably successful in getting what we did in this year of restraint.

But certainly he raises a policy issue, a philosophical issue about where schooling should begin. I'm not certain, however, about whether he is referring to compulsory nursery school. If he's talking about compulsory nursery school, then I begin to depart from him somewhat. I'm one of those who believe that children should spend time at home in those early years, that when they enter kindergarten that, you know, some of them, that's time enough for compulsory education. If he's talking about some kind of voluntary program or a program that is of a pilot nature or a program where it is absolutely necessary for a variety of socioeconomic reasons, then I come back to his position.

The number of nursery school children in the province, I am informed, is 1,360. Approximately 980 of those are in Winnipeg.

I can't disagree with the Member for Fort Rouge. It's just that the amount of money available, you know, is limited. . . . I just can't get it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact it's just a few moments after ten, I would propose that we adjourn for the evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that

Thursday, March 10, 1977

the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned until 10:00 a.m. Friday.