

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 17th, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. STEVE PATRICK, (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Clarence Edward Atchison and Others, Praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate United Fund of Greater Winnipeg.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills.

The Honourable the Minister of Education.

HONOURABLE GEORGE JOHNSON, (Minister of Education), (Gimli) presented Bill No. 39, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 25 grade 11 students from the Sacred Heart School under the direction of their teacher Mrs. Lansard. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. There are some 40 grade 7 and 8 students from Elie school under the direction of their teacher Sister Mary Ste. Henry and Sister Mary Kevin. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Morris. There are some 30 grade 7 and 8 students from Sanford School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Forsythe. This school is also situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Morris. There are 40 grade 11 students from Garden City School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Atamanchuk. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly I welcome you.

Orders of the Day.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY, (Leader of the New Democratic Party), (Radisson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Attorney-General and apologize to him for not giving him due notice of my question but I am sure that he would have the answer readily at his fingertips. Who is the Director of Corrections in the Province of Manitoba at the present time?

HONOURABLE STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General), (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, we do not have a Director of Corrections at the present time.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplemental question, Madam Speaker. Can my honourable friend inform me how long this position has been vacant; have applications been received for the position and when will the position be filled?

MR. McLEAN: The vacancy has existed, well it will be slightly more than a year. We have selected a person for the position. He will be here within the next 14 days. Now it's a matter of --I could be out a day or two on that but he will be here.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, a further question. I understand then the position will be filled by someone other than is within the Civil Service or connected with government at the present time, by virtue of the answer that "he will be here" at some 14 or odd days. Is this correct?

MR. McLEAN: The person is not presently a member of the Manitoba Civil Service.

MR. PAULLEY: Could the Minister indicate from whence the individual is coming?

MR. McLEAN: Saskatchewan.

HONOURABLE MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities), (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to table a return to an order of the House No. 7 on the motion of the Honourable Member from Brokenhead.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister for Public Works. Has the Honourable Minister or this department received any requests for traffic lights to be installed in Assiniboia at the intersection of Portage Avenue and Westwood Drive or Cavalier Drive and Portage Avenue?

HONOURABLE WALTER WEIR, (Minister of Public Works), (Minnedosa): From memory I believe, it's difficult to tell, I believe that it is true that we have. Unless I'm mistaken on location, lights will be placed at that intersection in the not too distant future.

MR. J. M. FROESE, (Rhinleand): Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Has the 75 percent been paid in connection with the expropriation at Grand Beach, namely the Duthoit case --75 percent of the offer made in connection with the expropriation of the property at Grand Beach in connection with the Duthoit case.

HONOURABLE STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources), (Fort Garry): I'll take that as notice, Madam Speaker?

HONOURABLE OBIE BAIZLEY, (Minister of Labour), (Osborne): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table a return to an order of the House No. 3 on motion of the Honourable Member from St. George.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Was he or any representative of his immediate Department at the hearing of the Rural Constructions Board which was held at Brandon I understand yesterday evening at which more than 500 people, according to press reports, showed their concern and attended a meeting in I believe the Prince Edward Hotel?

MR. BAIZLEY: No, Madam Speaker.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON, (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker I would like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Public Works. It's in connection with the land needed from the CNR for the four-lane highway west from Winnipeg to Portage. Has the Manitoba government made a formal request for the land they need either to the Board of Transport Commissioners or to the Federal Government?

MR. WEIR: Madam Speaker, there was a hearing once scheduled and it was called off at our request, pending further negotiations with those that were involved in the land. The negotiations have progressed to the point where we have asked the CNR to proceed with an amended form of their original abandonment which will make this possible. I fully expect that the hearing will be called in the very near future.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT: (Leader of the Opposition), (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, a supplemental question. Did I understand from the Minister that the hearing was suspended at the request of the government?

MR. WEIR: Yes, Madam Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Has a new request been made to have the hearing proceed with.

MR. WEIR: Yes, Madam Speaker.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI, (Burrows): I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Is there any truth or have we heard anything further about the production and discovery of new oil below the present producing formations in southwestern Manitoba?

MR. LYON: I'll take that as notice, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for papers standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that an humble address be voted to His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg relative to the Arts Centre development and the redevelopment of the area south of the CPR line and east of Main Street.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HONOURABLE ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs), (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, I would be prepared to accept this order subject to those matters that are currently under negotiation between the province and the city.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for papers standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside that an humble address be voted to His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, praying for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and the Metropolitan

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd).....Corporation of Greater Winnipeg relative to the Arts Centre development and the redevelopment of the area south of the CPR line and east of Main Street.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker I would be prepared to accept this order also, subject to the same reservation concerning matters currently under negotiation between the province and metro.

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

HONOURABLE CHARLES H. WITNEY, (Minister of Health), (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Education that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider the following bills: No. 3, an Act respecting Public Health and No. 36 an Act to amend the Manitoba Evidence Act.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre took the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may have the indulgence of the Committee just prior to going into the bills to draw to the attention of the House a matter that I thought some Irishman may have raised on Orders of the Day, namely that today is St. Patrick's Day and I think that this could be an occasion for us in this Assembly to forward our appreciation to the Irish Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba for the job that he is doing on behalf of Her Majesty here in the Province of Manitoba. I recall when the honourable gentleman was a member of this Assembly that every St. Patrick's Day we did have on our desk before us a little pot of shamrocks. I presume, Mr. Chairman, that this custom has not been followed recently because of the fear that it might be a violation of the impartiality of the Crown in matters politic. But I do think, Mr. Chairman, it would be a nice gesture on the part of this Assembly to wish all of the Irish in Manitoba, and those who would like to be Irish, many happy returns of the day, and in particular to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba.

HONOURABLE DUFF ROBLIN, (Premier and Provincial Treasurer), (Wolseley): Mr. Chairman, I am sure we all appreciate the gracious thought of my honourable friend and I suspect that the Chairman of the Committee might have a good deal of pleasure in conveying to His Honour the sentiment that's just expressed. I think we all concur in this tribute to St. Patrick, the patron saint of the Irish. My only claim to any connection in this respect is through my mother-in-law, a very distinguished lady indeed, who, I believe, rejoiced in the maiden name of O'Higgins.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, before we start on Bill No. 3, there are some very minor amendments in the latter part of the Bill that I would ask the clerk of the House to distribute, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee ready to proceed? Sections 1 to 33, subsection 12, of Bill No. 3 were read section by section and passed.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, on (12), while there is not an amendment before you (12) reads now, "declaring certain conditions or circumstances to insanitary conditions," the word "be" should be added "declaring certain conditions or circumstances to be insanitary conditions and declaring that certain acts contribute to insanitary conditions." This one was noted at the last moment, that's why you haven't got it before you. I will move that that amendment be made --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Subsection 12 as amended passed. Subsections 13 to 16 were read and passed.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 3 be amended by striking out the word "disinfestation" in the second line of clause (17) of section 33 thereof and substituting therefor the word "disinfestation".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Subsection 17 as amended, passed. Subsections 18 to 30 passed.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL, (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I am not checking on any particular section or sub-clause here, but it just happens that (31) seems to be one that rather emphasizes the point that I have in mind, and that is that under this Act we have these 40 subsections dealing with powers, some of them extremely wide, that can be regulated, given the force of law by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Now this I am sure is frequently necessary but I think we were assured in the Committee that there is a general power of appeal in

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd). this Act. Is this correct? Because taking (31) as an example we here give the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council the authority to pass what becomes law to prohibit the carrying on of any business, occupation, trade or industry or of any act that may be detrimental to the public health. That's just one of many extremely wide provisions that are given to the authority of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I know that a good many matters of detail in an Act of this kind simply have to be left to regulation, but when the powers are so sweeping, I just wanted to be assured that my understanding in the committee was correct, and that is that there is a general power of appeal against the use of these powers.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, the powers and most of the regulations here have been in force under the former Act and have not given any difficulty at that time so I think they have passed the test of time, but the matters of appeal of individuals against any overt act of a member of the department is protected.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm quite aware, Mr. Chairman, that this type of legislation is not new and I take the word of the Honourable the Minister that most of these powers were contained in a former Act, --regulation-- but I still say that when such sweeping powers are contained that there's at least a possibility of some action being taken that should have the due process of appeal available to them.

Sections 33 to 41 of Bill 3 were read section by section and passed.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Act be amended by striking out clause (c) of subsection (2) of section 42 thereof, and by renumbering clause (d) of subsection (2) of section 42 thereof as clause (c). This amendment is moved, Mr. Chairman, because the Clearwater Lake Sanatorium is no longer functioning.

Sections 42as amended to 45 of Bill No. 3 were read section by section and passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, because I may not be here when this Bill comes up for third reading, I would like, just before it is concluded to have it pointed out to me exactly where the "appeal" section is in this bill.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, Section 23 provides a form of appeal for anything dealing with physical properties, and section 24 a form of appeal for dealing with persons, and on section 23 anything dealing with less than \$2,000 there is appeal contained in the regulations at the present time and on the forms that are issued under the regulations I intend to have it noted on the bottom of the forms the rights of appeal that are available to the citizens.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you very much.

The Remainder of Bill No. 3 was read and passed. Bill No. 36 was read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill be reported. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Committee has considered Bills No. 3 and 36 and have instructed me to report the same, Bill No. 3 as amended and Bill No. 36 without amendments.

IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital that the report of the Committee be received.

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

Bills No. 3 and 36 were each read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 41 and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER, (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The second reading of Bill No. 38. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I adjourned debate on this Bill to have more time to give it further study and more thorough study too. I think most of the major matters in the Bill have already been raised by the members of this House, I am particularly interested in Section 2, 4(a), which deals with the matter of guaranteeing bonds and debentures and notes and securities of the Red River Exhibition. I wonder if the Minister could tell us does this cover operating expenses as well as capital? I would like to get that information from him. There are other sections such as Section 13 dealing with the delegation of power and so on but I think I'll leave questioning on that until we come to Committee. I have no objection the Bill

(MR. FROESE, cont'd). going to Committee and that will give us further opportunity to discuss it.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, if no other honourable members wish to speak on this matter, I would like to close the debate.

The first question that was asked Madam Speaker, was asked by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and was subsequently elaborated upon by the Honourable the Leader of the NDP. It's a question concerning Section 5 of this Bill.

At the present time, Madam Speaker, Section 13 of the Metropolitan Corporation Act reads that "the Corporation may pay for the reception and entertainment of guests and for expenses incurred in matters pertaining to the interests of the Corporation, a sum not exceeding \$10,000 in any one year," and it has been suggested that certain of the entertaining that has been done by metro may not fully comply with this definition in the Act. In a previous section of the Act the wording is somewhat different, and this is a section which refers to the making of grants of money. There it says that "grants of money may be made for any purpose that in the opinion of the council may be in the interest or to the advantage of the Corporation or the inhabitants of the Metropolitan area," and they suggested that a similar wording should be used for both cases. If this amendment is passed by the House, the section that is being amended with then read: "The Corporation may pay for the reception and entertainment of guests and for expenses incurred in matters that in the opinion of the council may be in the interests or to the advantage of the Corporation or the inhabitants of the Metropolitan area." I would assure my honourable friends that this amendment is intended to deal only with this expenditure not exceeding \$10,000 in any year and for the purposes of the usual entertainment, reception of guests and so on that is done by a Corporation such as metro.

Then the Honourable Member for Brokenhead asked the question concerning the exclusion of the municipalities of Ritchot and Rosser. As the honourable member may know there is a quarter section of the Municipality of Rosser that is within the limits of Metro and is completely surrounded by the City of St. James and the City of Winnipeg. It would be hard to exclude that quarter section from the area of metro and yet it is a part of the Municipality of Rosser. So unless we make this amendment, then Rosser will remain as one of the area municipalities by the definition of area municipality and the same thing applies for Ritchot Municipality where a small portion of that municipality still lies within the boundaries of metro inside the Red River diversion. So that this is just to make it clear that even though these small pieces of those municipalities may lie within Metro's boundaries, these are not to be considered as area municipalities and will not come under The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act except for those small portions that are within the boundaries of metro.

And then we came to the famous question asked by the Honourable Member for St. George as to whether or not Metro has the authority to levy for Pan-Am Games. Well Madam Speaker I must confess that this is a confused issue. I think that prior to amendments to the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act there was no doubt that metro did not have such authority because the section which would apply, I believe, is Section 4, subsection 8. That section reads: "The Corporation may be resolution of the Council make grants of money," and then it goes on to refer to the things to which grants of money may be made -- "charitable or philanthropic institutions duly authorized under The Charities Endorsement Act to canvas or solicit for funds, for aiding athletic or aquatic sports and for any other purpose that in the opinion of the Council may be in the interests or to the advantage of the Corporation or the inhabitants of the Metropolitan area," but it's I believe clear from the original section that this was intended to be grants of a nature to assist in sporting events or this sort of thing, not of a capital nature such as are the present requirements of the Pan-Am Games Committee.

This section was amended to include another subsection dealing with grants towards the capital cost of hospitals. So that now with this additional subsection in there there could be a conflicting opinion given as to whether or not Metro could make grants of a capital nature for aiding athletic or aquatic sports, and this is the reason why I have hesitated to give the House a legal opinion on the matter, I think it's something that would require a great deal of research and study before an adequate opinion could be given. And I think also that it depends on what sort of a grant metro may be asked for. If they were asked for a grant to assist in the building of a swimming pool so that the Pan-Am Games could be properly staged, then I believe that there would be grave doubts as to whether metro had this authority. I do not believe they have. If on the other hand they were asked for a grant to assist in the entertainment of the athletes who were coming to this area to take part in the Pan-Am Games, I think probably a very good

(MR. SMELLIE, cont'd). case could be made out for metro having this type of authority. So that it is very difficult for anyone to answer a blanket question which just says, has metro the authority to make grants to Pan-Am Games?

I wish Madam Speaker, that I could make it clear to the House that I'm not trying to avoid the question. It's simply that at this time I do not have a properly prepared legal opinion that would cover all of the ramifications of this question. That legal opinion will be sought and I hope that I may have it ready before this matter comes up in committee.

Then the Honourable Member for Assiniboia asked some other questions concerning the proposal to extend Metro's authority to allow the guarantee of certain liabilities that may be incurred by the Red River Exhibition. As the honourable members of this House know, the Red River Exhibition is a relatively new undertaking. It has been carrying on now in this area for some years and has been an increasingly attractive entertainment to this community. It has been growing year by year that it has been sponsored in the Winnipeg community. The Red River Ex has for some years been looking for a permanent home and they have not been able to find a permanent home for a variety of reasons --one of them being that they have not sufficient capital in order to pay for such a permanent home outright; and secondly that they do not have the ability or the credit on which they could borrow sufficient capital in order to provide this permanent home. They have talked to the Metropolitan Corporation from time to time and have made a proposal to the Metropolitan Corporation suggesting that a similar arrangement might be worked out as that evolved for the City of Winnipeg who guaranteed the debentures of the Winnipeg Enterprises to allow the building of the Winnipeg Arena. This is the proposal that is before the House. It is for the guarantee of the capital expenditures to acquire a site and the necessary facilities for the proper staging of the Red River Exhibition, such site and facilities to be approved by metro. It is in the nature of a guarantee only. I would trust that this should never become a liability on the taxpayers of metro but of course no guarantee can be entered into without that possibility existing, so that I can't give the honourable members any guarantee that the taxpayers of the area would never have to accept any liability under this item. I think however that the chances are good that they may never be called upon to make any such payment.

Then the honourable member asked a question concerning Section 6 and he suggested he wasn't very concerned about it. I thought I had explained this section when introducing the Bill. This is merely a section which says that the Metropolitan Corporation is deemed to continue even though all of the members of that Corporation retire and have to be re-elected. It's a usual section that you will find in The Municipal Act and in other similar statutes, which provides that this is a continuing corporation even though the membership might change. Any act commenced by one council may be continued and completed by a succeeding council. It's not a totally new corporation. It's the same body and this is just allowing that continuity that I think we all deem to be desirable.

And then the Member for Assiniboia talked about the problems of planning. I think I should explain Madam Speaker that the problems concerned with planning were one of the major reasons for the establishment of a Metropolitan Corporation in the first place, because it was very difficult to establish any consistent planning that crossed a municipal line, and as an example we had one municipality building a major thoroughfare up to the borders of an adjoining municipality and it came to a dead end there because the adjoining municipality could see no need for continuation of that thoroughfare within their own borders. I believe that it was absolutely necessary that there should be some overall authority to provide for such things as arterial streets and things of this nature. He then went on to talk about one of the problems of zoning, and he referred to a specific example in the City of St. James where, although the St. James Council objected to a particular use of land, at the same time that use of land had been authorized by a bylaw passed by the same Council of the City of St. James. When metro was established metro took over responsibility for the administration of that bylaw and I think it would be improper for metro to refuse a permit to any applicant for a use which complied with the existing bylaw. Of course this whole matter is at present under review because metro is now in the position where they have prepared their master development plan and the new comprehensive zoning bylaw. These have been subject to some considerable criticism of recent months and I understand they are now being reviewed and revised before any further public hearings take place; but that when the overall plan is completed we should not any longer have any problems such as the one that existed and my honourable friend referred to, where the municipality responsible for the passing of the bylaw complained because metro

(MR. SMELLIE, cont'd). . . . enforced it. I think that this is a matter that should be ironed out when Metro have completed their review of zoning.

And then the Honourable Member for Elmwood made a suggestion in a brief speech that was loaded with punch that now is the time to forget the concept of metro and to wipe out all the municipalities as they had no function left whatsoever except collection of garbage or something, and police, and fire, and that now was the time that we should consider total amalgamation. Well I think my honourable friend would get a darn good argument if he went to any one of the 14 municipalities remaining in the Metropolitan area. I don't think they would agree with him when he says that their jurisdiction is now so limited that they serve no useful purpose. I think we still have a need for the 14 municipalities that make up the area of Metropolitan Winnipeg. I think that those municipalities today are as different as the people that comprise this House. They each wish to develop in their own way. And if you try to tell the City of St. Boniface that they are the same as the City of Winnipeg or the City of St. James you'll get a real good argument; and justly so, because each of those municipalities have their own distinctive qualities and I think they should be allowed to maintain those distinctive qualities and to develop in their own way.

Madam Speaker, it is very difficult to discuss a bill, an amending bill that covers so many items as this bill does on a matter of principle. Most of the questions that have been asked have been questions of detail that could more properly be asked in Committee. I have no doubt when the bill does go to Committee there will be many more questions asked and perhaps we will have someone there better able than I to answer in detail.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 43. The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS, (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to take part in this debate this afternoon, although I will be very brief. As you no doubt have noticed, as you know Madam Speaker I am always bending backwards to try to encourage the government with their good legislation, to try to congratulate them, although I admit that it has been difficult lately to find anything to be able to congratulate them for. But I think that this Act that we have in front of us is a very good Act. It is something that was sorely needed up to now and I think that this will certainly improve the treatment of mental disorder of the people that are suffering same from our province here. I also feel that the Minister is very wise. He told us that in Committee we will have a chance to ask questions to some of the experts. It is rather a large Bill and I think there's a lot of, a little clarification that we would like to have.

I was interested mostly in part one, the admission to hospitals of people seeking treatment for mental disorder. I think that this is a good improvement. We have the compulsory and non-compulsory admission. We have people that feel that they would like to follow a treatment; they feel that they are sick; and it covers the people that are suffering from intoxicating liquor as well as narcotics. It will be easier to understand and easier to operate. This Act now replaces, I think it was three of the previous Acts that we have had before plus some amendments. There is something I would ask the Honourable Minister in closing the debate. I wonder if he could tell us a little more. At first it didn't dawn on me that maybe the St. Amant Ward in the San, --the St. Boniface Sanatorium-- would be covered here in this Act. There are certain things I would like to know. It seems that many of the points anyway would be aimed mostly at adult patients. I think this is all that we want to say at this time. Certainly we are very pleased to see this go to second reading, to go to Committee, and we will try to get more information when we are in Committee.

MR. S. PETERS, (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks 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 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 ask the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

HONOURABLE GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, I move 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 to Consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Education.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed, I would just like to comment further on some of the statements made last evening that I think should be drawn to the attention of the Committee. As I said earlier, I congratulate the Member from Brokenhead for his thoughtful and far-reaching statement on the goals in education and consider it a very positive statement. However, there are a few matters that I thought he --there's probably some slight misunderstanding or there might have been misunderstanding created by members of the House, and I would just like to comment on a few of these. May I say at this time I think as we go through the estimates appropriation by appropriation, that some of the details may be, I can enlarge upon them as we come to them, but I want to make a few general remarks now. And just before I do that, I think I also made a little mis-statement yesterday which I didn't intend to make-- that's concerning the permit teachers. I just want to make it clear because I think I gave some figures showing the average numbers of additional teachers required over the last few years and this requirement for more teachers was brought about not only because of the raising of standards of teachers for entrance into the Teachers' College, but also, of course, the university entrance requirement and inclusion of grade 12 as a high school course. I think I mentioned only the entrance into college yesterday as being one of the main reasons for the teacher increase. I hope that will be more clear.

Last night the Honourable Member for Brokenhead mentioned that the general course is not being accepted by students and parents. Yet in the three years I would point out to him the enrollment has gone from 700 some odd students in 29 classes in 25 schools to about 3,390 students in 149 classes in some 70 schools at the present time. I hope to say a little more about the general course when we come to Curriculum. Public knowledge and acceptance of the course is growing as evidenced by the --and I'll be making a statement on this later, I hope, on the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce action. They studied the course and thought it an excellent course for entry into general business and even by the fact that certain semi-professional groups have complained that too many students are being lured into the general course, on the other hand. He also said that the general course was not being accepted, one reason is because it is a dead-end course. I really look upon this as an astonishing statement really at the present time, because quite apart from the technology --that's the Institute of Technology and the 40-odd trades that are available, the first class of graduates has not yet emerged.

Also the honourable member said, as I understood it, we should instead provide them with a meaningful alternative to the matriculation course for which they are suited and one which provides for continuation beyond high school. Of course this is precisely what the general course is designed to do and is doing. I know he doesn't imply that the large number of students who, as he says, are wasting their time in the matric course because it's not suited to them, would be better off quitting school and trying to get jobs as they have done for years, with an incomplete standing, than they would if they were to take the general course and go out into the world with a grade 12 standing in the general course.

The honourable member mentioned there is too much rigidity between the different high school courses of study and says that the student's "must be given more meaningful alternatives than they have at the present time. Once they enter these alternative courses it's as though they enter watertight compartments. Once they're channelled that's it practically." Now I know as a teacher that the Honourable Member is aware of the fact that in 1960 the then Minister of Education laid down as the very first term of reference to the general course seminars that "there must be provision for transfer between courses." A great deal of attention has been paid to this by the Seminar and Curriculum Committee and in the general course program of studies there are very clear instructions concerning transfer into and out of the general course in that manual.

I am sure he is also aware of the fact that numbers of students transfer between our high school courses every year and they have done so for years; and I am sure he is aware of the long-standing instruction on transfer between courses which has appeared in our Secondary School Publication. The fact is that the students are not in watertight compartments, I don't

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd).believe. In fact, to date we have carefully avoided any suggestion of channelling or screening which I know this group has advocated from time to time. He may be interested to know that the university entrance course has recommended a course of prerequisite standing at the end of grade 9 and this is under consideration in the final report coming forward from that seminar.

With respect to university entrance, I note the honourable member said --and this is, again, a matter of concern to all of us here and to the public and parents-- those who develop late in these alternative courses should be given the option of writing the other exam. That is the university entrance exam. Now I am sure that as a teacher he didn't mean that the student should be allowed the dubious privilege of writing examinations in June on courses they haven't studied--I wasn't clear-- maybe I'm misinterpreting the honourable member-- but based on texts they haven't read. No doubt his concern was that such students might have to go back to the beginning, say grade 10, and start over. This may be what I interpreted in this regard. I would point out that for many years the university has stated, as printed in the Program of Studies for Secondary Schools, "students who complete any of the programs of study in the senior high schools in Manitoba other than the matric course may subsequently qualify for university entrance by passing exams in at least five grade 12 subjects required for senior matriculation." This they may do without any further requirement for formal study in schools and without passing the previous grade in the matric course. The identical privilege, of course, is available to adults over 21 years of age regardless of their previous background. Now such persons are often advised to begin certain subjects like maths, science or the second language below grade 12 level for their own sake, but actually it's not a requirement. Thus the statement that, "some people leave school at grade 8. 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, is not accurate in that sense. I know, as a teacher, he realizes the wisdom of doing some preparatory work especially if one's formal schooling ended about grade 8 or 9.

I could point out, too, that the Canadian Conference of Universities has already carried out a preliminary study on the possibility of setting up a Canadian College Entrance Board with a set of objective exams which may be used by any member university of the Board. This report was presented to the Ministers of Education across Canada at the last Canadian Education Association meeting here in Winnipeg last fall. None of the Ministers were prepared on what was presented at that time to accept the report. I think the background work had been done in some provinces but not in the others, and the Ministers deferred the matter until the next meeting. The head of the, I believe it is the Royal Rhodes Military School on the west coast, was the Chairman who addressed our group at that time and presented his findings to date. This is a matter which we will be pursuing further.

There are other matters, a wide range of subjects brought up by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. I would hope that as the debate proceeds that we can discuss some of these a little more thoroughly. I think that with respect to the council of higher learning I'm prepared to share this with the honourable members, I think that while we may not have exactly the kind of council coming forward that the honourable member is recommending, from what I interpreted in his remarks last night, I can tell the honourable member that we have had three or four excellent meetings since last summer with the affiliates and the university people and now have agreed to a start in this area. I should be able to pass to the honourable member copies of that agreement which has been agreed to by the various colleges and the universities and try and get sufficient copies for any who are interested.

The Fitness and Amateur Sports Branch was mentioned by the honourable member. The leadership program carried out by the Department of Welfare at the facility in that fine town of Gimli, Manitoba, is, I think, an excellent program producing outstanding students both boys and girls who attend there in the summer I think are making a very excellent start at trying to produce leaders in larger numbers and there is the fullest working relationship between the Fitness and Amateur Sports Branch and our Manitoba Secondary School athletic program where Mr. Nick is organizing inter-collegiate sporting events, holding seminars for teachers and assisting with equipment and programming throughout the Secondary Schools. I know the honourable member is mindful of the fact that there was an unprecedented number of applications to the new Phys-Ed course at the University so I imagine in the near future we will have large numbers of these highly trained people becoming available in our own province.

With respect to the general theme of the remarks made by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead, I would say in the main this is a very complex, difficult field to grasp or to try and

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd).....convey to the members of the Committee the vast amount of work that is going into every phase of curriculum in our schools. The time and effort that is being put in by our teachers and consultants is a very wonderful thing.

I'm sorry that the honourable member was not able to attend with some of us the other morning at the Ford plant where we have now housed our visual aid centre and radio and TV services. I think he would have been impressed by the plans that are going forward in audio-visual work, especially with the new science courses where apparently its almost a necessity to have the visual aid. Half of the necessary aids have already been purchased and are available. I know as an educator he'd get a great kick out of viewing the new departmental library there and the teachers' library which is available. The whole field of radio and television, I'm afraid, is going to be an absolute necessity --not afraid, but I'm convinced will be an absolute necessity in beaming out new courses and in teacher retraining over the next few years. I don't honestly think we will be able to carry out the retraining that's necessary without audio-visual aids, without reaching teachers through television. We're starting this program in the fall as I've announced. We are getting the fullest co-operation from the CBC. We're going to need a lot more co-operation in the future. I think that it's just exploding all over the place in other words. I'm most pleased with the co-operation of the Manitoba Teachers' Society who advise me and have already participated in seminars in mathematics courses at the four to eight level and who advise me that they will lend every possible assistance in any plans the department has for retraining in the future. But spread throughout the estimates are more monies this year for teacher retraining, some is in instruction, some is in curriculum, some is in the main estimates, and we are hopeful-- as a matter of fact, it's an absolute necessity that teacher retraining go forward at full speed.

I think that's just some of the things I wanted to mention, Mr. Chairman, on some of the points raised last evening and if I haven't been clear on any of them, I'd be too happy to accommodate the honourable members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a) passed, (b) passed.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK, (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, there's some questions that I asked the Minister didn't comment, but I presume he'll do it as we go on in estimates. But there is one thing I would like to set the Honourable Minister straight on, if I may. I know that I can't equal him in debating. Maybe it's inferior complex, I don't know; but I think it deserves an answer.

Last night the Honourable Minister berated the Liberal Party for, and I might say sucking the government into giving larger grants towards smaller high schools --(Interjection)-- Three resolutions, he says. I don't think that the Honourable Minister was just as familiar with what took place as the former Minister of Education -- and probably not at the time because he's just acquired, this is the second year -- the former Minister of Education knew more about it and I presume that's why he gave us that answer. But I completely disagree with the present Minister because when he refers to these resolutions made by my party here and some of the members who are not presently even sitting in the House, I think he is wrong in that he makes the statement as if it was the Liberal Party who helped the government in this blunder. But I'll say to him that the government beforehand had already decided to go along with what a great number, through probably not knowing, through improper, not proper education, have asked the government to concede to them, and they had already decided that they will go along with the people so when the members on this side asked the government to increase the grants, I think the members were right because there was an accomplished fact. We knew that the government is willing to accept the construction, or give permission for the construction of these numerous high schools in school divisions. Therefore, I do not think that that accusation in my opinion was valid.

And I'll just go back to a certain time, I've mentioned to you before, and I'm sure that the Honourable Attorney-General if he recalls it will remember this very plainly. It was just an example of what the thinking of some of the government officials at that time was, and this happened right in my own home town at Ridgeville only about three blocks from my own residence. The Honourable the Attorney-General then was the Minister of Education, and he had his say at a meeting -- there was a meeting trying to encourage people to accept the division system. There was an inspector there, local inspector; he had his say and then the Honourable Minister had his say. I was asked to comment on it and I did not reject the divisions at that time as I have never rejected them at any time in this House. I said that I'd go along with the idea of school divisions providing these school divisions give us large

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) enough schools. I said I'm in favour of centralization, and I knew at that time that about 75 percent of the people who were listening to me did not agree with me because they were proud of their little school. By the way, it was a two-room high school at Ridgeville at that time and still is. They were proud of their little high school, but I told them I did not think that that's going to do justice to our education; it's not going to do justice to our students coming; and I said, "This may be a disadvantage. You will probably lose this school here, but in my opinion we should be willing to sacrifice this and go for the division providing there is a central school," and the Honourable Minister well remembers, I am sure, where I even suggested a site, a proposed site for this central school, and what does the Minister say? He had a second opportunity to rebuff what I had said. He got up and he said he disagreed with me in certain aspects. He says, "We are not here -- we do not come here to take away your little schools from you. You may do as you please. You may have your school at Ridgeville," he says. "Dominion City may have their school at Dominion City," which by the way was only a four-room high; and he says, "You may have your school at Emerson," which was about the same, three or four-room high school. "You may all hold your little schools; we're not going to take them away from you. Sure, the trustees are going to tell you what to do." And he says, and this was -- I'm not criticizing for this last remark -- "I hope that some future day I will be here officiating at the opening of a twelve-room high at Ridgeville."

Now isn't this an indication of what the government was willing to sacrifice? The Minister of Education said that himself. He says I'm not here to I know that the Minister wasn't here, but if the Minister would have shown leadership at that time, the way I was accused even by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead at one time that I didn't show leadership. I think I did show leadership because I was not afraid to come up before the people and tell them that you must centralize to get the fullest benefit of this new school division. I wasn't afraid, but the Honourable Minister was afraid to come up there and tell the people. "This is what you must do. This is what you should do, in order to get the best benefits." He didn't do it. He did not do it at the time, but he went along with the people. He went along with the people because the people -- and naturally they're proud; the people wished to retain those little schools, and that's not -- that kind of a division, I said it then and I say it again, is not in the best interests of rural Manitoba. And now for the present Minister to come and berate our side that we -- after it was accomplished, after we saw the way the government was going, the government permitted the construction of these small schools. Sure we said -- I didn't oppose it. I voted for it because I felt what's the difference? They're building those schools anyway; might as well help the people, because the government promised at least 50 percent to take up the slack, at least 50 percent of the total school costs before that.

So I went along with it and I voted for that resolution. I didn't introduce it because never, at any time, was I ever in favour of breaking up school divisions into small high schools. I always believed in centralization and I still do, to get the best of it. And for the Minister, of course I'm not blaming him: I'm not attacking the present Minister. Probably he wasn't aware of what the former Minister was doing. Probably, in my opinion I think that the Minister wished acceptance of this school division so badly to show that something has been accomplished in a very, very short time, in great haste, that at all costs the people should accept it, and the Honourable the Minister, then the Attorney-General, I remember very well when he spoke at another town in my village, and that was at Woodmore in there, and what did he tell the people at the time when questions were put forward? I mean, the former Attorney-General, he was asked the question, "What makes you think that the people in Manitoba are going to accept this school division idea?" And what did he use -- I don't remember the exact words but he used the word "carrot." He says yes, they were the incentive grants, \$10,000 incentive grants, to get them to come in, and he said this carrot, this carrot --

MR. PETERS: Did he say that?

MR. TANCHAK: Yes. The Minister did say it. He said "this carrot." I didn't like it and I think I made a comment. I don't think the Minister heard it at the time -- (Interjection). The Minister did; I know he did. He said this carrot is an incentive; dangling this carrot in front of the -- as if the people of Manitoba were donkeys, rabbits or donkeys to go for carrots, and lead them astray; lead them into this oblivion and ruinous policy of the former government. And I say it was, because the government if they would have shown leadership they should have insisted that the people of Manitoba in rural areas -- I am not talking about the City of Winnipeg

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) . . . or the larger -- the divisions in some cases were almost perfectly in large areas. Probably they had their complaints because the grant structure doesn't work as well as was promised them, but it's in rural areas where this government made the most serious blunder by permitting the construction of these small schools in many, and I think it was the responsibility of the government to show leadership at that time regardless of opposition wherever it came from, whether it came from the people themselves or came from the opposition benches right here. It was the duty of the government and the responsibility of the government to show leadership at that time, and they had the chance of a lifetime to make something wonderful, to create something wonderful, but you've lost the chance now. You have made nothing but cost. Yes, you can remedy that, at great cost again going on a great construction spree once more. Probably you could go ahead and turn these schools into elementary schools, but then you have to build secondary schools again at great cost to the people of Manitoba, and I don't think it is fair, I don't think it is fair to accuse the Opposition, but the present government either hides behind its civil servants or likes to put the blame on the Opposition. We were not the government at the time. You had the responsibility. Why did you pay attention to us? You had the responsibility and you had the power. I don't agree with that.

MR. PETERS: You shouldn't have brought carrots into turkeyland.

MR. TANCHAK: I mentioned before that the government had a chance to build a worthwhile division system . . . they had, and this effort, as I said, began with much fanfare, but it encountered many difficulties almost immediately. Local authorities decided to build smaller schools inadequately equipped, often only a few miles apart, and what did the government do? The government dutifully just simply paid lip service to the local control; not wishing to antagonize anyone, sat on the side lines watching this tumult.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, last Saturday as I journeyed from my constituency, between my constituency and Winnipeg, I passed through the constituency of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and as I went through one of the very nice little villages in his constituency to my left I passed a building. It was an open-sided shelter or garage, and in that garage were five school buses from medium to large size; that is, medium to large in carrying capacity. On Monday morning, those five buses conveyed 150 boys and girls to the schools in that village, and at four o'clock in the afternoon they took them home, to their homes scattered throughout the length and breadth of that particular part of the sovereign constituency of Ste. Rose. That performance, Mr. Chairman, was repeated at least four times in that one constituency 200 days of the year, and repeated many, many, many times throughout the Province of Manitoba. In 1958 when I was first here, there was something like less than ten school buses in the entire Province of Manitoba -- I don't know how many there are now; I used to give these statistics when I was the Minister of Education -- and these buses are carrying, as I say, boys and girls from the farm homes of the Province of Manitoba to and from the new high schools and the elementary schools of the Province of Manitoba, and the member from Emerson has the -- well what would be the parliamentary word? -- to stand up here and say, "You didn't have any courage; you didn't do anything, and you committed a folly in the system that you brought about." What absolute nonsense! If he doesn't want to give anybody any credit for anything, and of course he ought to say so, and I presume that would be the interpretation to put on his remarks; but a veritable revolution has taken place in the educational affairs of the Province of Manitoba right before the very eyes of the member for Emerson, and he still, still, still can't see it.

It's all very well to say, "You could have done better." Sure we could have done better. Anybody can always do better. There can always be the second guessers and the fellows that come along afterwards and say, "Yes, I could have done a better job." I am certain that it could have been done better. Indeed, I have always said, and I say again, that certainly in the field of education improvement is always going on. No system is final; no system is perfect; but it was a devil of a lot better, if you will pardon the French, it was a devil of a lot better than what was before, and if he wanted us to wait around as long as he and some of his colleagues had waited around until they came up with a perfect plan before doing anything, well he had another thought to come.

Now he's told us about that meeting at Dominion City, or at Ridgeville, and I thank him for again reminding him of one of the happy events of my life. There may be some difference of opinion about what took place on that occasion but I'll be glad -- and I've said before that I accept his version correctly. I'm not too certain that -- well, let me not say any more than

(MR. McLEAN cont'd) . . . that. I want to deal, however, with this other matter to which he made reference, the matter of the grants for school buildings, and to repeat once again the story that I have told the members of this committee and of this House and to get it into its proper context, because he very neatly just sort of used a different word than had been used by the Minister of Education last night to convey a different impression. Let me relate the story once again, and I know that it's well known to everyone.

It will be recalled that the Macfarlane Royal Commission on Education among its reports recommended an increased grant for the construction of high schools, but their recommendation was that the grant be only payable in respect of schools with -- no, I'm in error. Their recommendation was that only schools of a certain size be allowed to be built. In other words, a high school would have to be -- and I think it was 12 rooms -- or a certain size, otherwise it could not be built. Now there would be a complete prohibition against anything except a reasonable-sized high school. I informed the House, Mr. Chairman, that that particular recommendation was not being acted on by the government, and there has never been any doubt about it. I said it, sitting over right where the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is sitting now, and on the very first presentation that I made with respect to that report, so that if anyone wants to try and create the impression that somehow or other we slid over this or that it wasn't mentioned, that is not correct -- I made that point quite clear. But, the members of the Committee will remember that in the first proposed grant for high school construction we did have a system of grants that was calculated to encourage the construction of larger high schools. The schedule -- and I don't remember the details of it -- was definitely weighted in favour of the larger school, and we no sooner had it in here than the complaints began to come in from the side opposite.

Now it's perfectly correct that we must accept, and indeed do accept, the responsibility for the changes that were made, but it is also proper and I think accurate to point out the background of those changes: The Honourable Mr. Bend, who was then a member of the House, I remember it so clearly in Room 200 in committee, pleading with the Minister of Education not to be so stubborn, that obviously there was going to be real need in the Province of Manitoba for smaller high schools than those recommended by the Macfarlane Commission, and wouldn't we agree to alter our grant formula so as to make these larger sums of money available for the smaller sized schools. Mr. Prefontaine, who was a member then for the constituency of Carillon, pleading from his seat across the aisle there with the government of the day, with the government to please alter it, pointing out to us that of course obviously this wasn't fair to the small communities who needed high schools and who were going to have difficulty, at a disadvantage, if this system which we had proposed was carried through. Well, we had. I think if I recall correctly, two or three different formulas in that October session 1958, trying to be more fair at the request of the members of the Liberal Party -- I won't say the New Democratic Party because the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, he'll correct me the first chance he gets after, so I exclude him from this consideration -- but pleading with us because of the need throughout the Province of Manitoba of small high schools to serve the boys and girls of the province and so we made those changes and brought in what in effect is the present capital grants for schools.

We always do, and indeed I had always pointed out and indeed pointed out at Ridgeville, that in the final analysis of course the decision with respect to the size of schools, the decision with respect to the location of schools, was a matter to be dealt with by the trustees. Never tried to hide behind that. We could establish the law with respect to the grants; we could establish the grants; but the decisions in the final analysis were those made by the trustees, and that was the whole point of the argument, that the members of the Liberal Party were saying, well if you say the decision is to be made by the trustees then you must deal with them all on a fair basis, so we devised the grant scheme, the plan which was accepted and indeed supported, and if I recall correctly that was one occasion when I was, when there was some expression of appreciation after the stubborn Minister of Education had been prepared to make some changes for what we had done.

As soon as the system began to operate and the advantages began to be obviously apparent to all concerned, we began to get requests from the Liberal Party for further changes to make it possible for smaller schools, which we were told were very essential in the Province of Manitoba, and I remember it so well -- again the Honourable Mr. Prefontaine who was a member of the House at that time; Mr. Dow who was the member for Turtle Mountain; speech after speech, resolution after resolution, for which every last one of you voted, spoke and

(MR. McLEAN cont'd) voted to give those extra grants for the smaller high schools. And we agreed, and we accept the responsibility for agreeing. We did. And that's the situation and there isn't a man of you over there, not one, who would vote against this today, not one single one; and the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, he attended the official openings of those five high schools in his constituency, very fine high schools, and I didn't ever hear of him saying, "I'm sorry, ladies and gentlemen, that the program of the government is such that it has been possible to provide this high school here at the minimum expense to you people." I didn't hear of him saying it, and he didn't say it.

Not only that, Mr. Chairman, not only that, but high school, small high school or big high school or a middle high school, they're a devil of a lot better than the high schools that were not there at all before 1958. And there are a lot of boys and girls, a lot of boys and girls who have been getting a high school education in a small high school that you chaps think are so poor now, that didn't have a chance before those high schools were there, that didn't have a chance before those buses were there to transport them to and from the school, that didn't have a chance of even -- and I know you speak so disparagingly now of the qualifications of the teachers in the rural high schools of Manitoba; well, what kind of qualifications did they have before 1958? And what were they being paid? Those are some questions that you might take time to answer.

It's all very well to say that the millennium is not here in the field of education. That's as certain as anything; you don't have to have any intelligence to say that or to know it. But we've been doing the very best we could with the money, and giving first place in terms of money to these educational advantages. And so I say, Mr. Chairman, that these high schools have been doing a good job, and there are many young people in this province -- why do you suppose that the University of Manitoba is being crowded out almost? Brandon College; the affiliated colleges. It's because of the high school system that was brought in with the school division plan in 1958. You talk as though nothing had happened. My God, the place is exploding with people that are getting their full high school education and you chaps sit there as though nothing had happened. Well, I mustn't get over-excited.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other thing that must not be overlooked, that a number of these high schools that may have started as small high schools are being enlarged, and there are already a number of them, that you refer to in such disparaging language, that may have started life on a very modest basis, that have already been increased and that are now no longer small high schools but would be the kind of school that you had in mind -- the Honourable Member for Emerson when he spoke at Ridgeville. And this is the basis and these are growing; they're growing to accommodate the increasing number of young men and women who are taking advantage of our high school education; and not only that, Mr. Chairman, but I'd be willing to bet a Panama hat -- somebody was talking about a Panama hat yesterday -- that there are already some of them that are teaching these two courses and more of them that will be teaching the two courses before we get finished. But even if they weren't teaching the two courses, the matriculation course or the University entrance course is still -- still Mr. Chairman -- better. It's far better for somebody living up at Alonsa to be able to send his son or daughter to the "small"--in quotation marks and underlined -- high school at Alonsa, and take the matriculation or University entrance course than not to have a high school at all to which he could send his son or daughter, and while I would be the first to acknowledge that it would be nice to have in Alonsa enough school facilities for the general course, the University Entrance course, the Commercial course, and all the other things that you would like, we have neither the people to provide it nor the facilities that would allow it. And so, rather than wait for the day when we can have all these things, we go ahead and do the very best we can and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the Committee that it's been a reasonably effective job. I didn't say it was perfect. It's not finished; we know it's not finished. You don't need to tell us that. We know that. Make some positive suggestions for improvements and remember that we did it when a lot of other people who ought to have known how to do it didn't bother.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, things were progressing fairly well until the former Minister of Education thought that he should defend himself while he was the Minister of Education. I'm awfully glad he did. He's very incensed that we questioned his courage and his leadership qualities. He's talking about that we're saying that nothing happened -- we're standing there as if nothing happened. I don't want him to feel that nothing happened when my honourable friend was there. He's ready to bet a Panama hat. Why doesn't he throw the suit in? I'll bet.

What has he done that he's bragging about? Mind you, you're in good form when the Leader of the Opposition isn't here, talking about parading around his constituency. I remember that he answered you and some of these charges that you made today. What was so courageous? You received a report of a Royal Commission; you've talked about this Royal Commission many times today and other times. You're very pleased to listen to this report of this Royal Commission, the Royal Commission that was named and set up up by the former administration. And when this thing came up -- and I wouldn't put it past the former Minister of Education that he asked for an interim report of this Commission. Well this was very popular then. You hurried: you rushed this vote to try and capitalize on it to try and win an election on this. This is exactly what was done. Now he's taking a lot of credit -- all the credit.

All right, I'm not talking about the principle, I'm just talking about the courage. Why didn't he say there was nothing for 10,000 children in this province? Why didn't he say that when he was the Minister for three or four years? Why didn't he say that all these fine buses would pass in front of certain kids and not stop? Why didn't he say that if he was so brave? He was in rare form. Maybe he'll answer me today. I tried to get answers from him for three or four years. He was pointing to where he was sitting a while ago. He wasn't sitting there. He was like a bump on a log; he didn't open his mouth. He didn't have the courage to open his mouth. So in the field of Education, I think he should be very very quiet.

What did he say in 1959 about these books for instance? "One of the things that is being done, as we pointed out at the special session that was enacted in law as a matter of fact, was that of the provision of textbooks to make it possible for all children to have necessary texts for their schooling." This is what he said, but he forgot about a certain group. Why? Can he answer me now? Can he answer me? His leader said in this House just last year that if a child was entitled to 100 percent, he's entitled to 10 percent. Why after saying that all the children of Manitoba would receive this help, why did certain people didn't receive that help? Why can't they qualify for bursary, for scholarship? I would like my honourable friend to tell me. Why didn't they have the courage when these people from St. Vital were breaking an Act, weren't going to school? Why didn't they have the courage to either, if the law was wrong to rectify it, or to force these kids to go to school. Is this the man of courage that he's leading us to believe he is? I wonder if he could -- (Interjection) -- What's that?

MR. LYON: party policy.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's my party. I'm talking for myself, never mind my party.

MR. LYON: You sure are.

MR. DESJARDINS: But my party my dear friend is not hiding the way you are.

MR. LYON: You haven't got anything

MR. DESJARDINS: Just the party. The shared services committee that was named, the shared services committee that was named by my honourable friend, they didn't even go through the motion of going through the Committee. Everything was done in a Conservative caucus and then they told the people of Manitoba, except to the Opposition, if they give us the majority, we will act. Just how cheap and low can you be? How low can you be? This is once you should sneak underneath your bench. You should be ashamed of yourself. You should be ashamed of yourself. You're a bunch of gutless wonders, that's what you are, just exactly what you are. That's what I said and that's what you are.

MR. JOHNSON: Retract that statement.

MR. DESJARDINS: I will not retract that question when he's talking the way he is. I certainly will not because people that have any nerve, if they want to show the courage they have, they will stand up in here -- they will stand up and they'll talk about all the report of the Commission.

MR. JOHNSON: Take that word back.

MR. DESJARDINS:about all the report of the Commission. He's standing up

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) here telling us how wonderful he is. Well why don't you do something about these kids, and if you don't want to do anything, why don't you say so? Why don't you say so? Why do you have to hide -- hide -- and this is exactly what you've done. You hid behind a smokescreen last year. You want to know what my policy is? I made a motion last year. I made a motion that we stand up and be counted on a principle. What happened? What happened? I was ruled out of order for anticipating. Anticipating what? What did the shared service do about any principle? I'd like to know.

So my honourable friends it's all right to brag about a Royal Commission, but read Chapter 11, read all of the chapter. All right, if you don't believe in that say so. Don't hide; don't evade anything; don't go round the province like the First Minister of this House, go around and try to promote prejudice, because that's exactly what's going on, trying to divide the people of Manitoba. That's exactly what's going on. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, it's a shame, it's the shame of this government, the everlasting shame of this government. -- (Interjection) -- I know it's terrible, that's what I've been trying to tell you. It's very terrible.

When you have a commission, if you're going to brag about a certain commission, read all the chapters, and if you don't want to do anything, say so. Don't pretend. Don't play politics on a thing like this. Don't play politics. If you want to help certain kids, only certain kids, certain students with books, with transportation, say so. Don't try to be afraid and then get up on your toes the way you have been doing today and tell us how wonderful you are; how much courage you have; because you have no courage at all until you are ready to say some things about all the report of this commission.

MR. JOHNSON: the remarks of the last speaker, I would sincerely appeal to the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, in the most delicate matter which he has brought up which has deep religious political connotations, to await the introduction of the resolution on Shared Services, at which time I do hope it can be discussed in an atmosphere of understanding and goodwill by all members of this House. I am not trying to avoid any debate at this time, but I would sincerely make that appeal to the honourable member.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to answer the former Minister of Education and I'm not addicted to very high words of praise or otherwise, but there is certain things that I must challenge the former Minister of Education, and I challenge him that he was wrong when he accused the former government of not giving any opportunity to the children of Manitoba to take advantage of high school. And I challenge the statement that he made that there were something like ten buses when he took over. It is not correct, because in my own area we didn't have school divisions but we had consolidation, and in Ridgeville alone at that time we had at least seven.

MR. JOHNSON: Where were the other three?

MR. TANCHAK: And in Dominion City, neighbouring town, they must have had at least seven or more. And what about the larger school unit in Dauphin? So that statement is not correct to say that there were only 10 school buses conveying children to the schools. I disagree with him completely. It is not correct. I challenge that statement.

I did not say that this government hasn't done anything for education. I give him credit. I give him credit for the larger areas -- the former Minister -- and I said that the divisions worked almost perfectly in these larger areas. I was referring to these rural areas where there's too many schools. This government permitted the construction of small schools, and sure the Honourable Minister, the Honourable Mr. Prefontaine -- and he did mention -- sure he pleaded with the government to consider the smaller schools in remote areas, small localities where they could not build a high school. There are many such places and I have no argument there. I'm not going to argue that. I'll still say that these schools where it's impossible to build, to centralize and build a large school, sure we're willing to help them, and Mr. Prefontaine was willing to help them and so was Mr. Bend and so was Mr. Dow willing to help those, because there was the necessity right there, but whenever it was possible to centralize -- that's what I tried to say. The government should have shown leadership and insisted on centralization and they did not. That's where I say the government didn't show any leadership. That's where they failed, and that's why I say that the government had a chance to make a wonderful, wonderful division in Manitoba and help education and they have failed in the past.

Now he says, encourage the construction of larger high schools. What kind of encouragement did the government give? Yes, he said we had the carrot -- as the former

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) Minister, the Attorney-General said -- the carrot -- incentive grants. That wasn't enough. He should have shown leadership and said this is what you should do. This is what the Royal Commission on Education recommended. Larger high schools, and I am sure that the present Minister of Education will be willing to admit that there was a mistake made, that there are schools now, schools which can not give proper instruction as far as the general course is concerned. I am sure that the Minister, the present Minister of Education will agree with me, and I am not blaming him.

The Minister says we should give some suggestion how to improve it, how to improve the situation. I, myself, think -- and I gave you one suggestion -- one suggestion was that you could probably change them to elementary schools, but it's going to be costly and the fact is that this government in its haste wasted a lot -- not wasted a lot, but spent a lot of money on the construction of high schools which presently are not adequate for the curriculum that is envisioned in the general course. The Minister knows that. He tries to throw a smokescreen over the whole thing. I still say that there was a blunder made and I still say that the government did not show leadership at the time. I say that the government had the responsibility to show the people -- take more time, don't rush it through, educate the people and show them the advantages of a centralized school, a large school, and they would have accepted it if you had given them a little time, maybe a year.

Sure there was progress in education. There is progress all over the world in education -- Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario and Toronto. We are not standing still. Knowledge doubles itself in say ten years. We know there is progress, some progress, but I say there was a blunder made before. Maybe there's no sense flogging a dead horse. Maybe as the Minister did suggest, give us some concrete examples of how to remedy it. We may -- as we go through we'll do it, but I tried to refute the statement made by the present Minister. He wasn't harsh about it or anything. He tried to defend the former Minister of Education in the government, and I presume that's quite an order. We attack and for the Minister to push the blame entirely on the opposition, I think is absolutely unfair, because the government was responsible.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Chairman, I'm getting a little sick and tired of sitting across on this side of the House and hearing Liberals -- (Interjection) -- that's why I'm standing up, because to listen to the Liberals over there talk about the education and what happened when this Bill No. 2 of 1958 was through proves one thing, that a lot of politicians have a darned short memory, because, Mr. Chairman, we hear the member for Emerson now saying "haste". The government was accused of haste in bringing this bill in. We were in a hurry to get votes -- (Interjection) -- The member for Emerson. You represent a lot of area but you don't take in Emerson.

Mr. Chairman, I can remember when this bill was discussed in the Committee of the Whole stage and I'm glad the Honourable Member who spoke as he did is now visiting us because I can remember one Liberal member -- one Liberal member who had the courage of his convictions to get up and say what he thought in Committee of the Whole, and he said he thought this bill should be postponed for a year. He thought that it should be reconsidered in a year, and I'm talking for the gentleman who used to represent Birtle-Russell. What support did he get from the Liberal party in Committee of the Whole? Not an iota. Not a bit. Not one member spoke up to support him.

I want to look at some of the things that have been said about the larger schools, we should have more larger schools.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, I'd like to correct the honourable member. I supported the member and I did say that I'd rather have this bill postponed for a year; educate the people; show them the advantages of centralization and they will accept it. You are wrong.

MR. ALEXANDER: I accept the member's apology. That's not the way I remember the proceedings in the Committee of the Whole, but I accept his statement as fact. But, Mr. Chairman, I defy any member to go through Votes and Proceedings and go through Hansard of this House and see where the Liberals made an attempt to have this bill postponed in this House, because on second reading of this bill it received the unanimous consent of all members of this House, including a grant scale for larger schools.

And here I want to talk to the Honourable Member for Ethelbert-Plains. He gave us quite a lecture last night about the fact that there were too many small high schools in Manitoba. Well I can say for him, his hindsight is a heck of a lot better than his foresight,

(MR. ALEXANDER cont'd.) and it's a good job we didn't listen to him in 1958 because he made a speech on second reading of this bill asking for increased grants for smaller high schools. He asked for increased grants for six-room high schools, and if we had followed his advice we'd have been worse off now than we are. So it's a good job we don't listen to the Liberal opposition too often in this House; a good job we don't follow their advice.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that this plan has been good, and I think once again the Liberal party are trying to use a little tenor of public feeling, they're trying to feel the public pulse and see if they can't get on the right side. The member for Lakeside at that time thought that centralization was a big bogey; it was a straw man; it was what people were afraid of; and he got up and made a speech expressing his fear that what we were doing was going to centralize high schools against the wishes of the majority of the people of Manitoba. We were doing away with the small high schools; we were doing away with the community school; and he didn't like it. He said centralization was against the best interests of the people of Manitoba. I can quote what the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains said in his speech in 1958: "I think that the scale of capital grants is not in the best interests of the province." They're encouraging 12-room high schools, that he thought in 1958 was not in the best interests of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): On a point of privilege, are you reading or are you talking?

MR. ALEXANDER: Pardon?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Are you reading what I said or are you talking in your own language?

MR. ALEXANDER: I'm quoting from the honourable member's speech.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: You must have a pretty good memory if you're looking this way and telling us what you're reading.

MR. ALEXANDER: Well I'll send it over and you can check my memory. "I think that the scale of capital grants is not in the best interests of the province. They are scaled according to the size of the school facilities, the number of rooms in the school, and that is not in the best interests of the province." -- (Interjection) -- I can say, as the Honourable Member for Morris says, I hope the expression on my face lets the opposite member know what I was thinking.

I say again, Mr. Chairman, that when it comes to education in the Province of Manitoba, I think it is in the best interests of the Province of Manitoba and the people of Manitoba that we pay very little attention to the utterings of the Liberal party in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, the first thing I want to say at this time is that I don't blame the former Minister of Education for his feeling of frustration and chagrin because I -- (Interjection) -- Not chagrin? Just frustration and perhaps a trace of anger then. That was a rousing speech he made a few minutes ago. No, I think in this case it was a justified defence, because in 1958 and '59 I sat here as a new member of this Assembly, and because I was at that time a new member I can recall very vividly what was going on, perhaps more vividly than I can now, and among other things I can remember the trouble that was given the government and the Minister by members of the Liberal party. They indulged in what I would prefer to call shifty manouvreing on this issue of the size of high schools.

It is no secret that the type of grant schedule that was implemented was deliberately designed to provide financial inducement to the people in the areas, inducement for them to build larger schools. Now, right after, there began a campaign on the part of some members of the Liberal party -- I don't think that the member for Selkirk indulged in it nor any of the front bench, I don't recall that too well -- but I do know that there was a campaign waged to let it be known in rural Manitoba that the sliding scale grants system was going to centralize the schools, or have the effect of centralizing the high schools, and they began to propose resolutions, etc., asking the government to equalize the grants schedule.

Now at that point I entered into the picture because I proposed to the Minister of Education of that time that in some certain instances a good case could be made for equalizing the grant schedule. In fact I think I sent him a memorandum to the effect that in cases where geographics set -- the patterns of settlement were sparse, in areas where there were relatively remote pockets of settlement, etc., it was just not feasible to have these areas

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . incorporated into a large central high school system and that these people would then in effect be penalized by the sliding scale schedule. I suggested at that time that these special cases could apply for the full 75 percent grant upon approval by a sort of a boundaries commission or a certain quasi-judicial committee or commission, and I think still that it was a very valid and a very worthwhile suggestion.

Now I don't know where the fault lies, perhaps to some small extent it does lie with myself for having proposed such a course of action. I don't know whether it lies with the Minister in accepting too many applications for full grants for the smaller schools, etc., but one thing I am sure of, Mr. Chairman, and that is that the campaign that was waged to reduce the incentive for the larger schools was begun by members of the Liberal party and there can be no escaping that statement. This is the plain fact of the matter. Therefore it is to me so very strange that these same people who advocated this in '58 should now be chastizing the Minister for doing in effect more or less what they wanted in the first place. -- (Interjection) -- Latter Day Saints perhaps is an accurate description.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to break into this dog fight that is going on as to who is responsible and who is not responsible for the proliferation or for the construction of some of these smaller high schools which are now thought to be undesirable, but I do want to interject a few comments to the present Minister of Education. We can narrow down our area of disagreement on what was said by him and what was said by me, and I've just got a few points here.

First of all, I would like to say to him that I readily admit that there would be some practical difficulties in trying to inject more flexibility as between the various high school courses, but because there are some difficulties inherent in this approach does not mean that we must not investigate it from all possible angles. I am suggesting when I talk about giving the student in the general course an option to write matriculation course exams, I am suggesting that it should be worked out so that at most he would not have to duplicate or spend more than one year upgrading into the other course of study.

I think perhaps we could think also of an expanded summer school high school program so that those who do very well indeed in the general course might, by a well developed summer school high school program, perhaps catch up enough to attempt the supplementals of the university entrance exams or to attempt what I hope some day will be instituted, namely, a University Entrance Board of examinations -- or a set of examinations sponsored by the University Entrance Board.

The Minister intimated in his remarks this afternoon that there has been a report by a committee that has investigated this possibility of having a national university entrance board established and he intimated that he was not too impressed, or at least several ministers of education were not too impressed by the potential or the possibility. I would suggest that there must be something amiss because in the United States this is a very common practice, a very common, shall I say phenomena that there does exist in fact a university entrance board which sets examinations which are accredited by many of the major universities. I cannot emphasize this enough because I feel this set of examinations for university entrance could help to inject flexibility into our educational system.

I do not suggest this set of exams as being in lieu of high school exams but rather as an additional set open to the students who do very well in the general course, and with some additional upgrading they could then attempt these exams. I also intend them -- I think they could be intended for graduates of the matriculation course who could write the high school exams and then for safety sake attempt the other set if they so wish. That's up to them. It gives a measure of individual choice, and more important perhaps, this conceived set of exams could be open to adults who as I said last night in their adult years -- early adult years, middle adult years, it doesn't matter -- will become well read and can attempt these exams on their own. Unorthodox? -- perhaps. Does it hold promise? I think so.

Now that was one point. The other point is that the Minister, the present Minister of Education -- I don't want to leave the impression for a split second that he is not doing a good job, but I want to suggest to him also that he is perhaps too much of a diplomat. Any disagreeable criticism that comes up he sidesteps it very neatly and manages to somehow evade the crux of the question.

For example, Mr. Chairman, for example I had some pointed criticism to make about the amount of enrolment in the university entrance high school course as opposed to

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) the number enrolled in the general course, and I said that the general course, despite its quality and I believe it to have good quality, is not being accepted. The Minister retorts today that the general course is coming along; it's being accepted because he suggests that today we have some 3,300 students enrolled in the general course.

Mr. Chairman, this does not take care of the criticism because 3,300 high school students enrolled in the general course out of how many? Out of 54,000. In other words, we have today a situation where in Grade 10 for example 14,000 students are enrolled in the university entrance course -- 80 percent; in the general course, 1,200 -- six percent. The distribution or the division -- the allocation is wrong, Mr. Chairman, and this problem has to be met; the problem must be dealt with. In Grade 11 in university entrance we have 15,500, 80 percent of the total high school population; in the general course in Grade 11 as opposed to 15,000 we have 558, again the ratio 80 percent in the university entrance course, six percent in the general course.

Now what do these students do? Let's take the Grade 11 enrolment: 15,000 take the matriculation or university entrance course, but of that number how many will in fact go on to university? Not that 80 percent you can be assured. Somewhere closer to 15 percent -- 13 percent -- and so to try and be as brief as possible, Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Minister that our university entrance course which has just been revised last year to add one additional course -- am I right, it now contains eight courses -- it is designed to be rigorous and challenging and so it must be for those students who want to go on to university type higher education. But it's not accommodating these students only. It is also accommodating those who certainly intend not to go on to university. It's accommodating 80 percent of our high school population, when in truth if it were really rigorous and challenging and if the students did well in their exams it should really be accommodating somewhere closer to 30 or 40 percent of the high school population and the other 30 percent or so should be accommodated in the general course, not as we have at the present, six percent.

The record speaks for itself. The general course -- something has to be done to make it more acceptable. I am not suggesting that the course content has to be improved to any great amount because I believe that the content is of high quality for the purposes for which it is designed. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Minister has clearly in mind by now, I think he did last night have clearly in mind what I was getting at, but because of his diplomatic personality he just chose to hold that problem in abeyance.

I would also like to take an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to put to the Minister a remark or two about the issue of parochial schools. I am of the firm belief that this government is trying to do the best it can with this problem, and I for one can assure the Minister that I do not intend to work mischief on this particular issue, but I would hope in return that the Minister will persuade his colleagues not to try to work mischief in return.

So far, we have managed to keep the issue out of the realm of partisan politics, but then I heard a suggestion a couple of months ago to the effect that the government was going to proceed with this matter only if it could have the assurance, the pre-assurance of a certain proportion of the parties in the opposition, and I suggest that that is working mischief. On what constitutional authority or on what constitutional practice or convention do they base such a course of action, that the government will not act unless the opposition pledge themselves in certain proportions to sustain their course of action.

Now it's still not too late and I would hope, with assurances from this side that we do not intend to work mischief and manouvre, that the government will in turn undertake not to work mischief and insist on some sort of newfangled constitutional practice whereby they're going to hold a proportion of the opposition parties responsible, where they're going to hold a certain proportion of the opposition parties in honour bound somehow to support them. Let's not have any of that. If they put their cards on the table, members will vote according to their own conscience, and that being so, it will be across party lines. How then can it become a partisan issue? I don't know, I think that's an entirely reasonable suggestion and I would hope the Minister would think about it.

I would also point out to the Minister, in case he or his staff is not yet aware and I'm quite sure they must be, there's been an entirely new concept adopted in American education just as of a few weeks ago, and that is the concept of the -- and it has to do with shared services, but yet not in the sense that we have heard the term shared services used before -- and that is they are now speaking about the construction of education centres which

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) would not be organic parts of the existing schools but which would provide certain basic services to a number of schools in relatively close proximity. It would be kind of a central position from which the existing conventional schools would avail themselves of satellite-type services. Now the rest of the matter of detail would have to be gone into, but it seems to be a concept which might lend itself to some practical use in this problem.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a straightforward question, not a rhetorical question, and that is there has been mounting discussion in Canada these days about the problem of crisis and confederation, bilingualism, biculturalism and so on, and it has been suggested now more and more often by various leaders in our society that the best single act of faith that could be shown by the rest of Canada to the French-speaking citizens of this country would be for some provinces to allow the French communities to use French as a language of instruction. So I would ask the Minister, has he received any formal request or submissions from interested associations or groups, and if he is at all in a position to answer, would he indicate his thinking on that matter.

And then before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take the time to correct one misapprehension regarding my remarks on the idea of regional centres of continuing education. I used the term last night, "community centres of continuing education," and some have the idea that we mean here centres of continuing education in every community, which would obviously be an impracticability, but there are definite regions in Manitoba, I don't know how many, eight or nine or so, and in each of these I can conceive -- I suggest we should conceive of the possibility of establishing these regional continuing education centres providing a multiplicity of educational services to young and old alike in which we would utilize the Fitness and Amateur Sport leadership people, the ARDA people, etcetera, etcetera.

So, Mr. Chairman, with apologies for wherever I've been repetitious, I'm interested to hear the Minister defend the current practice as between general course and university entrance course enrolment proportions.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to try to lecture anybody. I suppose maybe I'm not quite as capable. I suppose we could bring up some pertinent matter later on as we come to different items, but I'd like to get back into this little dog fight that the Honourable Member from Brokenhead has said. I noticed that the former Minister of Education seemed to think that before he took over there was practically nothing done for education. I disagree with him completely. Then the Honourable Member from Roblin spoke for quite a while but I don't think he said too much, except frown at us across here, but we're not too scared of him.

But coming back to this nothing being done for education, I completely disagree with him. The present Minister, and rightly so, boasts about the enrolment, and it is gratifying to learn that our high school enrolment increased by about 79 percent, if I heard him correctly, since 1959. This makes an average of about 15 percent annual increase and I'm happy that there is an increase, and although the government could take some credit for this increase -- I'm not taking away the credit from them for some of it -- but I do not think that the government deserves the full credit that it claims because to me it seems that there are three main reasons for this increase.

One, as I say, that the government helped along -- I'll give credit there -- but there is three besides. It's a natural increase in the post-war school population and I'm sure the Minister will agree with me -- a natural increase. The second one is the greater appreciation of the value of higher education. People are more aware of that nowadays because everybody demands that. No matter where they go they look for some position, for some job, and they're asking them what qualifications, and that's taking effect. People are more aware of it. The third one is the expansion of our economy. That has an awful lot to do -- and it's happened all over across Canada as I mentioned before. I'm sure that the Minister will agree with me that educational opportunities steadily kept increasing since 1870. Maybe not as fast as at the present time, the last ten years, but there have been opportunities -- there were greater opportunities. It's a case of necessity.

But it is absurd to point a finger at the former administration like the Premier did the other day, and what did he say? He said that today people are suffering because of lack of educational opportunities of the former government. I think it's absurd to point fingers at the former administration because we could do the same thing. The same reasoning we could apply it to almost anyone. We can apply it to the former Premier Roblin in here and then go down the line, Norris, Bracken, Garson, and say people are suffering. I think it's almost silly

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) to say that they're suffering. Times change so rapidly. I think this accusation is completely partisan, unjust and prejudicial. It's absolutely not fair.

The same could be said of the sitting Premier or the present Minister five years hence. The same thing could be said of them, that some of the people are suffering because there isn't adequate provision made for probable changes that come in a little later. Time doesn't stand still. I would say even now some people are suffering, if you can call it suffering. I think it's the wrong term. Even now some people are suffering due to the lack of opportunities as mentioned before. They can't take advantage, some of them, of the present general course, so that statement I don't think we on this side will accept. We'll accept some, probably some blame as any former administration will, not blame but it's the times mostly.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: I'm sorry I missed what was supposed to have been an excellent defence of his position by the Attorney-General while he was the Minister of Education. I hope I find time to read it. It must be very interesting because he'd have to make an exceptionally good speech to erase the blunders and mistakes that he made when he was the Minister of Education.

Somebody said that one of the statements he was supposed to have made was that the education wasn't so good under the former government, or it wasn't there at all. Well, Mr. Chairman, when you look around this House you see the product of that education. I think that it wasn't a hundred percent but you must also remember that a bit depended on the raw material too, and if anybody feels that he didn't receive the kind of education that he should have received, then of course he's got to look at it both from the schooling he received and what went into that school in the first place.

Now we've heard this afternoon that myself and others of the Liberal Party are to blame for the small schools in the province because we suggested that the scale of grants towards construction should not be less for a small school than they should be for a large school. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think if you read what was said then very carefully, you will note that when we did ask for equivalent grants it was because we understood that there would be on the fringe areas of this province places where you could not build a large central school. It just wouldn't work; you wouldn't have the pupils to teach in the first place, the number of pupils that would be required in a large school, and it was our feeling that these outlying schools, because they were in poorer areas than the schools that find themselves in the more populated areas, they were poorer economically; they were on the fringe of the province; and they required assistance much more than did the others. And it stands to reason, the same thing holds true today.

But there is another angle that we must look at, and that is when we were asking for increased scale of grants for construction, we knew at that time that the ultimate size of the school that was to be constructed lay in the hands of the Minister, and whether the grant was smaller or bigger, it was up to the Minister to decide whether that grant should go for a small school or a large school. Immaterial of what we said at that time, it was the Minister's responsibility, immaterial of the size of the grant, to decide whether the grant should be made for a four or five, an eight or a twelve room school, and that is where the Minister failed. He didn't do that. His measurement stick was political expediency and not what was good for the area. There's no question about that at all, Mr. Chairman.

Where the big mistake was made is that they tried to put in the recommendations of the commission in piecemeal and using those pieces which were best suited for their purposes. That's where the first mistake was made, and it is going to take a lot of money and a little bit of time to correct those errors. Had the recommendations of the commission been followed we wouldn't find ourselves in the position that we find ourselves today, and no amount of talking by the Honourable Attorney-General is going to do anything but strengthen the fact that those statements are true.

I wish I could suggest to the Honourable Minister as to what he is to do now, but it was his colleague that got him into that jackpot and I don't think he has to blame the opposition or ask the opposition to get him out of it. You just simply have to find a way of doing it. It's most unfortunate because we have hundreds of children in the Province of Manitoba today and there aren't anywheres near the equality of opportunities than there were in 1958 -- hundreds of them.

As I said yesterday, and I don't want to repeat myself because I don't think we should waste too much time on any of these items, once a point has been made that's sufficient, but as far as equality of opportunity, the cry that brought this government back into the seats they now

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd.) hold, that pledge -- and it was a solemn pledge and it was believed in all faith by those who heard it -- has not been kept. I think if we didn't bring this to the attention of the government then the government could tell us in three or four years from today, why didn't you tell us earlier? We didn't know the situation existed. They are using that means now to explain some of the mistakes they have made, and I say, Mr. Chairman, it's not anything that we are happy about. I for one am very sorry to see that that situation exists, and I do hope that the government will find a way in which to correct it, to make sure that equality of opportunity is available to every child as was so seriously and sincerely expressed by the former Minister of Education and the other members of the front bench.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister of Education asked that maybe we should wait until the Shared Services Committee tabled the report before we discuss this. I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister, first of all can he give us any idea when this will be done? This committee is finished, they had the last meeting and there's no sign of this report; and secondly, will the government or the Minister move that the report be concurred with? I think that this is something that we want, I know, because this is something that should be discussed here while we are going on the estimate of the Department of Education unless we are positive that there will be another chance later on. This was something very important last session and certainly I imagine that many members of the House would like to take part in that debate.

. continued on next page

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, so far I have been unable to get into the debate here, yesterday and today. First of all I would like to say to the Honourable Member from Roblin, if he finds it so boring on the other side he should come over to this side. And I think this is a fact, that I don't think there's much more boring than to be a back bencher in the government, especially to come out and speak very good of the government when there is so little to say.

Coming to the matter at hand, I would like to say that two divisions have been formed in my constituency over the last year, the Division of Rhineland and the other one is the Garden Valley, and both of these are functioning at the present time. I think they are trying to do their best under the circumstances. Both of the divisions haven't got their own schools as yet. They have built huts to accommodate the students on a temporary basis. In one division a new school is being constructed at the present time, but in the other one this is pending and most likely a vote will be held some time this year.

Now the report of the department mentions that there is a shortage of secondary teachers, secondary high school teachers, and that one of the biggest problems in the immediate years ahead will be to supply these secondary teachers. I just wonder what the department is doing to increase the supply of high school teachers. Certainly we know that most of the high school teachers get their qualifications after they have been teaching in elementary schools for some time and I feel the answer is that we should increase the enrolment in our teachers' colleges and induce more people to go in for teaching. I think this is the only way we can increase the supply of high school teachers.

The report makes mention of this need and they also give the reason for this. They state that there is an increase in population, which we all know; there is a higher standard of admission to the university, senior matriculation is now mandatory; and also more pupils attend high school longer. So that this condition, if it is not corrected, will continue and will get worse if we do not have an increase. I think the answer lies to a degree and that we should consider adopting a semester system for high schools. In this way we could make better use of our high school teachers who are in short supply; there would be less time lost as far as the students are concerned. They wouldn't have to sit a whole year in school and find at the end of the year that they didn't make the grade and that they've lost a whole year. If we had a semester system this time would definitely be shortened by at least half the time and I think the facilities too would be put to better use in that way.

This would also open the door and lend itself for other people to use our school facilities such as those that might be temporarily unemployed who might want to better their qualifications, or some people who might be able to get leave on a short-term basis and might avail themselves in that way of continuing education. I know for a fact that we've had students where they spent a whole year in high school and then probably toward the tail-end they took sick, or because of some reason or other they were unable to write their exams, and in this way missed a whole year's work. I think this is wrong and we should certainly do something about this. Just what is being done I would like to know from the Minister in this case. What are we doing for these people who probably fail one or two subjects in a given year? We know that United College is giving some service in this respect but it's an extra cost to the parents. The teachers college apparently puts on some courses but I think this is too poorly advertised. People don't know about it and we should let them know, get this across so that they could avail themselves of the service -- so that we could put the services that we are offering in this respect to greater use.

Another matter that I would like to raise is the matter of accreditation. Here again we find that the city schools that are accredited have a great advantage over the high schools and division schools in the province, and we find that this is based purely on teacher qualification and the facilities and that the student is not taken into consideration. I think this is wrong too, because the ability of the student definitely should play a role in this matter. We would naturally find that students who have a poor memory would find it difficult to pass in an annual exam where they might pass quite easily had we the semester system or where in an accredited school he has been making good tests throughout the years, the exams that are on a shorter term basis. So I think we are discriminating against our division schools in the country and also the others in the surrounding suburban areas.

Also, in my opinion, the teachers that are instructing in our secondary schools, the schools themselves might not qualify for accreditation but these same teachers, later on when the government exams are written, they are asked to mark these papers. They were not good enough in the first instance to judge the student, whether he was qualified and would make a

(MR. FROESE cont'd) pass, but when it comes to marking an annual exam he is hired to do so and he is good enough for the job, so I think if we recognize him in one place we should recognize him in the other as well.

I would also like to mention the matter of the general course. Here we find that only the larger division schools will be able to offer the general course, and what this could lead to is that the smaller division schools where you do not have sufficient pupil enrolment, that they might fill one classroom with the general course students and not have sufficient students to fill a second classroom and that they therefore would have to take the matriculation course, and vice versa the same could happen the other way around. So I am not completely satisfied that this is the proper thing we are doing. Secondly, I am also not sold on the general course at all.

Very often, or so often I find mentioned that in the future only about 30 percent of our students will qualify or pass the matriculation course. Now who makes the decision as to who is to enter the general course and who will take the other course. If this is a matter completely for the teacher or the principal to decide, I think we're embarking on a new principle in education because the parent no longer maintains the right in deciding as to what course his or her child will take. This will mean that we are now handing this matter over to the state and the state will make the decisions and rob the parent of the say-so. I think this will also bring about more private schools in this respect because we will find that our private schools more or less will not go in for the general course but will stick to the matriculation course. I would like to know from the Minister whether that is not the case, because as far as I can see it, I can't see where the general course will be accepted in our private schools.

Last year the Minister tabled a progress report on the work of the committees that had been set up on curriculum. I studied the report and I felt it gave us a lot of information. I wonder if we are going to get a further report this year on those committees or on the work that the committees have done; how far they have proceeded, and so on. I for one would appreciate getting a report on this.

I also notice from the Department of Education report on the Manitoba absenteeism, and here they claim that pupils could not attend school because they didn't have warm clothing and proper footwear and so on. Well this appears to me that the other departments of the government, namely the welfare department, is not doing their job otherwise certainly our pupils should be able to attend school whether it's winter or not.

I have some further matters that I'd like to bring up but I think I can probably do it just as well under the various items of the estimates and will wait until that time.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, there was some mention made and discussion took place in reference to the university and the Board of Governors at the university. Now I do hope that the Honourable Minister will give careful consideration to the fact that the present system is truly a good system. I know that there has been a movement afoot, and names such as Professor Morton have been connected with this movement, but I think that any changes in this direction truly would be embarking on a very dangerous experiment, and the reason I say it would be embarking on a dangerous experiment, Mr. Chairman, is that it is not unlike having management and labour in a business establishment. You must have, on the one hand, management that has its proper functions to perform, and this is the Board of Governors at the university. On the other hand, you have labour in a business establishment which is the academic instructional staff, and I think that if you were to consider — if you were to consider and place any member of the academic staff on the Board of Governors, I can assure you that if they were fair with themselves they would be confronted with the question of what master to serve, and I don't think that they can serve two masters. That's exactly what we would be asking them to do if we permitted members of the academic staff to have a voice or a say in the function that the Board of Governors performs today.

I have the utmost of respect for the academic staff at the university in the various departments because they are truly the educators of our younger people, and these younger people are eventually going to become leaders of our society, but we can not expect them to be the managers of their own functions which they perform at the University of Manitoba. On the Board of Governors you have businessmen; you have members of the alumni, some of whom are business people; others are from the teaching profession; and I think that at most there is an effort made to try and get a cross section of the community on the Board of Governors. There are people on this board who are trained in finance, people who are trained in management, and I think that we should encourage the members of our Board of Governors to

(MR. SMERCHANSKI, cont'd). . . . continue to preserve and strengthen the management function at the university level. We have an excellent system which is handled by the Senate, and you only have to be a member of one or the other parties to truly appreciate the important functions and duties that these people perform. I think that if we were able to sit in on a discussion or a meeting of the Board of Governors at the university, or sit in on the Senate discussions, I think we'd come to the conclusion that this is truly an excellent method of controlling and governing the University of Manitoba. I think that the academic staff of the University, in reference to the Board of Governors, should be just as separate a body as the church and state is, and to suggest any other change or to suggest a planned control of the board as has been suggested, in my opinion, would only be embarking on a very, very dangerous experiment.

Now I know something has been said about the British system, true enough, but our Board of Governors and our Senate at the University of Manitoba is the same as is practised in all the other provinces of Canada and is similar to the American system, and I think that we must at all times have a definite separation of management, which is our Board of Governors, and a separation of the academic staff which you can relate to the form of labour in an industrial concern.

It is for this reason that I know that the Honourable Minister of Education has a great deal of respect for our present system and I urge the present government to preserve that system. There is very little wrong with this system, and before any change or any contemplated change is made in reference to this governing body, that it be studied very closely, because when you have completed this close study I am quite certain - as a matter of fact I am absolutely positive that you will come to the conclusion that the present system is an excellent operating system.

I merely bring this to the attention of the government because to make any changes in this relationship of the Board of Governors and the Senate, I'm afraid you'll upset the balance and you're liable to invite a large number of headaches which are being taken care of today under the present system.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, there's been some things said about the general course today and I think it's very important for this committee to recognize one thing. What has drawn me to my feet is that it's been suggested that I'm too much of a diplomat to come out and to define or say something on the general course. I do want to say that I think it would be a real injustice to the general course to have any--I'm not saying it shouldn't be criticized but to have it debunked in any way, because it is not necessary to defend, I don't think, the enrolment between the general course and the so-called university entrance course. After all, the university entrance course was initiated in pilot studies last fall. It's in '62 that the first pilot classes in the general course came into being and the Grade 12 students in that general course who are graduating this year will be the first group out of the general course. The general course is the result of years of blood, sweat and tears by all kinds of teachers and educators that taught people in this province, and why is it designed?

The member from Rhineland has said he's afraid of this course. Good heavens, the vast majority, the large percentage of our high school students who don't plan to go on to a university career must have alternative courses. This is the first step in devising the kind of courses that our educators today feel are absolutely necessary in order to open more opportunities to the children, and we don't want to be rigid throughout the development of this course. It has been designed for re-entry at a point, but surely there's certain academic standards of achievement that we want these children to attain. We want people to come out of this general course first class students, and every single teacher and every single student that I have spoken to throughout the province who is taking this course is enthused about it, and this is the -- you just can't offer one course. I hope the Honourable Member from Rhineland isn't suggesting we just have a university entrance course and opt out and deny thousands of boys and girls the kind of opportunities we think they'll need. And we simply are going full steam ahead, and I hope, at the time we speak on curriculum in this appropriation, to give a detailed report of the general course development and some of the problems we're facing with the general course, but categorically at this moment the general course leads to eight technologies, general business and the various trades and opportunities at the M. I. T. Furthermore, I have spoken to the senate of the University to examine this general course in a professional sense to see what further courses this may recommend itself to. And it is

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd)... continually being revised by the best people in the province, and I think it would be wrong before we close today to have the impression about that this is something lesser than -- something less than it is, because it is an excellent course designed for a specific purpose, designed to meet the needs of the boys and girls who aren't going to go on to university at this time, and it is in the program of studies, which the honourable member as a trustee should have, that it points out how the person finishing the general course may prepare himself for university afterwards, if he is what they so call a late starter.

But this, as I said earlier this afternoon, this business of screening is something that we are looking at in the very closest light, recognizing the factors. And we're gaining experience with the general course. Certainly it has a rigorous content. It is lending itself admirably to the development of other -- the vocational commercial as I indicated. Yearly we're getting more into vocational commercial and vocational industrial type of courses at the high school level. But I wanted to make it abundantly clear that it is our duty to try and find these various courses for the, and furthermore this summer we have spent a long time, the seminar, on the occupational entrance course, the so-called former terminal course. The seminar has made a report after sitting this summer of the initial outline, I have distributed it to trustee organizations and educators and professional groups for their comment, and we're going full steam ahead in that aspect too.

So, the very flexibility that has been mentioned, and the very different types of alternative courses that will be necessary in the future, are things that are gaining our full attention, and more time, effort and money is being spent on this at this time than ever in the history of this province before, but we just can't get vulcanized -- take the attitude that every student, because his parents think so, must go to the university entrance course. A lot of the children don't want this, and we need the understanding of this committee in selling this to the boys and girls, and I hope it will commend itself when I have a further opportunity to give a more detailed report on our progress to date.

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 Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. MCLEAN: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the House do now adjourn.

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