

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 19th, 1963.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions

MR. CLERK: The petition of the Trafalgar Savings and Loan Association, praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Trafalgar Savings and Loan Association.

The petition of the Community Chest of Greater Winnipeg, praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Community Chest of Greater Winnipeg.

The petition of Leonard B. Ryman, praying for the passing of An Act respecting Trustees of The Apostolic Temple Congregation in The City of Winnipeg in the Province of Manitoba.

The petition of Mother Boniface Sloboda and Others, praying for the passing of An Act to incorporate Holy Family Nursing Home.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills
Orders of the Day

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct your attention to the gallery on my right hand where there are seated 90 Grade VIII students from the Cecil Rhodes School, with their teachers Mrs. Kozak and Mrs. Werrier. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. We wish to welcome you here to the Legislative Assembly this afternoon. We are pleased that you are interested and wanted to watch the proceedings here. We hope that what you see and hear will help you in your studies, that you will enjoy the afternoon, and come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture & Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, last week the Honourable Member from Brandon extended a very cordial invitation on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Winter Fair, City of Brandon, to the members of the Legislature, requesting that we journey once again to that fair city and take in the big show in Manitoba, the Manitoba Winter Fair. I understand that the 5th of April has been found a suitable and acceptable date to all of the Parties in the House and the government is happy to announce that we will suspend the proceedings of the House on the 5th of April -- Friday, the 5th of April, to make it possible for all the members to visit the Manitoba Winter Fair and to take advantage of that opportunity not only to enjoy themselves but to see the very best in agriculture on display.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Winter Fair, I want to express thanks that the government has seen fit to accept the invitation for the members and I would like to, while I'm on my feet, Madam Speaker, to tell the members that I will be circulating a circular paper asking them to indicate whether they will be able to go or not, and then I can make further arrangements. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Just one point on this. I appreciate the fact that the government has accepted the kind invitation of the Honourable Member for Brandon, but I think that it would be only correct for me as one of those in Opposition, Madam Speaker, and one of those who are particularly interested in the fact that the particular day that we are going to go to Brandon is Private Members' Day, that we in Opposition, and in particular those who have resolutions standing on the Order Paper in private names, have agreed to this. So it's not only the fact of the government of the day itself, but the fact that we, on this side of the House in Opposition, and I'm of course only speaking for my own particular group, the New Democratic Party, we have agreed to the suspension of Private Members' resolutions and our day as well as that of the government. I would appreciate very much if the Honourable the Member for Brandon would convey to the directors of the Brandon Fair that this is not just on the acquiescence of the government of the day, but also by the acquiescence of the private members of the Legislature as well.

MR. LISSAMAN: I was remiss in acknowledging that all private members certainly give up some of their privileges in agreeing to go anywhere on Friday, and I'm sure that the Leader of the CCF Party may rest assured that I will -- or the NDP, that I will so inform the Board of Directors and I'm sure that, knowing the tendencies of politicians to be eternally speaking, that they'll appreciate most fully the sacrifice that the private members have made there.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, yesterday while I was inviting myself as well as the members of this House to the annual "Pea Soup Night" in St. Boniface, I mentioned that Mr. Hebert of the Association de St. Jean Baptiste is endeavouring to get a larger hall, and I'm happy to say that he was successful in obtaining the hall of the St. Boniface College for this occasion, so it will be at 8:00 Wednesday, March 27th, at the St. Boniface College. I wonder if the members of the press would take this in note and maybe inform those that come every year that there will be a change.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to place on the table of the House the Annual Report of the President of the University of Manitoba for the year 1961-1962. I just make a comment that this is not a report which is required by statutes to be tabled, but it has been customary to do so and I am pleased to present it at this time. Sufficient copies are available for each member of the House.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Fund for March 31, 1962. Copies will be distributed.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I'd like to enquire of the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation when he expects to table the report of his department.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I am hoping to table this any day. It is at the printers at the present time and it is supposed to be ready this week.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I suppose I am right in assuming that even if other departments are finished, that the Department of Agriculture will not be called before that report has been tabled.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I think that's a fair implication, Madam Speaker.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I'm advised that two minority stockholders of the Columbia Hardboard Incorporated, a parent company of Columbia Forest Products Limited of Sprague, Manitoba, have sued Columbia Hardboard for involuntary bankruptcy in King County Superior Court in Seattle. Could the Minister indicate to this House what effect, if any, this court action will have on the million and a half dollars that the Manitoba Development Fund loaned the plant at Sprague.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I was not aware of this eventuality and will enquire and inform my honourable friend or inform the House later.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I believe I did present this the other day. I don't know what the technicalities are but I'll present it formally once again if that is what I'm supposed to do. I was asked to allow the matter to stand.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, the honourable gentleman has presented it formally. I think that all that is required now is for me to make a statement on the order that is technically before the House. I think that it will be found that almost all of the information required is already available either in the statute or in the Manitoba Gazette, but what has induced me to ask that the matter stand so far is because I'm not certain that all the points covered in this order, which is worded in a rather broad way, are covered in that sense, so I've come to the conclusion that what I should do is to accept the order with respect to those matters which are not available in some published document to which my honourable friend has access. So I would be glad to accept the order for any of this information that is not available in public documents.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before we go further in this matter, I want to point out to my honourable friend the First Minister that while the items concerned may have been published in the Manitoba Gazette in the past, the information that I seek goes back to the year 1945, and then 1958 and 1963. Now the Honourable the First Minister may state that all of this information has been published previously in the Gazettes of the past. I'm sure my honourable friend will realize that as far as I'm concerned as the Leader of the New Democratic Party, that I haven't got the research facilities in order to go back over these; that he has the personnel within his departments in order to obtain this information as requested by one of the members of this Legislature; that it is possible for him to obtain it without the necessity of me, the member in question asking for this information, to go back over all of these years in order to ascertain the information. I might say, Madam Speaker, that it deals with the question, while I do ask for the information as in the Order of Return for the fees, licenses and royalties charged by each department, bureau or other activity of the Crown as at January 1, 1945, in order, Madam, first of all to obtain this information as how we stood at the year 1945 it would be necessary for me as an individual member of this Assembly to go back over the Gazettes for years past. I'm sure that the departments concerned have readily available within the departments this information as to what the fees, etcetera, were as of this particular date, which I haven't. The same thing holds true, Madam Speaker, in respect of the information that I request as of June 1st, 1958. In the 13 years -- between the year 1954 and the year 1958, it would be necessary for me to then go over each and every Gazette for those years.

I suggest, Madam Speaker, that within the various departments concerned, if they are efficient, and I presume them to be, that they would have readily available in the respective departments this information. The same holds true, Madam Speaker, in respect of the year as at the 1st of January, 1963. The information that I seek is information that should be available in all of the respective departments and Crown Corporations and I think that this information should be made available to me who is asking the questions without the necessity, as the Honourable the First Minister suggests, that I should go back over all of the Gazettes, not only back to 1945, Madam Speaker, but the Gazettes prior to 1945 in order to ascertain what the fees were, etcetera, as at January 1st in the year 1945. So I ask my honourable friend to accept the Order for Return in light of what I have now said and the position that I am in at the present time.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think the point is covered by paragraph 171 of Beuchesne, sub-paragraph (ff) in which it says that it is not in order to seek information set forth in documents equally accessible to the questioner, such as statutes, published reports, etcetera. Now we've had a ruling on that already in this Session and I think we should adhere to it. My position would be that I'll be glad to answer the question insofar as it does not contravene that rule.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, we are now speaking on a point of order. I say to my honourable friend the First Minister of this House that this is not equally available to the Honourable Member for Radisson. There's no equality at all in the availability of this information. My honourable friend has it within his departments and I haven't got it. On the Order of Return, and I agree with him insofar as Beuchesne is concerned insofar as equality is concerned, but I suggest to him through you, Madam Speaker, that there is no equality, and on the point of order that my honourable friend has raised, then I reject it completely.

MADAM SPEAKER: I think that this is a matter of some difficulty, to which I would like to give some consideration. I will take the matter under advisement and I will give my decision at a later date.

MR. PAULLEY: I appreciate that very much, Madam Speaker, and in your consideration may I respectfully suggest to you, Madam, that you take into consideration this question of equality in its broadest sense, that here I am, a member of this Assembly seeking information from the government. We have been refused already once this year information of grave public importance and I suggest, Madam Speaker, that you should take all of these aspects into consideration before you reject the Return that I am requesting at this time.

MR. ROBLIN: I think that Madam Speaker is following the correct course, and I certainly will be prepared to abide by her decision.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following: (1) The cost of the window stickers or transfers used in the Provincial Parks last year to identify the cars which had paid the new fees imposed by this government; (2) from whom the stickers or transfers were purchased; (3) when they were ordered; (4) when they were delivered; (5) the quantity ordered; (6) the parks in which they were used; (7) the number of gates or entry points and their location; (8) the amount collected at each point.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. VIELFAURE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the monthly sales at the Liquor Control Commission store at Falcon Lake since its opening.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce has asked me to stand this matter for another day and I'm prepared to do so.

MR. EVANS: I wish to thank my honourable friend.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: (1) The acreage of Crown land in Local Government Districts sold to farmers in each year for the years 1959, 1960, 1961 and 1962; (2) the acreage of Local Government District lands sold to farmers in each year for the same years; (3) the acreage of Crown lands in rural municipalities sold to farmers in each year for the same years; (4) the same information as asked for in (1), (2) and (3) by individual local government districts and municipalities.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: (a) The number of highway construction tenders that were successfully bid and then recalled during the course of the year 1962; (b) the name or names of the construction firms that were successful in obtaining recall of tender; (c) the number of requests for tender recall that were denied by the Minister; (d) the amount of penalty assessed on the contractor (s) whose request for recall were successful; (e) the ratio of penalty assessment to contract amount.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I am not prepared to continue at this time and, unless anybody else wishes to speak at this time, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I crave the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend has been taken ill and cannot be here today, so I would ask that the matter be allowed to stand in his name unless somebody else cares to speak at this time.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand also.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Dufferin.

MR. WILLIAM H. HAMILTON (Dufferin): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. J. E. JEANNOTTE (Rupertsland): Madam Speaker, with your permission I would like to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Proposed resolution. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I submitted an Order for Return which the government has agreed to accept and I am waiting for this information prior to speaking on this subject.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I know the Minister of Education is anxious to reply to criticisms of last evening. I beg the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I'd like to suggest that we take the second readings of the two Bills that are marked "printed" before we go into Committee of Supply, so I would appreciate your calling Bills No. 25 and 33.

MADAM SPEAKER: Bill No. 25. The Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie.

MR. ROBLIN: No, this happens to be another gentleman with the same name, but who has different responsibilities, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Health.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health) (Gimli): And may I add, Madam Speaker, a different political philosophy.

Mr. Johnson presented Bill No. 25, an Act to amend The Tuberculosis Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, the principle involved here is simply that prior to the introduction of the universal hospital plan the Minister of Health was a statutory member of the Sanatorium Board of Manitoba and, in view of the fact that today the Sanatorium Board, like many other voluntary hospitals on whom the Minister was also a member and who was removed last year by legislation, it is thought probably best that the Minister not be a statutory member of these organizations for this reason. Also in this Bill, the municipalities used to make payments to the Sanatorium Board and had representation because of that. I am advised in bringing in this Bill at this time it was thought advisable, in view of the fact that the membership of the Sanatorium Board is picked from the public at large and the municipal representatives have not been sitting for some years, that this statutory requirement be removed.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Bill No. 33. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) presented Bill No. 33, An Act to amend The Mortgage Act for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, this amendment, the principle of it is of course to make the section of The Mortgage Act subject to subsection 1, section 11 of The Mechanics Lien Act. The Mortgage Act as it is presently constituted states in the section in question that its purpose is to remove any doubt as to whether or not a mortgagee can advance monies on registration of certain certificates of judgment, conveyances, mortgages, etcetera. As a matter of fact, the section does not remove the doubts and it is for this purpose that we are suggesting to the House that the section be changed to make it subject, as it is in practice, to the particular section of The Mechanics Lien Act.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Bill No. 35. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think that's printed, Madam Speaker, so perhaps we should proceed with the Supply motion. I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department V, Resolution 26. The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two matters before we proceed, arising out of our discussions yesterday. First, Mr. Chairman, with the assistance of the page boys when they are free to do so, I would like to distribute to each member of the committee a document from which I read yesterday giving the various courses in the Institute of Technology, and the admission requirements. This was requested by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. And, in addition, the pamphlets -- or brochure for each of the three courses that are already printed. We are proceeding rather quickly toward the printing of the brochures for each course; we just have three of them printed so far. I thought that the members of the committee would like to have these in hand for their information. If you will be good enough -- thank you.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I had a sleepless night moving furniture around in the basement of the Institute of Technology to make way for those who might want to use the space for Civil Defence or for shelter purposes, and I do want to explain to the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface that I didn't advise him very accurately yesterday when I was speaking about that space. May I just give the correct answer, namely, that with respect to that portion of the space in that building that might be used for as a fallout shelter, all that has been done is to have the walls and the ceiling built according to Civil Defence fallout shelter standards. No floor has been placed in that. It's an earthen floor and will be covered with gravel. We are not taking any action to actually make it into fallout shelter requirements at the present time. The point I was trying to make and didn't make clear was that it was being built in such a way that it could be if such a decision were made at a later date.

I should also explain that there are a number of things in the basement of the building. I mentioned the hairdressing school; the barbering school will be there as well; the students' lounge and certain other facilities, all of which are within areas that are built according to Civil Defence standards, and which would be available for that purpose. May I say one thing further, that although the space with might be used for fallout shelter purposes is vacant space, or will be vacant space, it is also space that could be converted into classrooms as the population of the institute expands, and the building is such that that space might be made into classroom space if, as and when the population of the Institute of Technology requires.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I come to a matter which was perhaps of more a spirited debate just as we closed last night, and I do want to say again what I said in the beginning yesterday, that one of the great advantages of the discussions here on estimates is the fact that we often-times have matters drawn to our attention which had been overlooked, and on that basis I do thank the Honourable Leader of the Opposition for something, and I shall deal with it in just a moment. In the beginning however, Mr. Chairman, I do want to return to him the booklet which he sent over to me, because I noticed that it belongs to one Gordon G. Newton, who is a school teacher and officer of The Teachers' Society and also the chairman of The Teachers' Society Pension Committee, and I am sure that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would like to return it to him, and I now have my own copy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, yesterday when we were discussing this important matter I had before me -- I had here the September - October, 1962 issue of The Manitoba Teacher and the editorial which appeared at page 86 of that issue. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that I read into the records the first paragraph of that editorial which set out the matter of complaint in the editorial; namely, that a person holding a permanent First-Class Certificate Grade B is entitled to teach any grade in a continuation school or a one-room high school. It went on to explain the situation with regard to that matter and it made the statement, that I now repeat, of course, that there had been no change made in the regulations respecting the teaching referred to in the editorial, that is to say, with respect to continuation schools and one-room

(Mr. McLean, cont'd) high schools.

As I am certain would be evident to the members of the committee from the paragraph which I read, and would be even more evident if members read the entire editorial, this particular editorial was, of course, a personal attack upon the Minister. Now I don't say that in any sense in criticism, because I recognize that when you go into public life you have to be prepared for personal attacks and I accept the democratic privilege of the Editor of The Manitoba Teacher magazine to say anything he likes about me, personal or otherwise, and he certainly exercised his democratic privilege in this editorial. But it naturally followed that I don't rush down to the mailman each week or each month to get the next issue of their magazine. In fact, I haven't read one since and it's rather unlikely that I will in the future.

It is a fact, however, -- it is a fact that a few days ago someone did say to me, pointing out the January-February issue, that there was another story or item in connection with this item, and referred -- or at least showed me the final page. I looked at the headlines and said: "Oh, that's just that same old matter again", and paid no further attention. This is the one to which the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has drawn to my attention now and I thank him for it, because it does refer to, not the same old matter at all but to a different item with regard to the same regulations, but to a different matter of teaching qualifications.

I now have before me the January - February, 1963 issue of The Manitoba Teacher at page 64, of which there is about a half-page under the heading of "Changes in Academic Requirements to Teach High School". This page gives, side by side, the old regulations and new regulations with regard to the minimum academic requirement to teach in a collegiate institute or a collegiate department. I should explain that a collegiate department is a three-room high school teaching grades 9, 10 and 11, a collegiate institute is a four or more room high school teaching grades 9, 10, 11 and 12; and so the regulations here referred to deal with the subject of the teachers' qualifications in collegiate departments or in collegiate institutes. It indicates that, under the old regulations, a university degree was required in order to teach in a collegiate department or a collegiate institute; and also indicates its opinion that under the new regulation filed June 13, 1962, that there has been some change.

Now if any of the members of the committee have seen any harassed officials of the Department of Education around the building this morning, they will know that we've been having some serious meetings concerning these regulations and endeavouring to make it clear to me exactly what these regulations mean. There seems to be some difference of opinion as to whether or not the new regulations actually amount to a lowering of standards. I'm not really much interested in debating that and I would accept it if the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition says that the standards have been lowered, and indeed if The Teachers' Society say that the standards have been lowered, I'm quite satisfied. I wish to say to the committee that I have given instructions to the department to revert to the former wording of the regulation, whatever that was, and to say that the former wording will -- that is, have indicated my opinion that the former wording should be restored. I find, however, that any change of this sort now must be referred to the advisory committee -- advisory board rather, for their opinion, and that will be done. I'm, of course, not able to say what recommendations they may make, but in any event the instructions have been given and the procedure that I have indicated will be followed. So I thought that I ought to give that information to the House and to acknowledge my appreciation to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, my appreciation for his having brought this to my attention.

I thought, however, that while speaking about this, it might be useful to give some statistics, because one must bear in mind the relative importance of these matters. I did indicate yesterday the comparison in the number of continuation schools. Perhaps I might repeat that and simply say that on June 30, 1958, there were 36 continuation schools in Manitoba whereas at the present time there are four; and that in the realm of one-room high schools there were 150 on June 30th, 1958, and that there are 47 at the present time. These are the two groups that we were speaking about yesterday. Insofar as collegiate departments are concerned, that's the high school, the three-classroom high schools teaching 9, 10 and 11, there were 48 on June 30th, 1958 and there are 25 at the present time. It will be seen that this is a rapidly disappearing type of school and indeed I would imagine that they will not be in existence very much longer, for obvious reasons. Insofar as collegiate institutions are concerned, there were 69 on June

(Mr. McLean, cont'd) 30th, 1958 and there are now 148. There has been a very substantial increase and I would expect there will be some further increase until all high school instruction is being given in collegiate institutes. I thought that those statistics would be of interest in the light of our discussions yesterday and in the light of the information that I have given now.

Then also I thought that referring particularly to the article which was drawn to my attention by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, that I ought to refer to the specific -- the statements with regard to the new regulations. They show three categories. First of all, they show that a Grade 11 person with non-matriculation standing may teach Grade 9; second, they indicate that a person with second year university may teach grade 10; and thirdly, that a person with third year university may teach grade 11. I don't suppose that there will be much debate about the second or third category and, in any event, I've indicated the instructions that have been given. I thought, however, that the committee would be interested to know that in the first category, which would appear on the face of it to be a rather low standard for teaching, that we have one teacher in the Province of Manitoba that falls in this category, and I am glad to report the name of that teacher and his location because I want to say something about him. It offers me an opportunity to indulge in a little philosophy that I don't often get.

This teacher is a Mr. Herman Koons, who is engaged in the Birch River Collegiate. Mr. Koons is a veteran teacher, a long-time teacher who has given outstanding service to the boys and girls of northern Manitoba. He has excellent inspector's reports. He is a teacher with originality; he inspires the students; he has a very capable grasp of the subject matter; he is an excellent disciplinarian and is loved by students and other teachers alike. I know Mr. Koons; he comes of a very outstanding family from the Swan River Valley and I can certainly vouch for the fact that he is an outstanding teacher. Now, I realize, Mr. Chairman, that there would be those who would say to me, "Oh yes, but he'd be just as good a teacher if he had a BA or a Bachelor of Science degree as he is now," and I'm sure that's the case. I do record however, that Mr. Koons went through school at a time in the affairs of our country when it was not possible for him to go to university. He began teaching when, I suppose if he received \$25.00 a month, that was certainly the maximum salary that he received. He never had an opportunity of getting the higher education which I am certain he would have liked, or that all of us would like to have, but notwithstanding this fact, Mr. Koons has indeed and in fact rendered outstanding service to the boys and girls of many school districts and is doing a wonderful job in the Birch River Collegiate teaching, as I say, Grade 9 students.

Now the point of all this is simply to allow me to say that, while of course I recognize that we live in the jet age and we must have rules and regulations and we must update all our standards, it always seems too bad that in this mass way we have to deal with things; we can't take account of individual people and the contributions which they have made, and indeed this teacher has made a fine contribution. As I say, I know that that's old-fashioned and wouldn't have much appeal to the members of this committee, but I like to deal with individual people. I'm not very much interested in rules and regulations and I just make that comment. I don't know what will happen to Mr. Koons when we have changed the regulations, but I did want to make this acknowledgment of the contribution which he has made in a lifetime of very outstanding service, even though he did not have the privilege of having the educational standards and the other standards that people would like -- would have preferred. Now I leave that subject, Mr. Chairman, for the present.

There was one other question that was asked by the Honourable the Member for St. John's respecting the information in the annual report concerning the racial and religious origin of students at the Teachers' College. This matter -- the answer is in two parts, or at least there are two aspects of this. The first is the question of whether or not they should be asked for this information when they enter Teachers' College; and the second one is whether or not it should be published in the annual report. Going at it backwards, I would be inclined to say that there's no reason for publishing it in the annual report. One of the officials reminded me this morning that I had really given instructions that it not be printed in the annual report and that through some error it was included. If the members of the committee feel that it shouldn't be, that would accord with my own view in that respect.

On the other hand, the matter of asking for the information when they enter Teachers'

(Mr. McLean, cont'd) College is on a little different footing. First of all, we have requests from the various church groups that we obtain this information because they wish to extend an invitation to the students to affiliate themselves or associate themselves with their respective churches during the time that they are in Teachers' College. And also, it is of help in the case, because we do have a residential Teachers' College, it is of help in the event of illness or that sort of thing; and also, for this same reason the information is requested by the churches so that if there is illness that they be notified and that they have an opportunity of visiting the student if and when ill. All of that seems to be a very reasonable sort of an arrangement. That's with regard to the religious affiliation.

The second with regard to the racial or ethnic origin, we find that many people insist on knowing how many people of a particular racial extraction are at Teachers' College, because many people are very proud of the fact that people of their group enter Teachers' College, and apparently this information is considered quite important. If you look, it's interesting -- if you look at the report, if you look at past reports, it is interesting to note the racial groups from which we draw our teachers, and some of our citizens have established a very enviable record in this regard. It's a matter of pride and that is the reason that the information is gathered.

Perhaps this will also allow me, Mr. Chairman, to say something just by way of extra curricular comment. I think it's not a bad idea. I'm not really very much impressed by the "melting pot" theory. I'm very proud of the fact that I'm of Scottish origin. In fact, I would be the first to admit that we're the best people in the world. I'm rather proud of the fact that I'm a member of the United Church. My family used to be in the Presbyterian Church and there isn't anything better in this world than a Presbyterian Scotsman. Well I think that everybody in this country, all our people come with wonderful gifts. I think of the sturdy independence of the Icelanders and the great interest, for example, that the Mennonite people have in education. They contribute a large number of our students in teacher training. The way in which these people of Ukrainian descent have brought themselves along, and again you see the statistics which is nothing less than a wonderful comment on the way in which this group of people have established themselves in this new land in a relatively short period of time. Well all of these things would be lost to us if we never at any time said "I'm a Scotsman or I'm an Icelander or I'm a Frenchman"; and all of these things would be lost to us if we didn't have some pride in our background. I would like to suggest, and I appreciate that this hasn't anything to do with this question, but I would like to suggest that we ought to be proud of our traditions and of our history; and that we should not, at any time, be ashamed to say so; and this is just one means of, as it were, keeping a record, because before long, not perhaps in our lifetime but indeed some time in the future, all of this will have disappeared and I suppose we will all be Canadians and proud to be indeed, but we will have lost something of our past association. I hope that we would not consider it necessary to do away with this important and delightful record that we keep at the Teachers' College.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Minister for his statement regarding the matter that was brought up last night, and I appreciate that he is going to investigate it further. I must admit that it's not an easy one to understand. I've gone all over the regulations many times and did come to the conclusion that there was watering down. I think that the misunderstanding arose over the fact the Minister was thinking merely in terms of the editorial that had appeared, whereas the regulations that I was pointing out to him last night were on other topics; in fact, particularly on the matter of collegiate institutes and collegiate departments. So I will accept the Minister's statement that he will proceed to investigate this further and if he finds that there is a watering down, that he will recommend that we return to the original regulations. On that subject, I'd appreciate if the Minister would tell us what the plans are insofar as raising standards. For example, this year at the Teachers' College he has gone on to, I believe, complete Grade 12 as the minimum entry. Is it planned to make that stiffer in the future or not, and what plans has he insofar as standard teaching certificates and so on.

Before we leave the matter of the disagreement we had last night though, Mr. Chairman, I must come back to the statements that the Minister attributed to Mr. Huband and the letter he claimed he had received, because in today's newspaper, and I'm quoting from the Free

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) Press of this afternoon, from the front page. The item is marked: "Teachers' Society and McLean Disagree", and then, "both Charles Huband who spoke for Education Minister Stewart McLean last December 10th and the Manitoba Teachers' Society have disagreed with the Education Minister's statements made to the Manitoba Legislature on Monday. Monday, Mr. McLean denied his statement and attributed it to Mr. Huband, which said Mr. McLean was prepared to revoke his own regulation which allowed non-degree teachers to teach in high schools. Mr. Huband, defeated Conservative nominee in the last provincial election, agreed with a tape-recorded portion of his speech in which he said, referring to the regulation, this was merely a re-enactment of legislation which existed and has existed from 1949 on. It was included by mistake and the Minister of Education had said that if anyone is particularly bothered by this it will be revoked." Now this is Mr. Huband speaking, presumably today to one of the newspapers. I have obtained a tape recording of what was said at that particular meeting and these are the proper quotations from Mr. Huband, so how does this square off with what the Minister told us yesterday that Mr. Huband was denying in his letter?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I made a statement as to the action I have already instructed be taken. I think no useful purpose would be served by pursuing this matter any further.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, yesterday I received an answer to my remarks that I made in the afternoon. However, I'm not satisfied and I wish to make one more request by this government that they reconsider the matter about increasing the grants to school districts in non-division areas. I feel that this policy of this government is doing irreparable harm to the students in these areas and it's something they will never be able to regain by losing a high school education at this time, and certainly this warrants the attention and consideration of this government so that these youngsters will have a chance of obtaining a high school education.

Then I would also like to comment on one or two things and ask for some information regarding some other matters. First of all, I notice that the Member for St. John's discussed this matter of racial origin and so on as information in the departmental report. I'm sure that if this was not contained in the report the government would have to offer that by way of Order for Return, so I think it's just as well to leave it in the report.

Coming to some other matters, I would like to know from the Minister in regard to having auditors doing the audits of local school districts. Local school districts still have their annual meetings and they are to be conducted within a certain period of time after the new year. In order to get an audit you have to have local people appointed as auditors to do the audit so that the electors at that meeting can consider the report. Now at the same time, under The Public Schools Act, you're also to appoint an official auditor that will be recognized by the department and whose report is being recognized by the department, which has to be in, I think, by July 1st or so. It seems to me rather odd that the electors of a district will have to consider one report and the government will consider another report. These reports might conflict -- who knows? I just wonder whether the government has considered these reports of various districts and whether there is conflict in the reports that the electors consider and the ones that are being sent in by the school district which have been audited by a public accountant or a recognized auditor of the department. Certainly I think this whole matter should be clarified and the electors of a rural school district should not have to consider a report that is not satisfactory to the government as such.

Now another matter that I would like to have some information on is in regard to evening classes. Under The Public Schools' Act, evening classes may be conducted. I'd like to know from the Minister how many school districts do avail themselves of this provision and do conduct classes. Is it just more or less in the cities that these matters are looked after or do we have other areas that avail themselves of it? Also, in connection with this, is the matter of adult education. Is the matter of adult education a matter of the universities only or does the department carry any responsibility in this matter? I feel here is an area that should be extended and expanded, because we have an ever-increasing number of people who will require additional knowledge and skills and so on, and that could be made available through evening classes or adult education. I think for the time being I'd like to get some information on this matter before I continue.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): If I may, I'd like to comment on the Honourable Minister's philosophic discussion on the use of the information regarding race and religion. I, too, didn't think it was too important a point but the Minister seemed to enjoy dealing with the philosophical aspects and I feel I'd like an opportunity to join him in this philosophical exercise. Insofar as the publication is concerned, I doubt very much if there would be an Order for Return if the information were not contained. I question very much the Minister's suggestion that many, many people would like to know the information as to racial origin, and since I trust that he intends to carry out his expressed intention not to include this information, I challenge him to keep some kind of a record for the following year as to how many of these many, many people do ask this question, because I wonder about the Minister's feeling of the desirability for this feeling of pride.

I admire and approve of his pride that he expressed in admitting that the Scotch were the best people, but I do question his assertion that the Scotch are the best people and I do make the point that there is a difference between accepting something and asserting it; and that assertion, I submit to the committee, Mr. Chairman, and to the Minister, is only based on a competitive spirit which may not be healthy in this case. If someone looks with pride on the fact that the percentage of students of any racial group is higher than the percentage of the populace, then obviously because one percentage is higher, another must be lower; and if it is considered that some racial group is not providing a percentage equivalent to its populace, possibly that denotes criticism in some way. Certainly it is not intended by the Minister, but yet why should there have to be this need to compete on this basis. I, too, do not agree on a melting pot theory, but I do feel that even if you wish to consider the contribution made by these prospective teachers, it would be of greater interest to know their cultural background rather than their racial extraction, and I make a distinction there. It might be of greater interest to know the languages with which they have facility than the racial extraction, and that's not necessarily the same thing.

I suggest that the danger in asking the question is that the information may be misused, and the most likely way it could be misused is when employment comes up at graduation and I would hate to think that information acquired for this sense of pride or statistical purpose might be misused in order to discriminate against some graduate of the institute in terms of employment. Certainly this could not possibly be the policy of this or any government, but one does not know how the person who has the information available is going to use it, so that I would suggest strongly that, with as much pride as all of us have in all our racial origins, that there is no need to continue it in the field of the students of a Teachers' College.

I would also suggest that the reasons given for continuation of requesting information as to religious denomination is one which relates only to the most personal feelings of the student; and if it is necessary to provide information, and it is necessary to provide information to, let us say, religious schools who would like to know whom they can get in touch with, and if it is a concern as to the full-time residents of the institute in case of illness, then surely the form could provide that if they like they may insert their religious denomination for purposes such as the Minister suggested and that would then leave it up to the student to decide whether or not the information should be made available for the uses which the Minister describes. Therefore, again, it is not an issue I make. I do question the continuation of the use of this information which is obviously requested upon application or admission, and I would suggest that the Minister was a little too enthusiastic in his philosophical approach to the brighter aspects of the use of these statistics.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister indicate to us on what basis he gave the Dauphin-Ochre area board a \$10,000 special grant?

MR. McLEAN: I think perhaps we might deal with that under the subject of grants.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I believe when the Minister spoke when his estimates got underway yesterday, he mentioned that there was considerable interest in the province towards consolidation. Did I understand him correctly? I know in some parts of my constituency there is concern over the present policy whereby a school requires a minimum of 35 students before they are entitled to two teacher grants. I cite the case of Mulvihill, where I believe the present number attending the one-room school there is 30, and the number of grades being taught is eight. I know the parents of the children attending this particular

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd) school are most unhappy because they feel that their children are not getting satisfactory education in view of the crowding of this particular school. They inflicted no blame to the teacher, but they feel under the present policy no child can get an adequate education under those type of circumstances. For instance, three miles away -- I believe it's three miles away -- another school is located, and I think the total pupil count there is seven or eight, and they have one teacher. I know there is a problem in some areas to get schools to consolidate -- or school districts rather, but it seems to me it is unfair, under the present policy, to force children to go to a one-room school and be crowded out under the circumstances such as Mulvihill. Has the Minister considered possibly lowering the pupil count which is -- lowering the pupil count in order that they would be entitled to two teacher grants. I am satisfied that this should be done so that we'd get better teaching for these children and it would make it much more satisfactory all around.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to the statement that I made earlier regarding the disagreement we had yesterday. I don't want to labour this point, however, the Minister yesterday in his statement used a letter which he claims to have received from Mr. Huband to deny what had gone on. At that time, Mr. Huband was speaking for the Minister at a meeting. This morning apparently, Mr. Huband is not in agreement with the Minister, yet yesterday the Minister was telling us certain things. Now someone is not being quoted correctly. Mr. Huband is not here to defend himself, yet the Minister used him yesterday, and this morning we have a disclaimer. It seems to me that either Mr. Huband deserves an apology from someone, or this House does.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1(a) -- passed; (b) -- passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I've been waiting to get in with a question. If the Minister is going to reply, I'd just as leave not insert my question. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister in mentioning the teacher in the Birch River School, Mr. Koons, to use his phrase, if I caught him correctly, "I don't know what will happen to Mr. Koons when the regulations are put in." Now I have to confess to a good bit of sympathy with my honourable friend's "old-fashionedism", because I have been accused or credited with a certain amount of "old-fashionedism" myself, and I think that this is a case where what the Minister has said is justified in connection with that particular teacher. What I am wondering is, will the regulations that the Minister announced yesterday, will they mean that this particular individual either has to bring his standing up to the requirement or he is out of teaching? It seemed to me it was just as definite as that yesterday. And then, my suggestion is, that if the answer to that question is "yes", my suggestion is that surely, even in such things as governmental regulations, surely there could be exceptions for people who have spent a long time in the profession and have demonstrated that, in fact, they are good teachers, that they should be exempted from the operation of regulations that perhaps quite properly apply to ones coming along later on or perhaps quite properly applied to those who are still in their active years of teaching. But if there are circumstances that an individual of that time simply can't qualify, perhaps because he's been away from active studies too long, perhaps because even yet he isn't in a position to go back and qualify under stricter regulations, surely there could be some exceptions made where the merit of the case is undeniable.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I must warn the Honourable the Member for Lakeside that he's treading on very dangerous ground, and both he and I shall be receiving some perhaps uncomplimentary remarks soon. I agree most heartily with what he has said. If the regulations are as contended for, Mr. Koons would not necessarily be out of teaching, but he would certainly be forced to go back into teaching in an elementary school, because I would assume that his qualifications would certainly be satisfactory for that. The only other avenue open would be to make an exception insofar as he is concerned. It was perhaps in a sense not -- and I don't urge this too strongly -- but in a sense to take care of some of these situations that I think perhaps we had thought we were looking after. However, we obviously have displeased other people in doing so and, as I say, unless an exception were made, Mr. Koons would be required to go back to elementary school teaching.

With respect to what the Honourable Member for St. George has said, this matter of the minimum number of students required for two teacher grants is a very troublesome one, and he's touched on a most important point. When we had the new system of grants introduced in

(Mr. McLean, cont'd) 1959, we lowered what had been the previous number of students required for two, three and four teacher grants, and thought that we were doing something that was pretty good. It now seems that it wasn't low enough, and of course we have to remember that no matter where you place the number there's always someone going to be one below or two below the standards.

One of the problems associated with this, and I'm merely indicating -- I want to say first out that this is under consideration and we've had a rather useful suggestion put before us by the Manitoba School Trustees Association in this regard, which is under consideration. But one of the problems is that there is also some pressure to lower the number of students required where you have a full school. We brought it down to 30 in elementaries, and of course there are those who say it should be 25, or 20 or 15, as the case might be. And what I would be afraid of is that if we had a system which in effect at Mulvihill gave one teacher grant for each, let us say for each 20 students in order to give them two teacher grants, that we would then be asked to make it 20 for all the province. I'm not explaining the problem very well, but perhaps that would indicate. In other words, we have to keep in mind that any system that's adopted must be one to give the assistance where it's required without necessarily conferring the same assistance on someone else who doesn't need it. May I assure him, however, that we are most interested, and I am particularly interested in this problem because of my interest in promoting consolidation, and certainly this comes into the problem of consolidation; and also because of the apparent discrepancy, as for example the school that he mentioned which is only a few miles away and which has one teacher and a teacher grant for probably nine or ten pupils. So I can only assure him that I am aware of the problem. I'm not able to say what we may be able to do about it, however, we are hopeful that we can perhaps provide some solution.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland asked some questions about enrolment in evening classes. I have the latest report here -- as a matter of fact it will be found at page 85 of the Annual Report, and perhaps that will be sufficient. It gives the number of places where evening classes are conducted and the enrolment in the various places within the various categories of academic, vocational, citizenship and practical arts, showing a total of 5,977 students in those various categories and in the places that are indicated in the report. The question of whether or not adult education should be under the university or under the Department of Education or under both, is a question that's a good one for debate. My understanding is that at one time the adult education was under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education, and for reasons which I presume were considered satisfactory, it was transferred to the University of Manitoba where it has been since that time. I, for one, would not be in favour of disturbing the arrangement because I have no evidence that it's not working satisfactorily, and would not be in favour of having a duplicate arrangement in this regard. When I speak of adult education being under the operation of the university, I'm speaking of true adult education, making only this comment that with regard to those items that are shown on page 85 of the Annual Report, these are items, or these are classes which are carried on under the jurisdiction of school boards and for which they earn grants from the Province of Manitoba through the Department of Education.

He asked about conflict in the auditors' reports. It was my understanding that by making the provision for the two reports, we were being of assistance to school districts. I can assure the honourable member that the Department of Education checks all reports, and if there were any conflict it would be detected immediately in the Department of Education. I think the arrangement about which he has spoken is one that was made for the convenience of school districts and school trustees.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Did I understand the Minister correctly when he said you need 30 pupils before two teachers are

MR. McLEAN: No, I was speaking about the regular grants -- 30 pupils in a full classroom for one teacher grant -- 30.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I have the regulations in front of me and, as I read them, you require 35 pupils before you are entitled to two teachers -- (Interjection) -- Yes. Before you are entitled to two teacher grants, you must have an enrolment of 35. Is that correct?

I am pleased that the Minister has indicated that this matter is being considered because

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd) I feel, and I think perhaps the Minister does as well, that the children in schools such as this, where there is maybe 30 or 33 pupils being taught eight grades by one teacher, isn't a satisfactory arrangement. I think the children are suffering and when they move on to a higher school, they're going to find it difficult. So I would hope that perhaps this matter will be changed within the near future.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask two questions of the Honourable Minister of Education. (1) On looking through the Report, I don't find the proper heading that it would come under and perhaps it is because I don't understand the phraseology, but I notice that -- and it's in the matter of curriculum research. I notice in looking through other reports, particularly the Department of Agriculture and Water Conservation, they have an item headed "Resolution 36" and it has "Economic Research" as a heading, "General Research" and "Specific Research". I'm wondering if -- now I state this in view of the fact that something I think we have all read -- we have heard various newspaper editors and magazine writers, and it's quite self-evident that in the last 50 years there has been more progress technically made than in the previous 2,000 years. I was wondering if, under the matter of curriculum research, instead of a part-time advisory board it would be advisable to have on staff a highly qualified person, whether it would be your best or one of your best teachers or your best school inspector or even a member from the staff of the University of Manitoba, to devote full time to revising and up-dating and studying other provinces', states' or countries' methods of improving curriculum. So that is my first question.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, if I might just suggest that that is an important question but that it will be brought up under Item No. 4 just at the top of page 6, "Student Instruction, Directorate of Curricula." I'll be able to

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4(a). I think if we try to keep to the matter that is under discussion and watch the items that are to come we can save a little time here.

MR. JOHNSTON: is of a general nature. It is my information that Manitoba is the only province left where the school boards are required to pay \$60.00 per teacher towards the Retirement Fund. I was wondering if there was a reason for retaining that principle or could it be explained as to why we were.

MR. McLEAN: The reason is that we have the principle of the employing boards making a contribution in respect of their employees and there is no suggestion of changing it. I believe that it is not done in some other provinces and it may well be that it is not done in any other province. I am not really aware of that. We have it in Manitoba; we have no plan to abandon it.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave (a) I've asked the Minister whether he would outline to the committee his views or his policies on the matter of increasing standards, and I don't think that there was any statement made by the Minister.

MR. McLEAN: We have no plans of any change with respect to the entrance requirements of teacher training.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on the general term as well, on the 22nd of February the Minister received a brief from three of the groups involved with education, the Manitoba School Trustees Association; the Urban School Trustee Association; and the Manitoba Teachers' Society. I think this is rather notable in view of the fact that you had here a joint presentation by trustees and teachers. There were seven points in this brief. The first, committee on teacher training and certification; second, research centre; third, amendments to the grant structure; fourth, the new general course; fifth, industrial arts; sixth, teaching the French option course; and seven, the Cuisenaire method of teaching arithmetic. I wonder if the Minister is in a position to advise the committee as to the position of the department on the suggestions made in this brief.

MR. McLEAN: On all of them? No, I'm not. These are all matters which are under consideration. With respect to the General Course, the primary matter was the need for publicizing the course and gaining public acceptance. I indicated that we are starting to do certain things in that regard and undoubtedly will be having further activities. I couldn't describe at this moment or couldn't say at this moment what all may be done in that respect. If I recall correctly, the Cuisenaire Method had something to do with the training of teachers in that

(Mr. McLean, cont'd) at the Teachers' College and certainly this is going to be given the most careful consideration. We already have the summer courses at the Teachers' College and, as I recall the request, it was that this be provided on an "after hours" basis at the Teachers' College and that's under careful consideration. I'm interested at the moment in just checking on the matter of staff to carry out such a project if it were decided to do so.

In the matter of the industrial arts teachers, this is a rather complicated problem and one that we're going to have to sort out pretty soon. In actual fact and by comparison, these teachers are now actually rated for grant purposes sort of, as it were, ahead of or beyond what one might call the equivalent people in the academic field, and this seems necessary in order to encourage people into this field. I'm however not very well satisfied with the sort of general arrangements in that regard and we're going to look into it. On the rather substantial question of a joint group with regard to teacher standards and teacher certification, this has many implications and aspects which would have to be considered. It is being considered. I'm not in a position to say what action may be taken.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c) -- passed; (d) -- passed. Resolution

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on (c) there's a very substantial decrease in the item provided here, in fact from \$545,000 to \$142,000, so a drop of \$400,000.00. Presumably this is a change in the funding procedures for the teachers' pensions. I wonder if the Minister is now in a position to tell us what the procedure will be or what he intends to do on the matter of teachers' pensions.

MR. McLEAN: As I understand the rules, Mr. Chairman, I really shouldn't discuss that until the Bill is before the members of the Legislature. At that time we will have full information on the financing of the teachers' pension plan and there'll be an indication of the reason for the reduction. I can say that the reduction is due entirely to the new system that's being adopted. To simply answer the question, "Is it a change in the funding?" would be difficult because actually, as we will find, that situation is divided into two parts and you will find that one portion is funded and the other is not funded; so that, as I say, one can't give a "yes" or "no" answer just on that particular point at the present time. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, I answer the question at the moment by simply saying that the reduction is due to the new Teachers' Pension Plan that will be introduced. I would like to suggest that we might reserve our discussion about the principles of that plan until the Bill is before the Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) -- passed. Resolution 26 -- passed. Resolution 27, Item 2. Education Grants

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon the Minister suggested that I raise this point on this particular item, regarding a special grant to the Dauphin-Ochre area board. Can he tell me on what basis this grant was given and when?

MR. McLEAN: I always hope, Mr. Chairman, to get through one session of these Estimates without having to answer questions about the Dauphin-Ochre school area. However, the situation is this, Mr. Chairman, that when the school division system was brought into operation we had a system of establishment grants payable to school divisions. We made those grants payable even to those divisions that made no change, as for example, Winnipeg; St. James; Fort Garry; St. Vital; Seven Oaks, after it became a consolidated school district; St. Boniface; Norwood. In other words, there were two situations. There was the situation where an existing school district, simply by a stroke of the pen, became a school division. It received a \$10,000 establishment grant. The Duck Mountain school division became a school division by virtue of a vote. It received a \$10,000 establishment grant. In the case of the Dauphin-Ochre area, they were given the choice of either remaining as a school area or a school division. They chose to remain as a school area and the question arose whether or not they were not entitled to the establishment grant on the same basis as, for example, the school district of Winnipeg was when it became a school division. And it was after looking at the legal position it was our opinion that they were entitled and it was paid for that reason.

MR. GUTTORMSON: In other words, Mr. Chairman, the other school districts received their money two or three years ago and this is the last one to receive the money. Is this correct?

MR. McLEAN: That is correct.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, on these questions of grants, there are some specific matters I'd like to ask the Minister. Am I correct in my understanding that the grants are based, in part, on increments of \$50.00 per year for the teacher as compared to the increments which are actually in effect, which I believe range from \$200.00 to \$300.00?

MR. McLEAN: There is a difference. I think in the case of elementary teachers, it's \$50.00; in the case of secondary teachers, it's \$100.00. In any event, and in both cases, the actual increments that are paid by school districts or school division in many instances, I suppose perhaps in most instances, are in excess of those which are earned insofar as the grant system is concerned.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, this points out what to me appears to be a most unrealistic view of the government in the grant situation. It's all very well for the government to say that according to our plan, according to our recommendations, there shall be a certain minimum and there shall be a certain maximum and that these increments should go up at the rate of \$50.00 per year. I have no doubt that the school boards would be satisfied to go along with that if, in their negotiations with the teachers, the teachers would be satisfied to go along with that. But the fact is, that because of the nature of the negotiations and because of the demand for teachers and because I presume the government might look with disfavor on a monopoly type of arrangement where the school boards would form a combine in order to artificially keep salaries low, the school boards find that they must offer terms to the teachers which are substantially in excess of those which the government appears to recognize. In other words, if it would take a teacher 40 years to get to a maximum, it might be found that the teachers will not agree and the school boards are compelled to plan to get to the maximum in ten years, and I am comparing the figure of a \$50.00 increment to a \$200.00 increment. It seems to me that this is most unrealistic and is an indication of the fact that the government blinds its eyes or wears blinkers to the real situation, and is one where there is an extra cost put on the school boards and, through them, upon the municipal taxpayers who pick up the difference.

Now carrying further, Mr. Chairman, I've had occasion to point out, and I believe my information is correct, that although grants have gone up in dollar total, they have actually gone down most substantially percentage-wise, especially in operational grants. I made the point, and I would like to make it again to hear the Minister's reaction to that, that in lumping grants, and I believe that in the report of the department they are lumped if I can read it correctly under what they call combined grants -- but I may be wrong about my reading of it, I too have difficulty with some of the phraseology -- that in lumping grants, we do not get a good picture of just what the problem is. When a capital grant is made by the province it is made to match a capital expenditure made by the school board, and when the school board makes a capital expenditure on which it has to borrow, that school board must plan to pay off that debt over a period of future years which means an extra load on the municipal taxpayer. But not only that, in the recognition that there is a capital grant to be made, there is also recognition that the facilities of the school division are expanded which is only again a recognition of the fact that the Minister reported, with pride justifiably, that the school population is growing and, as a result, it is obvious that the operational costs of the school board is going up; and if the government's contribution is being reduced percentage-wise on operational grants, then obviously we are heading into a very difficult situation.

Now I hope that the answer will not be, "Well, there has been a Royal Commission set up to deal with this and we'll consider it then," because I feel that the government, and the Minister in particular, must have been giving considerable thought to this problem and must have been arriving at some conclusion. I find it difficult to believe that the Minister with all the resources that he has at his call would be able to arrive at a conclusion which would be any less realistic and less important than that which this Royal Commission will give, and I would feel that there is much that should have been done and could be done without just saying, "Well, we'll wait for a commission to bring in recommendations." Of course if the purpose of the commission is to set the climate in the province to agree to additional burden of costs, then that might be a public relations matter, but as far as the government is concerned it has done nothing to indicate that it is doing anything to remedy the situation which exists today, and that is a reducing provision for grants, operational mainly, to the school districts and the resultant increase of the load on the municipal taxpayer.

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd)

Now I am sure that what I say applies to the school districts of Greater Winnipeg. I suspect, however, from reading the report of the department, that what I say applies to all of the school districts of the Province of Manitoba, and I am sure that if I am wrong the Minister will correct me. But I have noticed that, as far as I can read the statistics given to us, that the percentage is being reduced mainly insofar as operational grants are concerned. I'm looking forward to hearing what concrete steps the Minister plans to take other than sitting back and waiting for the report of the commission.

. Continued on next page

MR. PAULLEY: Is the Minister going to reply? All I was going to say was to add to the remarks of the Honourable Member for St. John's. I've mislaid the figures that I had a short while ago which emphasizes the very point that the Honourable Member for St. John's has drawn to the attention of the committee -- at least one aspect of it. But it seems to me that while we agree that the costs of education, the educational grants from the Province of Manitoba to the educational system in the province, have increased, they have not increased nearly in proportion to the amounts that are having to be borne by the local taxpayer. If memory serves me correctly, on the figures that I compiled a short time ago, that there was something of a ratio of 4 to 1, that the costs in recent years of -- in general the over-all educational costs have gone up about \$8 million whereas the provincial contributions had only gone up about \$2 million. I recall a few years ago when the present government was making its appeal for a majority support to the Province of Manitoba that one of the items that they estimated, or emphasized rather, Mr. Chairman, at that time was that they would keep more in balance the cost of education between the municipalities and the Provincial Government. As a matter of fact, I think I'm correct in recalling that at that particular time spokesmen for the government indicated to the electorate of the province that if they were elected, then there would not be any further increase in the over-all costs of education insofar as the local taxpayer was concerned. Now, we've debated that particular point in this House at least on four occasions, I think, since the government were elected to office, and it's not my purpose at this time to pursue whether the gentlemen opposite actually said this or whether they didn't, but the point of the matter is, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the whole ratio once again has gone all out of balance, that more and more the local taxpayer left -- the increases in the costs of education are continuously going up in greater proportion to any additional support as it is being received from the Provincial authorities. So I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable the Minister and his colleagues in the Cabinet will have to take this matter into consideration irrespective of what any commission reports, or in the interim before any commission makes its report.

Now, I don't know if these are the figures or not that I should be using at this particular time. I refer to page 114 of the report of the Department, which indicates to me that between 1960 and '61, which appears to be the latest figures that we have, that between these two years, the school district expenditures increased by about \$6 million, and in the same period between those two years, taken from the estimates insofar as school grants are concerned, the over-all costs, the increase from the Provincial Government, were less than half of the \$6 million. Now this is particularly true insofar as the suburban municipalities are concerned. I have the honour of representing portions of at least three of the suburban municipalities, and I find that they're continuously having to call upon their people for additional amounts for education far out of proportion to the contribution that is being made by the provincial authority. I think you will agree, Mr. Chairman, that the base of the source of revenue insofar as the provincial jurisdiction is concerned is far greater than that of the Provincial Government; consequently there is an ever-increasing onerous burden on the taxpayer at the local level. I've also noted, Mr. Chairman, that in a number of votes that have been taken recently over the past two or three years, a number of votes at the local level that have been taken to make provision by by-law for a new school construction, that the percentage ratio in favour of these by-laws is diminishing, but whereas here after the war, for a few years after the war, there was little or no difficulty insofar as school boards were concerned in obtaining a thumping good majority for a money by-law for schools, it seems to me from observation recently that the ratio in favour of new school construction is going down, and I greatly fear that unless the provincial authorities increase their grant structure insofar as capital expenditures and also insofar as normal educational grants structure, that the day may not be long off when the residents of the respective school districts will turn the balance over the other way and reject propositions of our school boards for additional facilities. I don't think I need to point out, Mr. Chairman, although I haven't the honour of representing any part of the City of Winnipeg at the present time, that here is a concrete example of the adverse effects on the taxpayer at the local level of the present grant structure that we have in the Province of Manitoba. This balance, if there was ever a balance, and I would suggest that there was some semblance of a balance shortly after this government took office back in '58-'59, that there may have been some semblance of a balance, although not very

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) much of a balance, but the scales have tipped so much that we're back now, we're back now -- and I say back advisedly -- I think into the same position or similar position to that which would prevail when the gentlemen on my right were the government of Manitoba, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, and I plead with the Minister and with his colleagues, don't await any longer Royal Commissions. The fact of the matter is that we have this problem before us today; it's a problem that can be remedied without awaiting a Royal Commission, at least when I say I should maybe qualify, Mr. Chairman, that "it could be remedied," I say it can be alleviated to a considerable degree by action of the government itself. If the Royal Commission -- and I sincerely trust and hope they do -- bring in recommendations for a re-appraisal of all methods of taxation insofar as education is concerned, all to the well and good. We'll look at it at that particular time. But I do say to my honourable friends opposite that I believe that you're failing the taxpayer of the Province of Manitoba in respect of educational grants. It's a situation that you can alleviate, and you can do it by your own action, and with these few remarks I plead with the Minister and plead with the government to have a re-assessment now of the question of educational grants in the Province of Manitoba. They've gone all out of balance, if they ever were in balance.

MR. McLEAN: I'm afraid I will have to disappoint both the Honourable Member for St. John's and the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party by saying that any substantial change is certainly going to have to await the report of the Royal Commission. May I make two other comments; that it would be useful, if the members care to do so, to indicate where -- because the revenue that's open to the Province is limited -- where you consider, in what other departments you consider reductions should be made and in what particular field, so that the money would become available to the Department of Education. I would be the first to welcome this transfer and, indeed, have a very good idea how it might be spent.

The second general observation I would make is that members may recall -- those who were here last year -- that I gave a comparison of the increase, the comparative rate of increase, as between the provincial contribution toward education costs and the local contribution, and pointed out that the comparison was three -- the increase was by three times in the case of the province to one in the case of the local cost; that is, the rate of increase insofar as the province was concerned was three times that of the rate of increase of the local people. Now, that's not to say that I was dealing there with figures for the entire Province of Manitoba, and it would be possible to pick out places, individual places, where that proportion did not exist, and so on, but I was dealing there with over-all figures for the Province of Manitoba. Now when I say that, that is not to say that I think that even the increase on the local level was a good thing. I'm not saying that; I'm not suggesting it. I'm merely saying that -- or did say that in proportion that the province, from its revenues, had borne a very substantial part of the increased cost.

Now, I would not wish to get into any discussion with the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party on the matter of finances because that's really out of my field. However, I would like him to look at page 114 of the Annual Report and to try and follow me through just a little bit of the situation as I see it. If he will look at the column running across the page, under the title "Expenditures" he will find that the total expenditures increased, as he has pointed out, from \$54.8 million to \$60.5 million between 1960 and 1961. That's an over-all increase in the provision of educational services of a little better than \$6 million. Then if he turns to the column above that, he will notice the various revenues which were open to the school administrations concerned, and look at the item of "Special Taxes." Now that is where it is indicated that the local revenues are raised, and you will note that the rise in expenditure there was from \$19.2 million to \$21.5 million, an increase of \$2.3 million. Now remember that the total increase was just a little less than -- I'm getting into trouble with this arithmetic of mine again -- but almost \$6 million; but the increase to the local taxpayer was \$2.3 million, and the entire balance of the increase comes in the other forms of revenue, all of which are received from the Province of Manitoba -- combined grants, from \$32.1 million to \$34.6 million; that's \$2.5 million; in capital grants from \$3.4 million to \$4.1 million; other grants, which are miscellaneous grants that are paid, and sundry -- actually there was no additional from sundry because that item went down. Now, the point I just want to take in the illustration which he has given us is that it is not correct to say that the greater portion of the increase was borne by the

(Mr. McLean cont'd) local tax basis but rather about one third of that increase was levied on local taxes. Now I just give you that analysis, as I understand the situation, and point that out for the information of the committee. Again, I'm not suggesting that even \$3 million is not a substantial increase; it was, but it's the smaller part of the burden of the total increase.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could just carry these figures of the Honourable Minister's a little further. As I heard him say, and as I read it, the increase in total expenditure was \$5.7 million out of \$60.6 million, roughly, which is obviously less than 10 percent increase -- I would guess at between eight and nine but it's obviously less than ten. The increase of 2.3 million on the special tax of 21.5 million is in excess of ten percent and this, to me, supports the contention that I made that the local taxpayer is carrying an increasing percentage of the cost than is the Province of Manitoba. I also did not hear the Minister comment about the difference that I seem to see between a capital grant and an operational grant, and I am still satisfied, from the figures I have, that the operational grant is going substantially down, and that is really a matter of even greater concern because it indicates the future. Now when the Minister mentioned that the government assumed three times the amount, or three times the percentage of increase, I don't know whether he's talking about the difference between '57 and '62, or what years; I'm wondering which years he is talking about.

MR. McLEAN: '62.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm sure of that because if the Honourable Minister went from '58 to '59 or to '60 he would account for it right off the bat, and we would know that that had to do with the new grant relationship, with the substantial increase of teachers' salaries, with the creation of the school division, but I am bound to come back to the Minister and ask him the question which is famous, and that is, "What have you done lately?" And lately I find that he hasn't done anywhere near what he did a few years ago. I have before me a document which I know is in the hands of the government. It's a supplement to a brief presented to the Executive Council in May of 1961, and they have figures there which I can't quite find in the government report that I have and -- these figures are estimated but they speak for the entire Province of Manitoba and draw the comparison between '60-'61 and '61-'62. This is estimated. General operational grants, \$20.5 million in '60-'61; general operational grants in '61-'62, \$18.8 million -- a decrease of \$1.7 million. They agree that the capital grants in those two years went up \$1.7 million and therefore they seem to be the same, regardless, of course of the natural increase in cost, but the decrease in operational grants is very significant and I would suggest that what the Minister told us was something that was in the past and that he ought to do something "lately."

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister in -- one of the first points he made was to request the Leader of this group or me to find him the money for the increased cost. I really rejoice in his invitation and I think I should defer to my Leader to see whether he wants the pleasure of dealing with it; otherwise -- (interjection) -- Thank you. Well -- (interjection) -- Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll just cut it short. I want to point out to the Minister a fact of which I am sure he is aware but which he may have overlooked just now, and that is that there are two ways that a department can find money in the government; one way by cutting down on something else, and the other way is looking for other sources of revenue. Now I hate to think that the mental status of the government is such that they could only look for funds for a project in that field which means cutting down on something else, and I will not go into that field which was dealt with so extensively by the group on our right where they found \$2 million so easily. I didn't quite follow it well enough to find it so I can't say that that's where you find it; but I would say that this party has consistently, both on the election platform and in this House, pointed out that there is another means or re-arranging the tax revenue that would provide this, and since the Minister invited me to speak on the issue, I'm happy to point out that we did not in any way suggest that the cost of education in the Province of Manitoba need be increased in order to re-arrange the tax. We did say that we felt that education was of such paramount importance that it out to be paid out of the pockets of the people based on ability to pay. We did say, and we reiterate, that it is wrong to put the cost on the real property assessment basis, and we recognize the fact when \$60 million are spent, of which some \$25 million -- I may be wrong about the figures -- 22 or 3 million -- come out of the pockets of real property ratepayers, that that money can be matched on a more equitable

(Mr. Cherniack cont'd) basis based on income tax, and we suggest strongly that that is not going to raise the income tax of the people concerned to any substantial amount such as to frighten them away from this province. These people do pay real property tax. They would be asked to pay it in income tax, but if their ability to pay is greater than the relationship that they bear to other real property taxpayers then they will pay more and the real property taxpayers would pay less but in the total it would add up to the same number of dollars; so that now that the Minister has invited us to suggest to him where he gets the funds I hope he will see his way clear to getting them, and quickly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I don't think that it's incumbent upon the Opposition to tell the government where to get the money nor to tell the government where to make a cut. I think that is their responsibility. The fact is that the municipal share of education has gone up proportionately higher than the government's contribution towards education during the past five years, and that the fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that the reason for that is due to the fact that the basis for determining a school division's share of the educational costs is on equalized assessment, and equalized assessment throughout every municipality in this province has gone up progressively during the past five years. Take for instance the municipality of St. Andrews which is only a part of the Lord Selkirk School Division. In 1956, the equalized assessment of that municipality was \$3,815,000.00. In 1961, the equalized assessment of that municipality was \$5,734,000, and in 1962 — I haven't got the exact figure, but it's well over \$6 million. Now since that is the basis for determining the school division's initial liability for educational costs, you can readily see that the higher equalized assessment grows in any municipality the greater is the proportion of the educational costs that have to be paid by that municipality. Equalized assessment, if I remember correctly, was originally devised as a means of taxation. Now it's being used as a means for determining grants. The original conception of equalized assessment, I think it was in those days when we had a municipal commissioner's levy in this province, and we taxed the municipalities on an equalized basis for the purpose of raising necessary revenues for that particular department. Now we are using that as a means of determining grants, and I think the system is wrong. I think any system which determines liability for raising money on the basis of assessment is too unstable to be used as a means for that purpose. I heard the First Minister speaking on the Throne Speech debate in connection with the provincial assessment in the municipality of St. Andrews. I heard him say that the capital cost of that land had gone up. That may be true, but the fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that these farmers and these residents in that area, they're there to stay; they're not holding the land for the purpose of speculation, and when their liability for taxation increases, something on account of some controls over which they can exercise no controls, I say the system is inequitable. I'd say that the only equitable way to determine liability for educational costs in this province or any other province should be on what it costs on a per capita basis to educate a child. Now it's all very well for the government to say that we have appointed a Royal Commission to look into this. I'd say that the government is in possession of all the facts and figures which will come to the attention of the Royal Commission, and I'd say, Mr. Chairman, that the only reason why a Royal Commission is being appointed, is in the hope that the Royal Commission will recommend a sales tax.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2 (a).

MR. MOLGAT: Do you want to pursue your point?

MR. PAULLEY: There's just one point that I want to pursue with the Minister. I used his report of the Department of Education dealing with the question of revenues and expenditures, and I used the figure to indicate which seems to me that the expenditures had risen by 5.7 million. The Minister indicated the difference between the figures as shown on the revenue statement there under special taxes as being just around a little less than \$2 million. I have now before me, however, the figure of the total tax imposition at the municipal level in respect of school taxation for the year 1960 as taken from the report of the Department of Municipal Affairs, and I find that the total tax imposition for all of the municipalities in the Province of Manitoba in respect of the year 1960 amounted to over \$30 million. The figure that is being shown on page 114 to which the Minister referred to as an indication of the tax imposition and the revenues from the municipalities is only \$19 million. Now, there's a vast difference, and

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) I think this substantiates, and I can substantiate by referring to the total tax imposition on municipalities as contained in the report of the Department of Municipal Affairs as against that as contained in this report that we have before me and to which the Minister referred, justify his side of the argument. I think, and it was on this basis that I mentioned that the ratio -- previously that the ratio had all gone out of balance -- that it appears to me that in the report of the Department that they're not taking into consideration all aspects of the tax levy at the local level, and it's that picture, it's that picture that we have to consider when we're dealing with the question of the greater imbalance between municipal and provincial contributions to education.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, I'm not standing up to suggest to the government some alternate means of revenue for schools. I think the gentlemen opposite are the government and it's their responsibility and the onus is on the government to find ways and means. They promised to lighten the tax load some several years ago, and now it's almost five years and the tax load has not been lightened. But I'm going to pursue the grants while we're still on the grants. Yesterday I asked the Honourable Minister what he has decided; whether he has decided to cease discriminating against certain areas in my constituency as far as teacher grants are concerned and I suggested that it was the children who were suffering and they had no say in it. I didn't get an answer. I listened very carefully to the answer given to the Honourable Member from Rhineland, but it didn't apply to my area, because the Honourable Minister was very optimistic about the outcome of the referendum being held towards the end of this month. He seems to think that the people will accept the division's plan and the problems will cease to be a problem. Well I wish it was just as easy in my area. I listened to him; there was no answer. I would like to ask the Minister, I would like him to tell me what his stand is as far as this problem is concerned of teacher grants in the proposed boundary division. I didn't get an answer yet.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, there is no provision in the estimates for any change in the present grant regulations that would have any effect on the territory referred to by the Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. PAULLEY: reconcile the figures that I have before me now and the ones that we were using a little earlier.

MR. McLEAN: No, Mr. Chairman, I'm unable to make any reconciliation of them. I think the principle -- we discussed the principle, and I don't think any -- I couldn't add anything to it by discussing any, or attempting to make any reconciliation.

MR. PAULLEY: Minister agree with me then, Mr. Chairman, that the figures as contained in the report of the Department on page 114, the item "Special Taxes" in respect of the year 1960 of \$19.2 million is not the revenue or the amount of taxes collected at the local level, but that the report of the Municipal Department which indicates a collection of \$30.2 million is the correct figure insofar as tax imposition is concerned on the local taxpayer?

MR. McLEAN: Well I would be very reluctant to admit that there was anything in the report not accurate. I would not challenge the figures that the Honourable the Member was given.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . in the accuracy but the explanation; there may be an explanation forthcoming that would indicate that, and would substantiate my contention, and I believe that it is correct that the level of municipal contribution, the local tax levy, has still increased in a greater proportion than that of governmental or provincial contribution to education, and this is the point which I wish to establish before this committee today, and in establishing this point I think that I can and have an indication that the Province of Manitoba are failing the people of the Province of Manitoba in respect of educational costs.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman finish be okay? I'm not too well satisfied with the answer given by the Honourable Minister. I presume that by his answer he means that the only way in which we will qualify for the grants in my area would be to get into a school division, right? He shakes -- nods his head -- that's the answer. We tried this winter and I -- probably the Honourable Minister is aware of that -- we've had two meetings during the winter months and we did try to revive this desire for a school division, but I must admit that we did not get too far; in fact the inspector in the area also took a hand in it. I don't know whether the Minister has been approached or not, but we're not able to resolve it. I wonder if the Minister

(Mr. Tanchak cont'd) wouldn't show a little more leadership here and give us some suggestions as to what we should do, or probably get into the area with some of his influential men from the Department of Education and show leadership. Give us some suggestions or some means whereby the problem could be settled. I notice that in Dauphin-Ochre the Minister did speak as well as he did speak in Ridgeville, I understand, but he was able to more or less persuade the people in Dauphin-Ochre that they were all right the way they are, that they didn't exactly have to accept the school division. Maybe with his persuasive ability he could persuade the people in my area to accept the division. I would invite him to do that, to come to this area. Will you?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, we're still on resolution 27? It seems that we've spent over an hour and a half in the wonderland of statistics, figures, and so on and so forth, but I think that out of all this one thing does appear quite clearly, and that is that the Minister is correct when he suggests that in an absolute sense the provincial grants have increased to a greater extent than have the costs to the local taxpayer -- in an absolute sense -- but proportionately in a percentage-wise sense there is no comparison. The cost to the municipal taxpayer for education is more than twice that of the increase percentage-wise to the Province of Manitoba. It shows up in all its stark clarity, right in the reports, and the report of the Department of Municipal Affairs, so we can have the pleasure of thinking on both sides that we're both right. But it all depends how you want to look at it. I suggest that it is a -- we're only deluding ourselves when we point to absolute amounts, for all the percentage that counts too because it reflects on the capacity of the province and on the municipalities to bear the cost of education. As I say -- and it bears repetition -- the municipalities, the cost of education to the municipalities, has increased in a percentage sense to a degree twice as great as it has to the Province of Manitoba.

Leaving that point, I would like to ask the Minister if he can convey a message to his department and staff to do something with regard to the format of the report, with regard to two specific items. One I'll leave till we get to Vocational Education -- but dealing with scholarships, bursaries and loans, it's really difficult to determine the amount of money made available for loans, the amount made available for bursaries and for scholarships in a distinct compartmentalized sense. Now, I presume that the Department of Education is providing somewhere in the order of \$140,000 per year to the University for scholarships, bursaries and loans, but it takes some digging to find that. On that very point, I would like to refer the Minister to page 49 of the report with regard to university bursaries. We have such a great discrepancy between the number of applications and the number of awards made. Now let the Minister suggest that there's a discrepancy because they found on going through the applications that perhaps some of the applicants didn't really deserve an award. I would point out to him that in the report of the President of the University, on page 161, we have the following statement: "The total amount" -- this is pertaining to the Department of Education monies -- "the total amount actually taken up was slightly less than the \$140,000 available," which seems to indicate that the reason why there's such a discrepancy between the number of applications and the number of awards is because after they made these limited number of awards they found themselves out of money, \$140,000 being the sum total of the amount made available to the university for bursaries, etc. by this Department. All of which brings me to the point that I think we have to re-investigate our present system of granting bursaries and loans. We have to clarify the difference between scholarships, bursaries and loans, because at the present time it's a pretty hopeless mess. Some are repaid; some don't have to be repaid. It's pretty hard to determine just how much has been loaned out as distinct from bursaries to students in each year; and before we leave this appropriation number, I hope the Minister will give us as distinctly as possible, as clearly as possible, (a) the amount of scholarships -- the amount of money paid out in scholarships to post-secondary students, (b) the amount of money paid out in bursaries to post-secondary students, and (c) the amount of money loaned to post-secondary students. Page 49 does not present a very pretty picture -- certainly no room for complacency.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister requested whether we could supply the means whereby we could increase expenditure of the expenses incurred in education, and I think the member for St. John's mentioned the two areas, one of reducing expenses

(Mr. Froese cont'd) in other departments, and also further taxation. I think there's a third avenue open which should be explored and should be expanded, and that is the matter of natural resources. I'm sure this area could be expanded and that we could derive revenues from our natural resources that we have in the Province of Manitoba. We see that both the provinces to our west, Alberta and Saskatchewan, receive enormous amounts due to the development of their natural resources. I know the amount that Alberta receives would cover four times over what we spend in education in Manitoba. New socialist Saskatchewan is receiving enough to I think almost cover the total cost of our educational program in Manitoba. So that here's an area which should be developed and which would provide us with additional revenue -- to give us the revenue to increase our expenditures in education.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to draw the Minister's attention to the fact that the cost of administration in the divisions has been going up continuously, and as far as the government is concerned it hasn't changed its original formula which I believe is a straight \$5,000 grant, or so much per teacher, depending which is larger. Well, the administrative costs in some of the districts have gone up -- oh I'd say probably five, six times what they were in the first year of operation, and this is a large item, and I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that he take under advisement the possibility of having this based on the percentage basis. Instead of having a set figure, agree to a certain percentage of the costs. Now, our divisions are run by good trustees -- at least mine is that I know of -- and they're very careful in their expenditures. Where they have no control, of course, is in the matter of loaning money to keep financing their operations, and the interest charges have been particularly high in a lot of the divisions. The reason for that may come up later in the session, but I would very seriously suggest to the Minister that the formula upon which these grants are based be changed from a fixed amount to a percentage of the costs. Now, whatever the percentage may be, we've undertaken in most instances to pay at least 50 percent of other aspects of the costs of education. That may be a proper figure to use in this case also.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd like to ask the Minister some details about the schools at Lynn Lake. I don't see exactly where else I could bring it up except under the grants. What is the establishment there? What is our responsibility, and what is the responsibility of the company in that regard?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, the School District of Lynn Lake is an organized school district, the same as any other school district. It has an official trustee who is also the local government administrator of the local government district of Lynn Lake, and in all respects the district operates as an ordinary school district, with local taxation for school purposes, and with all of the -- in all regular respects. There is one difference, and that is that under the terms of the agreement between the Province of Manitoba and the Sherritt Gordon Mines Limited, the Company is to provide the school buildings and, in addition, they pay a certain sum of money to the local government district in lieu of taxes that is based on a certain sum of money per employee and that's one's part of the revenue of the local government district and of course is available for school purposes and other necessary requirements, both the schools and local government administration. I don't think I could add anything to it, that is, to the explanation. These special arrangements are part of the terms of an agreement between the Province of Manitoba and the Sherritt Gordon Mines Limited.

MR. MOLGAT: I thank the Minister for his statement, and I was particularly interested in the portion where the company is responsible for providing the buildings. And my question is then, why doesn't the government see to it that the company does provide buildings, because at the present moment it is not. At the present moment there is one main school which is a reasonable school. It was built, I believe, at the time roughly when the townsite was established and is reasonable. In addition to that, then there is an old two-storey building which was amongst those transported from the old Sherridon site to the new Lynn Lake site. It's had added to it an annex in very poor condition. In fact, when I was there the safety door on the side did not work. It was, to say the least, deplorable type of accommodation. In addition to that then, there is another sort of double-hut arrangement for the smaller grades. So the present situation then is: the main school -- reasonable; this two-storey building and annex; very poor condition, where there are three classrooms; and apart from that, this other double building

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) with two classrooms. At the moment, there is construction going on. There's a new school being built. It's a steel structure, but accommodation is only being provided, as far as I could find out on my visit, for three classrooms. And yet we have obviously five classrooms now under what can be at very best termed "temporary quarters." Why is it that the company is only building a three-classroom school and not a five-classroom where there is the present need indicated?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, this is another one of these blow-by-blow episodes. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition says why isn't the government seeing to such and such and so and so. Well, of course, the government has no responsibility to dictate to the School District of Lynn Lake how they conduct their affairs, any more than it has responsibility of dictating to the School District of Ste. Rose how they conduct their affairs. The law is quite clear, that the official trustee is in the place of the elected school board insofar as the school district is concerned, and it's his duty and function to carry out his responsibilities in that regard. However, I have not necessarily stayed by that technical position, and at the request of the people concerned I did intervene and negotiate with the company with regard to the school building situation, and I think I might say that as a result of our interest in the matter they were persuaded to build the building which is now being constructed. They naturally were not too anxious to spend more money than they had to, and it took some persuasion to get them to agree. They have placed the new building there. It is now completed, and as far as I am aware is occupied. The terms of the arrangement were that the basic building would be placed there, that additional rooms would be added in this year of 1963, that new lights would be placed in the two-roomed annex, and that as quickly as possible the old annex, commonly known as the Sherridon Annex, would be discontinued -- the use of it would be discontinued. All of these arrangements were made by negotiations by ourselves with the company and in that instance we were acting on behalf of the school district, although we had no particular authority to do so. I believe that an improvement is being made in the school accommodation at Sherridon and we have done our best to give them every possible assistance. May I also say that we have been of some assistance to them in other matters, particularly relating to financial matters where we thought we could help them, and I believe that they are getting around to a reasonable situation.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is the original agreement signed with the government or signed with the school district? The original agreement providing that the company will supply the school buildings?

MR. McLEAN: My recollection is that the agreement was an agreement between the Province of Manitoba, Sherritt Gordon Mines Limited and the Local Government District of Lynn Lake. I do not think -- I can't just recall -- but I doubt that the school district is a party to the original agreement.

MR. MOLGAT: In this case then the government would have every right to get involved in seeing to it that the company does live up to its requirements if the government is in fact one of the signers to the original agreement. Now, would the Minister agree that there is actually need for five classrooms at the moment and not just three?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, that's the reason we made the stipulation to the company that they had to provide five classrooms. They were financially unable, so they said, to provide them all at once and so we agreed that they would provide three, which they've done, in the present building and the additional two by September 1st, 1963.

MR. CHAIRMAN: passed?

MR. DESJARDINS: I wonder if the Honourable Minister could tell me if this is the proper item that would cover the free textbooks for the I can't seem to . . .

MR. McLEAN: Yes

MR. DESJARDINS: If this is the place I wonder if the Honourable Minister could give me the exact amount that was spent last year on free textbooks and what is estimated for this year.

MR. McLEAN: We estimate about \$600,000 for textbooks in this forthcoming fiscal year.

MR. DESJARDINS: Does the Honourable Minister have the amount that was spent last year on that or -- this is the estimated for this coming term, eh?

MR. McLEAN: The estimate -- I wouldn't know the amount spent. Just a minute here -- no, I'm not looking at the right figures here -- \$640,000.00.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can tell me if it's the intention of the government to change its policy so that all the students, without discrimination, will receive free textbooks this coming year.

MR. McLEAN: There's no change in any of the provisions with regard to this item.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before -- this is no debate but just a request to the Minister. I note, Sir, on page 112. It lists there receipts and payments. It seems to me that we wouldn't get into a hassle as we got into this afternoon insofar as figures are concerned if in future we had this type of information in the Annual Report. If you'll note, Mr. Minister, that it shows there it seems to me in total receipts, cash balance, provincial grants, municipal taxes, etcetera, all compiled very concisely, and then there is an insert of page 113 which deviates from the method shown on page 112 and I'm wondering whether or not the Minister would give consideration, in compiling the report for the department in future years, to go back to the format as used on page 112. Information is more readily obtainable it seems to me on that set-up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2 (a) passed, (b) passed, (c) passed?

MR. McLEAN: On the matter of this 2 (b) Mr. Chairman, if I may just -- the Honourable Member from Brokenhead was asking some questions about the discrepancy between applications and awards. May I make this first comment, that I'm not particularly well satisfied with the general arrangements in regard to these matters and that is the reason we are presently working on a complete revision which, if we are successful, we may have before the Legislature next year. I think that the discrepancy between the number of applications and the number of awards is -- while it's substantial it's not a serious matter, because you must remember that we're in an age now when everybody applies for a bursary. They apply at a time when they don't know whether or not they're going to successfully complete the year in which they are at the present time; they have to apply; many of them fail in their work. Others of them are not of a sufficiently high academic standing to be granted a bursary, and others of course simply do not need it; they have funds available for their education and the system followed is that of providing the funds for those who can demonstrate a financial necessity. Now all of this is a very difficult thing because it's a matter of opinion and so it is because of that that I am hopeful that we will be able to change our entire system. I would hope that we might devise a system which would encourage young men and women, because we're talking for the most part here about post-high school people -- those who are in high school . . . there are relatively few people who need bursaries for going to high school in these days -- post-high school people, and I'm rather hopeful of developing a system which will encourage them to do as much as they can for themselves. I think that's worthwhile. There are employment opportunities available and I would hope that they would make the best use of these opportunities. I make that general comment to assure him that the system is not one that I particularly defend. I believe that it's working fairly insofar as the present system is capable of working adequately. I would hope that we will have a new system for discussion before too long before this Legislature.

MR. ARTHUR WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Item (b) (3), Miscellaneous Grants. I noted last year that there was an amount in there for alcohol education and as this amount is growing much slower in relation to the other grants, I just wondered whether the amount for alcohol education is increasing or is it being maintained at its constant level.

MR. McLEAN: The same level, same amount.

MR. WRIGHT: what the amount is please?

MR. McLEAN: Well now, at this particular point we have the grants to the Manitoba Alcohol Education Service. That's the former Temperance Alliance, and the amount is \$30,000.00.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of scholarships, and loan fund and so on. In the early part of the year, in one of the press releases it was indicated that the deadline for application for some of these bursaries or scholarships was the month of February. Now isn't this somewhat early for having a closing deadline? It seems to me that a lot of the students who would be considering going to university next year might not be yet in a position to

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) to know for sure and, while I appreciate the need for the department to get their applications in early so that they can make a thorough investigation, if it prevents people from attending I think we should consider changing that deadline, should we not?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, although we do try to see that no one is -- if there is a bonafide case of some person perhaps not knowing of the deadline or being prevented by some outward circumstance from applying within time we get them all in and deal with them. I'm inclined to think it is fairly early and I'm just at the moment not quite able to explain why it is, other than the desire of the committee to get applications in and begin examining them, assessing them.

MR. CHERNIACK: On this item I am happy to hear the Minister say that he is not satisfied with the program and that revisions are being made, because I feel that in this instance any suggestions that any of us can make will certainly not fall on deaf ears because of the fact that he is considering changes. Before I deal with this subject there are some questions I wonder if I could have answered. I see from the Public Accounts, page 181, that in 1961-'62 the loan fund expended some \$80,508.00. The Public Accounts do not show how much was allocated for that sum but I would be interested in knowing how much of the \$150,000 for '62-'63 was expended. I assume it was something like \$140,000 as mentioned by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead but I'm sure the Minister has the exact figure. And while the Minister is looking for that information, another question, just to confirm my impression that this fund is really a revolving fund and that there must be revenue for repayment of the loans which I assume is shown as a revenue item, and therefore I wonder if it's really, truly a disbursement in that it is a loan which is returnable. If I am right then may I suggest that the Minister give consideration to the thought that it might be advisable to build up a fund rather than to keep it at a low level if it were a revolving fund.

Now I have a third question, if I may ask it, and then I'd like to speak on this. The Minister has today distributed samples of certain brochures for the Manitoba Institute of Technology. I notice that in the Civil Technology one there is a statement that fees are \$200 per year and that substantial bursaries and interest-free loans will be available. I would ask if this is the item from which the funds would be available, and I also bring to his attention that I do not see similar sections in the two other brochures which were distributed and therefore ask whether similar provisions do not apply in the other fields.

MR. McLEAN: They apply to all courses given by the Institute of Technology.

MR. CHERNIACK: Then I would say that it is a pity that the others do not indicate the information, which I think will be part of what I want to say in any event about the loan fund. I assume the Minister does not yet have the answer to the question as to how much was expended last year?

MR. McLEAN: How much was actually loaned last year? No, I don't seem to have that figure, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WRIGHT: I assume that it is the \$140,000 which was referred to. Am I also correct in my assumption that it is a revolving fund? And that

MR. McLEAN: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I've had an opportunity to look at the regulations and application form for government bursary scholarships and prizes, and there are a few comments I'd like to make on it. The first and foremost is regulation 2(a) which sets out that one of the purposes of the awards is to equalize the opportunities for higher education in the province. That's a masterful statement and one which, of course, we would all welcome if it were really true, but I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if that is the purpose then what follows after this does not really indicate a complete effort to equalize the opportunities for higher education. In passing, I would refer to regulation 3(a) which says that the applicant shall be a Canadian citizen or a British subject, and I stop on that and wonder whether there ought to be that type of restriction. We have invited in this country of ours many peoples to come and settle here and to become residents and citizens. It seems to me that it is a form of discrimination for a person who has indicated his acceptance of the invitation by coming in and working, acquiring land; he's paying real property taxes; he's paying income taxes; and to tell him that his children may not qualify because of the fact that he has not completed the five-year residence rule. I think I'm right in suggesting that this is an unwarranted restriction if all the other

(Mr. Cherniack cont'd) requirements are complied with, and again suggest to the Minister that this is one of the aspects at which he take a look in this revision which he plans. I might even suggest that if it were right to be restricted, that it would be right to restrict it to Canadian citizens only and not enable British subjects as well to apply, because they, too, can become citizens as can immigrants from other parts of the world.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the indication here is that bursaries range from \$100.00 to \$500.00. There are different types of bursaries and the amount --(interjection)-- Pardon. Some are \$50.00 -- Well, my note said \$100.00 but possibly some are \$50.00. I don't believe that that is really a recognition of the fact that many students need more than that in order to be able to continue with their higher education. Loans are limited under the regulation in the main to \$300.00. There are several categories, and I say "in the main" just to save somebody pointing out that in one case or another it is somewhat different. Then of course the Minister in one case, and in another case the Lieutenant-Governor and Council, is given the authority to increase it and I would suggest from the report that we already have in the departmental report, that very seldom is the amount increased, and therefore, if the amount of the bursary or the loan is restricted to some \$300.00 then I don't believe that the premise on which this is founded -- that is, that the purpose is to equalize opportunity -- is carried out. There are many costs and many needs of students which go beyond the \$300.00, and in the day that I've had, the morning that I had to investigate this, Mr. Chairman, I have learned that there is a feeling -- and I am giving my opinion, after having spoken to various people who are concerned in the handling of this -- that there is a strong feeling of inadequate provision for funds for these purposes. Now I'm not saying I'm quoting them, but I'm coming close enough to what I believe to be the feeling that they have, and that is supported by the suggestion made by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead, and that is that there may be many applications that are not made because of the limitations shown in these regulations. And there are many people who are not even phoned. Now, the Minister pointed out, I think yesterday, that in most of these cases they are expected to repay the loan, say \$300.00 during the following summer, and I think he said he's not happy with it, and I'm not either because if it is, all they're doing is saying, "Instead of using the money you earned last summer, we're giving you an opportunity to go to work next summer and raise the money with which to make the rebate." I understand that this is not always adhered to, but this is the policy which is sometimes varied under certain circumstances, but very seldom. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, --Oh yes, I do point out that in addition to Manitoba grants we have certain other funds at the University, such as the Alumni Fund; there's a Kellogg's Fund and there's a Chown Fund and there are various others which have rather limited resources, and all and all, they, too, seem to be in the field of \$300.00 to \$500.00. I would suggest, therefore, that this is but a mere attempt to assist and only partially assist.

We all know the costs of university education are much greater than the amount of the tuition alone. I think it is wrong -- I fully agree with the Minister that a student must make every effort to make a sacrifice -- so should his family -- to see that he goes through school, but this reliance or dependence on the summer job, I think is not a proper one. I would suggest that -- for one thing you never know what the employment situation is, and I remember that last summer the efforts of the Selective Service were to see to it that the unemployed who had dependents should get jobs first, and as I recall it, university students had great difficulty getting jobs. Secondly I would point out that the reason for this break during the summer is not necessarily to have them go out to earn money, but may also be a recognition of their need to relax and to prepare for the next year, and I mean that not only physically, I mean that they can prepare themselves with the reading course and are usually given advice to that extent. I have come to the conclusion, Mr. Chairman, \$300.00 is not enough in many cases, and I suggest that the restriction freezes out a number of people who might have been in the list of applicants and who are not there. I suggest that repayment in the following summer is, in many cases, too soon, and indicates just a mere help for a brief period of time.

I suggest that there is insufficient search being made for recruits. I know that there are efforts made both by the Alumni Association and by the University to go out into the high schools and to find students, but as far as I have been able to gather, it's a rather hit-or-miss method, and although latterly they have been covering a little more of the area, I don't think that whoever

(Mr. Cherniack cont'd) is responsible is doing an adequate job in actually finding students who might be potential university graduates and who do not turn up because they are not found, and I suggest again there is an inadequate supply of funds available. I appreciate that there must be that sacrifice on the part of the student and his family, and I have seen many sacrifices in the days when I was in University, but I feel that this province has a tremendous stake in the university graduates and a tremendous interest in increasing the quality of the university graduate, and therefore we should make a much stronger effort to find them. And finally, I just want to conclude by saying that just because a student is at the university, it does not necessarily mean that he is going to be an asset on graduation. Many will not graduate; some will not necessarily measure up to the high standard that should be set, and I feel -- I think I've said this before here -- I feel that if it were a question of the availability of funds it would be much more important to find those who will get the best out of the university education than to leave it to their parents' ability to support them while they are attending the school.

MR. CHAIRMAN: passed; (c) passed. Resolution 27 passed.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): I'd like to speak to (c) if I may please. I'd like to point out on the general grant, as to what percentage -- from the Honourable Minister -- is capital expenditure and what is operating expenditure, under (1); and also as to whether under Part (2) as to the -- are there any special research grants included under (c)(2)?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I think I can answer that quickly. There are no capital grants in Item (c) (1). That general grant is made up entirely of operating funds. The capital grant for the university will be brought forward with the capital estimates of the province when we deal with them later. I don't think that there's any research in the grant for non-recurring expenditures. The research would really be in the general grant -- that is it's part of the budget of the university and goes to make up the amount that they require for their operation. The so-called non-recurring expenditures are of -- I suppose one might say of a sort of semi-capital nature, but don't particularly relate to research.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): one short, brief question in connection with (2) (c). For the over \$5 million grant of the government -- grant to university -- has the Minister of Education any say in the administration, or in an advisory capacity, or any other way -- or we're dealing them the \$5 million to do as you like.

MR. McLEAN: The Minister of Education has nothing to say.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to find out about the -- is the capital expenditure something in the vicinity of \$2,400,000.00?

MR. McLEAN: I think we have to wait until the capital estimates are brought down.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Well then, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate if the honourable minister would clarify a rather confused state of affairs in my own mind which might be quite natural, but on Page 91 of Hansard of March 7th, it was stated that the capital expenditures were something like \$2,400,000, the operating costs to the university was roughly \$5 million, making a total of \$7,400,000, and our total estimates in the budget is roughly \$5,865,000, making a difference of about \$1,535,000.00. Would the Minister be kind enough to explain where this discrepancy comes in and why?

MR. McLEAN: That speech referred to last year. These are the proposed expenditures for the forthcoming fiscal year, which will start on April 1st. Perhaps on that occasion we were referring to past expenditures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 27 passed? I call it 5:30 and leave the chair until 8:00 o'clock.