

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
1:30 o'clock, Friday, May 10, 1974

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You've certainly changed your appearance since before lunch, Mr. Chairman. It must be that cheap rye they serve now.

Mr. Chairman, I'll repeat that last paragraph. I think it's important and it won't hurt to have the record. In terms of practical results in the school, Frontier's record is deplorable. Last September of the total school enrollment of 5,245, only 58, or 1.1 percent, were enrolled in Grade 12. Given past performance we'll be lucky if half that number graduate. Even if they do graduate, what is their future? The program operated by Frontier trains students to leave the community, and when they leave they find they are totally ill-equipped to deal with the outside world. Those who remain, or return, have been trained to do nothing except receive welfare payments. They are caged in a never-ending land, where they have no right to even have expectations. The situation at the school, Mr. Chairman, is recognized by some of the teachers. We have different degrees of teachers, different ways of teaching. I've never been a friend to teachers since they turned down the right to strike. But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, the three teachers concerned at Frontier, two are so frustrated they are to resign their positions and go in the mining area. One is going to resign because the system as he sees it is very dishonest. Mr. Chairman, the educational system serving our remote northern communities is not the prior preserve of the Winnipeg-based central bureaucracy in the Frontier school division. It is rather the vehicle which should be controlled by the people it is supposed to serve, the vehicle which should enable them to develop themselves and their communities, which should decrease their dependency on the rest of the province, and which would free our people and have them become equal, participating members of society.

This is not happening, Mr. Chairman, on the Frontier's administration, nor will it happen. I have therefore no alternative but to advocate in the strongest possible terms a complete revamping of the public school system in the remote northern communities.

A MEMBER: Right on.

MR. BARROW: And at the same time to express to my colleagues in government my intention to pursue this crucial matter with all the force and energy at my command until it is dealt with in a manner satisfactory to our people in the north, rather than to the satisfaction of the Frontier administration.

I want to see our education system in the north pursue a course of action which will have the schools controlled by the communities: where the total community will be involved in education; where the education system plays a leading role in attacking problems of nutrition, housing, creating employment, and other social economic factors; where the talents and cultures of people are valued and utilized as vital and irreplaceable components in the school program, rather than downgraded as they now are. In short, I want this government to develop an alternative to the present educational system in the remote northern communities, and I want it done as soon as possible, Mr. Chairman. I want it designed in such a way that the people will be able to use this alternative educational system to develop their own alternatives to situations which they have to contend with in all aspects of their lives.

In closing, I would like to advise this Assembly that I am not speaking as one lonely backbencher. I'm speaking on behalf of six northern MLAs, all of whom support and have added to every word to what I've said. We also want to remind you that in March, 1973, our government published Guidelines for the Seventies. On Page 12 of Volume 1 you will find the following paragraph. "Furthermore and perhaps more important the guidelines involved a firm commitment. . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order, is . . .

MR. J. W. McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order is it standard procedure for a member to read into the record the written statements re the estimates?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I again ask you - that is a point of order - and ask you to review it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order it is correct that the rules of the House

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . do not permit the delivery of written speeches. From time to time, Mr. Chairman, in consideration of other members, especially when important statements are made, then I know that the Member for Flin Flon speaks almost exclusively extemporaneously; he probably is following his notes relative to something to which he wants to give specific emphasis to. But if the honourable member wishes to embarrass other members in this way, then I say that there is more embarrassment on that side of the House vis-à-vis written speeches than there is on this side, and he should gauge his remarks very carefully in that respect.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order. I well recognize the rules of the House. I well recognize that Cabinet Ministers and others that are reading policy into the--(Interjection)--that's fine then, Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order that new members - I've been here some time and we recognize the fact that some of the new members that come into the House that are not familiar with the rules, deserve that type of consideration on speeches, but it's my understanding that unless it's a Cabinet Minister, or somebody that hasn't been here, that's new, that the member should be able to express himself.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I say that the Honourable Member for Flin Flon as a new member, speaks almost exclusively without notes and extemporaneously. That that is his general style. I presume that he wishes to deal with a particular subject in a manner which he wants to specifically not be misunderstood, and allowances are made in that regard. I'm telling the honourable member that some of the oldest and more experienced members in the House are the ones who exclusively use notes, and they are on that side of the House. If he wishes this matter brought to the attention every time a member does it, then it will be embarrassing for the point of view of his members, not the member for Flin Flon.

MR. McKENZIE: Then, Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, in the final, so therefore from now on, it's par for the course that we all come in and read from written statements and could be asked to table them from here on in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is following his notes closely I would say.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): I think every member in this House at one time or another has followed notes very closely. I say I believe, Mr. Chairman, that every member in this House at one time or another has followed notes very closely, and if the Member for Flin Flon wishes to read a prepared statement or speech, I think that we should be courteous enough to let him be heard in that manner. I see nothing wrong with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will quote from the Guidelines for the Seventies on Page 12, Volume 1, and you will find the following paragraph. "Furthermore, and perhaps more important, the guidelines involve a firm commitment by the government to apply these principles in the form of concrete practical programs initiated for the purpose of overcoming many of the key obstacles to the improvement of Manitoba's social and economic environment by the end of the decade." We are nearly now halfway through this decade, Mr. Speaker, and as my friend, my honourable friend from Roblin has often said, we are laying it on the table, our cards are on the table, and we the northern MLAs in this government intend to keep our commitment. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order. I did not say that. All I said, that the rules are being bent today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. The Honourable . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . point out to the Honourable Member for Roblin, that the rules are bent by the Leader of the Opposition every time he delivers a Budget Speech Address or a Throne Speech Address, which he reads almost exclusively.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, the Honourable Leader of the House . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. Order please.

MR. BILTON: Are you extending me the same privilege you gave to the Leader of the House, Sir . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: He did not have a point of order.

MR. BILTON: I am not going to reply to that. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: He did not have a point of order. He can't reply to . . .

MR. BILTON: Well, the Honourable Leader of the House knows perfectly well that the

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. BILTON cont'd) . . . . important position of the Leader of the Opposition has . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. Order. Order please.

MR. BILTON: . . . it's his privilege and right to read if he wishes to.

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

MR. BILTON: . . . the rules, the First Minister does it.

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

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to let the House know that I have a few notes that are strictly for guidelines. They contain a few figures that I wouldn't want to be misquoted on, and I assure you I will only use them as a figure guide to make sure I cover all points.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested when the Minister of Education indicated that with the grant system that they presently operate under, the government operates under, that they were picking up I think he said 72 percent of the cost of education, and I would agree with the Minister that the government is picking up 72 percent of the education costs or thereabout last year if one takes the property tax rebate and uses it 100 percent for education costs. But I would suggest to the Minister he better speak to the First Minister, better speak to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, he better speak to the Finance Minister and tell them he's taking the 100 percent of that education or as it is now worded, property tax rebate, because when we talk about expenses for urban or municipal governments increasing to operate the services that these governments are providing, or cities, or towns, we get a pat answer back. Aha, but we're providing a property tax rebate program. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that I would agree 72 percent last year, because the actual school financial grants that were provided to the schools in Manitoba was somewhere in the order of 144 million dollars. And if we took - somewhere in the order of about 55 percent of the tax rebate system that was allotted to our citizens, some 42 million dollars, if we took about 55 percent of that which would represent somewhere in the order of I believe 23 million dollars for the City of Winnipeg citizens, and we added it to the amounts of money that were granted to us from the School Finance Board - the 144 million - if we took about 55 percent of it, we're looking at around 78 million dollars, then the total contribution, this is taking 100 percent of that tax rebate program last year for the City of Winnipeg, if we added the two together we'd get a contribution from the government of some 103 million dollars. But the actual cost for education last year in the City of Winnipeg was in the order of some 139 million dollars. So we get a figure of about 72 percent.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the Minister who is responsible for Municipal or Urban Affairs, the Finance Minister and the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources shouldn't stand up and say that they, aha, but the costs have risen in the City of Winnipeg, the costs have risen in Gladstone and Morris but we have a tax rebate program. Because they're using that rebate program twice. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you cannot squeeze the orange and get juice out of it twice. You can't empty the piggy bank on one department and turn around when we're dealing with another department and say you're using the same rebate for that department, because it's not true and if the government continues to put this forward to the public then I suggest that they're misleading the public, they're conning the public. Mr. Chairman, this year alone in the City of Winnipeg, if we take a same relative figure, I think there's 118 thousand . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could I just interrupt the honourable member to announce that we have a class of 13 students in the galleries from the Greenway High School in Minneapolis, United States, Grade 11 and Grade 10 standing, under the direction of Mr. Schmitt. On behalf of all the members I welcome you here today. The Honourable Member for St. James.

SUPPLY EDUCATION Cont'd

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in this year's costs for education in the City of Winnipeg - and I have to use these figures because I do not have available to me the total estimated cost for education for all of the provinces - but of the actual taxes that have to be raised by the City of Winnipeg for educational costs, the actual taxes that are put on the property owners this year, will total some 72 million dollars.

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) . . . . Now if we assume that the grants that were received under the present grant structure for education, if we get 55 percent of this, thereabouts, of the 144 million dollars, we're looking at an 80 million dollar grant for the City of Winnipeg, making the total cost of education in Winnipeg Proper some 152 million dollars. Now, if we also assume that the eight million dollars additional rebate that is proposed by the government this year, making a total of 50 million dollars, it would mean that the City of Winnipeg citizens would probably receive somewhere in the order of 27 million dollars, maybe 28. Somewhere in that order. I think that's fairly accurate. Then there's a total contribution of somewhere in the order of 107 million dollars by the Finance Board and the rebate program towards educational costs in the City of Winnipeg.

Now, we're taking 100 percent of that tax rebate for education, because that's what the Minister said earlier in his presentation the other day, that they were picking up 72 percent of costs of education. And I think that's an important note. The education department has said we're taking all of that tax rebate, the property tax rebate; nothing left for the municipalities, nothing left for urban governments. As was suggested by the First Minister, as was suggested by the Minister of Finance and as was suggested in this House by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Then, if we do apply that particular grant, all for education in the City of Winnipeg, then we have somewhere in the order of costs for education this year, somewhere in the order of some 150 million dollars. That's what it's going to cost us for education. And we take and total everything up, then I would suggest when we add that 107 million to the figure of 150 million, they're picking up somewhere in the order of, oh, we'll say 65 percent of the taxes. So we're not picking up 72 percent as they suggest. But the key point is, both departments are trying to use that tax rebate program and I would suggest that that is wrong to imply that both can use it 100 percent. So now let's get down to the nitty gritty. What percentage of that rebate that's going to you and I and the rest of the citizens of Manitoba, what percentage is going for education, what percentage is going for urban costs that each Minister has claimed from time to time in this House? Because, we give 50 percent of that rebate program for education, we're looking at 14 million dollars, that's what we're looking at towards education in the City of Winnipeg; 14 million dollars of that supposed 28 million that will go back to the citizens of Winnipeg. And if we add that to the 80 million that we know the Finance Board provides for education, that's roughly 55 percent of the 144 million dollars, then the total contribution from the government, Mr. Chairman, is some 94 million dollars. But we know that the cost of education in the City of Winnipeg this year is going to be somewhere in the order of some 150, 152 million dollars. Then I would suggest the government is picking up somewhere in the order of some 60 percent of the cost of education, not 72 percent. So let's have the actual figures, Mr. Chairman. Let's find out what contribution of the tax rebate program is going, in the opinion of the government, towards education, what part of the tax rebate program is going to the municipal governments for relief. Because we've heard it argued here in the House by the three or four Ministers that, you know, we don't have to worry about the education costs going up for the homeowner because they're getting back \$150.00 at least, for education. But we also hear the First Minister stand up and say we don't have to--you know, it's fine, "You've indicated that the cost of running the City of Winnipeg and other urban areas have gone up, and municipalities, but we've got the 150-dollar tax rebate."

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, you can't pull out money out of an empty piggy bank if one department has already taken credit for 100 percent of that rebate, and I would ask the Minister just what his other fellow Ministers have said, or has he even talked to them? Because there would appear to be a communication breakdown. If the Education Department doesn't have claim to this rebate, then I would suggest that we're looking at the property owner picking up somewhere in the order--and it's probably in the order of some 55 percent of the cost of education; the government is picking up 55 percent of the cost of education rather than the claim of 72. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it's fine the government let the people of Manitoba know the facts of what education costs are and what they are paying towards it, rather than using and hiding behind a property tax rebate program, which one department claims is the solution to their problems and the other department in turn claims the same amount for their department, because I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is wrong. It would weaken the people of Manitoba, and it's not fair, and I say they are conning the people of Manitoba with such statements.

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MINAKER cont'd)

Mr. Chairman, if we look at the costs of education in the City of Winnipeg and what has happened in the past year, the actual tax that the City of Winnipeg collected towards education last year was \$59 million. This year they're going to have to raise some \$72-1/2 million for education costs, up some \$12-1/2 million. And what does the government put towards that? Even if they use 100 percent of the property tax rebate, the \$8 million additional money that the Premier indicated he was putting towards this property tax rebate to cover costs of increase in education costs and so on, even if we use 100 percent of that rebate towards increased cost of education, and we take that 55 percent of the eight million, you're looking at somewhere around 4.6, 4-1/2 million dollars. That's 100 percent of that increased rebate. They're putting towards this increased cost of education in the City of Winnipeg \$4-1/2 million, of which 12-1/2 is the actual cost increase, and yet the Minister stands up and says we're paying 72 percent of the cost of education. Hogwash! I don't believe it, and nobody else in the Province of Manitoba will believe it, because it's not true. It's been shown that if you apply all these costs you're still not picking up more than 65, 60 percent, that's if you take 100 percent of the property tax rebate, and I suggest if that's what the government wants to do, fine, but then don't stand up, and don't the Ministers stand up and say, when we talk about the rising costs in the municipal and urban government, say, "Well, we have the tax rebate program for property owners," because it's all used up for education costs.

And what has happened in the City of Winnipeg with education costs this year? Well, I know in my own constituency of St. James, the education cost is increased by 10.6 mills, and an average homeowner of \$6,000 assessment - and that's a very low relative moderate type of home - will be paying \$48.00 more this year for education costs. If you take - or correction, they'll be paying \$63.00 more for education costs. And what has happened in the urban increased costs? They'll be paying another eight mills, so they'll be paying \$48.00, so a homeowner with an assessment of some \$6,000 will have to pay \$111.00 more taxes this year. But what does the government say? They stand up and say, "Well, we have taken the tax rebate program, we're giving \$150.00 to \$250.00 back." But you can't split it both ways. If you're going to split it part of it for the education costs and part of it for the municipal costs, then I suggest that the Minister better stand up and correct his figure of 72 percent, because it's wrong. It's right if you use 100 percent for the property tax rebate for education, but don't use it for both.

And, Mr. Chairman, what has happened in our different areas in Winnipeg? Well, I'll tell you what's happened. The education costs have increased in my own area some 45 percent over last year. In the area like St. Boniface it's increased 38-1/2 percent; in another area of River East it's increased 57.9 percent over last year. This is the amounts that have to be raised for school fees, school expenses. Total expenses. This includes the foundation levy, it includes all those that are payable to the school divisions - This is what they've increased the costs of.

Mr. Chairman, how can the government stand up and say that, you know, we're picking up 72 percent of the cost, because they're not. They're not, even if they credit 100 percent of that tax rebate program to education, they're not. And in my own area, of the increased costs the foundation levy has picked up two percent, two percent of the actual taxes that will be charged to the people in St. James. The school levy has increased to a point where they will pick up two percent, that's all. The grants will pick up two percent.

If you look at the City of Winnipeg, the overall participation by the government in sharing the costs of education is down somewhere in the order of 4.4 percent; they're not even in the same ratio or proportion providing the costs. And I've used City of Winnipeg, but I'm sure that if you're in Killarney or you're in Brandon or you're in Morris they're proportionate; they're facing the same problem. --(Interjection)-- I can't answer the Minister on Churchill River. I'm not sure. I don't have those figures before me. But what my point is, that don't stand and hide behind the property tax rebate program because that is obviously not the answer to the problem that faces the people of Manitoba at this point in education costs and the sharing of costs, because if you're going to take 100 percent of that tax rebate program, then I suggest you talk to your First Minister and say to him that "I've got all of that tax rebate program for my credit," and tell him to stop saying in this House that it's for part of the urban government increased costs and the municipal cost because it can't be, if you're taking all 100 percent of it.

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MINAKER cont'd)

I suggest you talk to the Minister of Finance and tell him the same thing; and I suggest you talk to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and tell him this. Because if you don't then obviously the government wants to hoodwink the public of Manitoba into believing that they're picking up the costs of education in this province to the tune of 72 percent, which they're not; that they're picking up part of the costs of urban and municipal governments through this rebate program, which they're not. So let's have these facts, Mr. Chairman. Let's find out what the total public school system budget is for Manitoba in the estimates of the government, and let us know what the expected amount to be raised in the Province of Manitoba through the foundation levy is, and tell us, you know, about what the expected amount to be raised for special levies are in all of the towns this year, the total budget. Let's have that answer, what percentage in the opinion of the Cabinet of the tax rebate program that they so gladly pat themselves on the back, or what percentage in their estimate is going and credited to education; what percentage is credited to the urban cost increases? Because right now, what the Minister has said, is 100 percent of it is credited to education. And that, Mr. Speaker, is not correct, and I would suggest that the Minister, if he wants to stay with this argument that all of it goes towards education, then he'd better talk to his colleagues and straighten them out, particularly the First Minister, who keeps claiming that even though the costs in the City of Winnipeg have risen 45 percent in three years, the tax rebate, the property tax rebate will correct that. But, on the other hand, the Minister sits there and says that he's got it all. So which one has got it all? All I know is, it doesn't matter who's got it all, I know who's paying for it all and that's the citizens of Manitoba, and they're paying for it and they're regretting that they have to pay for it, because all of a sudden the government pats itself on the back that we're giving back \$50 million. Mind you, it's costing us \$600,000 a year to give it back. I suggest, why take it in the first place, and leave it with the people, and I'm sure we can work something out and put the money, the \$600,000 that you're spending for administration of the distribution of this money, put it towards education and bring down a bit of that tax instead of patting one's self on the back and kidding the public in Manitoba that this money they're handing out is not only for education but it's also for urban and municipal costs, because one of these has to decide which it's for, or at least share it. Don't say that both of these have got it 100 percent because it's not true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this occasion somewhat reluctantly because--(Interjection)--Well, as a member that has not been privy to the debate from its outset with respect to the debate that we're on, namely the Minister's salary, in the Department of Education, I always have some misgivings about entering into a debate midstream, particularly when one has unfortunately been absent for part of that time. I've been suffering from a slight attack of the Bubonic Plague and have not been able to be in the Chamber in the last few days. And so my remarks, Mr. Chairman, may somewhat be redundant, may not always take into consideration those very good remarks made by previous speakers, particularly like the speaker that has just spoken, and who has posed I think some particularly valid questions to the Minister, and whatever I have to say I would hope would not be lost, that he would take the necessary time to make the specific answers to the specific questions asked by the Member for St. James with respect to the rebate system and who in fact claims the full credit for, or where the full credit for that rebate system should lie.

But, Mr. Speaker, sometimes, you know, a day or two absence from this Chamber is refreshing in that when you come back you don't really appreciate where you are. I listened with utter amazement, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister flying in high in third gear or something like that, when I sat down in this Chamber, to his description of the general educational scheme, and I couldn't believe my eyes, couldn't believe my ears, I couldn't believe that he was actually trying to say that black was white and white is red and what have you, and I thought surely that something, something had transpired in the few days that I had been absent in this Chamber that I was totally unaware of. Because, Mr. Chairman, you know, the Minister, the Minister stood up in his place and really it makes one realize that perhaps it was a mistake to make that rule change in the first instance, that Ministers be allowed to occupy the front row you know. I think maybe if he would have stayed in his original seat it would have been a little bit more acceptable.

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

But, Sir, he began in an attack in his general remarks, which I must say, which I must assume has been the tenor of his remarks in replying to opposition members up to now, in a way that just completely dumbfounded me. Mr. Chairman, the Conservative Party of the decade of the Sixties will not be remembered for its digging of the ditch around Winnipeg, or its problems with CFI, or indeed its problems with Southern Indian Lake or what have you. If there's one thing - and, Mr. Chairman, I have to demand and take the time of the Committee, if nothing else but in the memory of perhaps one of the greatest Ministers of Education this province has ever seen and had, and I'm speaking of Dr. George Johnson, that this Minister and this administration should take the time of this Chamber, time of this Committee, to lecture the Progressive Conservative Party, the previous administration, about our dereliction, our negligence, our lack of responsibility in the field of education. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is so preposterous that it denies denies description.

Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing, if there is one thing that historians will record, one thing that historians will remember of the Sixties, is the fact of the dedication, the priority rating given by the then administration to the field of education. And that just simply, that just simply cannot be denied. And, Mr. Chairman, I can, you know, I can expect an attack coming from different quarters, but I don't expect that coming from somebody who has been part of that revolution that took place in the Sixties.

Mr. Chairman, I rose and interjected in a bantering way during the Minister's remarks that I too at one time had been a teacher. Yes, I was a teacher. Left with the legacy of the do-nothing Liberal Party, which was prepared, which was prepared to see education relegated down to the status where it took upwards to 1,500, 2,000 permit teachers, green kids wet behind the ears out of Grade 11 high school, to have to man our schools. That was the kind of educational system that the Progressive Conservative Party inherited when we took office, and I really seriously challenge the Minister. He cannot be serious, Mr. Chairman. If he wants to stand up and suggest that we stood for an educational system that was bent, that was designed, that was engineered to bring education to . . . a few, Sir, that is an absolute insult to the kind of dedication that was brought to education in the Sixties. That, Sir, is an insult to the kind of people that worked in the Department of Education in the Sixties, Sir, that built the schools, yes and destroyed and took away some of those red school houses that my Honourable Member for Swan River likes to talk about every once in a while. But we built and brought in the unitary divisions at tremendous political cost from time to time, and we were a government that were prepared to face up to the political costs at that time, not back away as this Minister does whenever there is a little irate group of parents that say now, you know, we want to preserve our little school, and, you know, it is in Ninette or wherever it is now; we'll reconsider the whole education policy because of a little bit of political pressure brought upon the Minister of the day.

Mr. Speaker, what we had in the Sixties was a dedication to the idea of equalizing of educational opportunities to all the children of Manitoba, and we had the guts and determination to bring that about. And for the Minister, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister to make the kind of remarks that he made from his seat, just are inexcusable, just are inexcusable.

Mr. Chairman, we are not qualified academic expert people in this Chamber, and it's not for us to debate the details of curriculums offered. Our job in this Chamber, Sir, is to develop broad policies. One of the broad policies facing us in the '60s was just simply to bring physically the structure, the capability, the capacity of education to most, hopefully all, children in the Province of Manitoba. And, Sir, we did that. And that required the building of roads, that required the building of schools, that required the bringing up the whole status of the profession of the teaching education, and we did that.

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. ENNS: I listened with some, you know, some satisfaction to the Member from Flin Flon speaking. He speaks to me about his concerns, and they're good concerns, about how the educational system is reaching people that he is concerned about in the remote and isolated parts of Manitoba, and I think he has every reason to be concerned about them. But, Sir, and he mentions that of 5,000 or 7,000 students only so many are going on to higher education. Well, Sir, I asked him and I think he should remember who brought the possibility of education to those five or seven thousand students in the first place through the erection of the Frontier Division.

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

A MEMBER: The Roblin government.

A MEMBER: You did.

MR. ENNS: Well certainly you didn't help to do a great deal about it.

A MEMBER: No, Sir.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, when you talk about doing something about bringing about equality of education, educational opportunities throughout rural Manitoba, and the Member for St. Matthews knows this, if you want to talk about bringing types of courses and programs in some equalizing way with the better off, namely the larger urban centres, to the spread-out part of this province, then surely you can't condemn the efforts of the previous administration for their attempt at doing it. And, Mr. Chairman, I know that we sometimes denigrate ourselves in this Chamber by not bringing about the levels of debate to the level I think the people of Manitoba expect that we should from time to time. But, Sir, we're led by the government of the day, and in this particular debate we're led by the Minister of the day, and he surely cannot feel in any way satisfied to a level that he has led us in this current debate.

Sir, if there are curriculum problems, if the fast-changing scene of education is such that the system that many dedicated people within the Department of Education and many dedicated trustees and politicians went out, spoke for, encouraged the general population to raise the necessary funds for, even if it meant, you know, the kind of political consequences of seeing adverse effects on a small town because it was necessary to build the kind of a school in an opposing town or a larger town, but to provide the kind of education that was necessary that it had to be done, then surely those are the broad framework, the broad areas of policy that we in this Chamber have to debate. I'm not prepared to debate with either members of the staff sitting in front of the Honourable Minister as to crossing the t's and dotting the i's on every particular part of the kind of curriculum that should be offered. Sir, that is our job; to pass the kind of moneys necessary; to hire the very best people in the educational field; to see that those people are enthused and willing to work for a better educational system in Manitoba; to maintain and retain them in our system; and, Sir, from time to time they will be criticized. Their results will be criticized. Pressures will be put upon us as individual members from parents, from just the general results of an educational system, and policy changes will be reflected in this House. But I resent, Mr. Chairman, the kind of approach the Minister has taken up to now in his Estimates. To deny, and not to recognize, you know, the one particular area--Quite frankly, Sir, if nothing else, you know, that I will be satisfied at having had an opportunity to serve in the public arena, what it was to be part of the Duff Roblin administration, that did more than any administration this province has ever seen insofar as seeing to

(1) That we initially recognized the necessity for, if we're going to have an educational system, that we have to have teachers, and he then put in the necessary funds. We acceded to the legitimate demands of the Teachers Society, that you can't make teachers out of Grade 11 students overnight, and that really the whole profession of teaching had to be elevated up. And you had to do that with the necessary dollars, and you had to do that with the necessary educational qualifications. And certainly all that took place in the decade of the '60s.

(2) That you couldn't expect or attract people to enter into the teaching profession and to remain in the teaching profession unless you provided the physical structures for them to feel comfortable with and to feel that they could deliver the goods with. And certainly we did that, Sir, whether we developed the Unitary Divisions or the secondary level first, then on the elementary level, often, often at considerable political consequences to ourselves.

Sir, I can recall coming into this Chamber at the same time as the Honourable Member from Elmwood, the now Minister of Public Works, who now occupies the position of the Minister of Public Works, and he used to enjoy making speeches from this side of the House chastising the then Minister of Education, Dr. George Johnson, about the lack of research, about the lack of imagination, about the lack of innovation that was taking place in the Department of Education in those days. And you know, really, I have to say this, if my memory serves me correct, that the Minister of the day did not particularly challenge the member that indeed we were doing everything that we should be doing in terms of research, that we were doing everything that we should be doing in terms of innovation. No, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that we were so damn busy, we were so preoccupied with the fundamental problems of simply providing the vehicle of education, of building the roads, of providing the necessary funds, that we did not have perhaps the luxury that this Minister now has of indulging in numerous reports, CORE



## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . Reports, what have you, and re-examining his whole curriculum and re-examining the position that education should take as we approach the mid-Seventies.

Mr. Chairman, my comments today will not take issue with those efforts at all. I think the Honourable Minister, if he were in any way honest, if he were in any way interested in the educational system of Manitoba, he would have to surely, instead of the kind of, you know, instead of the kind of base partisanship that we've heard from him today, he would have to say, "Thank God, Thank God for a previous administration." You know, thank God for the previous people in the administration that basically set up the structures that built the roads, built the schools, built the regional colleges, built the over-all physical structures that he can now sit back and allow himself the luxury of looking at how can we further improve a system, a system that needs constant looking into, that needs constant improvement. Well, Mr. Chairman, we surely didn't get that from this Minister. We didn't get that from this Minister at all. Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, we wonder sometimes why there's a kind of degree of acrimony and bitterness in this Chamber. We wonder sometimes why there is the kind of abuse that takes place in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, the kind of performance that the Minister has been giving us, you know, should at least go some distance to explain the reason for the kind of performance that we have all too often in this Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know. The Honourable Member from Flin Flon, the Honourable Member from St. Matthews, they have taken time in the committee to suggest to the Honourable Minister that, you know, he is not necessarily the fountain of wisdom, the last fountain of wisdom in terms of the kind of educational programs that we should be offering in this Province of Manitoba. I think that should offer him some moments of sobering thought. Mr. Chairman, I would have hoped that a Minister that is ensconced in the government, that is privy to working with revenues twice, nay more than twice, that of its predecessor, should be talking to us about the kind of innovative programs, expansion of the existing programs, delving out into new areas of service in the educational field, rather than taking cheap political potshots at what, up to now, has been certainly probably the best educational system this province, these people living in Manitoba, could afford. Not the best - there's no such thing as the best. Not the last answer in education - there's no such thing as the last answer in education. But from the Minister of Education in the Province of Manitoba, I surely expect more than what he has given up to now.

I would like, for instance, Mr. Chairman, to hear from the Honourable Minister of Education, not simply in expounding his feelings or arguments about whether or not the old system was archaic, or not meeting the needs of the day, or whether you fail in two grades or two subjects was sufficient for cancellation out of the whole year and the student having to go over again. I'd like to hear some, you know, some new representation on the part of the Minister about what new areas he is going to go into as the Minister of Education. I'd like to know, Mr. Speaker, what his response is to the brief that was represented to him by the Winnipeg School Division No. 1, with respect to the problem of the multiple-handicapped retarded children. Now the Minister knows whereof I speak. He's been on national television on this particular subject. --(Interjection)--Well the Honourable Minister says, "Read Hansard." These are one of the penalties, these are one of the penalties that I have. He's but to nod from his seat right now. Will the particular instance that he and I are both aware of be covered under the expansion of program that he suggests that he is making? Will the Minister nod to me right now in his seat and say that one Stephen Neil, who is severely handicapped but who under a pilot program that is being carried on in the Winnipeg School Division has been indicated could be brought into the system and could be helped to some extent? Will he nod from his seat right now that the program - he suggests that all I have to do is read Hansard. Will he nod from his chair that this one particular student, or students like him, can and will be helped in the future, in the very near future, by expansion of the educational system? Mr. Chairman, I hear silence. I hear scribbling of the pen.

A MEMBER: Read Hansard.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Hansard is not before me. Surely we're not playing this kind of a game. Surely, Mr. Chairman, when we're talking about handicapped children, we don't have to talk about reading Hansard. Can't the Minister get up in his Chair and tell me?

MR. PAULLEY: You didn't give a damn about them.

MR. ENNS: Well, now we have the big story from the Minister of Labour. I'll tell you

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . why we didn't give a damn about it, because we had to build a school first. We had to build a school first and we had to build roads first to get people like that to schools. And you know that. You know that. I want to ask the Honourable Minister of Education first before the late House Leader, the some time House Leader of the New Democratic Party interjects. I simply ask him again. He made a reference that I should read Hansard. Does that suggest to me that my remarks in this particular affair are redundant and I don't have to pursue the case any more? That the brief presented by the Winnipeg School Division has been generally accepted by the Department of Education and that in the coming year at least, or in the very near future, that students like Stephen Neil, it will be possible to accept them within the school system with the necessary support from the Province of Manitoba? Is that what the Minister is telling me?

Mr. Chairman, I see smoke puffing out of his pipe, I hear scratching of his pens, but I hear no sign of assent. I hear no sign of assent, I see no sign of assent. --(Interjection)--Well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister chooses to, you know, maybe take advantage of the fact that I was not here a day or two ago, and that's his privilege of course. I recognize the Minister does not have to answer to any specific or particular charge, but, Mr. Chairman, this is but one example, but one example of a government, you know, of a government . . . If we found it possible, Mr. Chairman, with a budget of some \$374 million - that was the total budget of the Provincial Government the last year I was in office - \$374 million. Under that kind of a budget, Sir, we found it possible, Sir, to provide school bus transportation, a new venture under the Foundation Program which this Minister says was nothing. We found it possible, Sir, to provide new teaching aids, setting up a Foundation Program which provided for a whole host of new services throughout the rural parts of Manitoba. We found it possible, Sir, to establish technical schools throughout the Province of Manitoba. We, Sir, found it possible to considerably bump up and bring under the University Grants Commission an entire new level of support for the higher level of education in this province. All that, Sir, was done under a budget of \$374 million.

Now this Minister operates under a national or total provincial budget of some \$800 million, and I'm asking what significant increases, what expansion, what new programs has he brought into the educational system. And, Mr. Chairman, I'm not prepared to get into the kind of arguments with him as to whether or not a student should be restricted to this course or that course, or whether the CORE Report is good or bad. Sir, I am not quite personally qualified to make those kind of comments.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. ENNS: Right. That's fine. That's fine. I'm prepared to hire the best people to help me in doing that, and if they don't do the job that they should do, I'm prepared to fire them. And that, Sir, as far as I'm concerned, is the responsibility of a legislator, a government or administration. But I'm not prepared to, as the Minister is attempting to do in a woefully weak way, convince some of us about, you know, the kind of, you know, detailed philosophical intent of the particular curriculum that he's now being fed by members of his department. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education, I hope, will answer specifically, will answer specifically to the request that I make with respect to the brief that was represented to him by the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 having to do with the multiple-handicapped retarded children. He knows whereof I speak, and, well Mr. Chairman, you know, I just can't help but interject. This is the response from members opposite, you know: what did we do for them? What did we do for them? If that is going to be their measure of performance by government, Mr. Chairman, we will never move one step forward. If they're prepared, if they're prepared to accept as kind of their guideline, that whatever we did, whatever we did, we won't go a step beyond. --(Interjection)--No, but that's what the former Leader of the New Democratic Party is suggesting in chirping from his seat. That's what he is saying. He said, "What did you do for them?" What did you do for them? Well I don't have to recite what we did for them because we did an awful lot more for them in our brief years than these people have shown any occasion for doing for them. But now, Mr. Speaker, that's beside the point. My question simply is to the Minister of Education, and I'll take the words of the former leader of the New Democratic Party, I'll merely ask him: "What are you going to do for them?"

I would hope that, as I sit down, you, Mr. Minister of Education, will tell me precisely in unequivocating words, what you are going to do for one Stephen Neil and the likes of him.

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

Well, Mr. Chairman, I have that commitment from the Honourable Minister. I know when I'm ahead. I will sit down and listen intently to what the Honourable Minister of Education is going to do. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, I will not deal with many of the issues or most of the issues that has been dealt with by my two colleagues on this side and by some of the other members already. I think we've had considerable discussion in respect to foundation grants, the teacher grants and enrollment decline, teacher-pupil ratio, and some of the other issues. But I do want to bring a couple of things to the attention of the Minister at this time which concerns my constituency, but before I do that, perhaps I do want to pose one question to the Minister in respect to what is the government policy in relation to the City of Winnipeg and the present school divisions? Is there any part on the government at the present time to change the present divisions, to decrease them or make the City of Winnipeg, the whole City of Winnipeg, into one division, or what is the government's policy? I know that this is the concern not only of the Manitoba and the Winnipeg Teachers' Association, but it is also the concern of the various boards within the City of Winnipeg. So perhaps the Minister can give us some indication what the policy will be, or is his department undertaking any studies in this respect and what will happen as far as the present divisions are concerned?

The other point, I believe, and we've talked to some of the other members that raised this matter, in respect to the foundation grants, and I mentioned I will not take any time but I do want to bring to the Minister's attention again, and cannot bring it strongly enough, that the program, the system, the foundation system at the present time is not meeting the requirement because all we have to do is just look at each one, our own tax bills, and I would like to tell the Minister I think that the special levy is now carrying too much of the load and perhaps the foundation grant has to be changed and a new formula found or updated, because I can indicate my own case. In the last six years my own property tax has doubled and mostly due to education costs, and I can relate this same thing, perhaps most homeowners in my constituency in Assiniboia or St. James will tell you the same thing.

Now I did not bring any tax notices to really demonstrate to the Minister but I did, I believe, last year or a couple of years ago, and I'm sure that this is the case. I did have one and it's not up to date, where in a matter of, say ten years, from '58 to '68, the assessment on a small business property in St. James has increased from \$4,400 to \$20,000 and, Mr. Chairman, this is frightening really when this happens. So I know that the Foundation Program served its purpose and served it well in the beginning, but I think it's falling behind and the pressure is too much, too great on the special levy now. So I hope that the Minister will give this some attention.

But the real reason, Mr. Chairman, that I got up, and I wish to ask the Minister, what is the policy of the government and the problem that we experience in our constituency when many of the students from, say, Headingley had to be transported to the schools in St. James? And I don't totally disagree that if it's a temporary situation that we should build a new school building in, say, a location like Headingley if the population will not be there for the next several years. But what really transpired and happened last year where it was not satisfactory to many of the parents, there was great concern that these students had to be transferred from Headingley to St. James, but their greatest complaint was that they had to not go from, say, Headingley to the closest distance to the schools, but they had to go almost across the whole division from the furthest point of Headingley to the eastern section of St. James, and that was their biggest argument. Well, I'm sure if the Minister perhaps would have met with the parents before this happened, before, you know, they were told that they have to do this without any communication - I don't know what communication took place but it was related to me there was no communication - they were told by letter that the students will be transferred or transported from Headingley to some of them at Linwood School, which is on the far side of the St. James area, or the eastern part which is the furthest point, and their argument was well, why couldn't we go to school in Crestview or St. Charles? And of course then it would be two transportations. Perhaps the children from St. Charles would have to go to Linwood so you'd have two transportations and you'd be then disrupting two students instead of one because you'd be transferring two. But I feel if there would have been proper planning and perhaps a meeting held, this wouldn't

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . have developed. So again I'm saying to the Minister, maybe it's not right and it's not necessary, it may not be even feasible to try and build new schools or expand the present schools if the population will not hold it in the next several years. But surely there must be some better planning and this is not what's happening at the present time, Mr. Chairman.

The other point that I would like to raise to the Minister - there was another point; the same thing happened in the St. Charles Division where the students, two classrooms had to be accommodated in a community club, community center, St. Charles Community Center, which was not adequate really because I'm familiar with the situation and surely there should have been better provisions made or better accommodation, and perhaps the community center should have been updated somewhat, because it wasn't a proper place for having classes unless it was fixed up to at least what would have been reasonable. I know in this case the heating system wasn't sufficient, the flooring wasn't sufficient, the acoustics were not sufficient. It was just an ordinary community club, and that's where we had two classes and it was almost impossible to have two classes at the same time. Not only the parents were concerned - I know I had many calls and they met with me, so again, I don't feel that this kind of thing should take place, I think there should be better planning, Mr. Chairman.

So that's the two areas that I really wanted to bring to the Minister. I do hope that he'll give us some replies as far as the school divisions that I posed to him, the two questions, and I know that the teacher ratio is a very important problem at the present time because it will concern many of the rural divisions and I know they're concerned because they're saying it's the responsibility of the province to see that, regardless of the wealth of an individual, he should have, that children should have the same opportunity to education, and what is happening in some of these places that because of the enrollment population increases the teachers have a much heavier load, they're not able to reach the same options, and invariably your education is not--they haven't the same quality, and I believe this is very important. So it's maybe not necessary to build new schools but there must be some portable schools that have to be given consideration, and I think we haven't done too much in this area in the Province of Manitoba.

I know that the Member for Lakeside mentioned about permit teachers, and I just would like to say we've had permit teachers for many years and we shouldn't take anything away from them because we still have some in our system today who have been good teachers and they've been teaching for 20 years and--(Interjection)--Well no, that's the same that have been teaching for 20 or 25 years, and I believe they have upgraded themselves or taken courses each year, but there still may be some in the system and I don't think that perhaps--as far as I'm concerned I'm sure that they're doing a great job, otherwise they wouldn't have lasted in the system. So I'm just saying this, that there's--you know, they're not all - I know there are some in the system and I just didn't want it to be left that there's something wrong with permit teachers. I know in the Sixties it wasn't only the Province of Manitoba who had permit teachers, but all over. We had them in Saskatchewan and Alberta and Ontario, in fact we had to import teachers from Great Britain, and today the situation is reversed. They haven't got any teachers in Great Britain, in fact a drastic shortage, I understand, and they're trying to get them all over and they can't.

So these are just the two points. I don't want to take any more time of the House because I know my colleagues from St. Boniface and from Fort Rouge have taken the full time on this, the Minister's estimates, and in fact have discussed most of the major issues that concerns all of us. So I hope that the Minister will give me some answers on the points that I raised.

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Chairman, the former Minister of Education is booing me. I don't want to take much time of the House. I agree with the Member for Winnipeg Centre that the estimate time should be primarily the time of the opposition. But I did want to register one more concern with the Minister before he finishes his estimates.

But before I get to that, I wanted to comment on a few things said by the Member for Lakeside. I think that the previous government, the Roblin Government, did bring about some major improvements in the school system, and the statement I made yesterday wasn't intended to imply that there haven't been any improvements in the school system. They did build the schools, the new schools that were absolutely essential in many of the rural areas of the province. I can recall teaching in Evergreen Division out in the Town of Riverton in 1961, and I

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) . . . . started teaching in a new school built by the Roblin Government, and it was a fantastic improvement over the old school. And those new schools did help the education in the rural areas and that is to the credit of the Roblin Government.

There was an improvement during that period in the qualifications of teachers. I think there was an immense improvement, and that was a major improvement in the system. So I think that the field of education was one of the major areas of achievement for the Roblin Government and I would agree with the Member for Lakeside.

But there were still trends occurring at that time under George Johnson, under the Member for Riel, that I think were negative and wrong, and that was what I was talking about yesterday. And I'm a minority in my own caucus; I'm simply registering my opinion because I happen to hold it very deeply. Now I'm not advocating that we go backward with Bilton to the one-room country schoolhouse, the little red schoolhouse which the honourable member, the memory of which he cherishes, because that didn't provide a decent level of education really. It educated only a very--as the Minister of Education pointed out, education at that time was confined really to an elite; it educated very few people. And that's not what I want. What I want is a quality education, as the Member for Brandon West emphasized, a quality education available to every possible child in this province. I want this available not only to the children who live in River Heights or in the more affluent suburbs of this city, I want it available to the kid who lives in the working class areas, in the slums, in the rural areas. Okay.

A MEMBER: No problem there. --(Interjection)--

MR. JOHANNSON: I'm not speaking in a partisan sense and the poor Minister here is caught in a crossfire. Everybody thinks he knows--he thinks he's an expert in education. Well I'm not an expert but I think that the CORE Report represents a wrong direction, and this has been said before. I think it is a retrogressive step. I think it's a step in the wrong direction. The Minister made a defence of what he called the Department's response to the CORE Report. He says that the Department is not implementing the CORE Report, it is simply responding to it by accepting some of its suggestions but not all. --(Interjection)--Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside has a louder voice than I have even without a microphone. The suggestion that--the plan that 10 out of 20 courses in the high school program of a student be optional, and that three of them be student initiated, I think really has fantastic practical problems involved. Let's just take the example of the three courses that the student initiates. I taught up to 1969 in Lakeshore Division which had about 1,000 high school students in it. Those thousand high school students would, over their high school period, each have the option of initiating three courses. That means 3,000 courses, that mean roughly a thousand a year, a thousand individualized courses. Those thousand unique and individualized courses will be channelled through the teachers presumably to the school board.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I recall the Interlake School Board, the membership were not experts in the field of curriculum or education; they were farmers, they were merchants. The chairman when I was there last was Mr. Emil Moeller who was a sugar beet farmer. --(Interjection)--That I'm not disputing. He was a good honest guy but I don't think Mr. Moeller would presume that he would have the competence to give professional approval to a thousand unique and individualized courses. So what's going to be the result? What's going to be the result? Well one thing that will probably happen is that - or one thing that could happen is that the board will simply rubber stamp what the teachers tell them. Now I question whether how many teachers would feel that they were competent professionally to approve courses that were devised by their students.

At present we have a system of devising new courses which I think has a lot of strengths in it. Any new course that is devised is devised by teachers who are working in the subject, in the field, by personnel from the department, by people from the university who happen to have a professional expertise or an academic expertise in this area. And I think that system contains a lot of safeguards. But if you make it the responsibility of an individual teacher out in a country school to approve the unique courses submitted by each student, I think you're putting an impossible responsibility upon that teacher's shoulders. What will happen will be

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) . . . . that they will of course have to probably call in experts from the department or someone else. And so we get back to the department and the whole thing becomes a charade, a very expensive, very time-consuming charade. What will also happen I am sure and if any teacher - I think most teachers would agree with me - that because they're pressed for time, because they have a lot of things to do, they will tend to approve a lot of courses without really spending the necessary amount of time checking them over and the result will be courses that really are inadequate and these will be accepted as credits and this will lead to a dilution of quality, a dilution of excellence; it will to some extent reduce education to a bit of a sham, a bit of a farce.

Now I want to get back to one central thing which I think is really important. The central idea in the CORE Report - and this is an idea that's been accepted in the school system I think over a period of years now - the central idea is that curriculum must be based on the child's needs, interests and abilities. The CORE Report puts it this way. "The needs of the individual" - it's talking about the student of course - "are central and constitute the focal point for the efforts of the school." This is the central assumption, the basic assumption upon which the whole house of cards is built. And if you take that, you destroy that basic assumption, the whole thing falls. And they use this basic assumption.

The next point in the CORE Report, Page 9, Freedom and Responsibility. "Emphasis on the individual implies that the student in the secondary school should have the opportunity to make and accept the responsibility for making significant decisions regarding the kinds of educational experiences that will be best for him." From that basic assumption flows a whole series of things which in effect transfer responsibility from the teacher to the student. --(Interjection)--I think it is a big transfer and I think it is a false assumption, I think it is false as hell.

A MEMBER: Right. I agree 100 percent.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Chairman, I've got friends on the wrong side - that's the thing that bothers me. Mr. Speaker, this basic assumption started with Dewey and it's gradually been gaining acceptance in the school system. This is the central assumption of the Hall Dennis Report in Ontario and not it's the central assumption of the CORE Report and it's going to be the central assumption upon which the Minister bases his responses to the CORE Report.

In our society - several members have pointed this out - there has been some abdication of responsibility by parents. In a lot of families the child rather than the parents has become the center of the family and I think this is a totally wrong situation. In a family the parents must be the hub of the family and the children the spokes and this way you have a healthy family, you have a healthy growth of children.

The legal status of the teacher - I don't know if this still continues but while I was in school the legal position of the teacher was in locum parentis - in the place of the parent in the schools. It hasn't changed, the Minister tells me. And, Mr. Speaker, this to me is the proper, the proper system of values. The teacher in the school must be central, not the student. The teacher must be the one who teaches and the student learns.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm really afraid that we're going through a futile exercise. I hope we're not; I hope we're not. I hope the Minister is not totally committed to the making of the recommendations of the CORE Report or what he calls his response mandatory. --(Interjection)-- No, Mr. Chairman, that is one responsibility that I wouldn't want. I hope the Minister at least to some extent has an open mind and is willing to listen. I would really hope that he's not totally committed to the implementations of what he has outlined. I hope he is willing to reconsider.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: I wonder if the member would accept a question? Would he be prepared to support a motion that would rescind the announced mandatory implementation of the credit system in the high schools in Manitoba and return it to the department for further study?

MR. JOHANNSON: No, no. Mr. Chairman, I'm not prepared to move non-confidence in the Minister, I simply am asking him to keep an open mind on this particular topic and to listen to the pleas of some of us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I shall not be very lengthy in my remarks, I'll try and deal with the basic problems that I have in my constituency and I hope that the Minister will provide me with some of the answers that I think are very important questions that

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . deserve the attention of the House and the Minister. I do though however, Mr. Chairman, find it rather childish that the way the Minister took off in a tirade against me last night about education. The questions that I raised about education were directed to the Minister of the Attorney-General and I think was the press releases that are going around this city today and the people are talking. They were timely and they deserved to be raised in this House. And for the Minister of Education to stand up and make a tirade and say that it didn't deserve attention, I have no quarrel with the educational system or the students in this province, it's just a small portion of them in some areas and I can't vouch for others that deserve attention.

Mr. Chairman, let me deal with the matter of education. I ask the Minister of Education first what he's going to do about Camperville. He made certain statements in the House last year and he was out there to several meetings; he's made certain promises and I shall ask him to stand up and tell us what he's going to do. I am quite familiar what's happening there today and I'm sure, as he is and his department, of the many teacher changes that's taken place there in the last six months. It boggles your mind to think that this is supposed to be an educational system in our province and with the Minister going out there and having a public meeting and saying he'd devote all of his time and his talents to hopefully resolve that problem so I hope he will deal with that.

Let me also ask the Minister if he can tell me what's going on in Duck Mountain School Division, how they're getting along? Have they any problems and if they have problems has he prepared to deal with them or has he got any answers to some of their problems? I'd like him to spell out in my constituency - Intermountain School Division - have they got any problems? Is he prepared to go in there and help them resolve some of their problems? Pelly Trail School Division - what is he doing in there and what he's got for some of the answers to their problems? What's the department going to do to help the Duck Mountain School Division resolve the serious matter that they have with their buildings? I asked him in question in the House some time ago and he said that he was not prepared as the Minister, the government was not prepared, nor would he allow his staff - the Department of Education - to go in and assist the Board of Trustees to resolve a most difficult problem which is going to be very very expensive.

I ask him also, Mr. Chairman, in some of the questions that's been raised to me from time to time and this has come from trustees and parents, that a new Statutory Committee should be established in this province to annually advise the Minister or the department for the need of revision of grants and the development or priorities to find out where we're going in rural Manitoba and I'm going to ask him very quietly what he's done about it and if he's prepared to accept that as being need.

May I also point out to the Minister again, Mr. Chairman - I hope I don't raise questions that other members have raised - that I think there is still a pressing need to re-establish the priorities in our province for the educational future. Where are we going for the next five years? Where are you going for the next ten years? To set up some of the evidence of the future which this government and this Minister is planning for the destiny of these young people in our province.

And at the same time give us some idea of where the taxpayer who's going to have to pay the bill is going to be able to deal with these escalating costs which this year, or 1973, were up some 12.1 percent and I'm sure the figures are going to stagger us when we get them for 1974. And I believe it's the right of the Minister and the right of the taxpayers of this province to have a statement from this Minister as to what it's going to cost us. So may I ask the Honourable Minister that what he's got in mind for next year, the year after, the year after that? I think we deserve that type of an answer. Where are these escalating costs going to carry the taxpayers and where are we going with education? Are we going to have to include the ten percent inflationary factor over and above these other costs or what has the Minister and the department got in mind for the school divisions that are in my constituency: Duck Mountain, Intermountain and Pelly Trail? I'm sure he'll be able to give us some of those answers that my people are asking day after day and I promised that when we got to his estimates I would raise those questions and surely we'll get some answers.

May I ask though again when we're talking about equality of education in this province, and this was the concept of the Roblin days, where that we would eventually arrive at some day

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . some place where every child in this province would have an equal opportunity and get an equal chance for an education, which was the complaints of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon. The lowest cost divisions spent some \$585.00 I believe it was, per pupil in operating the division in 1973. And if my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Chairman, the highest cost division was close to \$1,000 if I understand it, which came to a difference of roughly 450 or 420, somewhere in that difference per pupil. May I ask the question of the Minister and what is the reason for this large difference between the sum of the one divisions and those that are at the thousand-dollar level. And if the Minister's got any answers to how we are going to get equal education for say a student in Duck Mountain School Division if you compare it with some of our urban communities, and I'm sure he has got some answers for that because he's been in the department long enough and I think will be able to fulfill us with some of those.

One other question I think again which deals with the equal opportunity for all the children in the Province of Manitoba, and assessment, assessment from one division to another still varies at an enormous length when you compare it to the per pupil basis. And of course the taxing power of the school division with the highest assessment when you compare it with a per pupil basis in some divisions in this province is four times of that when you compare it to Duck Mountain, which is the school division that comes closer to my heart. So I would think, Mr. Speaker, that that would indicate, I'm sure to him and indicate to me, that we've got to find some other way than property if we're going to equalize the educational problems, and I'm sure he's going to come back with the same old cliché that he's gave us of the property rebate tax and I'm sure he got some answers today from the Honourable Member from St. James about that formula which he can't sell me either. But I wonder would the Honourable Minister fill us in on where he's going on this and how he's going to fill that gap because I, as a member of the Opposition - I'm sure the Honourable Member of St. Matthews who already spoke supports me on that concept, and the Member for Flin Flon - that we deserve at least some answers. If he hasn't got the answers, tell us where we're going and how we're going to arrive at that point. I still support the educational concept. I find it very difficult to find the Minister of Education rising in a tirade yesterday, and attacking me for some problems that were not with education at all. They're with the Attorney-General's Department. I think it was cheap, it was uncalled for, and I hope that he'll give us some answers to the questions that I've raised.

. . . . continued on next page



## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that the remarks that I addressed, through you to the Minister yesterday with respect to the system of education in the province and the proposed improvements to the CORE Report, are one matter that was of consequence to the entire population of the province.

I would now like to address myself to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the Minister of Education, on a problem that is much closer to home. It is a problem that exists in the St. Boniface School Division and one which is very very difficult to live with. Yet in the remarks that were made by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, and in some of the remarks also of the Honourable Minister himself this morning in the way of an answer to some of the comments that have been made by members on this side of the House, there were allusions made to the French section of education in this province. Now I, as a francophone, am extremely pleased with the kinds of innovations that were brought about and the possibilities that were given to francophones in this province by the inception of Bill 113. I think that Bill 113 was a completion of the work that had already started with Bill 59; and it was a happy day indeed for me, particularly, and for the entire French community, when Bill 113 came into effect. The degree of assimilation of that French community was such that further delays would without doubt have taken a greater toll than it already has with respect to assimilation.

Now in the St. Boniface School Division it took exactly one year to put into play Bill 113. For the edification of all of the members present, it was put into play this way. There was the "A" course which the Minister referred to this morning, whereby all of the subjects were taught in French with the exception of the English language, and that course was parallel to the English course given to students in the other streams of education. Then there was the "B" course which dealt with roughly a 50 - 50 percent, or a carrying on as it were, of Bill 59. There were a number of families in the St. Boniface School Division who opted for the "A" course. And to make this course possible a school was set aside whereby, and completely set aside, for the teaching of this course from grades 1 to 8, and St. Boniface College the secondary section took it from 9 to 12.

Now, I cannot but help but again stress the kind of role that the Provincial Government has played in this area. It has received a great deal of support and financial help from the Federal Government but the initiative it took should have given all of the opportunities to a school division to carry the program on without hesitation. After the first year of operation at Tache School - and now I think this name will register with a lot of the members in this Chamber - the School Board threatened that it had to, because of the limited enrollment, it had to close that school and transfer the course into another locale where it would not be possible to function as properly as it could at the Tache area. Because of parent representation this closure was postponed or delayed. I say postponed or delayed, because at the end of the second year we are faced again with the closure of this school. Now, the department has taken initiatives, happy initiatives I might add, I'm not now criticizing them as I was under the CORE Report section of my talk, but they took some happy initiatives and appointed a man that was to co-ordinate the instruction of the French language in the province. This man came in last year and worked for an entire year at evaluating actually what was happening in French instruction. By and large this gentleman said that the level of French instruction in the province was deplorable, and a great deal had to be done to bring it up to the standards of the other, the English flow of instruction.

On page 13 of his report this gentleman said that there was only one exception to the analysis that he was making and that was the viability of Tache School and St. Boniface College. Now that's the same school that today the St. Boniface School Division would like to close. I agree with the Minister and with all of the gentlemen who have spoken about the importance of school division autonomy. I think that this is something that is unquestionable. Because of its intimate relationship with the people who live in the area, it has to relate to the people of that area. So I would never want any further watering down of the authority and the autonomy of a local school division. But I indeed, Mr. Chairman, am heavy of heart to know that one school division has not been civilized to all of the efforts that are being made by the two levels of government in this country, both the Federal and the Provincial. It insists on closing down a school that was evaluated by a man who is of the profession, capable of properly evaluating the work that's being done; it insists on negating all of those efforts. And it would seem to me,

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MARION Cont'd) . . . . Mr. Chairman, that I have asked the Minister to act as the arbiter in this case in some of the questions that I put to him previously during the question period in the month of March and at the beginning of April.

I've had the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to speak to the Minister about this case, and I know that his sympathy definitely lies with the parents of the children that are attending l'Ecole Tachê.

Je suis très heureux, Monsieur le Président, d'adresser les quelques paroles sur le système d'éducation francophone de la Province du Manitoba dans ma langue maternelle, étant donné qu'il y a présentement des membres de cette Chambre qui sont aussi de cette même descendance. Il me semble que lorsqu'a offert le Ministre, plus tôt ce matin, d'offrir certains financements pour aider la Division scolaire si elle se sent dans le besoin ou si elle se sent désavantagée parce qu'elle offre le cours en français qui est parallèle à celui-là en anglais, il me semble que ce geste est valable, par contre, il me semble qu'il y a encore un problème qui est plus profond et ce problème c'est bien celui-là que la Commission scolaire de St. Boniface elle-même n'a pas compris ce qu'essayait de faire le Département de l'Éducation de cette Province.

I think that is incumbent upon the Minister, and I say this not as a direct order, because I have insinuated that his feelings have been voiced to me whereby he appreciates the requests that are being made by the parents to make sure that this school is not closed. I think that the Minister said this morning that he was willing to fund, because of the fact the program that was now initiated at Tache, with the . . . program at Provencher, were both in essence parallel courses and of a pilot project nature. I appreciate the kinds of effort that the Minister is willing to make to make sure that these programs are carried along at least for the length of time required to properly evaluate which of the two that are presently in existence in the school division of St. Boniface are the more viable, or are the courses which show the best response to the possibilities of fundamental bilingualism for a franco-Manitoban in the Province of Manitoba. I appreciate these. But I can't help but feel very frustrated at the fact that the St. Boniface School Division, who should, in essence, be implementing this kind of thinking, has seen fit not to, of its own volition, make that "A" course as obtainable as it should, and taught under the conditions that make it possible for the course to have its full impact.

I would expect that if the Minister has the opportunity of dialoguing with the school board he will make those points with that authority, and if they are able to put a case before him whereby the funding is necessary then he will see fit to go along with reasonable requests in that area. But it would be my sincere feeling that the Minister would also voice the objects again that the Provincial Government has with respect to French education, so that that division might show the kind of leadership that is incumbent upon it to show and that it to this day has really not been showing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I just had one or two comments to make. They're more in the way of questions rather than comments to pass on to the Minister. I was wondering if he would explain to the House funds that are available in the way of teachers grants for private parochial schools and how a school becomes eligible for this. Are there any schools in the province that's receiving them now, and if so why are some of the schools because they happen to fall in different districts than others, don't receive these grants. I would wonder if it's available to all schools through the province who want to apply for it and who makes the decision. Is it the school board of the division or is it the Department of Education, as to who gets the grants and who doesn't? And the reason why some schools are being able to take advantage of this and some don't seem to be able to.

And if he is knowledgeable on it to give us the answer, if any of the City of Winnipeg School District No. 1 participates in this or are they taking advantage of these grants that are available?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, there have been a number of honourable members of the House who have participated in the debate in my estimates this afternoon and while being up on my feet this time round I would like to attempt to deal with as many of the questions and issues raised by honourable members as time will permit, attempting to, one being mindful of the time constraints, and secondly, also wanting to give as complete replies as I possibly can.

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK Cont'd)

Therefore, dealing with honourable members in the order in which they spoke, firstly, the Honourable Member for Flin Flon expressing his concern about Frontier School Division; and one of his concerns was that the division as large as it is, while certainly geographically being the largest in the Province of Manitoba, is administered by an official trustee as opposed to having an elected board. Then he went on to suggest the need for a complete revamping of the system and so forth. Now it is true that at the present time Frontier School Division, or rather the affairs of Frontier School Division are administered by an official trustee. Of course, an official trustee has all the powers of a school board in dealing with education matters related to his particular school division. It must also be borne in mind, Mr. Chairman, that Frontier School Division is a new creature of government, created at the time that a move was made toward the establishment of unitary school divisions; and it must be borne in mind that at the time, and in fact even at the present time, I would doubt whether Frontier School Division is ready to assume full responsibility of the administration of its own affairs. When I say that I doubt if they are ready, what I'm really saying, Mr. Chairman, is that I do not believe that the mechanism has been devised to enable the people of that huge part of Manitoba to administer their educational affairs in the best interest of the entire area. But, having said that, I would not wish it to be interpreted that I am in any way suggesting that that ought not be our goal or our objective, and it certainly should be. In fact I would also wish to remind members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that whatever could be done at the present time to enable the school division, or the people in the school division to participate in a decision-making process has been done through the establishment of advisory committees and advisory councils. There is an advisory committee attached to the operation of each school within Frontier School Division and there are many, every community of any size has an elementary school, and then of course there is the high school at Cranberry Portage known as Frontier Collegiate. Each has an advisory committee attached to it and in turn the advisory committee has representatives of it sitting on an advisory council for the entire Frontier School Division.

Now the previous government had established a high school at Cranberry Portage and that was the focal point to which students seeking a high school education went to obtain it. It operated that way for a number of years and at the present time a number of things are happening. Frontier Collegiate is still continuing, of course, but many communities wherein the population warrants it have high school instruction being offered locally up to whatever grade level the enrollment numbers would make it possible to offer high school education - Grade 9, Grade 10 and so forth. I think one must not lose sight of the fact that schools in a division such as Frontier School Division, they have to do a number of things, or the philosophy of education within a division of that type has to be mindful of a number of factors. One, to provide an education program that would be meaningful, relevant, useful to the people of the community, one which would be of benefit to those from Northern Manitoba who may elect to seek their livelihood remaining in the north and offering them an education program that they'd be able to put to use. This is in line with our stay option program which is policy of this government.

And secondly, it also must be such that would make it possible for those in Northern Manitoba in the pursuit of their ambitions, of their careers, may have to move elsewhere both for training and eventually for the practice of their occupation, of their profession or whatever it may be. So therefore the education program does in fact have to incorporate both of those features.

Now I don't think that it would be fair to design a program that would be designed primarily for those, or exclusively for those living in the north and choosing to remain in the north, because then you're putting those who may be of best service to the province working elsewhere, you're putting them at a disadvantage, and similarly it would be equally unfair to offer a program that would be completely meaningless and irrelevant to those who may choose to remain there. And in other words being urban oriented, southern Manitoba oriented and so forth. So the problem that the Honourable Member for Flin Flon poses is not one that can be resolved overnight but certainly one that - and in a moment or two I wish to indicate some of the steps that are being taken to move in the direction - concrete definite steps are being taken moving in the direction suggested by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon. Then of

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK Cont'd) . . . . course it must be borne in mind that Cranberry Portage itself is a community within which is housed Frontier Collegiate and therefore whatever may be done that may tend to reduce the enrollment at Frontier Collegiate would eventually, or could eventually have undesirable effects on that community in terms of employment prospects and so forth. In other words, on its general economy. So therefore whatever is done related to the delivery of the education program that may tend to move education back into the communities it has to be done in such a way that would not produce certain benefits in one area but adverse or undesirable effects in another. And both have to be borne in mind.

During the past year we have had our staff work in the Frontier School Division to do a close and thorough study of the education needs of a school division, and I would just like to indicate to you, Mr. Chairman, what some of the recommendations are as to the things that ought to be done and in fact what is being done at the present time.

But perhaps before I come to that just one further comment on the question of self-government of the Frontier School Division.

I did meet with the advisory council of Frontier School Division, in fact it's a year ago now, at which time I indicated to the advisory council my interest and concern and desire to move in this direction at as rapid a rate as may be possible. I did indicate, and of course the advisory council certainly is well aware of some of the problems that must be overcome, the ramifications of developing some system of self-government that would be practical because there are geographic factors, you know, the remoteness of the communities, the distance among them and so forth. Of this they are aware. And I indicated to the advisory council that I would like them to take this suggestion back home to them, to their own advisory committees attached to each school and discuss it with them and then report back to me at the next meeting of the advisory council, or as soon as they may be able to report back. I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that the advisory council did exactly that and will be reporting back to me very shortly, within the next few weeks, at which time they will be making some suggestions and also seeking further direction and clarification and advice from myself and the Department. So it's quite apparent then, Mr. Chairman, that this matter is not an issue that can be very easily resolved, because even the people who would be directly affected or most affected by any move in this direction themselves have certain questions, certain reservations, concerns that they would want to discuss further with the Department of Education before continuing their move in that direction.

Now to deal with some of the problems and the needs of the students and the teachers in Frontier School Division as we see them at the present time, on the basis of the report that we have received from a staff person that was given this assignment. And I'm just going through these in the - I'm not certain whether they're arranged in any particular order of priority or - I would doubt it very much. I think that all of these are matters of considerable concern and hence they are listed here.

One suggestion that he makes that - and this is being done - making more materials available to the teachers to enable them to deal more adequately with the subject of Social Studies. I would suspect that one of the problems in Frontier School Division is one of making the study of Social Studies more meaningful and relevant to their own home situation, to their own environment. And this is being done.

Then insofar as audio-visual materials are concerned, insofar as the supply of the hardware, this appears to be reasonably ample and adequate, it's heavily used, but we must concentrate more on the provision of software materials to make proper use of the hardware.

Then of course we also looked at the cost of transportation which is a very significant factor in Northern Manitoba. The cost is high to transport the students to and from Frontier Collegiate to bring them in September, back home for Christmas and so forth, and this I would feel would require further study - and this to a degree, or at least as it applies to Frontier School Division touches somewhat on the concern raised by the Honourable Member for Roblin when he speaks about future plans. I would like Frontier School Division, which I would like to remind you again, Mr. Chairman, the Frontier School Division is a school division empowered to make its own decisions, to operate its own school program, but I would like the Frontier School Division to consider the implementation of a semester or trimester program at Frontier Collegiate with a view to doing two things. One, making the laboratory and shops, home ec facilities available to the high school students for some periods of their term in high

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . . school and at the same time make it possible for those same students to remain at home for a longer period of time under the control and guidance and direction of their parents. Now I realize that to do that the cost factor, you know, will emerge and that we will have to look at it.

Insofar as the curriculum development is concerned, and I would probably deal with this more adequately when we proceed to deal with other resolutions in my estimates, and particularly those dealing with specific programs, and when we come to native education I'd be able to elaborate on that at greater length. The reason for it is I can give you a detailed description, probably take me three or four minutes to find it in my estimates book, but when we come to that section on the estimates I will have the material there and be able to outline in detail innovations in all programs that may fall within that particular branch. -- (Interjection) -- The honourable member says he'd take my word for it. I'm glad to hear that, and may I also suggest to the honourable member that should I forget or should time run against me then I would hope that somewhere along the line we would find time for me to outline to the House new and innovative programs that are under way.

Then we are concerned and we have the post school activities of the graduates at Frontier Collegiate. We're attempting to locate the present whereabouts and present occupation, do a follow-up on the graduates; in fact on all students at any time that attended Frontier Collegiate since the date of its inception, 1965 to 1972. -- (Interjection) -- The Honourable Member for Lakeside says that this sounds like snooping. I can assure the honourable member that nothing will be asked that would in any way violate the provisions of The Personal Investigations Act. All that would be asked would be - we would want such information that would assist us in enabling the education program in Frontier School Division to function even better to the advantage and for the benefit of the people of Frontier.

I'm glad, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Member for Lakeside is very accommodating this afternoon. I know he usually is but when he assumes his role as an opposition member in the House it surprises me that he can be all that accommodating.

Then we also conduct various exchange trips between students of Frontier School Division via the Youth Secretariat and perhaps on this particular point, Mr. Chairman, even though this is an activity involving the school division itself, but this does fall under the aegis of the Youth Secretariat and perhaps could be dealt with at greater length when we come to deal with my other department, Colleges and Universities Affairs. Student trips have been arranged for high school students of Frontier Collegiate and Norway House, and then of course we have the exchange program during the summer months for students from Frontier and for students in the core city area to have an opportunity to spend some time at Frontier Collegiate acquainting themselves with life and the environment in the north.

And I also wish to assure the honourable members and the honourable member for Frontier that in-service sessions are held for the teachers, in-service sessions dealing with teaching methods, dealing with matters touching upon native culture and so forth, and thus to better acquaint the teachers with the students that they're working with and thus in turn enabled them to offer better service to their community.

Now this is only a brief response, Mr. Chairman, to some of the concerns raised by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon and as I've indicated, I hope that we'll be able to deal with this at greater length at another point in time.

The Honourable Member for St. James attempted to make us, or make the House believe that at some time or another I have said that with the existing grant structure coupled with tax rebates that the share of the education costs borne by each and every taxpayer in the Province of Manitoba shall be something in the order of 20 percent, that the province picks up 72 percent of the education cost of each and every tax bill. At no time did I say that the province picked up 72 percent of each and every tax bill. I never said that. -- (Interjection) -- For the whole province, for the whole province, not off each and every tax bill. In fact -- (Interjection) -- Well all right, I'll tell -- well in some school divisions, last year, for example, in, well it's a school division -- (Interjection) -- 72 percent, that's the provincial contribution.

A MEMBER: Last year?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Last year? Last year it was in the order of 70 - yes, yes. You know I could dig up the figures. Well just a minute now. Last year, yes the honourable member's -- last year, 1973, the total provincial contribution of school expenditures were

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . . 75.01 percent. Yes, last year. -- (Interjection) -- And that's giving credit for the rebate, yes.

A MEMBER: Now you got all the rebate . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: No. No, in some school divisions we pick up -- Turtle River we pick up 88 percent of the costs, we pick up 88 percent of the costs. But the fact of the matter is, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that, you know, what the Honourable Member for St. James really is doing is nothing more than playing with words. The honourable member knows just as well as I do, the honourable member knows just as well as I do that our tax rebate structure, in fact the tax rebate structure with the two factors built into it, the minimum and then the portion that's adjusted according to one's income, that that in fact pays the total tax bill for a large percentage of the people, total tax bill - municipal and education. And the honourable member knows that. But really, you know, with a credit of up \$250 which, if that's a tax item, if that's tax expense that a taxpayer has to pay, he pays the one bill which, a portion of it of course is earmarked - municipal portion of it is education. And the assistance is there, and in some cases it does take care of the entire amount. -- (Interjection) -- No. I'm talking about the impact that it has on a taxpayer. I'm talking about the impact that it has on a taxpayer. -- (Interjection) -- No. And that's the one that I'm really concerned about, and that's the one that I'm sure that honourable members are concerned about, or they should be concerned about.

The honourable member also wanted to know exactly what amount of the education foundation grants are, in the current fiscal year I presume, would be applicable to the City of Winnipeg only. Well at the present time, if the honourable member wishes, I'll be able to obtain these figures. But the honourable member should know that we pay grants to school divisions, to school divisions as entities and with the exception, this figure I do not have, because within the City of Winnipeg there are many school divisions, and there are many school divisions that extend beyond the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg into other municipalities. But if the honourable member wishes it, I will certainly do my best to obtain this information for him at a later time.

You know, I should also point out to honourable members when we talk about that . . .

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would allow a question at this time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. James has a question.

MR. MINAKER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Would the Minister have the figures with regards to the total grant for the province last year from the Finance School Board in regards to assistance to the City of Winnipeg, what the figure was last year in total grants, excluding any rebate on property owners? What that grant was from the government for the operation of the education system in the City of Winnipeg and what it was for the whole province. And would he have the figure for this year.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I indicated to the honourable member just a moment ago that we paid grant to school divisions and not to municipalities. -- (Interjection) -- The total? Mr. Chairman, we can give a total figure by divisions not by municipalities. The honourable member is asking from his seat if we could add the total of the divisions, but as I indicated to the honourable member just a moment ago, that the boundaries of many school divisions extend beyond the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg. Just to name some: Seven Oaks, Transcona-Springfield, River East and so forth; so in other words, all of the land contained within the school division does not necessarily lie within the City of Winnipeg. So it isn't just a matter of totalling up the grants for the school divisions you know within Winnipeg. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Chairman, yes, I could obtain the total for the school divisions, all or a portion of which are for the . . . You know if the honourable member -- I'm not quite certain whether we ought to engage in this type of dialogue or whether it wouldn't be preferable if I'm given the opportunity to make my remarks and then whatever I have not clarified the honourable member would certainly have an opportunity to ask for clarification. I think it would be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister has one minute left and any other member can make his contribution following that.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to, before we leave the question of grants there was just one other comment here that I wanted to make. I wanted to point out

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . . . to honourable members, Mr. Chairman, that the present grant structure has built-in within it a number of equalizing factors. One, in the low assessment areas the major portion of the Foundation Grant is paid from provincial revenues. The example that I gave, for example Turtle River, the Foundation Grant formula picks up 88 percent, whereas in the higher assessed areas the percentage of provincial revenues in the Foundation Grants is proportionately lower. And there was a very good reason for that, and that is the philosophy on which the Foundation Grant formula was established at a time when it was reasonably effective but less so today.

And as a further equalizer, Mr. Chairman, capital grants for building purposes cover 100 percent of the approved costs, thus enabling the low assessed areas to obtain as good schools as anywhere else in the province. And of course transportation grants cover almost the entire cost of transportation.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I will have to continue at a later time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. HARVEY PATTERSON (Crescentwood): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I didn't realize that we were in for such a long debate on the Department of Education and I realize that it probably is one of the most important departments of the government because it does have the necessary facilities and abilities to shape the future of our society. When we first started off in the department I thought it would roll through rather quickly as the Minister has always impressed me as a sort of a quiet spoken, easy-going chap and he seemed to be sitting back taking life rather leisurely and smoking his pipe and sort of not seeming to be too aware of things, but he surprised me. He has responded to the barrage of criticism and questions and proves to me that he's a Minister to be reckoned with, that he has a lot of gumption and certainly the man to be leading the Department of Education. It looked to me when we first started off in the debate on the department that he was going to have rather clear sailing without too many interjections or real in-depth questioning, but as the prodding continued he certainly has responded very well. And I just thought that I should take the opportunity to say a few words and give the Minister a little moral support, if nothing else, and also to give him an opportunity of some more time because I can realize that he has many queries and questions that he hasn't had time to explain to this particular point in the debate.

But there's no doubt in my mind that the Minister is the expert in the field that we need. He's been around in education for a long time, travelled far and wide in the province and his wife is an expert also in education, she's a former teacher; no doubt he gets plenty of counseling from that direction as well, so this probably makes him a better Minister than what might normally be the case.

But talking on some of the things that has arisen in the Chamber I just want to say that some of the honourable members talked about the work ethic. Well I don't think that the work ethic is dead at this time in our history and I think that the students that are presently in the educational system will progress and grow up to be good outstanding citizens. They will develop, I don't think that we have to be too concerned about that. They seem to have the ability and the desire to do that. The only fear that I would express in that regard is that the so-called radicals of today possibly will grow up to be the conservatives of tomorrow, and that is my only concern in that regard and I just hope that some of them will retain some of their radicalism as they go into the adult world and possibly follow along in the footsteps of the Minister of Education.

There's been much talk about discipline in the school system. I am one that does favour some discipline in the school system. I think it's good, I don't think it has done any of us any harm and I don't think it will do the children of the future any harm. I'm a little bit concerned about the trend toward the permissiveness and I would just caution the Minister that we shouldn't go overboard in that area and just keep things in a proper control and not have too much of a swing one way or the other. I think there's a middle road to play in this given area and I would hope that the Minister would see his way clear to do so.

In regard to discipline of children, I concur with some of the previous comments that the greater responsibility falls on the parents and in this area society seems to be lacking somewhat and I would just like to take some of the onus off the educational system and place it on the parents where it properly should be, because nowadays the parents seems to take sort of an easy-going attitude toward the children and leave it up to the teachers and the professional people to more or less rear the children when it should be the responsibility of the parent, and

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) . . . . I would stress that the parents of Manitoba should take a greater responsible role in the development of their children.

There are some of the programs that the department are currently engaged in and I would just like to comment and pass along a few compliments on some of those programs. The GED system, General Education Development, is a good program. I know that thousands of students have performed in that program and I think the results have been most gratifying and I would certainly encourage the Minister to carry on that trend, expand it and improve it and do whatever he can to keep that system alive.

There is a program that I have been closely involved with in the labour field and that is the FOCUS Program and that is a good program as well. The intent and direction of the program has not been all that bad. There have been a few areas that we have had complaints about but in the main the direction of the program is to inform the worker and bring a higher level of education to people in the work force and I think that that particular emphasis on the program is good.

The programs that we have in Adult Education are far reaching, they are very extensive and they are increasing. I think that more and more - I haven't seen the latest statistics - but I think the enrolment in Adult Education is maintaining the level that it has over the past few years, if not increasing, and I would highly commend the department for their efforts in that particular area.

Now when we look at the Department of Education, it is one of the departments that is most susceptible to change and it has to change in order to keep up with the times, but I don't like to see change just for change's sake. I can recall when my daughter first started school, the Cuisenaire system was in effect and I wasn't too impressed with that particular system and I found it didn't do her that much good in an educational sense, so that was one change that I wasn't too pleased with. And I don't know what the evaluation and the end result of that particular program was, but my impression was that it was not too successful.

I think we are as adults in our society, just by nature I think hesitant to change and I sometimes think that there's an over resistance to change, but we must continue to experiment, even if we don't change, we must continue to experiment.

A MEMBER: Right on.

MR. PATTERSON: I'm going to have an experiment with my honourable member here, very shortly. But this is the connotation that I would put on changes that we experiment to a great deal before we actually go ahead and make the changes that have a profound effect on the educational system. So I would just like to mention a few of those things to bring my concerns to the attention to the Minister.

The recent change that I have seen developed, and I don't think it's in all the high schools yet, and that's the semester system, and I must say that I was willing to give it a whirl. But I'm not convinced yet that it's the best system. My daughter has been involved in that system the last few years and I'm not satisfied that she has progressed through that system any better than what she would have progressed under the former system. In fact I think possibly she might have been somewhat short-changed on the change in that system. Because it's possibly good for a percentage of the students because they have a lot of desire and self-drive and things like that but when you get the run-of-the-mill type of student, I'm just wondering about the semester system. And I would like the Minister to take cognizance of that concern and possibly explain what direction we are heading in the future as to the semester system. I'm concerned about the amount of free time that is allotted or developed through the semester system. The study periods to me, they should be compulsory, they should be supervised, because all of the students don't have the same desire to get through the educational process as what the more highly confident and qualified students do. So the study periods and free time are two concerns that I strongly express to the Minister in that regard.

In my brief experience with the educational system in our city, concerning the guidance counsellors, I think they are required, and I think that the appointment or picking of the guidance counsellors has to be handled by a very delicate process, because it is not too many people that can be a guidance counsellor. There are many many good guidance counsellors in our system and there's no doubt in my mind that they can help the students, and do help the students, but my concern in this area is the selection of guidance counsellors, and I must say that I have encountered a very small percentage that have been of what I would consider to be an inferior



## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) . . . . quality. But I think this is a general trend in any given segment of our society that we can't all be top notch. But I think the guidance counsellor is one area where we have to stress top notch people, because these are the people that are going to have a great influence on the students in the school system.

Some of the honourable members opposite in the front bench had a lot of concern about the tax rebate system. Well, I think it is a quality program. I think it improves the quality of life for people in Manitoba, and even when the Conservative administration had the one shot rebate system for educational purposes, I wasn't objectional to their program. I thought it was a good program and maybe it was a good program. There didn't seem to be too much public reaction against it and maybe that's one reason that the Conservative government didn't carry it on because it was a good program and people kind of bought it, so maybe that's the reason they cancelled because it was good for the people. Had it been bad for people, maybe they would have kept it in force, but I certainly didn't object to receiving \$50 rebate back on my taxes under the Conservative administration. And I certainly have no objection in the direction of the property tax credit program at the present time. I think it's a good program and I for one support it, and going amongst the people in my constituency, I haven't got any complaints about the property tax credit program that the Manitoba government has in effect at the present time. So I would urge the Minister to impress upon the Cabinet to keep that program in effect and in fact expand on it, because I think it's a very necessary program and it certainly helps the people on fixed and low income.

Now my colleague from St. Matthews expressed a deep concern about the CORE Report, and I must say that I agree with some of his sentiments. I read the report once. I haven't had time to study it in great detail and pick out all of the quotations that my honourable colleague did. I found it to be a very comprehensive document, a very deep document, and I'm not ashamed to say that in certain areas it was over my head. Because I don't pretend to be no expert in the educational field or anything like that and I found the report interesting to read, but I would run into paragraphs or comments that just didn't make sense to me because I didn't understand them. When I was reading, and I thought it was double talk, because the complicated terminology involved in the report I just didn't grasp the meaning of it and I would be somewhat concerned about the overall philosophy and direction that I took from the report. This is what concerned me most was the philosophy inherent in the report and the direction that the report seemed to be espousing. And I could be totally wrong in that, because maybe I didn't grasp the meaning of some of the words in the report. So I would respectfully request the Minister to take a cautious approach to that report, study it very deeply, don't do anything that would be of a hurried-up nature type of program development arising from the report.

And I must say that in the CORE Report, the labour field, we did have an input into the report. I know one of my close friends in the Labour movement, Ron Aftanas, done considerable work in regard to the CORE Report and I respect his ability and his opinion, and therefore that's why I take a cautious approach to the report myself because I know Ron Aftanas and I can truly appreciate his position on a document of that nature. Now whether his ideas and comments had any prevailing effect on the report or not I can't say, but I do respect his ability and I would think that he would have some say as to the drafting of the report. But I must emphasize to the Minister, doubly if I have to, that in my reading of the report and my impression of the report is that the report should be dealt with cautiously, that the report should be thoroughly studied, and not too quick to implement it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. PATTERSON: In other words, Mr. Chairman, what I would suggest would be a conservative approach to that report. That should make the Honourable Member for Lakeside happy.

Now I would like to express a couple of proposals to the Minister and he can probably inform me as to what is developing in this particular area and how we go about doing something or more about it. We may be doing a great deal now, but I'm just wondering what the future holds for us in this regard. And that is education on birth control and education in regards to sex education in the school system. And I'm hoping that we can establish classes on these two headings and I think that the children in our modern day society have a right to know what life is all about. In other words, there should be some expression on the old phrase of the birds and the bees. And Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to hear the Minister say that we have a

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) . . . . program or some classes that are not too far distant that are coming into the educational curriculum and I'm talking down in the grade school level. Now - I'm not talking high school or anything like that. I think that this type of education has to be implemented into our curriculum oh say around the Grade 6 level - but I'm not fixed on that grade. If the Minister wants to bring it in at Grade 1, fine and dandy. I'd support him. No problem. So I'm just looking for something -- (Interjection) -- Well, if the liberals want to bring it into kindergarten, then we might see a national policy on education in that regard. But at this particular time I'm just requesting the Minister to advise us what his department is doing, what they're looking at in that particular area of those two topics that I mentioned, the birth control and sex education. And I would hope that if we haven't really got anything detailed in that area that the Minister would see -- (Interjection) -- well I haven't finished my comments on it yet. The Minister would certainly -- well, I'll put in this way, colleagues. The Minister would certainly give me a great deal of pleasure if he would proceed in that area as quickly as possible. And I know that the Honourable Minister is aware of the need for education in that area.

Mr. Chairman, my real pet project in the educational field is that I want to urge the Minister to implement into the educational system without any undue delay because to me we have been waiting for it for a long time, and that is education in the labour field. We have been advocating that, we have been presenting briefs on it, not only to this government, to governments over the years, that we really desire some curriculum courses and then once again this would have to start in the early years of a child's education. In our school system we have classes on business administration, banking, insurance, finance and many other managerial type of functions, so to me the scales are vastly overloaded in favour of the managerial business type of society, when perhaps it should be over-loaded in the other way. Because the majority of the people in our society are working labouring people and we don't have the emphasis on their place in society as we do on the others. I'm suggesting that this type of education should start in the Grade 4 or 5 area, if not right from the beginning. There are greater, the percentage is far greater of students ending up in the labour force than in the managerial class so this is why I stress that we need the education in the labour field.

I would suggest that we need classes and instruction on union structure. A lot of the young workers that come into the fold don't know anything about a union. They just don't understand it. And when we talk to them it's amazing to find out that they are really ignorant of the organizations and things available in the labour movement.

Labour history is something that should be stressed in the classes. If we can teach about the Plains of Abraham and Lord Nelson and all of these things, why can't we teach about the 1919 strike, the Chicago riots, Clarence Darrow, and all of these people.

The Union administration, if we can teach business administration why can't we teach union administration. It would seem to be just common-sense to me that these things should be in the curriculum and they should be equally as valuable to the student's education.

Industrial relations. Everybody's worried about people going on strike - why they go on strike. How many classes have you got in the educational system about industrial relations? I know in the university we have, but what about the grade schools and the secondary educational process. My daughter didn't encounter it at Grant Park so I would take it that it's not too general in our educational system. The industrial relations, the working together of people. And the peaceful resolve of disputes rather than having conflict all the time.

Labour Law. Why can't we teach labour law in our educational system. We teach all other kinds of rules and regulations. So a little bit of labour law would certainly seem to be appropriate.

Collective bargaining, the tools that develops the living standards of the workers. The people should understand what collective bargaining is all about. They should know that this process is available to them and I think that the school system should be ashamed of itself for not bringing these things to the attention of the people. I know in my own case I didn't learn about the labour movement until late in life. Had I learned about it in my school days I would have been much better prepared to handle the things that I encountered. Workers' Compensation, there's a great area that we need the people to know something about. People come into the labour force and there's a very small percentage of them know that workers compensation is available to them when they get injured. This wouldn't need to be a major course in the

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) . . . . educational system but certainly one of the complementing courses that could make the people aware of their right, and if a man goes on to be a manager, a banker, whatever, it wouldn't hurt him to know a little bit about workers' compensation; he might never use it but it certainly wouldn't hurt him because when the Honourable Minister of Labour has to face the Chamber of Commerce and the Manufacturers' Association then he would probably get a more receptive hearing if those people were tuned in on some of the things that he was trying to bring forward in our society.

Fringe benefits. How many workers know about the fringe benefits that are available to them when they come into the Labour force? They just don't understand. They don't realize that the union has these things in their collective agreement, I know it's hard for some people to believe this, but when a young worker 18, 19 years old comes into a plant to work he's really ignorant of what's available to him or what should be available to him. You know you might think that the students and that are well educated nowadays and they're real topnotch people, but we have in Grade 12, First Year University, that stature of student coming into the work force and some of them even start to work and don't know the rate of pay that they're going to get. They don't even ask what the rate of pay is. This is how hesitant they are to ask about their rights, and why I think we should have the type of education that I am advocating here is that I want the workers to be concerned about their rights and be ready and eager to ask about their rights. And they really don't do that because they are a little shy about it because they don't want to be nosy or something like that.

Just in closing, Mr. Chairman, there's just two topics; unemployment insurance they should be aware of. They should be aware of the labour movement worldwide. The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the International Labour Organization, the Canadian Labour Congress. The people should be aware of these things and I impress upon the Minister to do something in this field and in the not too distant future. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words before we adjourn for the Private Members' Hour this afternoon and I'm not one of those that's had the privilege of being educated in university, I got my education the hard way, driving four horses after I retired from the high school back about 39 years ago.

A MEMBER: That was under the Liberal administration.

MR. McKELLAR: I don't know what administration it was but I know it was a year when there was a lot of rust anyway that year and there wasn't much wheat.

A MEMBER: That was right before Confederation.

MR. McKELLAR: I had an excellent teacher those three years that I had in high school. That teacher happens to be one of the inspectors in the school system of Manitoba today, Richard Moore. I think he's in St. James, at least he was out there a year ago if he hasn't retired lately. A man who was born and brought up in Elgin, Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- He's retired now is he? Taught me my Grades 9, 10, 11 high school anyway and he was an excellent teacher I'll tell you, one respected by everyone in our community.

And in front of me here we have a man who was brought up in my part of the province, around Wawanesa, and I congratulate him on his appointment as Deputy Minister of Education and I wish him every success in his years in that portfolio. The Village of Wawanesa also supplied the Government of Manitoba two deputy ministers in the past, both in Health. One was Dr. Jackson back in the thirties, was the Deputy Minister of Health, and later Dr. Elliott who we all knew very well was Deputy Minister of Health back in the fifties and early sixties. So Wawanesa has contributed to the Province of Manitoba in many ways.

Now I want to get on education because I'm one of those that as I mentioned I do have a brother teaching in - assistant principal of a high school in Calgary, 100 teachers in his high school, he's assistant principal and he tells me he's no longer teaching. This is one of the things I'd like to speak on this afternoon. The numbers of teachers we have in administrative office in our educational system who no longer are teaching, who no longer are contributing to the classrooms in the Province of Manitoba. And I think it's a shame; I think it's a shame, because I'm sure that they could contribute much to our educational system in the classroom. And about all they do, Mr. Chairman, and I know full well, is to keep law and order in the school and also solve many of the individual problems of the students that they have from day to day. And I think it's a shame. Many of them have their Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . . Arts, Bachelor of Education and other degrees which I know that they have spent many many years studying for and I'm sure that they could put a lot of that education to better use than trying to keep law and order among the students in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we also have other problems and I want to deal with them because some of them will affect my area, some of them involve my area now. One of the things that I don't totally understand is the REAP Program. Some of the people in my area call it RAPE but I'll deal with it as REAP, R-E-A-P. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars mentioned by the Minister involving contracts with eight school divisions. Now I'm quite aware how the school systems are set up, I am quite aware of the responsibilities of school boards, their involvement in all the activities, in all of education from Kingergarten to Grade 12. And for the life of me I can't see why we need REAP, but I want the Minister to answer me why we need this other program.

I was always told that they were given sufficient moneys both through the government, both through local taxation, to finance all education. They were supposed to decide on the types of programs to be taught in the several school divisions. Now we have REAP. I want to know where this fits in. I want to know what this will do for the school divisions. I want to know where the school board, what part they play in this particular program. I want to know if it will mean another bureaucracy, if that's all we're hiring. I want to know what this bureaucracy if they are hired what they will do for that school division and a few other questions I would like answered, because Tiger Hills and Turtle Mountain are two of the school divisions in my constituency who have signed contracts. Now I have never saw the contract myself and I've never really been involved because I've been in here since the early part of the winter. But it does seem odd to me that we have an extra program on top of the several programs that are already established, and established programs up till now have been in my opinion sufficient in most school divisions for them to function properly with if they have sufficient moneys, and what has happened in the past, if they didn't have sufficient moneys they went to the people on special school tax.

Speaking of special school tax I would like to say that in the school division which I reside in, Souris Valley, our mill rate is up ten mills this year, ten mills special school tax. On my farm it means \$340.00 extra school taxes which I'll have to contribute, which the Minister says he's going to contribute \$50.00 more rebate this year than last year. Well that's very good but I want to say the taxes are up \$340.00.

Mr. Speaker, I know my time is going to be short but I want to deal with one other topic here and before I do I want to say that I do have a child in school even though he's only in Grade 4, he's got a long ways to go, but I want to say the type of education that my boy's got. When he was in kindergarten he spent six weeks in Honolulu, he went to school in Honolulu during the winter months in Honolulu. Grades 1, 2 and 3 during the winter months he spent six weeks in California school system. California - there's no problem. Any of these places there's no problem. You go there one day, you register, and the day you leave you get your report and come back to your own school, like in his case in Wawanesa. This past year he was eight weeks in Honolulu, spent eight weeks there, registered there and enjoyed the school system there and now two weeks ago he's back in Wawanesa again. But it's no problem. This is one of the problems you hear about people travelling. But it's no problem at all. The only thing I would say that from now on he's going to be in trouble because the history books are going to be quite different in their school system than ours. But the first four grades there's really no problem. I think he's had an education, this boy, that you couldn't get in any other way but in the manner in which he got it, I'm glad that he got that because I think he'll have something to remember for all time to come. I think this is something for a child. I only wish that I'd have had the pleasure of going to Honolulu instead of him, but I had to stay here.

Now getting back to the CORE subjects, and I've got five minutes before we go into the Private Members' Hour. I want to say something about this, and I want to say how I think it will relate to the school divisions in my constituency. Because we do have many different sizes of schools. The one that is right in my home, Wawanesa, involves about six high school teachers and around 120 students, 120 students, 125 students, somewhere in that neighbourhood in high school, teaching the many courses that they are able to teach, but also these students if they want extra courses go to Souris for these extra courses. Now you tell me, Mr. Minister,

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . . that they're going to have 10 compulsory subjects, Grades 10, 11 and 12, and the other subjects are going to be optional at the discretion of the school division, the school superintendent and the school principal and students. Now I can see how you could teach it in a school in Brandon, Winnipeg, well maybe Souris - I can understand because they have a bigger school. But I can tell you right now that they're going to have problems.

And one of the problems they're going to have, that we're going to be so many teachers over grants if we're going to instruct these children in all these different subjects, because this is going to be one of the great problems, is trying to relate this to small high schools in our Province of Manitoba. Now I don't know whether you're going to change the grant structure or not, but I can see that out of that ten subjects, optional subjects there that you might have at least three or four students or five students taking one particular subject. This is a possibility. Now everybody knows you can't teach five students unless you've got a lot of tax money, a lot of tax money. And I would say to the Minister, before you start into the CORE Program that you have already related here, which will be compulsory in September, 1975, that you look at your tax base and you decide just how far we can go. And if you can only relate it to Winnipeg and Brandon I would say relate it to Winnipeg and Brandon where they have larger high schools and can move teachers from one school to the other without having to go 30 or 40 miles. This is one of the problems in our school divisions, like between Souris and Wawanesa you got 30 miles; between Hartney and Souris you have 25 miles; between Boissevain and Killarney you have 25 miles, and you can't move teachers like you can in Winnipeg or you can in Brandon. So I say try it in Winnipeg and Brandon if you want to experiment but I think to the rural schools it's going to create real problems in trying to get proper instruction for the small number of students that will be relating to those individual courses. And I can see real problems. I can see real problems. Before in the past we had occupational entrance, we had general course, university entrance course.

Now I know that most of the students will decide - well a lot of them decide they want to go on to university, a lot of them do. Now how do they relate the basic subjects? Will that permit a student to go to university? Will that permit them, those ten basic subjects in Grades 10, 11 and 12 the compulsory subjects, will that permit a student to be qualified for a university course when they go into university? I want to know that. And the students want to know that. They have to be told that in advance. But you can't tell a Grade 9 student all this, they can't absorb this and I'm sure that the teachers and the parents can't absorb it because I'm a parent and I tell you even one and one doesn't make two in arithmetic today, doesn't make two. I can't help my son in arithmetic because the arithmetic is all changed.

One of the things you're going to have to do is educational. Don't start this too soon. Don't start it too soon. You're trying to move too fast on this. Let's experiment. Let's experiment up there in the constituency - the Honourable Member for Flin Flon wants a change up there. Let's try it up in Frontier first. Let's try something up in Frontier. Maybe that'll work up there. But I tell you it won't work in Souris Valley; it won't work in Turtle Mountain; it won't work in Tiger Hills, because your high schools are too small and it's impossible to move the teachers around. This is what you're going to have to do; this is what you're going to have to do. You're going to have -- (Interjection) -- Well I'm not here to argue and I only got a half a minute but I'll tell you I'll have a debate on that in concurrence because it just won't work. It won't work. It won't work.

Another one thing before I close. We're stressing the French language all over Canada and my God, we're going to hear biculturalism and bilingualism for the next 60 days. But what are we doing in the educational system? We don't even have a language requirement to go to university now. We don't have a language requirement. Something we always had. Something which, I could never go to university because I could never study French, I could never pass it. But I tell you if we're going to be serious about biculturalism and bilingualism let's be serious. Let's have a language requirement for university education. Let's make it that way so that when they do get through their university that they've got a second language. The Honourable Minister doesn't have to tell me he can speak a second language, like Ukrainian, Ukrainian. What's wrong with having Ukrainian? What's wrong with having French? What's wrong with having Gaelic? My language, Gaelic. Nothing wrong with it. I'm not saying what language but I tell you we missed the boat when we dropped that requirement, we dropped that language requirement for

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . . university entrance. All we did was make it easy and we're still making it easy and the Minister's still making it easy for the students. But I tell you it's not an easy world, it's not an easy world and the Member for St. Boniface mentioned that. It's a tough, rough world and I tell you it's going to be a lot tougher and rougher in the next 40, 50 years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The time being 4:30 Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, has directed me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: First item is Resolution 15 and the amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for--absent? The question is open.

MOTION on the amendment presented and carried.

MOTION on the resolution as amended presented and carried.

RESOLUTION NO. 33

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 33. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel, WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba, the Manitoba Branch Lines Abandonment Association, the Canada Grains Council and many other groups of citizens and private citizens continue to study the feasibility of proposed abandonment of many of the branch lines in the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railway in Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS the well-being of Canada, particularly Western Canada is in part dependent on achieving an efficient and low cost method of producing, collecting, transporting and marketing grain;

AND WHEREAS the separate parts of the system which consist of producers, elevator companies, railways, etc., are also dependent on the effectiveness of the total transportation system and the manner in which each is able to respond to market opportunities;

AND WHEREAS many of the branch lines in Manitoba are scheduled for total abandonment in the year 1975;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Legislature consider the advisability of appointing a committee to study all of the aspects of railway abandonment and report it back to the next session of the Manitoba Legislature.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a historical problem that's been related to this province and the other provinces of Western Canada whereby next year, 1975, we face the abandonment of thousands of miles of our transportation system which has served this country well and has served it efficiently over the hundred years of our history. And as a classic example of the importance of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, this past crop year we will in all likelihood have handled the largest grain crop in our history with this old archaic system.

Mr. Speaker, much has been done outside of this Legislature and I have comments which I have read from the Department of the Minister of Industry and Commerce regarding rail abandonment but, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the time is past due for members of the Legislature to continually overlook this problem and not become involved in it. Because if next we're going to see the abandonment of these thousands of miles of our transportation system by rail which has served us so well over the many years of our history, I think the time is overdue when we as members of the Legislature and elected people of this province should become involved.

Mr. Speaker, I am well acquainted with the Branch Line Abandonment Association of this province, I've been a member for many years; I've attended the annual meetings on most occasions; I took part in the debates at that level, so I'm quite familiar with the works and the

## RESOLUTION 33

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . effort that's been directed towards attacking this abandonment of our system by people outside of the Legislature and people from many walks of life. I'm also quite familiar with the work of the Canada Grains Council and the many studies and reports that are on record today and which most members no doubt have read. I'm also familiar with the studies that have been done and conducted by the grain companies and the railroads regarding this very important matter.

But, Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting to find under the direction of the Minister of Industry and Commerce that he has committees set up under his jurisdiction that I was never familiar with nor am I aware of, and I wonder how many members of the Legislature know that the Minister of Industry and Commerce has set up a Manitoba Transportation Economic Council, and who in fact are the members of this council. I never saw it until I got this directive on my desk on I think the 27th of April, that there is in fact a body in this province known as the Manitoba Transportation Economic Council. --(Interjection)--Well are they bringing a report to the Legislature? Have any of the members heard this group in committee, have they got any of their reports or documents on our table to prove that they were working for the people and members of this Legislature? Mr. Chairman, I fail to see any evidence on the table of this committee.

Mr. Speaker, he also in his report, the Minister of Industry and Commerce talks about a sub-committee called the Manitoba Transportation Advisory Committee. Well the Honourable Member from Radisson is all uptight about it but nevertheless if these committees are functioning are they appointed by the Legislature or were they appointed by the Minister? If they're doing work on behalf of us, the members of the Legislature, have they no records or no reports to lay on the table of the House so we know at least what's going on? So, Mr. Speaker, I become very uptight when I saw that the Minister of Industry and Commerce is quietly by himself conducting and establishing committees and why can't we share the information, because I don't think there's any member of this Legislature that is more concerned than myself and many others on this side of the House that are going to lose thousands of miles of rails that's going to be abandoned.

I would refer, Mr. Speaker, to the Prairie Economic Council that was held last year in Calgary and that meeting, and the Peacock Plan that was laid on the table and possible solutions to the transportation problems in Western Canada. And I've never heard any of the members of the government who were there and took part in those debates even discussing that in this session of the Legislature today. And I don't know why. Are they not prepared? Is the plan a bad one or has there been further studies done by the government regarding the Peacock Plan? I don't know, and this is basically, Mr. Chairman, why I put my resolution on the Order Paper and asked the members of the Legislature to deal with it.

Mr. Chairman, very briefly, the grain producers of this province share with other facets of our agricultural community of Canada the constant problem of the increasing costs of rail transportation and their primary products, and that's basically the economic base of this great province in which we live. Our economy is built around the producers in rural Manitoba. I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that 80 percent of the revenues from grains and oil seeds comes from our export markets and Canada today, as you likely heard the Minister of Finance on television speak this morning, and said that this country is wholly dependent on our export markets. Canada today is one of the greatest exporting nations in the world and therefore I think if we lose our transportation system how are we going to maintain the status that we've been recognized in the world as one of the leading export countries of the world? Certainly I'm sure that every member of this Legislature will agree with me that Canada and Manitoba as an exporter of our primary products in the agricultural industry, we've got to meet the challenges of the marketplace of the world's market and how are we going to do it without a transportation system? And that basically is my quarrel. Because the marketplaces that we're dealing with in the world today, Mr. Speaker, are becoming more and more and more competitive and people are learning how to grow these agricultural products more efficiently than they did in the past. If we end up with a system for transportation to getting these primary products to our ports that's abandoned, then how are we going to survive or how are we going to maintain that status which we are recognized around the world today?

So, Mr. Speaker, I would think that because of the major factor in getting these primary products from the farmer's backyard to our export ports and the fact that it's going to be abandoned, at least many thousands of miles are scheduled for abandonment in Western Canada this coming year, then this Chamber and the members deserve to dig their heels in and let's try and

## RESOLUTION 33

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . see if we can't solve it. And if we can't solve it, if the rail lines and the railways are determined they're going to abandon them and if they're going to be abandoned, what other system have we got to take its place?

I raised that question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Highways when he placed his estimates before the House. What has this government or what has that Minister done to set up another transportation system to take place of these abandoned lines? And unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I didn't get an answer; I didn't get an answer. I don't know why because I would think if the Minister of Industry and Commerce is sincere in appointing these committees that he's already put on the record, surely the Minister of Highways some place must have communicated with the Minister of Industry and Commerce and they've met on some occasion in the past, Mr. Speaker, and give us some answers. What are we going to do if these lines are going to be abandoned? And of course what's going to happen to our rural community, Mr. Speaker? There's a great concern expressed in these communities today where these branch lines are going to be abandoned. And of course historically we know today what's going on with the problems that we have with our transportation, for the subsidies, the railways are being subsidized to keep these branch lines functioning. And who are paying for those subsidies, Mr. Speaker? These costs are being borne in many ways by the producers and the rest of it's been borne by the taxpayers. And there's all kind of evidence that that system can't carry on forever, whereby we have branch lines out in my constituency where there hasn't been a railway tie put in for four years; there's spikes, the trains are on a 10 miles per hour limit and when the engine and the cars go over, the spikes all flop up and down. The weeds haven't been cut, the fences haven't been repaired. So the railways have made up their mind where they're going, Mr. Speaker, they're going to abandon the system.

And if that system is a bad system and it can't be changed then I say that we've got to find some other way to make certain that our primary products get to the export market and Canada doesn't lose its status which it is today considered as one of the leading export countries of the world.

And as I said, Mr. Speaker, various groups have studied these problems including the Department of Industry and Commerce and the grain firms, and if you read these studies some very interesting things come out. First of all, Mr. Speaker, we find that the operating costs of our country elevator systems and our terminals are rising at an alarming rate like everything else in our society today. These costs are naturally going to become a burden on the back of the producers and the consumers and they're going to give us problems at the export level, and unless they can be reduced, or at least unless they can be held, we are in trouble with our exporting people that are dealing with us. The country elevator costs, Mr. Speaker, as I understand them, in the year 1969 that the cost of running our elevator systems was some \$84 million and they handled roughly 576 million bushels of grain that year. So the cost was roughly 14.5 cents per bushel for the elevators to handle the grain and put it on the trains and move it towards the export market.

In 1964-65, using that as a comparison, Mr. Speaker, the western grain producers delivered some 670 million bushels at a cost of approximately \$85-1/2 million, and the cost if you relate that to bushels was 12.7 cents per bushel. But the projected costs, Mr. Speaker, for the year 1975 for handling, which I say will be likely the highest in our history, is of some 670 or maybe close to 700 million bushels, the cost is well over the hundred million dollar factor, I believe it's going to arrive at 115 or 120 million dollars, somewhere in there. That rises the cost per bushel for handling that product to some 16.4 cents per bushel. So this year - that's '73 that I'm talking - this year where our handling will likely be 950 million bushels, the largest handling or the largest crop we've ever had in history, I don't know what the costs are because I haven't had the figures and I doubt if they're available. But because, as I say again, because most of that product, that primary product from their agricultural community is sold on the export market, Mr. Speaker, and must be competitive in the marketplace of the world, there is a limit as to how much of this the producer can subsidize or the taxpayers can subsidize if we're going to transport this grain to our ports.

The Canada Grains Council in their examination and their study of the problem of alternate transportation systems and alternate systems of handling our grain, they soon realized in their report, Mr. Speaker, that grain handling and transportation systems could be changed in many ways. There are I think 4,800 country elevators across Western Canada today and the concepts



## RESOLUTION 33

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . that have been designed to try and replace them are such, Mr. Speaker. There's the concept of 20 inland terminals being established across Western Canada to replace those 4,800 country elevators. That has received wide publicity; I'm sure most of the members are familiar with it. But if one uses the variables between the 4,800 country elevators that are out there today and the 20 inland terminals that still are not built, then we find that there's all kinds of possibilities that exist in between those two extreme systems. Some 13 studies went through to try and design a system that will work the best between the 4,800 country elevators and the 20 inland terminals. And of all the studies that I have read, Mr. Speaker, and all the studies that I have checked, it's evident that the small possible inland terminal structure or system would be the lowest and would provide the lowest cost of getting the grain from the farmer's field to the export market, and the cost, as I understand, with that type of a smaller inland terminal system is about 35 cents per bushel, which is 14 cents per bushel cheaper than building those big 20 inland terminals that they're talking about with the extreme at the terminal systems.

Trucking costs naturally are greater, Mr. Speaker, because with the large inland system the trucks would have to go farther. With only 20 terminals collecting all the grain for all across western Canada, it's quite evident that the trucking costs will rise considerably. Some figures have been projected, three to five to ten cents per bushel. But anyway the trucking costs in my estimation, Mr. Speaker, they've got to be reviewed with caution, because until we know what the road costs are going to be, and I hope that the Minister of Highways or the Minister of Industry and Commerce or the Prairie Economic Council or through the Peacock Plan, until we know what it's going to cost to build these roads to replace this transportation system, I don't think we can stand up and even offer or suggest a figure of what the alternative costs are to these producers if we go for a trucking system.

Also, Mr. Speaker, studies show that rail movement of grain of course has many advantages which we all know, and it's cheaper, it's far more efficient and it's done the job over the last hundred years of our history. But the railways, Mr. Speaker, regardless of all the studies and the talks and the meetings that have been held, are still determined that they're going to abandon many of the thousands of miles of this system next year. So I say, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon as I present this resolution to the House, that the day and the age and the time has come when the members of this Legislature have got to involve themselves; it's a very very serious matter, that we are seeing a transportation system that served us for a hundred years and it's served us well, a lot of it's going to be abandoned next year and what have we got as an alternative.

So I submit the resolution in good faith and hope that we as members of the Legislature can get involved in this thing before - everybody else outside the Chamber has worked on it, they've studied it, and I don't think we've done enough in this Chamber. So I submit the resolution in good faith and I hope the members will deal with it honestly and that the committee will be established so that we as the members of this Legislature can go around and join the Canada Grains Council, join the grain companies, join the primary producers, join the export companies and keep Canada where it always should be as the number one exporter of the primary products, the agricultural products of this great province.

. . . . continued on next page

## RESOLUTION NO. 33

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the resolution by the Honourable Member for Roblin I must indicate first of all we do not have any quarrel, in fact welcome this resolution --(Interjection)-- I will -- welcome this opportunity to have this matter brought in for debate in the House. One of the first things, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should do even though the Honourable Member for Roblin did give a fairly thorough background, I think there should be an indication of what the government and the Minister of Industry and Commerce has been doing with regards to the rail abandonment lines throughout the province. There has been more attention given to transportation during the past year than perhaps at any other time in our nation's history. Obviously the issues of branch lines and the rationalization of grain handling systems as they affect the rural way of life and the general economy have been placed high on the list of transportation priorities. Extensive resources have been expended on studying these problems, and I would like to summarize some of these for you, Mr. Speaker, and provide a certain amount of background.

As a lead-up to the 1967 National Transportation Act the Federal Ministry of Transport put together a plan of guaranteed railway network which is due to expire January 1st, 1975. Rail lines not protected were open to abandonment prior to that date. Approximately 18,000 miles of the prairie rail lines were protected, leaving some 1,850 miles of unprotected tracks. The latest reports indicate that the C.N. and the C.P. have filed 160 applications with the Canadian Transport Commission to abandon some 1,173 miles, of which 462 miles are in Manitoba. However to date, I'm happy to say that none of these applications have been processed.

The first reason for this, Mr. Speaker, was that the Federal Government realized that a reasonable basis of accounting was required in order to ensure that the costs being presented by the railways were accurate. The railway costing order was presented on August 5th, 1969, and was promptly appealed by C.P. Rail who were desirous of overstating their costs. The prairie provinces and the Branch Lines Association of Manitoba strongly opposed this appeal which was ultimately rejected by the Supreme Court in 1971. Thus the railways have been prohibited from grossly overstating their cost of branch line operations.

Mr. Speaker, the processing of the abandonment application was further delayed while everyone waited for the research reports on grain handling that were being carried out under the grains group set up by the Federal Government. However, when completed the Federal Government immediately passed these reports on to the Canada Grains Council for a thorough review by all interested parties. The Canada Grains Council reviewed these reports and used them as a base for further research into grain handling and transportation in Canada. Mr. Speaker, the review and a state of the industry study have been completed. Further studies on such topics as the most efficient system, high through-put country elevators, the demand for Canadian grain, the present capability of and future demand for the Pacific Coast grain facilities, the eastern elevator system and the Brandon area study are ongoing or nearing completion.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in 1973 any hope that railways had of seeing their abandonment application processed was quashed by the Prime Minister when he froze all branch lines to January 1st, 1975. Now that is less than a year away. The concerns of the prairie provinces, Mr. Speaker, relating to branch line abandonment were perhaps best documented in the position papers prepared for the Western Economic Opportunities Conference held in Calgary last summer, or last fall. The western premiers recommended that a federal-provincial committee be established to see that the required consultation takes place between the two levels of government before any changes are made in the system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm relating the position that the government has taken and what work has been carried on by the Minister of Industry and Commerce. The western position sought to insure that the criteria for any abandonment take into account costs which might be transferred to any person, organization or government and not just the savings that could accrue to the railways. Further, the programs must provide for compensation to individuals and local and provincial governments for any additional cost they will incur in providing alternative services. And I believe the Honourable Member for Roblin did take this into account; when he was speaking on the resolution he did bring this to the attention of members here. Well, Mr. Speaker, the government has been working and is concerned and is very happy to see that this resolution as I indicated earlier is brought before us for debate.

## RESOLUTION NO. 33

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd)

Finally, that any clearly essential rail line abandonment is only carried out on a planned and a phased timetable. The Western Economic Opportunities Conference did result in a federal-provincial committee on western transportation as recommended by the western premiers. This committee, Mr. Speaker, is actively considering a wide range of transportation matters including those relating to grain handling and transportation. The work carried out by this committee can be particularly effective as it reports directly to a senior committee comprised of the western ministers responsible for transportation and chaired by the Federal Minister of Transport. Mr. Speaker, the province has been very active on this issue because as stated earlier, as of January 1st, 1975, at least 462 miles of line in Manitoba will be eligible for abandonment, and there is wide concern for this. Twenty-six grain elevators with a capacity of some 1.8 million bushels are situated on these lines. Now there has not been any indication what would happen should the abandonment take place. Where would the grain be stored?

Furthermore, indications are that this potential abandonment could be quickly expanded to 1,045 miles of track affecting 95 towns, some 16,000 people, 184 elevators, 9,000 farmers and a potential loss of over 12 million bushels of storage capacity. Now this would be absolutely catastrophic if that policy should be allowed, if there is no particular contingencies and should this be proceeded with without some great hue and cry raised. I remember, Mr. Speaker, a few years ago when we were on an agricultural committee, we did go around to the various communities and there was views expressed by the people over the Federal paper or the book - what was it called? Members will remember there was reference about railway abandonment, the establishment of central elevators in the various districts. Well it seemsto me that there has not been too much progress in that field and I'm very happy to say thatthat is fortunate. In fact since the railways are claiming losses in Manitoba on 1,850 miles of trackage these figures could be further extended.

Now, Mr. Speaker, over the past year the province's transportation organization has been restructured with a view to having an effective control over our efforts to develop a more positive input and direction in formulating transport policy at the provincial level. Mr. Speaker, this committee known as the Manitoba Transportation Economics Council is a pool of transportation expertise from the various government departments and acts as a central organization in preparing the province's position on transportation matters relating to rail, road, air and water, and the Minister of Industry and Commerce --(Interjection)-- -- The monorail? I don't think that it comes in this particular case at this stage. A sub-committee called the Manitoba Transportation Advisory Committee has been struck and the Member for Roblin referred to it from a news release, the Government Information Services, that was just put out some time last month.

The Manitoba Advisory Committee has been struck and includes representatives from municipalities, management, labour, grain carriers and other groups concerned with transportation. This is a forum in which the views of those directly involved with transportation are sought in order that we may be assured we are in fact protecting and promoting the public interest. The new structure has resulted in a more positive control over branch line study because it's comprised from the various representative groups in our society who would be adversely affected should there be no organized way of approaching and the stopping of the rail line abandonment policies that had been adopted by the rail companies.

Mr. Speaker, potential branch line abandonments are not the only problem that faces us at the present time as The Crow's Nest Pass Act of 1897, the National Transportation Act and The Railway Act lacked strength in some very important areas. For example, Mr. Speaker, the railways are obliged to handle grain at statute rates but it is not mandatory for them to maintain adequate equipment inventories, nor are they being compelled to maintain branch lines in a reasonable state of repair. And this is what is happening. A lot of the branch lines are just being left untended; the ties are rotting and there's very little being done to keep them operational. This matter is of paramount concern as the railways are scrapping grain cars at the rate of some 1,800 per year and are refusing to invest in the replacement of this equipment because of their alleged losses. I know some companies have gone into the more profitable job of hauling potash from the Esterhazy area, therefore not providing adequate cars. I know there was some concern earlier this spring, problems of hauling adequate grain supplies to the

## RESOLUTION NO. 33

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) . . . . Lakehead, and because of an order by the Federal Government that finally sufficient cars were found to bring in grain in adequate quantities to assure that there would be continued shipment and meeting our obligations in the countries with which we trade. For the same reason they refuse to perform the necessary maintenance of branch lines, many of which are deteriorating into a state of disrepair. Extensive funds will be required to rebuild many of these lines, particularly if they are to handle the 260,000 pound covered hopper cars which are on the rails today. Therefore they will not be able to take them onto these branch lines because the track and the road is not built for that type of weight. Furthermore, there has been a serious slowdown in service over the past year attributed to car shortages, strikes and weather conditions. The cost to the producer from this lack of service could reach \$600 million as a result of lost grain sales. And I believe a few weeks ago there was that indication in the newspaper of the loss incurred by the Canadian western farmers as a result of inadequate service.

Mr. Speaker, the province has been actively involved in many areas relating to the branch line and grain handling problems. Aside from the various presentations made to the Federal Government and arguments presented relative to costing and rationalization, there has been extensive input in various organizations working directly on these problems. Mr. Speaker, as indicated, our transportation staff work very closely with the Branch Lines Association of Manitoba providing technical assistance and processing complaints relative to such matters as service and maintenance of branch lines.

Mr. Speaker, the government has also been involved in a Canada Grains Council study to ensure that producer and community interests are being considered and that some measure is made of the social implications of rail rationalization. Mr. Speaker, the government has gone on record as stating that should any of the grains council studies refuse to recognize the importance of measuring the social implications of rail abandonment or rationalization or the limitations on some of the cost data that has been presented, then the province will have no recourse but to withdraw from the study groups. Despite having had to take this stance, the government felt that it was important for the province to ensure the farmer and community interests were fully recognized in any and all of the studies being carried out. Mr. Speaker, the government recognizes that modifications must be made from time to time if the government is to have an efficient system, or if we are to have an efficient system to accommodate the flow of grain to export position and most important, a system which is instantly responsive to demands of a competitive world market. However, the principle of social justice must be applied to any change that is planned for the system. That is the people and the communities adversely affected by rationalization must receive full compensation for their loss.

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated to you, research on branch line abandonment and grain handling has been carried out, or is being carried out by the Federal Government through its grains group, the Canada Grains Council, the Federal-Provincial Committee on Western Transportation, the Departments of Agriculture of the Western Provinces, the Branch Lines Association of Manitoba, the Manitoba Transportation Economics Council and the Department of Industry and Commerce. In view of its intensive activity it is obvious that the work is being actively pursued and we believe that a special committee set up to study these matters would merely result in a duplication of effort. A legislative committee on railway abandonment would therefore be rather redundant.

Mr. Speaker, therefore I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Roblin, No. 33, be amended as follows: . . .

MR. MCKENZIE: Following the amendment could I ask the honourable member a question, Mr. Speaker? Before you amend it . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable Member can ask him afterwards as well.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: That the resolution be amended (a) by deleting the words "Manitoba Branch Lines Abandonment Association" where they appear in the first and second lines of the first paragraph thereof, and substituting the following: "The Branch Lines Association of Manitoba" - the correct name of the association concerned - and (b) by adding after the fourth paragraph of the resolution the following new paragraph:

"AND WHEREAS the Manitoba Government in conjunction with other western provinces

## RESOLUTION NO. 33

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) . . . . has publicly stated its concern with the maintenance of railway branch lines at the Western Economics Opportunities Conference in 1973; and (c) by deleting all the words after the word Legislature in the first line of the last paragraph and substituting the following: "Endorse the various efforts of the Manitoba Government in its opposition to indiscriminate railway branch line abandonment and commands that the Manitoba Government, who along with the other western provinces took the position at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference last year that (1) The criteria for any abandonment take into account costs which might be transferred to any group, any person, organization or government and not just the savings that could accrue to the railways. (2) The programs provide for compensation to individuals and local and provincial governments for any additional costs they will incur in providing alternative services. (3) Any clearly essential rail line abandonment is only carried out on a planned and phased timetable; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Manitoba Government continue to pursue this matter by means of the Federal-Provincial Ministerial Committee on Western Transportation."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable member a question?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: If I can answer it, yes.

MR. McKENZIE: Can the honourable member give me the names of the Manitoba Transportation Economic Council and can he also give me the names of the Manitoba Transportation Advisory Committee?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I'll take that question as notice. I'll inquire from the Minister of Industry and Commerce and we'll make that available.

MR. McKENZIE: I have one more further question for the honourable member, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I wonder will the honourable member also take under advisement and find out if these committees, one or the other or both of these committees can be called before some committee of this House, the Agricultural Committee preferably but any other committee. If we can question these two committees in the . . .

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Well I'll bring it to the House Leader's attention and see if that suggestion . . . . The committee could actually determine that . . . .

MOTION on the amendment presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take the opportunity to join the debate. The resolution that has been brought forward by the Member for Roblin I think deserves a different type of scrutiny than the Member for Radisson has suggested in his backslapping amendment where he praises the government for all they've done. In the past, the rail line abandonment question has always got down to be a political thing. It's not a technical problem and it's time I think that the Legislature through a special committee should take part in this type of a study and also should bring back a report to the government for an action that will help the people who are affected by the threat of rail line abandonment in our province.

The whole question is political, it's not a technical thing at all, and to suggest that there's no place for this problem to be examined by a Legislative Committee I don't think is right at all.

Back in 1970 I proposed a resolution that dealt with railways, although not with rail line abandonment, with the cutback of services when the CPR announced that they were going to close down 57 stations and take away the agents and the caretakers and so on. And at that time I proposed a resolution and the amendment was made by the then Minister responsible for transport - that was the Minister of Labour - and even with the amendment it still was a satisfactory resolution. The resolution recommended that the problem be examined by the Economic Development Committee. That resolution passed, Mr. Speaker, it passed and what did the government do? Absolutely nothing. They were instructed by way of resolution to study the problem at that time by the Economic Development Committee and we all know that that was the end of it; the government didn't call the Economic Committee to deal with the problem at all. But I still say that there is a place for a Legislative Committee to examine this problem and report to the Legislature so that the government can act with full political backing of all 57 members of the House, hopefully, when they deal with Ottawa.

So I don't see that the amendment that the Member for Radisson proposes is going to do

## RESOLUTION NO. 33

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . much, is going to do much at all. As a matter of fact the amendment itself is almost defeatist in attitude. It says in part three of the last paragraph: "Any clearly essential rail line abandonment is only carried out on a planned and phased timetable." Well that's what the railways want. That's what they want to do. And for us to tell them to go ahead and do it, that's unbelievable; it's unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. You know, this is just like cutting off one of the arms of government when they're trying to deal with this problem, and you're helping the railways with this amendment. Unbelievable. --(Interjection)-- Well I may sound like Otto Lang but that's the meaning I take out of the resolution. You're encouraging the railways to go right ahead, and for us to vote and pass that amendment is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION on the amendment put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 34.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I believe the understanding was that after this one we would call it today, or call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The hour of adjournment having been agreed upon, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 Monday afternoon.