

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, April 1, 1969

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're dealing with the amendment by the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and both the previous Minister of Health and the Minister of Health invited me to speak some more on this so I'll just have a few words. We've had a couple of hours and I won't prolong this anymore, but I want to make sure, I want the Minister of Health to assure me that the Corporation did not have any instructions, were not asked to look into anything, but they, on their own, recommended that the chiropractors and the optometrists be included at this time. This is right, isn't it? This is what I want to know, and then they didn't recommend any other group. These are the only two questions. If the Minister wants to answer this, I'll desist and we can have a vote on this. I want to have this quite clear.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I think I've said about all I can say. The various briefs that came in were shared with the Corporation and came through my office or directly to them, and in the latter part of January they recommended that serious consideration be given to these two areas. The government made the decision and take the responsibility for putting it in Section 49. They're also aware of the other briefs from our physiotherapists and occupational therapists and feel this can be dealt with very efficiently through the Hospital Commission. This is the limit of our extension at this time and I want to be perfectly clear on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to say a few words to this amendment that has been proposed. To begin with, I am going to vote against it, and I want to say that I'm doing this not to support the government because I think the government really hasn't done a job in bringing in a comprehensive medical care plan. It has brought in some but not everything.

Now I do not care for the controversy between the doctors and the chiropractors. I think that they will eventually, through public pressure and public opinion, come to terms. At the present time, I don't want to try and settle this through the Medicare Act. I think this is not the time nor the place for it. If we do have difficulties in regards to recognizing whether the chiropractic profession is operating properly or not, the time to do that is through the Act that pertains to the chiropractors, and this also applies to the medical profession and also to any other paramedical profession. If we want it to become more stringent in how they operate, that is the place to do it and not under the Medicare plan.

In respect to the question of priorities, as to which should come first, second or third, I may probably take issue with the government whether they put chiropractic services first or something else, but that, too, isn't too important. My main concern is that we get the medicare services as comprehensive as possible, and since the government has committed itself to some, I don't want to take them out just to indicate to them that I'm not happy with the priorities. I would have liked to have seen more in there, but since they have not seen fit to do so, I certainly won't deny myself those that are in there now.

In regard to the chiropractic profession itself, although I have had some experience in regard to treatment for what the chiropractic profession offers services for, I must say this, that as much can be said for them as against them and this holds true for the other professions as well. Some members may shake their heads, but this has been my experience, Mr. Chairman.

The other thing I would like to say, the reason I certainly do not support the amendment is because I think a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush, and if we've got the government on record that they are going to do something now, why take it out of the Act. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is the amendment by the Honourable Member for Elmwood. Do you wish that I read this or are you ready for the question? Well, I'll read it for the benefit of the members. That words "chiropractic or" and the words "or to both" be struck out in the second line of Section 49 (1) of The Medical Services Insurance Act as set out in Section 26 of Bill No. 33.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. DOERN: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

A COUNTED STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas, 6; Nays, 42.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the amendment lost.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I think that there's a rule, Rule No. 12 that says: "A member shall not vote upon any question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of any member so interested shall be disallowed." And I suggest that this is a case where a certain vote should be disallowed.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): . . . remainder of the Bill.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . motion on some of the things he said, maybe we should have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Chairman, I rise on what I believe to be a point of privilege, although I'm not certain as to whether points of privilege extend to happenings beyond this House, so I'll throw myself on your mercy. Something has developed in connection with Medicare and I have been so grossly misrepresented in tonight's Tribune that I would like to set the record straight, with your permission.

I received a few days ago a letter from Brandon from M. V. Naidu, President of the Citizens' Committee for Medicare in Brandon, and he writes me: "Dear Mr. Lissaman: Enclosed you will find a copy of my letter to the Honourable Walter Weir and also a copy of the resolution of the Citizens' Committee for Medicare, Brandon, passed on March 21, 1969. The contents are self-explanatory. We hope you will do your best to fulfill your responsibility as a member of the Legislature that passed the Medicare Act, and to carry out your duties as a representative of the people at large and not just a small group of vested interests who, by voting for you, have placed in your hands their confidence and their hope for a better life."

My reply of the day after receipt of that letter went as follows: "Dear Mr. Naidu: I would like to assure you that all members of the Conservative caucus are doing their utmost to come to a sound sensible solution to the medicare problem. We have found the situation to be most perplexing and a very conscientious attempt to arrive at the best conclusion for Manitoba has been made. As a duly elected representative of the people of Brandon constituency, I find the second paragraph of your letter insulting. I have expressed the opinion publicly to a Brandon audience in the past that under our system of responsible government a representative is elected to use his God-given intelligence in the making of decisions. The approval or disapproval of his decisions and actions may be at a later date signified by the electors at the polls. I have no intention of becoming a pawn under the dictates of any group, whether it be a vested interest or a citizens' committee. Yours truly." Signed by myself.

Tonight I pick up the Tribune and I read this report. Now the first part of it is relevant, but lest I be accused of quoting out of context I will, with your permission, read the entire article. "Brandon" -- Tonight's Tribune. "The Citizens' Committee for Medicare has decided to seek public support for getting medicare benefits for the people of Brandon, all doctors in this city having announced their intention to opt out of the scheme that goes into effect April 1st. At a meeting early this week, the committee members decided to extend an invitation to local doctors for a public or private dialogue on the issue of medicare. They decided to encourage public support through newspaper, radio and television advertising. When it was pointed out the committee had no finances, one person present said, 'Here's the first dollar of the campaign.' Others followed suit and the committee president, Dr. M. V. Naidu, said later, \$30.00 was collected. The members decided to seek public donations." And this is the reference to myself. "Brandon MLA Reg. Lissaman said in a letter read at the meeting that either the government amend the legislation so the doctors provide benefits of the plan to all Manitobans, or else the government should bring the doctors (working in the plan) to Brandon." And then it goes on with some unrelated information.

Now the letters I have read to you are the only correspondence I have had with Dr. Naidu. I don't know whether this is completely sloppy, terrible reporting or whether someone has purported to have read a letter to me expressing the sentiments in this article, but I must disavow it completely. I'm going to try and find out where the mistake lies and take the proper actions. But I wanted to set the record straight for this House, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 26 -- passed; Section 27 -- passed; Preamble -- passed; Title -- The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I was going to let this thing just slide right through the way it's going, but I too have been reading the newspaper over the dinner hour, and reading

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . the Free Press I run across the following paragraph, which is in a front page article, saying that there's no need really for the Bill to pass last night, it could be delayed, no harm done. And then there is the statement made, and I quote: "On the other hand, the Minister," -- and I might say the Minister referred to is the Minister of Health -- "On the other hand, the Minister said it would have been appropriate if the Bill had received Royal Assent before Manitoba's official entry into Medicare, and accused opposition members of reopening a 'can of worms' in an effort to embarrass the government with a series of proposed amendments and argumentative questions."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I admit to you that I became somewhat disturbed by this quotation, and I'll sit down without any further comment if the Minister is prepared to stand up and deny the contents of this paragraph to the effect that he accused the opposition of reopening a "can of worms" in an effort to embarrass the government with a series of proposed amendments and argumentative questions. If he is prepared to either deny this statement or withdraw it, I won't say any more; if he isn't, I wish to make further comments.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I must say, as I was leaving the House last night rather tired, in the hall there were four reporters waiting. The exact terminology -- I don't recall stating it that way. I want to be perfectly honest in my dealings in the House. I think I merely pointed out that the opposition had taken the opportunity to debate the several matters, pre-miums, and what have you, and I'm not in any way being critical of the opposition. If I said that, it might have been said in a facetious tone. If I said those words -- I just don't recall it -- but if I did say anything that indicated anything in that nature, I certainly apologize to the committee.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I vote we pass the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Title -- passed; Bill to be reported . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, before we -- as usual, I'm trying to assist the government here. Is there any need to make this retroactive, that clause, to cover yesterday; and if so, maybe we should do it now.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that so long as the Bill receives third reading and Royal Assent this evening, the Royal Assent will be taken as occurring on the first minute of the 1st of April which will be 12:01 this morning, and all problems are looked after. If my honourable friend can give me an undertaking that we will be able to have Royal Assent tonight we'll have no problems. I'm travelling hopefully at this stage.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I intend to put forward a motion that the Bill be not reported, and I would like to make a few comments before I do so.

I have stated before in this House that as far as I'm concerned not a single person in my constituency has asked me to support this plan; neither have they called for legislation of this type, that it be passed in this House. On the contrary, many have indicated to me that they are not in favour of such a plan and that they're opposed to it. Then also, one of the local papers reported that out of some 600 bills that were sent out, only 160 had been paid. This was quite a concern to the municipalities, and from what I gather of the way these matters will be dealt with, part of the burden will be looked after by the government, but a share will fall on the municipalities to bear. This could prove to be quite a burden for some of our centres in Manitoba if the people will not participate as the government most likely believes they will.

To me, it seems that the big carrot was the main factor why this government brought in that legislation. It was the big federal grants that prompted them to go into this plan, and this is identical to what they did in the school program here in Manitoba where they also placed the carrot and inducement grants for people to accept certain proposals. Now they've fallen for the same thing and also accepted the federal program in passing this legislation in order to qualify under the federal legislation. Mr. Chairman, I think we should be passing legislation on principle and not on expediency, not just because there are big carrots dangling that we should pass legislation, bring in legislation just because of that.

Then one other matter I object to very strenuously is this matter of assignments. I've discussed this before, and when the legislation was first presented to the House, when mention was made that the doctors opting-out will not have the right of assignment, I understood it at that time to be that the doctors would not have the right to accept assignments - those that were opting-out. But now I find in the regulations that it is reversed, in that the people of this province are prohibited from making assignments to doctors that are opting-out. We're

April 1, 1969

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . placing the onus now on the people of this province instead of on the doctors that are opting-out. I feel this is wrong in principle. The people of this province find out every time they use the services of a doctor, whether he belongs to the plan or not, and then act accordingly. I think the onus should have been placed on the other group and not on the people, because now we're denying the people the right to make assignments. -- (Interjection)-- Am I not right? You can speak on this after.

Our people were quite happy with the MMS, with the voluntary program that has been in effect for many years. A large group were subscribing to it; this was shown by the financial statement that was brought in on MMS, where they received some 28.6 or 28.7 million in subscriptions from the people in Manitoba. We had a voluntary plan that gave a number of provisions and you had a choice as to what type of coverage you wanted. I think people were quite happy with it. Why do we have to impose a measure on the people now with the plan that is compulsory?

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, these are my reasons for objecting to a plan of this type, that is being made compulsory; that the people have to subscribe, and if they will not have the means that they will run into trouble. They're the ones that will have to fork up the additional money every month and pay the premiums, and the way things are going now, they're actually going from bad to worse. Many small farmers have a very rough and tough time to be able to make ends meet, and now we will be required to make a monthly payment under this plan. Mr. Chairman, if we're going to impose this plan, the government then has an obligation, if these people are up against it and can't meet these bills, that they then should also offer assistance and not leave them saddled with the burden and the obligations. So, Mr. Chairman, I move that the Bill be not reported.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a motion by the Honourable Member for Rhineland that the Bill be not reported.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 33 and wish to report the same with amendments.

#### IN SESSION

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Normally, we would vote against this motion that the report be accepted, but it is certainly not our intention to slow this Medicare Bill. We have had quite a discussion; a good debate; not, I don't think, that we reopened a can of worms. I think that we've had this Bill -- a chance to discuss it after listening to the people in Committee only since yesterday afternoon, so I think this is not exaggerating. But we have talked about assignment, we have talked about premiums and so on, and this is not the reason why I say that normally we would oppose this, but we would oppose this because the government of Manitoba has committed a fraud against the people of Manitoba. They have committed a fraud because they would not give us the information and they are using the premiums under this plan, not only to pay for a new service but to try and make more money for the Consolidated Fund, and this is after the Minister of Finance has said to the people of Manitoba that the taxes will not be increased.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to belabour the point any longer, but I think it should be said at this time that we will go along and we will try to make this Bill -- every single member of our Party and I'm sure every single member of the House -- will try to make this plan work, will do their best now, but we will keep on protesting. I don't say that we will never bring in any amendments, especially in regards to the premium, but we are protesting as strongly as we can the fraud committed on the people of Manitoba here during the session on this Bill, when the premiums are used to bring money to the Consolidated Fund.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I think that today, being the day on which this program of medical health services to the people of Manitoba has commenced, is an important day in the lives of Manitobans and in the life of this Legislature. Ours is the only Party that accepted

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . the four principles laid down by the federal government in this legislation as it came from the recommendations of the Hall Commission, and we accepted them as being essential for the provision of proper health services to all Canadians. That is why we accepted the universality of it, the importance of portability, and all factors which made it possible to make this available to all people.

It is a plan, as I say, which we endorsed -- and I'm correct in saying that ours is the only Party that accepted the four conditions that have been laid down that said they were right. The other parties disagreed with them, the other parties have taken the position they were forced into it, and be that as it may, we're all in it. And in recognizing that we have made a great stride forward, and in agreeing to vote now in favour of the Bill which is just a further implementation bill, we of course indicate that this Bill and the act of this government is not the plan which we would have brought in, in the sense that we feel that there is not sufficient financing based on the principle of ability-to-pay and that the flat premiums are wrong.

Of course what we discovered in committee just a short period of time ago, like yesterday, to the effect that the government is actually making a profit on the operation to the extent of at least of 3.9 million, converting monies raised on a flat tax rate -- the most regressive form -- into pouring close to four million, or maybe more dollars, into the general revenue of the province is absolutely wrong and one that we didn't know until we got the information out from strenuous questioning. The fact that assignments are being considered at all for opting-out doctors is wrong, but in spite of that we have a Bill which still makes possible a great improvement in the provision of health services to the people of Manitoba, brought in over the will and against the will of the Conservative Party and of the Liberal Party.

In spite of that, as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface said, we have it; we have to make it work. I only hope that in the effort to make it work that the government will not bow easily to all the pressures to which it has been and will be subject, and will maintain the position which it has taken today -- and I assume that the proposed regulations are being passed as of today prohibiting assignment, and I think it's important that it should be recorded if that is the case -- and I hope the government will not bow to pressure and will not make it possible to harm the plan, or even destroy the plan, by any further giving in to pressures that may yet come, and will certainly come, no doubt about it. In any event, we are happy for the people of Manitoba that at long last today we have started on this project, and I hope that we continue to provide even better service to the people of Manitoba in this field.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would in fact permit me to add something to the debate that has went on for several days. Being a country MLA, I think somebody has to stand up in the Legislature and justify that this city, where we sit here tonight, is the number one medical centre in North America. We have the medical philosophy, the experts, as we sit here tonight. So we're moving from a new world which was created basically by the doctors, and people like you and I who are legislators, and all the technology of the university, and we have in those years over the free enterprise system created a medical centre which I say is above reproach in North America. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I met a lady in the St. Regis some two weeks ago -- (Interjection) -- I'm glad to see you supporting me on this one Jake -- whose husband is under surgery in this city. She was not able to find medical technology or surgery in the United States but she found it in Winnipeg -- a brain surgery of some form or other -- but nevertheless her husband today is cured. So when we move from the free enterprise system and now we're in a socialized scheme, I would like, as a country MLA, to stand up and thank the medical profession for what they have done for Manitoba.

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

MR. JOHNSON: I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Transportation, that, by leave, Bill No. 33, An Act to amend The Manitoba Medical Services Insurance Act, be now read a third time and passed.

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

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm opt-in.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Youth and Education. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I suppose I should start from the beginning again but I don't believe in being repetitious, so I'm not going to repeat. The Minister of Finance said that I was through with congratulations, therefore I'll dispense with that from now on.

It is fairly difficult to go ahead and criticize education, because criticizing education or how it is being done is almost tantamount to criticizing motherhood. I am not going to say that this government hasn't accomplished anything in the ten years plus since it has been in power. I would say that the government has accomplished something, but to make comparisons -- like most of the ministers like and this present Minister is not excluded -- make comparisons with years back I don't think that it is a very fair way of making comparisons, because it is not only the Province of Manitoba that has made progress as far as education is concerned, it applies to every province in Canada and it also applies practically to every country in the world. There have been tremendous strides made in education, and likewise Manitoba made some progress, but not as great progress as most of us would like to see in this fair province of ours. In fact, I would say that Manitoba even now just seems to be following in the wake of other provinces. I don't think that Manitoba is the first in almost any of its efforts as far as education is concerned.

Now I am not criticizing, as I said before, the departmental staff. There is only one criticism that I could make as far as the different departments in education are concerned. I am not criticizing the present staff whatsoever because I realize that they are very conscientious people, but as we all know, most of the staff, higher staff in the Department of Education and all the way through its various departments, is composed of ex-teachers -- not that I have anything against ex-teachers because I am one myself, and I am sure that it is necessary to have them because they know quite a bit and probably know more about education than anybody else -- but I would like to see a few more people in the department heads, people from different businesses, different professions and so on, more of the grass-roots. I would like to have a few of those, more people -- there are a few, I would have to say one or two only -- and this would make for a better understanding of not only the feeling of one side but the feeling of the people as a whole in the Province of Manitoba.

We all know that the Minister of Education has a distinct honor of being responsible for a department which is the greatest spender, say about 40 percent of the total government expenditure from 1969 is being spent through his department -- \$150 million -- you could say that's an awful lot of dough and the dough is still rising. I wonder if the government is ready to make a loaf -- to bake the loaf, or permitting the cost to rise. I do not think that the cost of education the last ten years, or the progress that we made in education in relation to the cost has been justified. I still think that the costs are rising too rapidly, something similar to this unbridled bronco who is running around the fields, and there seems to be no control. I cannot blame our civil servants for this because it is the government which makes the policy and the civil service has to carry out the policy that the government tries to formulate. In many instances the government didn't have a very definite policy as far as education is concerned, and this has been said previously. Some of you may say, well what's the use of rehashing old hash or whatever it is. It has been said before but I think it bears well to repeat it, that the government was too much in a hurry immediately after its election to try and prove itself, especially in education, and through this an awful lot of money has been wasted.

I don't think that even now the government really has a definite policy where it is going, and when I say this I am not including the City of Winnipeg or the larger areas. These places were large before; these places were showing the way in Manitoba. In fact, I think that the Department of Education relied on them for different research and so on. They were big, and I will probably say that as far as education in the large city is concerned, large cities and bigger centers, it seems to work well, not because of the effort of this government but by virtue of the fact that the ability was there and the numbers were there. But the problem in the rural areas is completely different. I would say about the only problem that both have in common is the cost, the high cost of education.

I referred to the mistake that this government had made ten years ago, and you know

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) . . . . what the mistake was. -- (Interjection) -- One of the former ministers doesn't know. If he doesn't know, I am going to repeat it and tell him what the mistake was. This government was too much in a hurry to formulate this plan. --(Interjection)-- No, you didn't catch up; you made a mess and it's still a mess in the rural areas. It is a mess, not in all the rural areas, but in most of the rural areas it is still a mess, creating boundaries with different divisions, starting out with division schools then going into unitary, then going into composite schools one after another, and if you asked the people, they don't know where the government is going and I don't think the government knows what they are doing themselves. The boundaries in the first place were not formed properly and that's where our trouble arises now. I am not the one who is saying that alone, you ask the Chairman of the Boundaries Commission and he will agree with me, because he did when I spoke to him personally. He says that's where all the trouble arose, because the government did not take enough time to form those boundaries. They just gave a deadline and we had to meet it, and these boundaries or the different divisions were not formed properly and that's where our trouble stems from at the present time.

Even now, not so long ago, last fall, I was to a meeting of the Boundaries Commission at St. Pierre, and what were we told there? That my own division -- the boundary division -- they said you haven't got enough students for one single high school. So why was it formed that way in the first place? We didn't lose that many students. It was poor policy originally and the people of that area have to suffer now.

Now conditions in most of the rural areas where there are no large centers, as I said before, are deplorable; in some cases they are almost criminal. You may ask the question, why? Well I answered some of them before. What are our boundaries going to be? Do we know? No. We have got the Boundaries Commission now in operation, or working or taking people's money, money from the people of Manitoba for four years, and what have they accomplished? They have got one report now, the Interlake report. They changed some boundaries there considerably. I will not go into that because I am sure somebody else will take it up later. What will our boundaries be? We do not know. Where will our schools be? We do not know. What kind of schools will be okayed by the government? The people do not know. Will they be high schools, special schools, vocational schools, composite schools? We do not know. At a recent meeting, again in St. Pierre, the question was asked: What would a composite school, say in this area, cost in the area around St. Pierre, Steinbach all through there? The answer was we have no idea whatsoever; we do not know what the cost is. For four years, as I said, the Boundaries Commission under the chairmanship of Mr. Smellie has been wasting the tax money, good tax money provided by these people, and they haven't accomplished too much to date and people are getting quite impatient. They are paying high taxes and the government has created in some areas, not in all, as I say, this mess.

We know that for ten years the present government has been promising two things, two promises in education. (1) We will shift the burden of taxation from the property owner onto a larger base. Has the government accomplished that in ten years - shifted - every year we hear that, but no matter where you go, go to any property owner who pays tax and he will disagree with the government because the government hasn't kept that promise. We know how well the government has succeeded, because even now the government is still promising to do what they had promised some ten years ago. As I said before, instead of the property tax depreciating or going down, it has sky-rocketed like the space ship until it is almost unbearable at the present time.

The second promise that was made to the people of Manitoba was to give their children equal opportunity for education. Has the government accomplished this? -- (Interjection) -- The government has accomplished this. I would like you to prove that to me. As I said before, in the city these children have a good opportunity and an equal opportunity by virtue of their bigness, but to provide equal opportunity in most of the rural areas the conditions have to be created to make this possible. What kind of conditions? The most important one I would say is transportation. Sure, you will tell me, you've got transportation, you've got thousands of buses driving back and forth through the country. Yes, it is quite true that there are very expensive buses driving back and forth through the country. We know that the residents in all areas - and I'm not against the principle of unitary divisions, I'm just telling you what conditions there should have been to give equal opportunity. The residents in unitary divisions accepted the principle of this system because they thought that it is better than what they had

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) . . . . at the present time, but the conditions and transportation, as I said before, are just criminal. In many areas children are being carried, as I said before speaking on Highways, on very dangerously rough and dusty roads and some for great distances, over 50 miles on these dangerous roads. Do you expect the people to take this long, to bear this? No. Can you honestly tell me that a child who has to get up 6.30 in the morning and meet a feeder bus - as in many areas they have - board the bus about a quarter to eight and then board another bus on bumpy roads to reach the school at 9.00 o'clock has the same opportunity as a child who lives in the close vicinity of the school? No, he hasn't got the same opportunity, and I think that it was up to this government, or the two departments should get together and wherever there is transportation necessary, the Department of Transportation should see to it that proper roads are built and that they are maintained properly. Now that's one condition - good transportation to give equal opportunity.

What about facilities? And at this time, I just learned today that a new school has been approved, a new high school has been approved at Vita, and I wish to thank the Minister for that. I wish to thank the Minister for that, but I will say this is long past due, it should have been done years ago - at least a year ago. We all know that when high school divisions were instituted the existing high schools were abandoned and new ones were started, as I said before, all over the country; they kept growing like mushrooms. A lot of them are now outdated, a lot of them probably sold, some probably not used or maybe transferred to elementary schools, a lot of money has been wasted, millions of dollars, and maybe probably now the government hasn't got enough money to provide facilities where these facilities are necessary. We heard last week the Honourable Member for Assiniboia complain to this government about the necessity in his own riding of staggering classes. Why? Lack of facilities. So that's not providing equal opportunity.

I can describe to you conditions in one division that I know of, and just for the purpose of identification I'll call it unitary division "x". Smaller high schools, elementary schools were all discontinued. They were closed, and now the school population is centered in two ends, the east end and at the west end, into two different points. To accommodate students in these two places, 25 huts had to be either moved in or built to accommodate the students, and that has been now I think the practice for almost three years, studying in these huts. And don't blame the board for it, because they have asked for a school to be built.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education) (St. Vital): Vita too?

MR. TANCHAK: It could be Vita, it could be Emerson.

MR. CRAIK: Where the million dollar school is going up?

MR. TANCHAK: It could be in Vita, it could be in Emerson; it's unitary division "x". And there are many such - it's not the only one. Some have more than 25 huts. We can't blame the board, the board had to accommodate these pupils, these students, so naturally the huts were built. Now the conditions in division "x" up to now are just deplorable. Washroom and toilet facilities are inadequate. Children after travelling long distances to school, say one to one and a half hours, would have to come to this school and stand in line to use the toilet facilities. Is that equal opportunity? That's why I say it is just about criminal and that's a true fact - inadequate facilities there. You can repeat this condition about 20 times in Manitoba. I am sure there are many others like that, and you will get the picture involving some - what is it - 53,000 pupils that have to be transported daily. Not all the conditions are the same, but in very many you have the same conditions. Maybe I shouldn't be that rough because really and truly I believe in the unitary divisions and I always did believe in it, in the principle, but I always believed that before you go ahead with this you have to lay the proper foundation to make this work harmoniously, and it doesn't seem to work in many divisions. And I blame the government for this because the government, although they pretend that they are doing things very fast, they are very very slow.



(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) . . . . Now I would like to touch on a few other things. As far as curricula is concerned, I still hear the same complaints that the curricula, the textbooks and so on are being changed so rapidly that new courses are announced and the teachers haven't even got the textbooks to go with them in time when the school starts. I would say that our curriculum should be made flexible enough to fit different regional circumstances, for the time being anyway, until this government catches up with what they have promised the people ten years ago.

Now let's go to permit teachers. I believe the Minister did say something about permit teachers, and ten years ago the present government promised to do away with permit teachers, belaboured the former government because the former government did not provide enough qualified teachers to staff all the schools. Now what is the situation at the present time? On Page 84 in the report, the government report, what have we got? In 1964-65 we had 291 permit teachers; 1965-66, 337 permit teachers - going up; 1966-67, 351 permit teachers; and last year, 1967-68, 465 permit teachers. And there is some special authority -- I understand these teachers are actually - they have some training but probably not fully qualified - they have special authority. I will not go into it but the permit teachers, they are still increasing. Why, when this government promised that we will have enough qualified teachers. I think after ten years the government should have been able to do something about it.

Another complaint that I hear, mostly from the school trustees, they feel that this . . . . salary schedule as supplied by the government is completely outdated. It should be looked into and probably updated.

Another suggestion that I may make at this time is that when a new school is being proposed, naturally the government requires that an architect be hired to make the plans - and I have nothing against that - but these architects are very expensive. Why not say have an architect make a plan for a high school and why not make most of these high schools uniform throughout the rural areas. I know it will not apply in very large centres, but the rural areas, why not make it a standard or uniform plan for Manitoba schools, and I am sure that a lot of money could be saved.

I notice - and I don't know whether I should even go into this at the present time - but I notice, and I am very happy about it, that the teaching of languages has gained some momentum, especially under the former Premier. This Premier seems to have a different attitude towards certain languages. I will agree that we live on an English-speaking continent and that everyone of us, every child in Manitoba and Canada should try to master as far as possible the English language in all our schools, but I strongly believe also that any student should have the option at any time to study another language, a language of his choice, and that option at the present time does remain - there is an option. I know when I went to school, and I wanted to go to university at that time, I was told you must have another language, you must have either French or Latin, so I chose French and Latin - I chose two. At least one language was compulsory, but at the present time there is no compulsion to take any language at all.

Members will remember that on several occasions in past years I introduced resolutions in this House requesting that the Ukrainian language in Manitoba be recognized and be expanded, and as a result of that I know that this language was accepted. It was accepted in the high school, later on it was Grade 7 and 8 and at the university level. I am happy about that, and I hope that some time in the future the Ukrainian language will be permitted in lower grades, Grade 6, Grade 5, because I strongly believe that to master any language a child must start early.

Members will also remember that I supported resolutions requesting the extension of French language teaching. I had nothing against it. I supported the resolution, and on one occasion I even had the honour of seconding the motion that the French language be extended to a lower grade. I had nothing against it. I believe that in order to master the language you must, as I said before, start at an early age. I am not advocating that the learning of any of these languages, be it German, be it Russian, Ukrainian or French, be made compulsory, but that it be made permissive. I think that any man that can master two languages is two men, and if he can master three languages, you are at least three. You remember what Professor Kirkconnell said? "If you can master ten languages you are ten men in one." There is no harm in learning another language, not at all, and I think our country should be big enough to recognize the fact that a multi-cultural society could exist here in Canada, not under compulsion. Any politician who directly, or indirectly by innuendo, misrepresents any effort to bring harmony

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) . . . . about is, in my estimation, I think he is guilty of bigotry, because there is room for all languages here as long as they are not being compulsory. You must know the English, but there is room for others. It is nice to know more than one language. It doesn't hurt anyone; it also develops the brain. You say that many subjects in our school are being taught just to develop the brain. Well most of these languages will be useful. If I learn Spanish I could go to South America or go to Spain and I could use it, and there are many other practical uses for it.

I don't know if the remark - I wasn't there - but the Minister of Education at the University of Manitoba spoke of compulsory language requirements. It was in Winnipeg here when referring to the language bill, and I am not going to say that the language bill is perfect - and I am not promoting it, it is a Federal issue and they are promoting the language bill - but at least I think it is the duty of the leaders of political parties, and especially the leader of the government here, to explain this language bill, what it means. If it is compulsory, in the opinion of the Minister it is compulsory, in the opinion of the Premier it is compulsory, tell the people so. I do not believe that it is; I think it is just permissive. I don't see any compulsion about it. I don't think the Premier should say that, or the First Minister or the Minister of Education should. I believe that the Premier in Ottawa here strongly indicated his bias on the provision of accommodating certain languages. He indicated that bias. Now this time it might have been one language biased towards one, what about tomorrow? Maybe tomorrow it will be the German language, the day after tomorrow it may be the Ukrainian, then it might be some other language. I do not see why we couldn't accommodate other languages as long as they are not compulsory.

Talking about universities, I regret that the Minister told us that it may be necessary for the university to raise the tuition fees next year. I know that many university students cannot afford even the present fees and it's regrettable that the Minister thinks it may be necessary to increase tuition next year. I hope that the Minister is wrong this time; I hope that some other means will be found to finance the university students. We know that recently Canada, as well as other nations, had its share of unrest at the college and so on. Fortunately, Manitoba, relatively speaking, was well behaved and I would like to compliment the students, the university students in the University of Winnipeg - United, and all over Manitoba for their good behaviour. True, they had some demands, but relatively speaking, as I said, they were pretty well behaved. I believe that our students should be free enough to express themselves and to propose changes in values and so on, but lately we have heard in other countries, as well as in some of our cities that some uncompromising campus militants seem more interested in disorganizing college administration than just trying to revise conditions in curriculum, conditions existing in the school. In many instances some foreign - and I believe that - some foreign rabble-rousers, who probably were not even students at these universities, participate in these uprisings. It probably is advantageous to some countries to have these unrests in our fair Canada, different ideology, and who would like to foment some discontent among our university students, knowing full well that later on these are the people who are going to be running the affairs of Canada. I think it should be the aim of the university administration to preserve our academic freedom, but I don't think we should permit the destruction of the function of the university.

There is a bit of confusion right now in Grade 12 promotions - Grade 12 promotions. The Minister did make reference to that and I hope that he refers to it once more and explains it better, because to me it seems that there is still some board exams, some school exams, and there are some school standings that have to be considered. I think you should formulate a policy so that the students will know exactly where they stand and know exactly what to expect.

Visual aid pictures. The teachers are still complaining that certain films are not procurable at the proper time. They will ask for a certain film - whatever you call those, there is another name to it - but they will ask for this and the reply will be it's not available at the present time. And the teacher will say, well when will it be available? They can't even get that. A lot of teachers complain to me that they can't even get the date on which that film will be available. They say it is almost impossible for them to tell - it's too much work to look into that. So maybe the Minister should look into that.

Quite a few complaints I have had, and probably I can bring them when we come to the point in the estimates on bursaries. Some even tell me that there is a little bit of political pork barrelling as far as bursaries are concerned, and I hope it is not true. I hope it isn't true,

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) .... but some have been telling me that there is some political pork barrelling. In fact .....

MR. CRAIK: Explain.

MR. TANCHAK: Explain? I shouldn't be using names, but certain people came up to me and told me that you just come up to me - and that happened to be during an election - and I'll see that you get a bursary.

MR. EVANS: I think the honourable member should put up or shut up.

MR. TANCHAK: Well I am putting up and I told you that I'll be ....

MR. EVANS: Go ahead.

MR. TANCHAK: I'll go into it when we come into bursaries.

MR. EVANS: Until you are ready to back your things, don't make hints of that kind.

MR. TANCHAK: I said it was brought to my attention.

MR. EVANS: Well, who brought it to your attention and what did they say?

MR. TANCHAK: We will come up to that when we come to bursaries. I made that statement before.

MR. EVANS: If my honourable friend specializes in sly insinuations, then I think he shouldn't do it.

MR. TANCHAK: I don't think it's any insinuation, and if the Minister wants to make a speech I will sit down and the Minister can make his speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to remind the honourable member he has been speaking for 35 minutes now - five minutes more.

MR. TANCHAK: I'm just about finished. I just made this remark about the bursaries that some people brought it to my attention that there is political pork barrelling.

MR. EVANS: Who said what?

MR. TANCHAK: I don't have to come up with it at the present time, because I made my statement that I'll do it at the proper time later on.

MR. EVANS: Well then don't do it now. -- (Interjection) -- Tell him to behave like a ....

MR. TANCHAK: Maybe it's not correct and I hope it isn't correct, and I said that I don't believe that it is correct but it has been brought to my attention.

MR. EVANS: Well you have now made the statement that it's not correct.

MR. TANCHAK: I do not say it's not. I believe - I hope it's not correct.

MR. EVANS: Well don't say it if you don't know it.

MR. TANCHAK: He likes to hear himself. There is only one more item that I wanted at this time to touch on, and that is a subject that is sometimes very difficult to touch on, and that is the merit rating of teachers. I'm not going to say that the teachers, because I don't know how to do it, and I remember the Minister before us, the Minister of Education, at that time years back said the same thing: who is going to merit rate them? Is it going to be the inspectors or the school boards or the parents? It's pretty difficult. But we know that in all professions, it doesn't matter what it is, and in all businesses, there are people who are not fit to do justice to what they are doing, and practically all of these professions or all the different departments, they have some kind of a system of weeding out people who are not fit for the job, and I think that some system of merit rating teachers should be implemented. I know it has been tried in one or two areas and I would like to know whether the department has made any progress on that.

With this, Mr. President, I think that's about all that I have to say. Later on in estimates I'll have more questions to ask.

..... continued on next page

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating the new Minister of Education on the position he's accepted and wish him luck in the succeeding year or years. One thing I'm optimistic about at the beginning is that he might give us somewhat more pointed answers than his predecessor who often took some time to answer and I sometimes had great difficulty in getting to the pith and substance of the answers, so I hope that we might expect crisper replies from the new Minister. I would also like to extend congratulations to the members of the civil service who work in the Department of Education for the excellent work that they do.

Mr. Speaker, there are many questions and issues to deal with in the Department of Education, but one that I would like to begin with is something that we are already getting warning of and that is that the Minister has kind of indicated that there is going to be, or he expects an increase in tuition fees at the University of Manitoba. In fact, in his opening comments on the department he pointed out that tuition fees average about 16 to 17 percent of the university's operating budget and he said, and I quote: "that it now appears possible that despite a very great increase in provincial grants for next year, the universities will wish to seek additional revenues by an increase in tuition fees." If they do, their actions should surprise no-one and of course we have seen in the succeeding weeks and months indications that the three universities, Manitoba, Winnipeg and Brandon, would undoubtedly be increasing their university fees. In fact, Dr. Lockhart, the President of the University of Winnipeg, indicated that based on past experiences it would be likely that the fees would increase from \$75.00 to \$100.00 per year. So that, given the fact that we've had general warnings and given the fact that the Minister seems to expect this increase, I think that we too can expect an increase. I would like to deal with this question because I think that it falls under a rather more significant heading, namely the question of equality of opportunity, which is best attained in our present day social system through education, and I think this is in a sense the heart of the matter.

The government is spending in the forthcoming year something like \$43 million on university through the Universities Grants Commission and I think there's an opportunity that if the government could see fit to spend an additional million or two that we could achieve in fact an equality of opportunity, so that students who are now presently finding it either impossible or difficult to go to university, could. If you look at the statistics that would bolster the case, one sees some very interesting points. For example, something like 45 percent of the income of university students comes from gifts or loans from their families. Now that's a figure which I'll deal with in greater detail later on, but this means in general on the average that a typical university student receives about \$500.00 or more from his parents to go to university. Now, of course, those who are from lower income groups tend to get very little, if anything; those who come from higher income groups tend to get more; and the result is that by raising tuition fees there's an undue hardship created on the students from lower income families. Also, when you consider that for those students who come from rural Manitoba that they have to pay additional costs, in particular room and board, and transportation costs and so on, it makes it almost impossible for the son or daughter of a small farmer to attend university, and the result is that people who come from rural areas tend to be from the better off classes because their expenditures are probably about 50 percent higher than the students who are from the urban areas and the Metro Winnipeg area.

When you look at the number of students who drop out of university every year or who have their education interrupted, something like 15 percent of all university students drop out. When you consider that out of a couple of hundred thousand students in the Canadian university system that's some 15,000 to 20,000 students have their education interrupted largely because, I would maintain, of economic reasons, then we can see how serious this is indeed. For example, students who come from real low income families, when you look at 100 percent of the students who drop out or who interrupt their university careers, 30 percent of them come from families with an income level of less than \$3,000, which is pretty low, but obviously this has a great bearing on it. Another 32 percent come from those with families from \$3,000 to \$5,000 and another 15 percent from those from \$5,000 to \$6,000, so if you look at — this is the general picture — students who come from families with incomes less than \$6,000 a year, 78 percent of those students who drop out come from this type of economic bracket.

Now another thing that perhaps is not known when you're considering raising tuition fees, and I want to relate this also to the question of student aid when I run through this section, the

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . cost of fees and books and equipment is only one-third of the total costs that students have. In other words, some people may feel that tuition fees is the major part of a student's expenditure. It's really only a third of his total cost, two-thirds being additional. Also, students from lower income groups have to, in general, seek part-time employment during the university year and this of course, if you look at some of the statistics here, 29 percent of all students work for pay during the academic session, and that nearly a quarter of those students work 15 hours a week or more at their job. This, of course, would mean that there'd be naturally less time to study, less time to relax and so on.

Summer earnings are becoming a very serious crisis for the university student. Every year we hear more talk about the fact that they are unable to find employment. For example, it was estimated that out of all those applications in the past year for employment through Canada Manpower, only about 25 percent of them will be filled, and according to one survey 71 percent of the students worked for at least one month during the summer. That means that 29 percent of them are unemployed and of course some of them would only work for one month. And when you look at some of the monthly earnings that students have, I think the rates are rather shocking. It seems to work out to about \$250.00 a month. Figures range from female students in Arts averaging \$160.00 a month to students in Medicine and Law and Engineering earning \$250.00, \$260.00 or \$270.00 a month, so these are not very significant amounts of money and when you're trying to save from them it certainly presents some difficulty. We know, the Minister emphasized this in his speech, that there are loans available through the Canada Student Loan Plan, but the problem here is that students are borrowing \$1,000 a year in some cases and graduating with \$4,000 to \$5,000 in debt, which is not a very cheery thought.

I think one of the most telling statistics of all is the fact that when you look at the western provinces and you compare the amount of money, the amount of grants and scholarships and bursaries available, Manitoba probably has the poorest record of all. The average student in 1969 in terms of receiving government aid, averages something like \$69.00 in the province of Manitoba. You compare this to B. C. with \$93.00 per student, Alberta with \$167.00 per student and Ontario \$395.00, you can see that we are certainly dragging very far behind.

If the Minister is suggesting that fees should be at about 17 percent of the operating costs of the university, I must take issue with him. To tie the student fee structure to a percentage of the operating costs of the university, I think is not the way to look at it, because if we're going to use a set figure given the rising costs of the university in the next five or six years, we're going to have university fees of \$650.00 to \$850.00 and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this kind of money is simply going to make it almost impossible for the average student to continue his education. So I do not agree with the Minister if he suggested that student fees should make up an approximate percentage of operating costs. I think that what we want to look for in this province is that the university fees should be either held at a certain figure; if not eliminated, at least kept to a specific figure, and the amount of bursaries and loans should be geared up.

Now the Minister has said that the fees of the students at the University of Manitoba are extremely low, and if you look at the universities in western Canada, it is true that our universities are the lowest in terms of the average basic tuition fee, but the problem is that we're only a few dollars behind the other universities. If we increase our tuition fees by \$75.00 to \$100.00 on the average, then we will go from the lowest to the highest. We're now only \$10.00 behind some universities, \$25.00 behind the leading universities, Victoria and Simon Fraser, so if we jump \$75.00 to \$100.00, we're going to go from last place in terms of the lowest tuition fees in western Canada to the highest, which is a very dubious distinction.

Just a final point in this particular area. Again, I was mentioning some of the figures of aid for university students. The people who come from the lower income bracket in some cases are getting a few hundred dollars from their parents, but when you get into the so-called higher income brackets from \$7,000 to \$10,000 a year, parents are giving their children an average of \$630.00, and when you get to \$10,000 and over they're getting an average supplement non-repayable of some \$900.00.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think to sum up this point, the Minister of Education could probably, by increasing the grant to the universities by another million or so, could probably hold the tuition line. On the other hand, he should at least, if he's going to increase tuition fees — first of all I think he should hold the line on tuition fees, and secondly I think he should increase the amount of student aid available. The least he can do, the very least, if he's going to allow an increase in tuition fees by not providing enough funds to the universities in Manitoba, the least

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . he can do is to significantly increase the amount of student aid. Now, he has told us that he is increasing student aid from a million dollars to \$1, 200, 000. At the same time, he tells us in his remarks that the student population at the university is rising on an average by about ten percent. And then there are the costs of inflation. So when you really boil it down, we're not really increasing the amount of student aid very significantly. What we're doing is we're sort of keeping pace. We have so many students and so much aid, when the number of students go up we increase the aid a little; we're really standing still. I think that if the Minister himself believes - and I'd certainly like to hear his views on this - if he believes in equality of opportunity and if he believes in allowing the students from lower families to go to university and get an education, then I'd like to see him come up with some more money, because for a very small amount of money - I'm now talking one to two million dollars which may sound like a great deal of money - but for one to two million dollars you could practically buy equality of opportunity in education in this province, and given what you can buy through bursaries and greatly increased aid programs, grants and bursaries of a few hundred dollars apiece to a few thousand students, I think it's a small price to pay.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with an issue which came up a year ago and then came up again last fall, and this is this question of these trade schools which are operating in the province of Manitoba, and in particular the bankruptcy of the Business Machines Institute which we had about a year ago, and then more recently in the month of November the bankruptcy of the VIP Computer School. We all remember about a year ago that the Business Machines Institute went under, went bankrupt. There were several hundred students who had gone through their doors and there were dozens of students who were enrolled and they were caught in the squeeze, because the organization went under and these people were left in the middle of their training program, and at that time the Minister of Education, the former Minister, revised the Trade School Act which had not been looked at for some 25 years, and gave assurances to this House that we were going to tighten up our restrictions; we were going to increase the amount of, sort of deposit or whatever it's called, that these people would have to put up, and we would carefully watch the growth of any new schools in this area. Well, no sooner did one school go under and no sooner did we pass some new amendments and no sooner did the Minister give us assurances that this would not happen again, when we had a new school come on the scene within weeks of the former bankruptcy. Advertisements went into the paper, and I recall at the time getting some information from these people and forwarding it to the Minister.

The organization that immediately came in looked pretty shaky to me, as an observer, but the government looked into the situation, granted them a license and they went into business, and within a few months they went under. - (Interjection) -- Well, the second one was the VIP Computer Training Center, and they had a few hundred students and promises that people who took computer courses, like programmers, could earn up to \$10, 000 annually and analysts could earn over \$12, 000 a year. I don't know how on earth anybody who took these courses from these schools could expect to earn that kind of money - maybe ten years later, after taking further training from some organization. These are schools that offered, in general, six-week courses in computer programming for so many hundred dollars and then held out promises of \$10, 000 a year jobs. The result is that when the school went bankrupt that there were students who were left in the midst of their key punch courses and their computer training courses and so on. And then what about the students who graduated? Some 150 students graduated through this school and of what value is their degree? How would their degree be regarded by the business community in view of what had just gone on? Well, of course, no sooner had this happened when the new Minister gave us more assurances that future operators of commercial and trade schools would have to post higher bonds and explain their financial solidity. Well this is the exact guarantee we had from his predecessor.

Mr. Chairman, at that time I wrote to the Minister and asked him to look into this bankruptcy and asked him whether he would examine this whole question. He wrote back to me and said that they had made a very detailed and careful study of the promoters and that they had used outside agencies in assessing their financial capabilities and their reliability and so on, and that they couldn't find grounds to deny an application. It seems to me that the onus shouldn't be on whether or not they should deny an application but whether or not the case could be made to give them some grounds for accepting their license, rather than just a negative feature whether or not they should deny.

The Minister also said that there were some 35 trainees who completed the key punch

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . course and he was not aware of any graduate who had not found employment, and then he just mentioned that there was a smaller number of graduates from the computer programmers course, but I just wonder what happened to these people; whether they did get jobs or whether the department attempted to find jobs for them, or whether the department attempted to offer them some assistance to complete their course.

Mr. Chairman, I think the whole question on these trade schools - and we've had two very unfortunate experiences in one year in this province, which to me is enough - the question I have to the Minister is this: These courses are very brief and I would like to know why people are taking these courses. For example, are they taking these courses through private schools because they are not offered at provincially-run institutions like MIT? Or like our high schools? Because if this is the case, I would like to know why they are not being offered. If this kind of short course is valid, if the Minister feels that he can sanction a short course in computer training for a private trade school, then I would like to know why we don't offer it in our public school system - if he feels that that brief training program is valid. If he feels that that brief training program is not valid, then I think that the Minister should not allow these courses to be run in our province. It's as simple as that. I think it should be one or the other. Because there is obviously a demand for these courses which the public school system isn't meeting and the Minister is allowing a short course, and I would like to know why this is so. I would also like to know whether the Minister has any general comments as to why these institutions failed, and whether or not he can give us any guarantees in the future that we are going to get even more stringent requirements to prevent what's already gone on.

Well I have more comments to make but I think, Mr. Chairman, that I'll maybe hear from the Minister if he is going to speak at this time.

MR. CRAIK: Well Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether anybody else wishes to direct more questions here, but if not, I would like to comment on some of the items that have been brought up here this evening.

First of all, if I can go back to the Honourable Member for Emerson and go over some of the items which he has mentioned here, it's pretty obvious, first of all, that he's done a very good job of contradicting himself a good way through most of his comments that he has made. First of all he is scolding us for probably not spending enough to keep up to the mark where he feels maybe we should be, and how we shouldn't compare what we are spending this year with what we spent last year. I don't know just what yardsticks he would suggest that we try and use. He then suggests that the amounts we are spending again are too high. Then he goes on to make a case for presumably the very bad conditions in his own area, and by the way just happened to mention that one of the newest school projects we have on the go happens to be right in the middle of the area which he's discussing.

Well, I think, first of all, there's a pretty serious charge in amongst many of them that he has made and I think it's one that he should justify. As you know, when you are giving out bursaries you can't give them out to everybody that applies for them and it's the easiest below-the-belt tactic in the world to suggest that somebody got them because of a special favour. I mean, what else is new? This is as old as the game, and if bursary support is increased, which incidentally I tend to favour myself, to increase the support of bursaries, to a point where we are doubly sure that nobody is being hindered from their basic education because of a lack of financial support, we can suspect and predict that the cases where charges of this sort will be made will be even greater, so I'd suggest that he keep his ear tuned real sharp and he'll hear, along with the member for Hamiota who has this sort of an ear as well, of probably a great many other cases where somebody did not receive a bursary and felt that there was a degree of favoritism being used.

But, on the positive side, I would like to suggest that if cases do come up where somebody brings about a complaint that appears to be quite legitimate, that this information be passed on to the officials of the department or to myself and we can have it looked into, because we don't want this sort of thing happening if in fact there has been an oversight of some sort.

The Member for Emerson has also made the point about the problem with the buses. I think I would like him to tell me specifically the case which he was talking about where the person was travelling the distance of 50 miles, up at 6:30 in the morning - he implied that this was an elementary school child as well. I think that I would like to have him document this and tell me exactly the specific case so that I might look into it. If in fact it is just an inference, then it's a different matter. Ten years ago we had 5,000 children riding on buses, today

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) . . . . we have 50,000. This is a drastic change. There is also much more progress to the graded system.

He has made the comment about the problem with permit teachers. I might point out that the statistics he took from the annual report are a year old. The total in January 1, 1968 was 465; 240 of these only, though, were elementary teachers, the others were secondary, 225 holding university degrees and some training, so you have to separate these into their categories. This year, the number is reduced by 99. So 191 in elementary on permit; 175, almost an equal number, in secondary, which again hold university degrees, and most of these hold some sort of formal educational training; for a total of 366 out of a total number of teachers in the province of 11,066. So the percentage, then, by those figures is about 3 percent, plus 3 point something percent of the total on permit, and one and a half of those three are people that hold university degrees. So you're talking about one and a half percent of your teachers that may be on permit, and I defy anyone to say specifically that the permit alone is the yardstick by which you can measure teachers. On the average you're right, but not in every single solitary case, so I would say we are down to the point of diminishing returns on this and we may never reach the point of zero. This, of course, is the discretion of your school boards to some extent. If they discover a good teacher, regardless of his educational qualifications, then there is no reason why discretion should not be used in that particular case.

He suggests that in school construction that the architect's fees are burdensome and that we should go to one standard plan. I think that you have to look at this in its entirety. I think you will find that fees for design and total school costs, that is, when you consider operating as well as capital, run you less than half of one percent of your annual budget. I think that you in turn have to consider how much, in fact, of this you would save by going to one central design. If you are talking about a quarter of one percent or something less than that, then you have to make the value judgment as to whether a stereotype design is in fact worth the price you pay or is worth the money you save. I think that there's good argument that flexibility in the design is important. I would point out here, though, the important factor that the designs of the schools are reviewed when they are submitted to the Building Projects Committee, and alterations and recommendations for alterations are made by the Building Projects Committee, and it's very seldom that a school design goes through without some improvement being made on it in the light of the experience that has been accumulated by the Building Projects Committee. There is no question that we do get some designs which have been referred to as white elephants. This is a subject of opinion. Nevertheless, time will tell whether, in fact, the designs are such,

I think perhaps the rest of his comments were aimed -- he did mention the Grade 12 exams. As I pointed out in the introductory address to the estimates, the exams in Grades 10 and 11 have been -- department exams -- are no longer required, and in June of 1969 the only exams that will be administered by the Department of Education, the departmental exams, are those in the University Entrance Course. This is a move that allows more flexibility in the schools. Whether or not we go away from the exams in Grade 12 is doubtful. We have had requests from a number of bodies to make this move, to do away with Grade 12 exams as well. Personally, at this point, I doubt very much whether this is to be recommended. We do need a screen at some point in the system and I wouldn't be in a position to recommend it at the present time, but we have made this progressive move, I think, and also saved a great deal of money by doing away with the exams in the lower grades, and this is to the satisfaction so far of all concerned, the school boards, the teachers, apparently the parents and certainly ourselves, so it's been a good move all the way around.

This of course is possible because we have an educational system now that is better equipped to do this sort of thing. Under the unitary system we are developing local administration which is taking over more responsibility, and we're making real good progress in developing this responsibility and in the department being able to get its hands out of many of the former areas of responsibility that rightfully lie with the division boards themselves.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.



IN SESSION

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.  
DEPUTY-SERGEANT AT ARMS: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly at its present session passed a Bill, No. 33, An Act to amend The Manitoba Medical Services Insurance Act, which in the name of the Assembly I present to Your Honour and to which Bill I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

MR. CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to this Bill.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

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